August 2017

Lux Occidentale: The Eastern Mission of the Pontifical Commission for Russia, Origins to 1933

Michael Anthony Guzik
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

LUX OCCIDENTALE: THE EASTERN MISSION OF THE PONTIFICAL COMMISSION FOR RUSSIA, ORIGINS TO 1933

by

Michael A. Guzik

A Dissertation Submitted in

Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in History

at

The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

August 2017

ABSTRACT

LUX OCCIDENTALE: THE EASTERN MISSION OF THE PONTIFICAL COMMISSION FOR RUSSIA, ORIGINS TO 1933

by

Michael A. Guzik

The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, 2017
Under the Supervision of Professor Neal Pease

Although it was first a sub-commission within the Congregation for the Eastern Churches (CEO), the Pontifical Commission for Russia (PCpR) emerged as an independent commission under the presidency of the noted Vatican Russian expert, Michel d'Herbigny, S.J. in 1925, and remained so until 1933 when it was re-integrated into CEO. The PCpR was given authority over the spiritual and material mission to Soviet Russia, including refugees who had fled the Bolshevik Revolution. While most studies concerning the Catholic Church and Russia are religious or political histories which focus, respectively, on martyrdom or the contest between the so-called free world and Communism, this dissertation is instead a social history which employs religious anthropological categories.

The dissertation argues that soft-Orientalist dynamics were at play in the PCpR through the structures which it managed and engaged– especially the Russian Catholic Church of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite, and through its mission of evangelization as it managed forms of worship, taught Catholic belief– especially as formulated by Vladimir Soloviev, and enforced codes of behavior– especially concerning clerical celibacy and marriage. The sense of the

barbarity of the Bolshevism, which at one point was compared to Islam, justified for the members of the PCpR their sense of superiority over the Russian people.

Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank my director, Neal Pease, for his kind guidance, constant encouragement, and insightful criticism with respect to this dissertation and during course work. I would also like to thank the members of my committee from UWM, Winson Chu, Christine Evans, and Carolyn Eichner for the same, and I would like to thank Piotr Wrobel from the University of Toronto for serving as my outside reader. I owe much to my committee. While their thoughts and suggestions have made my academic work all the better, all errors, weaknesses, and omissions in this dissertation are my own.

I would also like to thank Dr. Johann Ickx and the staff of the archives of the AA.EE.SS in Vatican City which house the documents that were essential for my work, without whose kind help and professional service I could not have written this dissertation. I would also like to thank the staff of the ASV and Dr. Giancarlo Rigotti, the archivist for the Congregation of the Eastern Churches, for their patient help and professionalism. Additionally, I would like to thank Anita Cathey & Barbara Lettermann of the History Department of UWM, and Alfredo del Risco, S.J. & Renato Martinez of the *Canisianum* in Rome, whose administrative expertise and personal care helped immensely.

To M.B.B. Biskupski I say "*Dziękuję serdecznie*," trusting that he understands the depth of those two words. I would also like to thank John O'Malley, S.J., Donald Bain, James Skedros, Helju Aulik Bennett, James Pula, +Anthony Kuzniewski, S.J., +James Hennessey, S.J., Eugene Beirne, David Ehlers, Gary Parese, and Carl DeLorenzo, whose historical expertise both inspired and guided. I also would like to thank Czesław Prokopczyk, Joseph Lienhard, S.J., Joseph

Koterski, S.J., John Conley, S.J., Margaret Guider, O.F.M., Joan L. Roccasalvo, C.S.J., Gerald R. Blaszczak, S.J., and +John Long, S.J., whose expertise in other academic areas helped me grow as a scholar. I want to thank Joseph Mueller, S.J. and "Wally" Stohrer, S.J., for valuable advice at the beginning of my course work.

I would like to thank Frederick Dotolo, Dennis Recio, S.J., Joanna Rogalska, Donald Fisher, Michael Kane, Keith Weaver, Stephen Molvarec, S.J., and +Lt. Col. Gregory M. Ehrmann, USMC (Ret.), who indulged me in needed conversation, and managed always to remain positive and encouraging.

I would like to thank my Jesuit brothers from my home provincial office, the *Canisianum* in Rome, and my local community at Marquette University– some of whom have moved on to the St. Camillus Community– for their support. I want to thank especially Michael Boughton and James Miracky, who were responsible for me during this time of special studies. Their attentiveness and service went well beyond the duty which our provincials required of them.

Lastly, I would like to thank my family, especially my father Anthony, mother Judith, grandmother Ellen, brother David, and my sister-in-law Heidi, whose enduring love, encouragement, and support has been constant and beyond measure. To you I am grateful beyond words.

Chapter 1
Soft-Orientalism and the Writing of Catholic-Russian History

The history of the Catholic Church and Russia has been, rightly so, a story of conflict. The Catholic Church has been a foreign element with respect to Russia, ranging from the faith of benign foreigners– nonetheless an other– to the faith of competitors and enemies. The schism between the Catholic and Orthodox Churches[1] themselves, each of which regarded themselves as the True Rome, intensified this conflict, and was further complicated when the monk Filofei of Pskov wrote Grand Prince Vasilij III of Moscow in 1510, "'...two Romes have fallen, but the third stands, and there will never be a fourth.'"[2] While in the same letter Filofei assured his new political ruler that he [Vasilij] was the most beloved of God, the defender of the true and

---

[1]It is important to note that this dissertation will follow the convention used by Catholic and Orthodox theologians in regard to distinguishing "Orthodox" from "orthodox, "Catholic" from "catholic", and "Tradition" from "tradition." "Tradition" (with a capital "T") in both churches signifies that which has been handed down from ancient times and is considered to be essential to matters of faith and morals, and therefore cannot be altered or abandoned. Many equate the concept of Tradition with the "Rule of Faith" articulated by Irenaeus. Contrarily, "tradition" (with a minuscule "t") signifies that which has been handed down, perhaps even from ancient times, but is not considered to be essential to matters of faith and morals. Correlatively, Orthodox (with a capital "O") connotes a member of one of the Byzantine, Syriac, or Chalcedonian Rite Churches, and orthodox (with a minuscule "o") connotes a Christian who believes what is in the Tradition, without alteration. Catholic (with a capital "C") connotes a Roman Catholic or a Christian who is a member of a church in communion with Rome, while catholic (with a minuscule "c") connotes a Christian who is not "sectarian" or "heretical," but who is regarded (usually by his/her own magisterium), as a member of the one, true church of Christ. In depth analysis of these issues is presented by Francis A. Sullivan, S.J., *The Church We Believe In: One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic* (New York: Paulist Press, 1988). The term "Christian" will be used contextually, and connote a person or community which accepts the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed of 381, popularly known simply as the Nicene Creed. Thus, depending upon the historical era, it might be used to indicate all Christians, or it might be used to indicate Protestants or any non-Catholic.

[2]Wil van den Bercken, *Holy Russia and Christian Europe: East and West in the Religious Ideology of Russia*, trans. John Bowden (London: SCM Press, 1998), p. 146.

uncorrupted faith, and the only monarch destined in justice to rule over all Christians, the Holy Roman and Byzantine Emperors had also believed this for centuries. Even the Roman Pontiffs would make similar claims to universal sovereignty within both the temporal and spiritual spheres since the Middle Ages.[3] In short, within all three Romes, a legal relationship existed between their respective political and religious authorities and the people they governed. This prompted Professor Wil van den Bercken to note, "Rome is everywhere."[4] Yet, these three Romes are not the same.

In spite of political and religious similarities, these "Romes" have become symbols of difference. Rome is "western"; Constantinople (now Istanbul) and Moscow are "eastern." Rome is the seat of the Pope and of Catholicism. Constantinople (Istanbul) is the seat of the Orthodox Ecumenical Patriarch, the new "first among equals," and of Pan-Orthodoxy. Moscow is the seat of the Russian Patriarch and of Russian Orthodoxy. The differentiation between the three Romes implies not only separate– and separated– existence, but also self-sufficient[5] symbolic meanings. Part of that meaning is constructed by descriptive words used to differentiate western from eastern. The words themselves matter.

---

[3]Note for example, *Unam Sanctum* by Boniface VIII, promulgated on 18 Nov 1302, which many church historians have understood to contain one of the most extreme claims to papal political and religious authority; *cf.* Papal Encyclicals Online, *Unam Sanctam*, last modified March 18 2014. http://www.papalencyclicals.net/Bon08/B8unam.htm.

[4]van den Bercken, p. 149.

[5]According to Christian ecumenists, self-sufficiency is a technical term which describes the attitudes of churches, whereby each thought that it had the fullness of truth and the most likely– if not the sole– means for salvation. A useful but general account of the ecumenical movement is given by Thomas E. Fitzgerald, *The Ecumenical Movement: An Introductory History* (Westport, CT: Praeger Conn, 2004).

In *Trent and All That: Renaming Catholicism in the Early Modern Era*, John O'Malley argued that names are not merely labels of differentiation; they suggest a deeper meaning. In other words, names are symbols which introduce historically contextualized significance, through which, that which is named is interpreted and understood. O'Malley then goes on to analyze the historiography of what he calls "Early Modern Catholicism," in which the "Reformation" and "Counter-Reformation" are the chief characteristics. He argues that while some names have disappeared from historical discourse due to a variety of factors, others have endured. These terms have either achieved a certain neutrality over time or have remained politically-charged.[6]

The problem of politically-charged names and terminology is certainly present when analyzing the historical forces which the three Romes symbolize, when they converge or clash in what Timothy Snyder has labeled the "Bloodlands."[7] For example, while terms such as "Uniate" and "Eastern Rite" have fallen out of usage, their replacement with "Greek Catholic Church " and "Ukrainian Catholic Church " does not lessen the political and religious tensions surrounding the existence of Byzantine Rite Catholic Churches in Ukraine, caught somewhere between Polish Roman Catholicism, Russian Orthodoxy, and Ukrainian Orthodoxy. The name "Russian Catholic" appears contradictory as an east-west amalgam, and "Byzantine-Slavonic Rite" is unavoidably a politically charged term because of the attitudes of Polish nationalists, Soviet officials, and Russian Orthodox bishops and priests.

Ethnic, national, and religious tensions have existed in these "Bloodlands" for centuries,

---

[6]John W. O'Malley, *Trent and All That: Renaming Catholicism in the Early Modern Era* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000), pp. 1-3, 125-26.

[7]Timothy Snyder, *Bloodlands: Europe Between Hitler and Stalin* (New York: Basic Books, 2010).

but have reached a certain apex in the twentieth century. Before the average person was motivated to do violence to his or her neighbor, s/he had to believe that the view of the Other was wrong and even dangerous in comparison with the his or her personally held truth. Thus, it is important whether one calls the major city in what is now western Ukraine Львів (L'viv, Ukrainian), Lwów (Polish), Львоў (L'vou, Belarussian), Львов (L'vov, Russian), Lemberik (Yiddish), Lemberg (German), Lvovas (Lithuanian), or Leopolis (Latin). Different names help create difference and separation in the same locale. Neighbors might have lived in the same geographical location but in different worlds, each in a sense governed by a different Rome.

Thus, the choice of names in this dissertation must be a conscious one, with the intention of not being co-opted by the attitudes of the people, movements, and ideas being examined. This will be determined within context. The choice of one name rather than another is not meant to reinforce any particular agenda or ideology that is being analyzed. Within quotes, the names chosen by the historical actor will be preserved. Such consciousness is necessary, given the dichotomies and divisions which are a part of universal, not just Eastern European, history.

While Jenő Szűcs and Julianna Parti noted that the origins of the division of Europe into Eastern and Western areas emerged in the twelfth century as a consequence to the Schism of 1054,[8] Piotr Wandycz further noted that this division became politically significant due to the

[8]Jenő Szűcs and Julianna Parti, "The Three Historical Regions of Europe," *Historica Academiae Scientarium Hungaricae* 29, no. 2/4 (1983): 132-133.

contest in Russia between Westernizers and Slavophiles.[9] However, Oscar Halecki,[10] Piotr Wandycz,[11] and Larry Wolff[12] asserted that the earliest and first meaningful division within European history was not an east-west, but a north-south divide, which emphasized the cultural and political primacy of the Roman Empire– especially the Western Roman Empire– and its inheritors.

Deno John Geanakopolos, followed this basic logic in *Byzantine East and Latin West*.[13] While accepting the primacy of the basic north-south divide before the Renaissance, he critiqued the east-west divide, challenging the assumption of western primacy by shifting the locus of high culture and civilization away from Rome to Constantinople. He argued that what made the Latin west truly great was its Byzantine influence, in contrast to what western scholars erroneously argued, based on false claims such as a simplistic Caesero-papism and the false assumptions such as the theological supremacy of Roman Catholicism.[14] Because Geanakopolos argues that

---

[9]Piotr S. Wandyz, *The Price of Freedom: A History of East Central Europe from the Middle Ages to the Present* (New York: Routledge, 1992), p. 2.

[10]Oscar Halecki, *The Limits and Divisions of European History* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1962), p. 35.

[11]Wandyz, *The Price of Freedom*, p. 2.

[12]Larry Wolff, *Inventing Eastern Europe: The Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1994), p. 4.

[13]Deno John Geanakopolos, *Byzantine East and Latin West: Two Worlds of Christendom in the Middle Ages and Renaissance* (New York: Harper and Row, 1966).

[14]Philip Sherrard draws attention to these deficiencies in *Greek East and Latin West: A Study in the Christian Tradition* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1959). Less sophisticated and more polemical is John S. Romanides, *Franks, Romans, Feudalism, and Doctrine: An Interplay Between Theology and Society,* Patriarch Athenagoras Memorial Lectures (Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1982).

western greatness is built upon a Byzantine foundation, his act of refutation inadvertently reinforces the assumption of western primacy or supremacy.

With the advent of history as an academic discipline in the late nineteenth century, it often worked congruently with the nationalist project into the twentieth century.[15] While Marxists rejected the nationalist project in favor of class-based histories, they too were swept up in nineteenth century academic and political movements.[16] Both nationalist and Marxist historians often employed what Ireneusz Karolewski and Andrzej Suczycki have called the genealogical model of national development to explain the rise of nation states.[17]

Generally speaking, the narrative strategy of nationalist historians often essentialized the nation by anthropomorphizing it: a nation incubates in pre-history, is born into history, survives its trials of growth, and finally reaches maturity when various ethnic groups are folded into the nation which speaks one language, lives on one territory governed by one state, and is able to defend itself against neighboring states. Although the realization of this teleological aim is portrayed by nationalist historians as matter of romantic drama; its failure or impediment is portrayed as tragedy.[18]

---

[15]Dennis Deletant and Harry Hanak, eds., *Historians as Nation-Builders: Central and South-East Europe* (London: Macmillan Press, 1988), pp. 9-14.

[16]John Barker, "Marx," chap. in *The Superhistorians: Makers of our Past* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1982).

[17]Ireneusz Paweł Karolewski and Andrzej Marcin Suczycki, *The Nation and Nationalism in Europe: An Introduction* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011). These authors name for models utilized to explain the source and development of national identity: functional, rationalist, genealogical and constructivist. However, historians generally use only the latter two.

[18]Hayden White, *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth Century Europe* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973).

Conversely, Marx thought the achievement, even to a degree, of the nationalist teleological aim was erroneous and doomed to failure. He noted, "'Hegel remarks somewhere that all facts and personages of great importance in world history occur, as it were, twice. He forgot to add: the first time as tragedy, the second as farce.'"[19]

Generally speaking, the narrative strategy of Marxist historians essentialized class structures and narrated a cycle of oppression and liberation within the framework of dialectical materialism: human society moved from primitive communism into the experience of oppression as nation states were born, developed, and reached maturity, the penultimate stage of development. Marxist histories promised full communism in the final stage– its *telos*– when humanity would mature such that governments and classes would wither away, and people would produce according to ability and consume only according to need. This is not unlike the Christian narrative, in which humanity began in the Garden of Eden, sinned, and is on the way to the *parousia*, both a natural and supernatural *telos* for Christians.

For both the nationalist and Marxist historians, teleology was an important aspect of the historical narrative.[20] History was going somewhere, and it was evident to these historians that not everyone was at the same place in the historical time line. Western European nations and peoples were regarded to be more advanced, Eastern European nations were regarded to be less

---

[19]Karl Marx, "The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte," in *The Communist Manifesto and Other Writings*, intro. and notes by Martin Puchner (New York: Barnes and Noble Classics, 2005), p.63.

[20]Both the Catholic magisterium and Orthodox primates and bishops understood history to have a teleology, but not one rooted in the temporal order. Their understanding of history could best be explained by Augustine, *The City of God: Against the Pagans*, ed. and trans. R.W. Dyson (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

advanced, while colonized peoples– especially in Africa and Asia– were regarded to be least advanced. Ernst Breisach summarized this presumption through a quote from G.W.F. Hegel: "the East knew and to the present day knows that only One is free; the Greek and Roman worlds knew that some are free; the German world knows that all are free."[21] In contrast, scholars are still pre-occupied with the unfreedom of Russia.[22]

Edward Said has argued that this style of thought reached a certain maturation through the experience of, and reflection upon, European imperialist expansion, which by the end of the First World War, had claimed 85% of the Earth.[23] Europe was at the forefront of human progress; all others lagged behind, but especially the Orient which Europe had colonized. He asserted that the idea of the Orient was the product not only of European travelers, explores, and colonizers, but also of European academics– especially historians and anthropologists. As such, Orientalism was not so much discovered as constructed to reinforce European (primarily but not exclusively French and British) cultural and political superiority, which cast the "Oriental" as the less civilized, exotic Other. For the Europeans, this included a moral mandate, to "take up the white man's burden.... to serve [their] captive's need... [their] new caught, sullen peoples, half devil and half child."[24]

---

[21]Ernst Breisach, *Historiography: Ancient, Medieval, and Modern* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1983), p. 232.

[22]Daniel Rancour-Laferriere, *The Slave Soul of Russia: Moral Masochism and the Cult of Suffering* (New York: New York University Press, 1995).

[23]Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (1978; repr., New York: Vintage Books, 1994), p. 127.

[24]Rudyard Kipling, "White Man's Burden," in *The Complete Verse*, foreword M. M. Kaye (London: Kyle Cathie Ltd., 2002), p. 257.

Larry Wolff correlatively argued that western European notions of their cultural and political superiority also existed with respect to the generally Slavic areas of Europe, which were also deemed to be Eastern. Because the Slavs and the non-western minorities who lived in Eastern Europe were understood to be less barbaric than Arabs and Africans, Wolff described this Western European view of the Slavic world as having undergone a demi-Orientalization, the overall attitude of which could be termed soft-Orientalism. He argued that while the "Near East," "Middle East," and Africa are always Other in European histories, Eastern Europe is "a paradox of simultaneous inclusion and exclusion, Europe but not Europe."[25] Given the shifting nature of the European-ness of Eastern Europe, where the region begins is also shifting. Identifying which "western" countries exist on the border of Eastern Europe–and therefore civilization– becomes noteworthy as an academic exercise and a political act of inclusion-exclusion. Indeed, Francis Dvornik remarked, "It is unfortunate that in reviewing the historical evolution of Europe it is customary to speak of traditions distinctly Eastern and Western: the distinction marks a tragedy. The distinction is conventionally accepted as something necessary, as something that has always operated in the history of Europe, as an unaccounted-for imponderable."[26]

Even historians writing before the linguistic turn[27] noted a certain arbitrary character in

---

[25]Wolff, *Inventing Eastern Europe*, p. 7.

[26]Francis Dvornik, "Western and Eastern Traditions of Central Europe," *The Review of Politics* 9, no. 4 (October 1947): 463-4.

[27]This is understood not to be a single shift, but a series of shifts in methodological thought by historians whereby they began to apply principles of linguistic philosophy to history; *cf*. Judith Surkis, "When Was the Linguistic Turn? A Genealogy." *The American Historical Review* 117, no. 3 (June 2012): 700-22.

dividing east from west, and that "dichotomic divisions into West-East, as well as centre-periphery, oversimplify many historical problems."[28] Firstly, on the sphere of the Earth, east and west are compass orientations relative to magnetic north. With a circumference of approximately 25,000 miles (or 40,000 km), if one travels far enough in either direction, one ends up where one started. Geographically speaking, Europe is more or less the western peninsula which juts off of the world island. However, identifying exactly where it begins is impossible. Since the closest, clearly identifiable geographic feature is the Ural Mountains, thinkers have conventionally marked the geographic border between Europe and Asia. Practically speaking, this is unhelpful.

The use of a purely geographic category to define Europe presents both political and cultural problems. With regard to the former, the Ural Mountains split what we understand contemporarily to be Russia, but not the Ukraine.

Historiographically, a purely geographic definition of Europe is rather unhelpful, as it does not take into account human activity in the political, social, cultural, and religious realms. Defining Europe by taking into account those themes not only imbues a deeper understanding and meaning of Europe, but also value. Implicit and explicit comparisons have helped to highlight regions or themes, but often at the cost of social and cultural ranking. For example, in November 1877, Fyodor Dostoevsky lamented, in his defense of the Pan-Slavic and Pan-Orthodox movement, that the great western powers looked upon his countrymen as a "cunning

---

[28]Henryk Samsonowicz and Antoni Mączak, "Feudalism and Capitalism: A Balance of Changes in East-Central Europe," chap. in *East Central Europe in Transition: From the Fourteenth to the Seventeenth Century*, ed. Antoni Mączak, Henryk Samsonowicz, and Peter Burke (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985), p. 6.

and barbaric Great Russian race."[29] While the theme of barbarity will be developed by Michel d'Herbigny and utilized by the Pontifical Commission for Russia (PCpR)[30] in the 1920s and 1930s, a contemporary example of the soft-Orientalist attitude about which Dostoevsky lamented can be found in a publication of a lecture given by Sir Arthur Evans at Sion College in 1874.[31]

Evans defined Eastern Europe using racial criteria in a travel log narrative, a popular trope in the European colonial era.[32] He began his by admitting that he, his brother, and a friend had lost their way in "the wild parts of the Austrian province of Carniola"[33] and had received help from the "cottagers [who] came out and gathered round... in a ring, just as so many sheep...."[34] Evans noted:

> ...the Slavs have gone their way and we [the English] have gone ours. Our languages have branched off in different directions till... the speech of our race is utterly unintelligible to a member of the other. Still, blood is thicker than water, and even at the present moment it may be well to remember that,

---

[29]F.M. Dostoievsky, *The Diary of a Writer*, trans. and annotated by Boris Brasol (New York: George Braziller, 1954), p. 898.

[30]*Pontificia Commissione per la Russia*.

[31]Sir Arthur Evans, *The Slavs and European Civilisation: A Lecture Delivered at Sion College, Feb. 23, 1878* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1878).

[32]Knut Hamson began his travel log of his 1903 Oriental adventures in St. Petersburg; *cf. In Wonderland*, trans., with an intro. and notes by Sverre Lyngstad (Brooklyn, NY: Ig Publishers, 2004). Although this style of writing is no longer considered a serious academic exercise, it has not disappeared. Note Rebecca West, *Black Lamb and Grey Falcon: A Journey through Yugoslavia* (New York: Viking Press, 1963) and Victoria Clark, *Why Angels Fall: A Journey Through Orthodox Europe from Byzantium to Kosovo* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000).

[33]Evans, p. 3.

[34]*Ibid*., p. 4.

> though the Slavs are not so near of kin to us as the Germans or the Norsemen, they are yet our cousins. The Turks, on the other hand, are not related to our Aryan family at all.... Speaking generally, [the Slavs] are behind the other European nations , Teutonic and Romance, in civilization and social and political development; but it would be unwise to argue from this that they are incapable of attaining to the highest civilization.[35]

Evans argued that the social and political retardation of Slavic development is due primarily to geography, which has placed them on the borderlands of Europe– from the Baltic to the Black to the Aegean– to act as the *de facto* buffer against "Asiatic Barbarism."[36] Secondly, Evans asserted that Slavic social organization has also regarded their development. While western European society is built upon the nuclear family, the Slavic world is built upon the extended family, a "group of families," or "family communities" in which property is held in common.[37] In other words, Evans charged Slavs with tribalism. This, he asserted, instills within them an incapacity for organization and a susceptibility to the "half-developed social institutions" of socialism and communism. Slavs are therefore generally lazy and prone to anarchy, from which they are rescued by the firm rule of Emperors imposed upon them.

For Evans, Slavic, eastern Europe is clearly less civilized and developed than western Europe; it needed non-Slavic rulers (such as Rurik) to organize the Slavic nations politically. Yet, eastern Europe is considered superior to the Orient (Asia) because the Slavs are the cousins of the Western Europeans, whose influence has imposed a helpful social order and raised the level of culture. The Slavic world is at once included and excluded from Europe, the paragon of

---

[35] *Ibid*., pp. 5-6.

[36] *Ibid*., p. 12.

[37] *Ibid*., p. 7.

civility and culture.

In the midst of the First World War, Friedrich Naumann argued in *Mittel-Europa* that Central Europe is in the penultimate stage of its historical development, based upon a political rather than a racial framework.[38] To this end, he identified three stages in German history. The first is the pre-Napoleonic stage, in which "nothing north of the Alps could be compared to Rome, Constantinople, Moscow, Paris, or London, for all our mediaeval towns lacked the crystalizing power of a ruler."[39] The second is the post-Napoleonic stage in which Naumann found himself: a Germany which has not realized regional hegemony. He asserted that the contemporary difficulties faced by Germany and Austria-Hungary were due in part to the victory of the *Kleindeutsch* notion over the *Grossdeutsch* in the construction of Imperial Germany, and that post war difficulties would be remedied or prevented by the acceptance of the *Grossdeutch* principle. For Nauman, the creation of this Greater Germany would usher in the final stage of German history. Germany would finally achieve its *telos* of regional hegemony, and act as a catalyst to advance the condition of non-German minorities in the region. Slavs are marginalized both politically and culturally, preserving "soft-Orientalism," while Germany is portrayed as the eastern-most bastion of western civilization.

All of this, of course, depended upon a German victory during the Great War, which was not to be. The First World War ended in defeat for Germany and Austria-Hungary, and a politically significant Central Europe super-state did not emerge. With the added destruction of

---

[38]Friedrich Nauman, *Central Europe: A Translation by Christabel M. Meredith fromt eh original German of Mittel-Europa*, trans. Christabel M. Meredith (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1917).

[39]*Ibid*., p. 52.

Imperial Russia, quite the opposite emerged. A series of smaller states with contested borders were created, and their existence raised the question of the natural character of Central Europe. Thinkers such as Evans and Nauman clearly manifest a soft-Orientalism as they understood Eastern Europe to be an ethnically, religiously, and nationally diverse region, economically backward, with a need to be managed imperially. However, other thinkers– such as those who follow– thought Eastern Europe to be a region with a diverse character more properly managed by diverse states which sought to overcome economic, social, and political retardation imposed by imperial rulers. Soft-Orientalism was again inadvertently preserved here, in the decades-long argument for the value of Eastern Europe.

In the *Borderlands of Western Civilization*[40] Oscar Halecki defended the political and cultural character of these regions by creating new regional categories, which define Central Europe and re-imagine which nations are included in and excluded from Western civilization. Halecki generally equated Christianity with Western civilization,[41] which provided a broad unity for Europe, while simultaneously sub-dividing Europe into four regions: Western, West Central, East Central, and Eastern.[42] Halecki maintained that the heritage of Western and Central Europe could be traced to Rome, and while Eastern Europe was governed by the Third Rome, it owed its heritage to the Second.[43]

---

[40]Oscar Halecki, *Borderlands of Western Civilization: A History of East Central Europe* (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1952).

[41]Halecki revisits these themes in his later work, *The Limits and Divisions of European History* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1962).

[42]Halecki, *Borderlands*, pp. 4-5.

[43]*Ibid*., p. 46.

Halecki used religious identity, specifically Catholicism and Orthodoxy, to manage the theme of inclusion and exclusion. Catholicism– in both Roman and Byzantine varieties– allowed the nations of the ancient *Rzeczpospolita*, the Second Polish Republic, and even the Polish People's Republic to be counted with the west, i.e. as fully European. Orthodoxy pushed Russia and some of the peoples who could have been Catholic but chose Orthodoxy, to the fringe. Halecki applied this logic to his history of Poland, which he portrayed as a Catholic and western country suffering domination by the USSR.[44]

Halecki used ethnic factors to distinguish West Central from East Central Europe, the former being predominantly German and the latter predominantly Slavic. Central Europe can have complex ethnic characteristics, yet retain a common character because of a common political experience. While Nauman argued that Central Europe was unsuccessful due to a lack of a single, unifying empire, Halecki argued that Central Europe was successful precisely because its political diversity, i.e. its composition of several empires (Prussian, Polish, Austrian, and Ottoman), gave it vibrancy. Halecki argued that East Central Europe became politically successful because France (a Western European power) wooed Poland (an East Central European power) as an ally as a means to contain the Holy Roman Empire (a West Central European power). However, pressure from Sweden, Russia, "Germany", and the Ottoman Empire prevented full participation in such an arrangement. Soft-Orientalism remained an essential part of the narrative. Polish success was due in part to France, and its failure due in part to Eastern European Russia and the Islamic, i.e. non-European, Ottoman Empire.

Halecki maintained that the success of East Central Europe was destroyed in the

---

[44]Oscar Halecki, *A History of Poland,* 9th ed. (New York: David McKay Co., Inc., 1973).

eighteenth century, and that in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the East Central European corridor itself collapsed.[45] As West Central and Eastern Europe consolidated, they swallowed Polish territory and began to pressure the Ottoman Empire. The Eastern Question shifted from how to manage a successful, expansionistic empire to how to manage this "sick man of Europe."[46]

Ultimately, Halecki argued that the collapse and disappearance of East Central Europe was an aberration, and that it was not natural that Germany and Russia should border each other in the nineteenth century. Although Halecki does not include the coincidental development of nationalist histories as a scientific enterprise as part of his analysis, this is as important as the political collapse. Western, West Central, and Eastern nationalist historians could justify the ascendency of their states as a natural consequence of the failure of East Central European ones.

The brief existence of independent states during the interwar period in this East Central European corridor for Halecki was the rebirth of the so-called natural state of affairs,[47] but was cut short when these states were brought under the Soviet sphere of influence. Halecki concluded with that a "new era might be inaugurated for all of those who today [1954] suffer in

---

[45]While Norman Davies and M.B.B. Biskupski do not expressly rely on Halecki, this logic can be found in their works. Note Norman Davies, *God's Playground: A History of Poland: Vol I., The Origins to 1795* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1982), and *A History of Poland: Vol II., 1795 to the Present* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1982). Note also M.B.B. Biskupski, *The History of Poland* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2000).

[46]Halecki, *Borderlands*, p. 142.

[47]n.b. a similar argument during the collapse of the Soviet Union and its sphere of influence in the late 1980s by Joseph Rothschild, *Return to Diversity: A Political History of East Central Europe Since World War II,* 2nd ed., (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).

East Central Europe...."[48] The reference to "Soviet barbarity" further pushes Eastern Europe toward exclusion while simultaneously preserving the primacy of western European status. Francis Dvornik nearly concured when he wrote in 1974 about the inhabitants of this region, "Today their past is their only inspiration in carrying on the struggle to preserve their national identity. Nowhere more than in Central and Eastern Europe is it true to say that modern development can only be understood in the light of medieval history."[49]

In 1947, Francis Dvornik asserted that, "...Central Europe only includes the Germans from the Rhine to the Oder, the Czechs, the Magyars, the Slovenes, and the Croats," excluding the Poles due to their policy of repudiating as much as possible any alliance with the Empire and with the Czechs. In *The Making of Central and Eastern Europe* (1974), Dvornik adjusted his earlier understanding, and in a sense recombines the categories of West Central Europe and East Central Europe as Central Europe. Russia remains in the East. While Dvornik always regarded Central Europe as European, Russia remains subject to the soft-Orientalist inclusion/exclusion dynamic, even as he argued for a fundamental unity among Slavs which not even religion could disrupt.[50] Dvornik consequently argued that this pan-Slavism did not originate in nineteenth century Russia, but that

> Tsarist Russia... did not succeed in profiting fully from the Pan-Slav idea. It is an irony of history that the regime which succeeded the tsarist autocracy inherited even this idea from tsarist Russia and was able not only to make a

---

[48]Halecki, *Borderlands,* p. 475.

[49]Francis Dvornik, *The Making of Central and Eastern Europe* (Gulf Breeze, FL: Academic International Press, 1974), p. iii.

[50]Francis Dvornik, *The Slavs in European History and Civilization* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1962).

> reality of the dream of the Ruriks in 1939 and 1945, when it united all "Russian" *votčiny* with Moscow, but also to profit from the Pan-Slav sentiments to extend its sway over all Slavic lands in the name of a new "orthodoxy."[51]

Jenő Szűcs and Julianna Parti propose a similar, but not identical geopolitical division of Europe.

They divided Europe into Western, Central, and Eastern regions. They maintained that Western Europe is the product of Roman Catholicism having been folded into a German political culture, which had in turn built upon Roman Imperial conquest. Russia remained eastern, as an Orthodox region untouched by this dynamic. Central Europe, therefore, exists between the German and Russian worlds.[52]

They bolstered their category of Central Europe by noting that after 1500, a "very sharp line of demarcation" along socio-economic lines emerged, and after another five hundred years, it was "as if Stalin, Churchill, and Roosevelt had studied carefully the *status quo* of the age of Charlemagne on the 1130th anniversary of his death."[53] This same line is, generally, the eastern boundary of Charlemagne's realm.[54] Prosperity is perpetually found west of the line, and poverty to the east. Although this is not essentially a moral judgment, the assertion that the west is seemingly naturally more affluent implies superiority over and against the east; soft-Orientalism is therefore preserved.

---

[51]*Ibid*., p. 555.

[52]Jenő Szűcs and Julianna Parti, *The Three Historical Regions of Europe*, pp. 132-33.

[53]*Ibid*., p. 132.

[54]Other scholars take a less optimistic view, arguing that beyond this line, any type of meaningful coherence is non-existent, and that as a result, it suffered a type of colonialism; *cf.* David Turnock, *The Making of Eastern Europe: From the Earliest Times to 1815* (New York: Routledge, 1988).

While these previous historians– writing before the linguistic turn– considered the character and borders of Europe historically, historians writing after the linguistic turn have often utilized what Karolewski and Suczycki call the constructivist model, which presents the modern nation state as something which emerged in the modern era, rather than as an essentialized something which had its roots in the past.[55] Succinctly, this model assumes that nations and nation states emerged and developed from unique formative events.[56] Constructivists argue that markers of identity– including nationalism and religion– are subjectively created in time and not objectively discovered over time. Consequently, the categories by which nations and religions are analyzed are also themselves created. Considering such categories from an historiographical rather than an historical framework would better illustrate not only the "dialectical relationships between borders and their states," but also the nature of "symbolic geographies, namely the construction of imaginary borders between civilizations."[57]

---

[55]There are many such studies. The general work of Brian Porter-Szűcs, Keely Stauter-Halsted, and perhaps unexpectedly, *Independence Day: Myth, Symbol, and the Creation of Modern Poland* by M.B.B. Biskupski (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012) serve as examples of historical analyses which argue that Modern Poland is constructed, and not necessarily a natural development of the early modern *Rzeczpospolita*. Timothy Snyder argues this dynamic for all of the inheritor modern nation states of the *Rzeczpospolita* in *The Reconstruction of Nations: Poland, Ukraine, Lithuania, Belarus, 1569-1999* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003).

[56]Perhaps the best known constructivist is Benedict Anderson, who argued in *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (New York: Verso Press, 2006) that nations developed in part due to the development and dispersal of print media. Others, such as Ernest Gellner argue that a state can even invent a nation where it did not exist; *cf. Nations and Nationalism*, 2nd ed, intro. John Breuilly (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2008).

[57]Lillyya Berezhnaya, "Ruthenian Lands and the Early Modern Multiple Borderlands in Europe: Ethno-Confessional Aspect," chap. in *Religion and the Conceptual Boundary in Central and Eastern Europe: Encounters of Faiths*, ed. Thomas Bremer (New York: Palgrave

Piotr Wandycz, in the historiographical introduction to *The Price of Freedom*, did precisely this. There, he teased out the theoretical strains which separate East from West.[58] While recognizing the fluidity and arbitrary character of categories dependent in different degrees upon the East-West dichotomy, Wandycz recast the method in dealing with East Central Europe. He noted that in an East-West dichotomy, a clear and firm geographic divide between west and east, even in gradations, is at best incomplete. Wandycz proposed to complement the models proposed by Halecki and Szűcs (he did not mention Parti) which advocate a West, East-Center, East paradigm with one

> borrowed from economics and popularized by Hungarian scholars. It is based on the notion of center, semi-periphery, and periphery, and has the advantage of showing that countries that belong to the East-Central group have socio-economic counterparts in the West, South, and North.[59]

Wandycz defined the core as "Italy, northern [France] and part of south-eastern France, the Netherlands, west and part of southern Germany, and southern England," a description which he rephrased as a "longitudinal strip from Palermo through Naples and Antwerp to London,"[60] justified by the character of its development, the effect of its achievements, and its density of

---

Macmillan, 2008), p. 40.

[58]However, Wandycz reverts to utilizing the category "East Central Europe" in "*Między Pluralizmem a Totalitaryzmem: Tematkya Ustrojowa*" and "*Wojna i Pokój*," chaps. in *Historia Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej*, tom 2, ed. Jerzy Kloczowski (Lublin: Instytut Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej, 2000).

[59]Wandyz, *The Price of Freedom*, pp. 3-4.

[60]*Ibid*., p. 4.

population. Wandycz noted that if nineteenth century GNP per capita were to be considered, Switzerland and Sweden would be added to this core, and the characteristics which comprise this core would also be true in the twentieth century.

The semi-periphery exists on both sides of this strip, not just east of it: "southern France, Spain, Portugal, Brandenburg, Bohemia, Hungary, and Poland," and the periphery "would include Scandinavia, Lithuania, Russia, and the Balkans."[61] This does have the advantage of invalidating an East-West sensibility, as well as creating a core which does not reinforce nationalist historical claims made by the great nineteenth century colonial powers of Britain, France, and Germany. Its weakness is its reliance on national demarcation in the eastern semi-periphery. The placement of Lithuania within the periphery and preserving the peripheral status of Russia are good examples.

While modern Lithuanians, for example, would not want to claim a cultural heritage with Poland– especially in the twentieth century– the *Rzeczpospolita* is the common heritage of Poles and Lithuanians, as well as Belarusians, Ukrainians, and some Jews. A tension then arises when the evaluation economic and cultural factors are not congruent.

Lastly, Russia remains on the periphery, and not unlike the Near East. Wandycz, quoting George Vernadsky, notes: "'if Russia is Europe,'... 'she is only partly so.' Muscovite autocracy and the subordination of church to the state was alien to the western tradition. So was the Ottoman system based on Islam."[62] And so the dynamic of inclusion and exclusion remains, as does the soft-Orientalist ranking of Eastern European states based on comparison with the west.

---

[61] *Ibid*.

[62] *Ibid*., p. 3.

In the effort to refute the second class status of "Eastern Europe," scholars have not only preserved the east-west dichotomy, but also the latent value judgments present within that dichotomy. Wandycz at least is conscious of this dynamic.

The works above which have sought both to define, and to create sub-categories of, Europe have sought to demonstrate the value of "Eastern Europe" in some way or another.[63] Generally, such value is imparted by demonstrating how the area in question has some link to, or resemblance of, the west, thereby indirectly preserving the primacy of Western Europe and inadvertently perpetuating the soft-Orientalism against which they seek to defend Eastern European peoples. These categories have, in turn, contextualized the work historians have done on the Catholic Church and its relationship to Russia or the Soviet Union. Histories of the Russian Catholic Church, also known as the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite, comprise a discrete and

---

[63] A plethora of subsequent histories about this region (rather than histories which define the region) have been written which are too numerous to analyze here. Some, written explicitly to dispel western ignorance, are rather simplistic overviews; *cf.* E. Garrison Walters, *The Other Europe: Eastern Europe to 1945* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1988) and John Dornberg, *Central and Eastern Europe,* International Government and Politics Series (Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press, 1995). More sophisticated studies certainly exist. Some frame their histories in ideological movements; *cf.* R.J. Crampton, *Eastern Europe in the Twentieth Century– and After*, 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 1997), which traces the political history of the region as a movement away from totalitarian oppression toward democracy, an argument reminiscent of Francis Fukuyama; *cf. The End of History and the Last Man* (New York: The Free Press, 1992). Note also Orest Subtelny, *Domination of Eastern Europe: Native Nobilities and Foreign Absolutism, 1500-1715* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1986), which traces the experience of absolutism, utilizing socio-economic and political analyses. From the self-defined, non-Western perspective, the sophisticated work by I. IA. Danilevskii, *Russia and Europe: The Slavic World's Political and Cultural Relations with the Germanic-Roman West*, trans. and annotated by Stephen M. Woodburn (Bloomington, IN: Slavica, 2013) defines Slavic against Germanic-Roman Europe. The consideration of Russia as a borderland between Europe and Asia is developed by Gyula Szvák, ed., *The Place of Russia in Europe and Asia*, CHSP Hungarian Authors Series No. 5, eds. Peter Pastor and Ivan Sanders (New York: Columbia University Press, 2010).

sparse sub-field within this study.

The Russian Catholic Church, though a Byzantine Rite church, was unlike the Greek Catholic Churches which re-entered communion with Rome in the Union of Brześć in 1596. The Greek Catholic Churches claimed a genealogy which its members traced to the Apostolic Era, and its union with the church was itself the aim of the Roman Curia. The Russian Catholic Church, contrarily, was a partial-creation of the Catholic Church in the early twentieth century not as an end in itself, but as a means of evangelization and the conversion of Russia to Catholicism, which Neal Pease has correctly called "'sheep stealing' on an unheard-of scale."[64] As such, political and religious factors are inextricably interwoven in this history.

While it is arguable that all religious movements are political– at least to a degree– due to their involvement in the public forum, the Catholic management of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite in the Second Polish Republic and Soviet Russia was an undeniably and intensely political operation, even if officials in the PCpR denied political motivations or goals. Historians who examine the Russian Catholic Church deal simultaneously with religious and political factors. The weight they give to those factors and how they define them is more a matter of accent than clear differentiation and demarcation of *regnum* and *sacerdotium*. Thus, histories of the Russian Catholic Church fall into either the Political School or the Religious School, each of which has sub-categories.

Histories of the Political School assume the Catholic Church to be an international institution distinct from national governments but part of the social structure of nations, due to

---

[64]Neal Pease, *Rome's Most Faithful Daughter: The Catholic Church and Independent Poland, 1914-1939* (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 2009), p. 155.

the nature of its *magisterium*. This *magisterium* is comprised of all Catholic bishops regardless of rite, the first of which is the Bishop of Rome, the Pope, who by virtue of his office has both a primacy of honor among, and juridical primacy over, other bishops. By virtue of its authority to teach the Catholic faith, the *magisterium* also has authority to govern its Catholic faithful, requiring that they believe certain dogmatic and doctrinal propositions and to behave in accord with those propositions, and worship publically in accord with canon law. While this is a religious phenomenon, it has clear political ramifications: bishops promulgate policy and manage their dioceses and Catholic institutions within their dioceses. Additionally, bishops also represent their diocese to the Vatican, and such representation often includes national aspects of the culture in which their diocese exists. More officially, the papacy is recognized by international lawyers to be a *sui generis* institution even after the loss of the papal states;[65] it therefore has a secretary of state, sends nuncios, and receives ambassadors.

The national policy of various states, vis-a-vis Catholicism, ranges from friendly and cordial to hostile and confrontational. With regard to the Russian Catholic Church, interested state views have tended toward the latter. To narrate this history of the Russian Catholic Church, the Political School can be sub-divided into the *Ostpolitik*, Espionage, and Eastern-National Schools of thought.

Within *Ostpolitik* histories, the Russian Catholic Church is but a small part of the Eastern foreign policy of the Vatican. Although the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite is rather insignificant in these histories, the themes it illustrates are congruent with the larger themes of Vatican-Soviet

---

[65]Robert Graham, S.J., *Vatican Diplomacy: A Study of Church and State on the International Plane* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1959), pp. 7-8.

diplomacy.

Robert Graham argued that the foreign policy of the Vatican has as its primary aim evangelization. Concretely, this means the preservation if not the expansion of the organs of evangelization: first the Catholic Church, secondly other Christian churches, and finally, other religious associations. Second, the Holy See desires to ensure its right to evangelize. Third, the Holy See desires to advocate for the people whom it wants to evangelize, for either their material and spiritual well-being.

With regard to Russia, Constantine Simon noted the early association of Catholicism with the Poles through the false Dmitri established a foundational precedent of antagonism during the later half of the sixteenth century.[66] Russia is ultimately beyond the realm of Roman Catholicism. However, the partitions of Poland, in which many Catholics suddenly found themselves within Russia, both reinforced this association of Catholicism with Poles and politicized it. While historians have noted that the hierarchy did not defend the Polish nationalist cause against the new Orthodox rulers of eastern Poland in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries,[67] Graham asserted that even after the *rapprochement* between Russia and the Holy See after 1870, "the relations between Rome and St. Petersburg were never very easy, especially in questions relating to Russian Poland."[68] Poland was– and remained– a

---

[66]Constantine Simon, SI, "I Gesuiti e la Russia," *La Civiltà Cattolica* 4 (1989): 356.

[67]Pedro Ramet, *Cross and Commissar: The Politics of Religion in Eastern Europe and the USSR* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1987), p. 59, and Brian Porter Szucs, *Faith and Fatherland: Catholicism, Modernity, and Poland* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), pp. 8-9.

[68]Graham, pp. 68-69.

stumbling block of Vatican relations to Russia.

While the military and political action of Russia (and Prussia and Austria) against the Polish *Rzeczpospolita* prompted an ideological crisis between the Vatican and Tsarist Russia, Graham argued the converse was true between the Vatican and Soviet Russia. He asserted,

> the source of the conflict is, of course, ideological. On the one side there stands the Soviet Union, which, to its missionary program of worldwide revolution, joins doctrinal and practical atheism as a fundamental of its expanding political system. Opposite, there stands a worldwide religious organization two thousand years old which has the tenacity that only religious faith can give to human beings which, confident in its destiny, does not reckon in terms of years but of centuries. The effect of this tension is felt in almost every domain and in almost every country.[69]

Graham argued that persecution of Catholics in Russia by the Bolsheviks is a natural consequence of atheistic communism. He analyzed the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite only through its exarch, Leonid Feodorov, whose incarceration and death he recounted. Correlatively, Graham analyzed the missions of 1925 and 1926 of the French Jesuit Michel d'Herbigny, who failed to create a strong underground Roman Catholic Church in the Soviet State.[70] For Graham, the Vatican is the hero and the Soviet government is the villain which victimizes not only Catholic missionaries, but its own people.

Hansjakob Stehle also understood the conflict chiefly in ideological terms, describing the *ostpolitik* of the Vatican as a crusade, which in the long run, became associated with the anti-communist foreign policy of Nazi Germany based on mutual foreign policy goals: the defeat of

---

[69]*Ibid*., p. 350.

[70]*Ibid*., p. 367-71.

"Bolshevism." Stehle argued that, in turn, the Soviets viewed any Catholic conduct on Soviet soil as a threat to their sovereignty. Stehle only mentioned the Russian Catholic Church obliquely, through an examination of Leonid Feodorov– similar to that of Graham– and the *Russicum*, which he asserted was

> connected with a 'Russian-Catholic' church... placed entirely at the service of preparation for an imaginary future. Here only Russian was spoken and dress was in the style of the Orthodox priests. D'Herbigny himself, shortly before his trip to the Orient, grew a beard because– so the Pope had told him– 'for the Russians a beard is also a medium of apostleship'...[71]

Stehle constructed a much more checkered narrative: the aggressive foreign policy of the Vatican dovetailed with the Soviet assumption that their continued existence was always threatened by the west.

While these histories contain little that is exotic about Vatican foreign policy toward the east, the soft-Orientalist dynamics which place Russia on the fringe of a more developed Western Europe remain in *Ostpolitik* histories. Both Orthodox and Soviet Russia are opposed to Catholicism on ideological grounds and are hostile or even violent toward Catholics. The character of the Russicum reinforces this separation on both theological and cultural grounds.

With respect to the Soviet Union, Espionage School histories narrate the hidden side of Vatican foreign policy: the use of spycraft for intelligence gathering and counter-intelligence to defeat of atheistic communism and Soviet Russia, the chief organ for its survival. These histories resemble those concerning the modern nation-state, focusing on the mechanisms of

---

[71]Hansjakob Stehle, *Eastern Politics of the Vatican, 1917-1979*, trans. Sandra Smith (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 1979), pp. 129-30.

spying employed by the Vatican, and their positive or negative effects in the Papal contest with Communist secret and espionage services, e.g. the Soviet NKVD, GRU, KGB, the East German STASI, and the Polish SB.

David Alvarez created a "new direction in intelligence history by investigating the place of the Vatican, the world's oldest but smallest power, in that history. The result is the first detailed description of the intelligence history of the Papacy"[72] from the close of the Napoleonic Wars to the conclusion of the Second World War. Alvarez paid virtually no attention to the Russian Catholic Church, except to consider the behavior of Michel d'Herbigny as head of the Pontifical Commission for Russia and the creation of the Russicum.

Alvarez treated d'Herbigny as a Vatican spy and spymaster, although he never overtly labeled d'Herbigny as such. He described the bishop physically as one would a spy, a "tall, slim figure in nondescript civilian clothes [who] slipped out the rear door of the Moscow hotel" and as a "tall stranger [who] leaned forward and in a conspiratorial whisper disclosed the purpose that had brought four strangers together in a small Catholic Church in the shadow of a police fortress."[73] Alvarez also narrated the activity of d'Herbigny as a clandestine operation meant to create an underground Catholic Church– akin to a spy ring– which would survive the Soviet anti-religious program. The use of the Assumptionist priest Pie Neveu by d'Herbigny– who had secretly consecrated Neveu a bishop in the shadow of NKVD headquarters– as an intelligence operative, rounds out d'Herbigny as the spymaster whom Pius XI consults for reliable

---

[72]David Alvarez, *Spies in the Vatican: Espionage and Intrigue from Napoleon to the Holocaust* (Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press, 2002), p. 3.

[73]*Ibid*., p. 130-31.

information concerning the Soviet Union. Correlatively, Alvarez recounted the Deubner Affair, the sensational possibility that the Soviets had found their way into the Vatican *via* the personal secretary of d'Herbigny. Alvarez clearly interpreted the possibility as reality. His treatment of the Russicum is more subtle. While Alvarez acknowledged it as a seminary, he portrayed it as an intelligence academy, noting

> the new college's program of study, with its emphasis on total immersion in Russian language, history, and culture (to the point where the students spoke only Russian and affected the long beards of Russian Orthodox clergy), probably raised eyebrows in the offices of the OGPU, where intelligence offices may have wondered if this was a seminary or a training school for spies.[74]

Similarly, Eric Frattini examined Vatican espionage from the sixteenth century to the late twentieth century through an analysis of the Holy Alliance, "the Vatican's espionage arm," renamed "the entity."[75] Despite the fact that the Soviets regarded members of the Russian Catholic Church as Vatican spies,[76] he did not examine it. Rather, his history is a sensational and even irresponsible spy story. His treatment of the Russicum is illustrative.

Frattini placed the creation and management of the *Russicum* under the Holy Alliance as an espionage school, rather than under the Pontifical Commission for Russia as a seminary for the training of missionaries for Russia, in effect completely validating the claims of the OGPU.

---

[74]*Ibid*., pp. 144-45.

[75]Eric Frattini, *The Entity: Five Centuries of Secret Vatican Espionage*, trans. Dick Cluster (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2004), pp. 1-2.

[76]Walter Ciszek, S.J., *With God in Russia*, with Daniel L. Flaherty, S.J. (New York: Image Books, 1966), *passim*.

He even claimed "in a final phase of preparation, two members of the Polish army trained the "recruits" in parachute tactics so they could be dropped from airplanes into different parts of the Soviet Union.[77] Correlatively, Frattini accepted without question that Alexander Deubner was an OGPU agent who successfully penetrated the Vatican.[78]

John Koehler examined the issue of Soviet spies in the Vatican.[79] Like Frattini, he did not examine the Russian Catholic Church in spite of Kremlin concerns. Likewise, he did not examine the conduct of d'Herbigny, the role of the Russicum, and perhaps most egregiously, the Deubner Affair.

Although histories of the Espionage School range from irresponsible to solid scholarship, all of them create or rely upon an exotic atmosphere through which Vatican efforts to evangelize Eastern Europe, while relying on the same dichotomies that mark *Ostpolitik* histories: the political, theological, and cultural marginalization of Russia. While *Ostpolitik* and Espionage School histories treat the relationship between the Catholic Church and Russia mainly from an international perspective, the Eastern-Nationalist School treats that relationship on a more localized level.

Pedro Ramet argued that the portrayal of church-state relations behind the iron curtain has reinforced a false dichotomy which pit church and state against one another. He rightly

---

[77]Frattini, p. 221. This is possibly an allusion to an indiscreet inquiry to a Polish military attaché at a diplomatic reception about the "possibility of parachuting priests into the Soviet Union"; *cf*. Alvarez, *Spies in the Vatican*, p. 145.

[78]*Ibid*., pp. 223-28.

[79]John O. Koehler, *Spies in the Vatican: The Soviet Union's Cold War against the Catholic Church* (New York: Pegasus Books, 2009).

complicates the understanding of church-state relations by demonstrating: 1. both churches and states are themselves factionalized, 2. federalized religious policy, especially in Yugoslavia (but also true in the USSR) was uneven, 3. the shifting availability of international connections of a church to its sister churches also shifted state policy, 4. the spread of neo-Protestant groups also factionalized churches, and 5. the ability of the Vatican to impose itself on the local level through its bishops varied from country to country.[80]

Although Ramet did not examine the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite, he did consider issues surrounding Russification, with which, for example, the Second Polish Republic was concerned. The Tsars had demanded that Latin be replaced by Russian as both the ecclesial and liturgical language of the Catholic Church inside of Russia as an effort to "sap Polish and Lithuanian nationalism..."[81] He later pointed out that the Bolsheviks were "absorbed with the task of assailing the Old Order to which the Russian Orthodox Church was organically tied..."[82] By extrapolation, Russian Catholics in Poland would be unwelcome because of their Russian-ness, and unwelcome in Soviet Russia as a Vatican-protected remnant of the Old Order.

Neal Pease considered the Byzantine Slavonic Rite as an aspect of church-state relations in *Rome's Most Faithful Daughter*. In regard to Russian Catholics, Pease showed the tense and often antagonistic relations between the Second Polish Republic and the Vatican concerning the presence of things Russian in the Second Republic, or things Russian which would affect the future of the Second Republic. From the perspective of the Polish Government, Pease argued,

---

[80]Ramet, pp. 1-2.

[81]*Ibid*., p. 13.

[82]*Ibid*., p. 48.

the existence of the Russian Catholic Church complicated the chauvinistic Polish policy toward eastern minorities by offering an alternative to Latinization or membership in a Polish autocephalous Orthodox Church, especially when "one quarter million Polish Orthodox had adopted Latin Catholicism."[83] For Pease, Poland may be the eastern outpost of Catholicism, but it had no desire to be a Vatican agent or dupe.

Dennis Dunn argued in *The Catholic Church and Russia* that the divide between the West and Russia can be traced to the schism between the Byzantine and Roman Churches and Mongol control of Muscovite lands. Dunn argued that the Orthodox Church in Muscovy worked in tandem with the absolutist rule of the Romanovs, and that this theologically justified absolutism came into conflict with the "Catholic Church's insistence that it be free to preach the gospel, to inspire change in individual lives, and judge governments in light of Christ's teachings."[84] He further contended that Soviet commissars acted similarly to Tsarist officials in three ways: (1) both Tsarist and Soviet officials were absolutist in their style of government; (2) they understood Catholicism to be the religion of their enemies, and (3) they nonetheless used the Catholic Church for political advantage: modernization by the Tsarists and material relief by the Soviets.

The treatment in this work of the Russian Catholic Church is also limited. Dunn gave brief mention to the series of visits by d'Herbigny, and emphasizes his effort to set up the structure of an underground Catholic Church.[85] Dunn also examined Feodorov as a link between

---

[83]Pease, *Rome's Most Faithful Daughter*, p. 171.

[84]Dennis Dunn, *Catholic Church and Russia: Popes, Patriarchs, Tsars, and Commissars*, (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2004), p. 13.

[85]*Ibid*., p. 86.

the Vatican and "Russian Uniate Catholics."[86] Lastly, Dunn noted that in the 1970s and 1980s, there were "attempts to revive the Russian Uniate Church, but the effort was more symbolic than practical, and, generally, only the Latin liturgy was practiced."[87]

Antoine Wenger similarly observed in *Rome et Moscou, 1900-1950*, that great political tension existed between Russia and Roman Catholicism, and painted a portrait of struggle and survival. Contrarily, in *Catholiques en Russie*, Wenger narrated their outright persecution.[88] However, in *Rome et Moscou*, Wenger contended that Catholicism is a foreign religion for non-Russian peoples in Russia. In regard to the Russian Catholic Church he, like other historians, examined the clandestine mission of d'Herbigny to create an underground Catholic Church,[89] and the difficulties of Leonid Feodorov.[90] However, he also examined the cases of Russian converts to Catholicism Nicholas Alekseivich Tolstoi (not a relative of the great novelist Leo), Alexis Zetchanikov, and Jean Deubner (father of Alexander Deubner of the "Deubner Affair").

Tolstoi, an Orthodox priest greatly influenced by the writings of Vladimir Soloviev and the son of the master of ceremonies of the Russian imperial court, converted to Catholicism.[91] Zertchanikov also converted through personal study, and was placed in charge of managing the

---

[86]*Ibid*., p. 63.

[87]*Ibid*., p. 172.

[88]Antoine Wenger, *Catholiques en Russie d'après les archives du KGB, 1920-1960* (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1998).

[89]Antoine Wenger, *Rome et Moscou, 1900-1950* (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1987), pp. 185-210.

[90]*Ibid*., pp. 306-09.

[91]*Ibid*., pp. 58-65.

liturgical rite inside of Russia.[92] Deubner acted as a clandestine Catholic missionary within Russia.[93] Wenger noted that their acceptance of the tenets of Catholicism, at odds with state-managed Orthodoxy, put them in real peril. Additionally, their desire to celebrate liturgy in accord with the Byzantine Rite put them at odds with mainstream Catholic thought, although Rome forbade the conversion of Russians to the Latin Rite. Although Wenger mentions these liturgical dynamics, he did not analyze them in depth, and utilized the standard dichotomy of Rome vs. St. Petersburg/Moscow– West vs. East.

The *Ostpolitik*, Espionage, and Eastern-National subdivisions within the Political School portray Tsarist and Soviet Russia at best as political rivals, and at worst, political enemies of the Catholic Church, and understand the rivalry between the Catholic and Orthodox Churches as the medium through which this rivalry is played out. These histories argue that the chief motivation for this political rivalry is ideological. Before the October Revolution, the ideological contest occurred between Catholic and Orthodox Christianity. After the October Revolution, it occurred between Catholic Christianity and Soviet-style communism. Histories of the Religious School also utilize these themes, but these are marked by a focus on the church *qua* church which is engaged in the rivalries noted above, rather than emphasize these rivalries. Like the Political School, the Religious School is also has sub-divisions: Descriptive, Iconic, and Topical.

Descriptive Histories do not argue clear theses, but seek to paint identifying markers of the Russian Catholic Church in general portraits. These descriptions range from marginally helpful to useful and enlightening.

---

[92]*Ibid*., pp. 69-70.

[93]*Ibid*., pp. 65-66.

The least useful is *[The] Russian Catholic Church*,[94] which is a collection of Wikipedia articles on the topics of the Russian Catholic Church, Russia, the Catholic Church, Patriarch, and Exarch. The article on the Russian Catholic Church is a two page summary of its origins, history, structure, and post-soviet revival. Slightly more helpful are the sparse descriptions which appear in the two editions of *The New Catholic Encyclopedia*.

The first edition of *The New Catholic Encyclopedia* portrays the Russian Catholic Church as an Orthodox Church in communion with Rome, saying only, "Catholic Russians of the Byzantine rite number only about 3,000 and owe their beginnings to the embryonic Russian Catholic Church of the Byzantine [Rite, sic!], begun in Russia in the first quarter of the 20th century under Exarch Leonid Feodorov (1879-1935).[95] This single sentence is found within the section on Byzantine Catholic Churches. The second edition of *The New Catholic Encyclopedia* allots a small section to the Russian Catholic Church, comprised of three sentences. In addition to the above, the second edition says, "the Russian Catholics never mustered enough numbers or support to have an independent hierarchy. There are two Russian Byzantine Catholic parishes in the U.S."[96] This is inaccurate; the unofficial list of parishes published by the Society of St. John Chrysostom of Ayatriada Rum Katoliki Kilise[97] lists as parishes of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite:

---

[94]Jesse Russell and Ronald Cohn, *[The]Russian Catholic Church* (Edinburgh, UK: Lennex Corp., 2012).

[95]G.A. Maloney, "Byzantine Rite," in *The New Catholic Encyclopedia* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967), p. 1001.

[96]G.A. Maloney and B. Miller, eds., "Byzantine Christianity," in *The New Catholic Encyclopedia*, 2nd ed. (New York: Thomson Gale, 2003), p. 748.

[97]Society of St. John Chrysostom of Ayatriada Rum Katoliki Kilise. Unofficial and Partial Directory of Russian Catholic and Other Byzantine-Slavonic Rite Churches and Institutions.

St. Michael's in New York City, Our Lady of Fatima in San Francisco, CA, St. Andrew's in El Segundo, CA, and Christ the Redeemer in Chicago, IL. Though it lists Sts. Cyril & Methodius in Denver, CO, that parish has closed. Additionally, Our Lady of Kazan in Boston, MA and Christ the Redeemer in Chicago, IL are listed as closed in 1974 and 2003, respectively. Likely, the two parishes referenced in *The New Catholic Encyclopedia* are St. Michael's in New York City and Our Lady of Fatima in San Francisco, which Donald Attwater emphasized in his presentation of the Russian Catholic Church in America.[98]

Donald Attwater provided a useful introduction in a two volume work on the "Eastern Churches," first published in 1935 and revised and updated in 1961 to provide a pan-optic description of the non-Latin Churches. The basic category of classification are those churches in communion with Rome which he examined in volume I and those not in communion with Rome, which he examined in volume II.[99] Attwater devoted a short chapter to the Russian Catholic Church, tracing its genealogy from baptism of Kiev, which he dated "about the year 989,"[100] through the Council of Florence and the experience of the some members of the sect of старокатолики (literally "Old Catholics") whom he called the "Old Believers." He then shifted to serialized descriptions of important persons who popularized the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite in Russia, i.e. Vladimir Solovyev, Leonid Feodorov, Andrew Szepticky, Anna Abrikosova, and

---

Stable URL: http://rumkatkilise.org/listing.htm.

[98]Donald Attwater, *The Christian Churches of the East, Volume I: Churches in Communion with Rome* (Milwaukee, WI: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1961), p. 124.

[99]Donald Attwater, *The Christian Churches of the East, Volume II: Churches not in Communion with Rome* (Milwaukee, WI: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1961).

[100]Attwater, *Churches of the Christian East, Volume I*, p. 120.

Nicholas Alexandrov. He followed this with a short review of the survival of the church through a presentation of its parishes across the world. Part of the narrative includes the persecution of the Russian Catholic Church both under the Tsars and under the Soviets, but does not proffer any meaningful conclusion concerning such suffering. Presumably, the importance is self-evident.

Somewhat useful is *Windows Westward: Rome, Russia, Reunion* by Stephen Gulovich, in which he expressed as his aim to "give a true picture of the historical background of the Christian Near East,"[101] and in so doing, argued that reunion between Rome and Russia is most possible and likely through the Byzantine (Greek) Catholic Rites, which he mistakenly classified as the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite. If this fundamental mistake is forgiven, his argument is politically provocative. Written in a popular tone and beginning with descriptions of church architecture and the Divine Liturgy, Gulovich recounted a general history of Byzantine Catholicism, in which he argued that "its curse and nemesis was political intrigue..., [as] Russian political and ecclesiastical leaders considered it Russia's sacred mission to... convert the whole world to the Orthodox Church."[102] The existence of Byzantine Churches in union with Rome is both the clearest symbol against, and obstacle toward, this goal, which explains this persecution. Correlatively, Gulovich noted,

> The more the Catholic Church of the Byzantine Rite will flourish, the sooner will the reunion of these separated peoples be effected. Conversely, any injury inflicted on that Church will indefinitely postpone reunion. Would that all Catholics, of all rites, understood. [sic!][103]

---

[101]Stephen C. Gulovich, *Windows Westward: Rome, Russia, Reunion* (New York: Declan X. McMullen Co., 1947), p. 11.

[102]*Ibid*., pp. 62, 112.

[103]*Ibid*., p. 154.

By accident, Gulovich demonstrated that the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite serves as a litmus test of Orthodox-Catholic, Russian-Western, relations.

The best presentation of the Russian Catholic Church is accomplished by Florentyna Rzemieniuk in *Kościoł katolicki Obrządku Bizantyjsko-Słowiańskiego (Neounia)*, or *The Catholic Church of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite (Neounion)*.[104] Her aim, minimally, is to recapture the memory of the Byzantine Slavonic Rite in a meaningful way, with its struggles in the *Kresy* and in Harbin in Manchuria during the interwar period. While an excess of articles on Eastern Church topics appear in popular journals, scholarship on the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite is sparse. Even in her conclusion, she noted, "a lack of many kinds of works on the subject of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite exists in Polish and foreign historiography" (*W polskiej zagranicznej historiografii brak jest jakichkolwiek opracowań na temat Kościoła katolickiego obrządku bizantyjsko-słowiańskiego.*)[105] She presented (1) the origins of the Russian Catholic Church, (2) its struggles in the Second Polish Republic concerning its Russian spirituality, its political involvement, its contest with the Orthodox Church, and its struggle with the Greek Catholic hierarchy, and (3) its struggles in Harbin as an entity caught between the USSR and China. Her diocese-by-diocese analysis resembles the methodology used in other works of Church History; n.b. *Unia w Kuraszewie* by Mikołaj Dawidziuk, which reconstructs the interwar experience of the Russian Catholic Church in Kuraszew.[106] Rzemieniuk primarily demonstrated the culturally

---

[104]Florentyna Rzemieniuk, *Kościoł katolicki Obrządku Bizantyjsko-Słowiańskiego (Neounia)* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Universytetu Lubelskiego, 1999).

[105]*Ibid*., p. 337.

[106]Mikołaj Dawidziuk, *Unia w Kuraszewie: Historia neounii w Kuraszewie na tle polityki państwa polskiego w latach 1919-1939* (Bielsk Podlaski: Stowarzyszenie Muzeum Małej

indistinct position of the Russian Catholic Church in the Second Polish Republic. On the one hand, the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite was not Polish, and in many cases, unwelcome. On the other hand, it did have support in some quarters. Furthermore, using the center-periphery model, Rzemeniuk argued that the Russian Catholic Church may have existed on the periphery– in the *kresy* and in Harbin, but the Pope was nonetheless its head. The chief weakness of her work, as well as the other descriptive histories, is that the significance of the Russian Catholic Church and its experience is at best inferred. Iconic histories seek to remedy this by conveying the significance of the description being relayed.

These iconic histories utilize religious imagery, overtly or covertly relying on the Christian scriptural dichotomies portrayed in the final judgement: good and evil, truth and falsehood, victim and perpetrator, i.e. the powerlessness in union with Christ and the powerful in league with Satan. Iconic histories of the Russian Church have precedents in works such as *[The] First Victims of Communism: White Book on the Religious Persecution in Ukraine.*[107]

Hide Me Within Thy Wounds: The Persecution of the Catholic Church in the USSR by I. I. Osipova[108] sought to recover the historical memory of the titular problem. Presumably, it is written chiefly for former Soviet citizens. Similarly, *The Forgotten: Catholics of the Soviet Empire from Lenin through Stalin* by Christopher Zugger sought to remind westerners of the supposedly forgotten, and therefore marginalized, experience of suffering of millions of

---

Ojczyzny w Studziwodach, 2008).

[107]*[The] First Victims of Communism: White Book on the Religious Persecution in Ukraine* (Rome: Analecta O.S.B.M, 1953).

[108]I.I. Osipova, *Hide Me Within Thy Wounds: The Persecution of the Catholic Church in the USSR*, trans. Malcolm Gilbert (Fargo, ND: North Dakota State University Libraries, 2003).

Catholics of every rite, "to bring an awareness of the complexities and marvels of the Soviet Catholic Church..."[109] These books are moral narratives intended to laud the virtuous, suffering Catholics (of every rite) and condemn the vicious Soviets.

Osipova contextualized the persecution of Russian Catholics by reminding the reader of the historical precedents of the Tsarist regime, the policy of which was "deliberately to portray the Catholic Church as exclusively Latin and even Polish. Partly as a result of this, many Orthodox were "firmly convinced that the 'Uniate' concept was a Polish Jesuit Papist plot to seduce the Orthodox into Catholicism."[110] Any attempt at union, i.e. *rapprochement* between the Russian Orthodox and Catholic Churches would be treason, and a betrayal of Russian society and culture. Once Patriarch Tikhon expressed public support of real ecumenical dialogue with the Catholic Church in the summer of 1920– in the midst of the Polish-Soviet War– the GPU began its surveillance of the Russian Catholic communities both in Petrograd and Moscow.[111]

Osipova continued with the reports of informants, trials, and with life in prison camps for those not executed. The moral charge against the Soviets of false arrest, torture, and imprisonment, i.e. persecution, is made by an analysis of the judicial process and the experience of the condemned. With regard to evidence, Osipova noted that it was collected by the surveillance of the secret police, and questioned how voluntary a "'voluntary collaborator'"[112]

---

[109]Christopher Lawrence Zugger, *The Forgotten: Catholics of the Soviet Empire from Lenin through Stalin* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2001), p. xxii.

[110]Osipova, p. 3.

[111]*Ibid.*

[112]*Ibid.*, p. 4.

recruited from within the Russian Catholic Church would be. Additionally the reports do not contain the natural language of those interrogated; rather, observations and information is shaped into the standard trope of secret police reports, which used politically charged words used to describe covert Catholic activity, such as "'expose', 'win over', 'inform', etc."[113]

In regard to the experience of the condemned, the lengthy analysis of the experiences of Catholic and Orthodox Christians in Solovki Prison and of the GPU preoccupation with the Russicum are meant to show that Soviet attitudes were greatly in error. Osipova noted that while the Exarch Leonid Fyodorov did not think universal *rapprochement* was possible between the Catholic and Orthodox Churches outside of the action of grace, Fyodorov did notice that both Catholic and Orthdox priests in the prison did, "in the end [become] 'brothers in the Faith'."[114] In regard to the Russicum, Osipova marshaled evidence to demonstrate that its graduates were not Clandestine Vatican agents, but were priests committed to serving the Catholic Church, which meant in part the opposition to (atheistic, materialist) communism.[115]

Unfortunately, the book does not conclude but simply ends after the consideration of a priest freed in 1955. However, Osipova has made her point: Russian Catholics suffered unjustly. To further her point, she included photographs of the victims at the end of the book. Osipova believed that the evidence largely speaks for itself. Contrarily, Rev. Christopher Zugger constructed what a theologian might term a "passion narrative," a narrative of redemptive suffering of Catholics of every rite in Russia. Although Zugger did not explicitly use theological

---

[113] *Ibid*., p. 151.

[114] *Ibid*., p. 69.

[115] *Ibid*., pp. 137-76.

terminology, his underlying theme is one of theodicy, i.e. finding theological meaning in suffering.

Zugger utilized Christian imagery which would resonate with the historical agents themselves. He contextualized his analysis of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite by comparing Exarch Feodorov and his flock to the "'passion bearing saints'" Boris and Gleb, "who accepted death at the hands of a renegade brother prince rather than plunge Rus' into civil war and destruction."[116] Zugger provided a description of the Russian Catholic Church– a much richer description than that found in the Descriptive Histories mentioned above– in which its members are portrayed as suffering at the hands of the Russian Orthodox Church, the Soviet Government, and Polish Roman Catholics. References to the Russian Catholic Church are found throughout the book; however, he focused on the Russian Catholic Church in Chapter 13, "The Passion Bearers of the Russian Catholic Exarchate." This book is also an update and expansion of the monograph by James J. Zatko, *Descent into Darkness" The Destruction of the Roman Catholic Church in Russia, 1917-1923*,[117] in which the fate of the Russian Catholic Church is attached to the Roman Rite, and not woven into a narrative about Catholics in Russia.

The strength of this monograph is its ability to synthesize multiple themes in a chaotic atmosphere into a comprehensible, unified narrative. Its weakness is its meager conclusion of hope for the future, symbolized by the return of the Holy Cross Cathedral in Uzhgorod to Greek Catholic use in 1991. Catholics of every rite did survive these persecutions, yet strategies for

---

[116]Zugger, p. 157.

[117]James J. Zatko, *Descent into Darkness: The Destruction of the Roman Catholic Church in Russia, 1917-1923* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1965).

survival employed by Catholics– with the exception of reference to their hardy faithfulness– are only minimally present in the narrative. While Iconic Histories seek to impart meaning by overt or implicit allusion to Christ-like suffering, Topical Histories impart meaning in other ways, by the study of restricted and distinct aspects of the Russian Catholic Church, rather than by a grand overview and analysis.

Konrad Sadkowski examined the role of religion in the construction of national identity. In an article examining the construction of Ukrainian national identity Chełm region from 1918-1939 and its conflict with Polish governmental religious policy, Sadkowski used the bishop of Lublin, Maryan Leon Fulman, as an exemplar of normative Polish episcopal attitudes toward minorities. Sadkowski demonstrated that these attitudes were shifting, becoming more emotionally charged over time. He noted that while the Roman Catholic Clergy of the Lublin diocese opposed the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite as a "'Russifying' instrument,"[118]

> Bishop Fulman initially supported conversion to the Roman rite (and Polonization), but when this failed by 1930 he became a proponent of the Byzantine Slavonic rite as an instrument for proselytizing the Orthodox. When this too proved a failure and Orthodox priests continued to arrive in the Chełm region allegedly to provoke Ukrainian nationalism, Bishop Fulman's position toward the Orthodox clergy converged with his clergy's.[119]

Sadkowski examined the related problem of relationship of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite and the Roman Catholic clergy as agents of Polish national identity in "The Roman Catholic

---

[118]Konrad Sadkowski, "From Ethnic Borderland to Catholic Fatherland: The Churh, Christian Orthdox, and State Administration in the Chełm Region, 1918-1939," *Slavic Review* 57, no. 4 (Winter 1998): 827.

[119]*Ibid*., p. 815.

Clergy, the Byzantine Slavonic rite, and Polish National Identity: The Case of Grabowiec, 1931-34."[120] This reworks the issues considered in the previous article, but argues

> the association between religious affiliation and national identity– i.e. Latin rite Catholicism with Polish identity, Orthodoxy and Greek Catholicism with Ukrainian identity and Orthodoxy with Belarusian identity– was too powerful by the early twentieth century for the Vatican to override with an overly theorized vision of a new religious harmony under its canopy.[121]

While the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite was not meant to be political, and its clergy was exhorted to avoid anything that might be construed as political, the very existence and activity of the rite itself was understood to be a Russifying agent, and therefore it was unavoidably political. Sadkowski did more than demonstrate how, and even why, Polish Catholic clergy worked against the neo-union; he raised important questions about the nature of the relationship between Catholicism and Polish national identity without providing any answers.

Leon Tretjakewitsch examined the often overlooked problematic nature of Catholic, i.e. Vatican, attempts at reunion through a biography of Michel d'Herbigny. Tretjakewitsch argued that d'Herbigny and his contemporaries demonstrated an "unwillingness or inability... to learn from history, [causing] them to repeat many mistakes of the past and therefore also to reap largely the same results."[122] Tretjakewitsch noted that in spite of a short lived Catholic-Orthodox

---

[120]Konrad Sadkowski, "The Roman Catholic Clergy, the Byzantine Slavonic Rite, and Polish National Identity: The Case of Grabowiec, 1931-34." *Religion, State, & Society* 28, no. 2 (2000): 175-84.

[121]*Ibid*., p. 176.

[122]Leon Tretjakewitsch, *Bishop Michel d'Herbigny SJ and Russia: A Pre-Ecumenical Approach to Christian Unity* (Wüzburg: Augustinus Verlag, 1990), p. 30.

dialogue, any possibility of open discussion to lay the groundwork for reunion was impossible. Polish political hostility, the political machinations of d'Herbigny, Catholic ecclesiological assumptions of theological primacy and ecclesial self-sufficiency, and erratic and even contradictory strategies for reunion made not only dialogue but any ecumenical activity counter-productive for reunion. Tretjakewitsch even noted the hostile opinion of the supposed Russophile d'Herbigny toward Dostoevsky, finding "little or no merit in [Dostoevsky's] novels, [and identifying] Lenin and Trotsky as "'spiritual sons of Dostoevsky.'"[123] While Tretjakewitsch clearly demonstrated the reasons for the failure of reunion between the Catholic and Russian Orthodox Churches, he did not explicitly consider the problem as one of cultural prejudice.

Vincenzo Poggi introduced the theme of cultural prejudice in the concluding chapter, "*Pregiudizio culturale e ricchezza dell'Oriente Cristiano*" [Cultural Prejudice and the riches of Eastern Christianity"] of *Per La Storia del Pontificio Istituto Orientale: Saggi sull'istituzione,i suoi uomini e l'Oriente Cristiano* [*Concerning the History of the Pontifical Oriental Institute: A Determination of the Institution, its Men, and Eastern Christianity*].[124] Poggi, proposed that the roots of this prejudicial sense of superiority can be traced to the Middle Ages and more specifically to Possovino, who in his opinion best exemplified this prejudice.[125] However, Poggi narrated the history of ecumenical activity as slowly moving away from this cultural prejudice,

---

[123]*Ibid*., p. 181.

[124]Vincenzo Poggi, SJ, "Pregudizio culturale e ricchezza dell'Oriente Cristiano," chap. in *Per La Storia del Pontificio Istituto Orientale: Saggi sull'istituzione,i suoi uomini e l'Oriente Cristiano*, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* Series, 263 (Roma: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 2000).

[125]*Ibid*., 421-22.

having its "splendors and disgraces" ("*fasti e nefasti*") without making them clear in this rather short chapter.

Overall, Catholic and Western histories of the Catholic Church and Russia utilize a victim-victimizer model, in which the church is the victim and Russia and/or the Russian Orthodox Church is the victimizer. In this way, the virtue of the Catholic Church is maintained even if it makes mistakes, and the vices of Russia push it toward the traditional sense of barbarity. Religiously, the predominant narrative is that of martyrdom of the Church, and under the Soviets, with other churches as well. Politically, the predominant narrative is of conflict, intrigue, and struggle, all of which seem to function as prologue to the Cold War. This dissertation will differ, both in form and content.

The analysis of the conduct of the PCpR under the leadership of Michel d'Herbigny will eschew the traditional religious and political analyses, which have preserved the victim-victimizer model of history. Rather, this dissertation will analyze how soft-Orientalist attitudes of the members of the PCpR affected the relationship between the Roman Catholic Church and Russia between the years of 1925 and 1933, when the PCpR was an independent commission.

The PCpR existed within the Congregation of the Oriental Churches (CEO) since 1922, and after it was re-integrated into CEO in 1934, existed until its suppression in 1993. More or less, the life span of the PCpR was congruent with that of the USSR. Because Vatican archives make available materials for consultation only up to 1939, a study which ends on the threshold of the Second World War would leave an analytical narrative hanging. Examining the PCpR while it was independent, from 1925-1939, gives a discreet view into the mentality of the PCpR. The narrative can focus primarily on its relationship to Russia, with Vatican politics in the

background, rather than have to shift the focus in 1934 to include that as well.

The analysis of this cultural history will utilize the categories employed by cultural anthropologists in their study of religion: (1) creed, i.e. theoretical belief concern divinity, and the relationship of the divine with the mundane which underlies the religion and provides a foundation for the following elements, (2) code, i.e. the expected behavior required by the religion, and (3) cult, i.e. the worship of the divine. Although a synchronic analysis would provide a clearer understanding of the development of the mission of the PCpR and the PCpR itself, the analysis will be diachronic, as it presents more clearly how soft-Orientalist attitudes were at play in the aforementioned development. Within the context of that diachronic analysis, infrequent references will be made to provide a minimal sense of the synchronicity of events.

This dissertation argues that the PCpR both utilized and perpetuated soft-Orientalist attitudes present in Western European culture from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The chief difficulty in making the case is how strongly to tease out the theme of soft-Orientalism. None of the members of the Catholic Church outrightly said they thought Russians were a lesser people, though the constant concern about the suffering of Russia due to the barbarous situation comes very close to making such an admonition. The difficulty is how to make such a case prudently: Make it too strongly, and it becomes caricature. Make the case too weakly, and it becomes inconsequential. Being co-opted by either extreme would render the dissertation another means of conveying soft-Orientalism rather than an analysis of it.

Practically, the dissertation consists of five (5) chapters and a brief conclusion. This chapter, Chapter 1, has presented the historiographical importance of the overall project. The creation of understanding of Europe itself has been, in part, an exercise in soft-Orientalism, in

which the historical narratives of the Catholic Church and Russia have contributed. Chapter 2 examines the logical question of why the Catholic Church needed a specific commission to deal with Russia, when it had not needed one before. Succinctly, the PCpR was created out of the sense that Russia, even before the Bolshevik Revolution, was becoming ripe for evangelization and conversion to Catholicism. Chapter 3 examines the structural aspects of the PCpR and Russia, and so includes those aspects of cultic worship, which help not only to form ecclesial structures which not only conveyed, but themselves symbolized, soft-Orientalist attitudes. Chapter 4 examines the creedal beliefs of the PCpR, which chiefly utilized the Russian theologian Vladimir Soloviev (1853-1900), who had himself appropriated and internalized soft-Orientalist attitudes. Chapter 5 examines the code of behavior– laden with soft-Orientalism– which the PCpR employed in its aid to Russians and Russian refugees, the needs of which arose from the post-Revolutionary barbaric situation in which they found themselves.

Practically, a brief note concerning the citation of archival materials is in order. Unlike many archives, the holdings of the various archives of the Vatican are not numbered, and each archive within the Vatican has its own system of cataloging its holdings. Therefore, citations within this dissertation are constructed such that evidence may be easily found within the system of each individual archive.

The archives of the *Segretaria di Stato della Santa Sede per gli Affari Ecclesiastici Straordinari* (AA.EE.SS.), organize materials by country (such as Russia or Polonia), or by Vatican bureau (such as the Pontifical Commission for Russia– PCpR). Within those sub-holdings, documents are archived by box and then folder. Within each folder, documents have been stamped with page numbers. Thus, a footnote entry such as "AA.EE.SS., PCpR 1/3: 86"

would mean that the reference data is held in the AA.EE.SS. archives, in the subsection dealing with the Pontifical Commission for Russia, in the box #1/folder #3, on page 86.

The Vatican Secret Archives, or the ASV, organizes its sub-headings similarly, which are in turn organized by year. Within those sub-holdings, documents are archived by box and folder. Thus, a footnote entry such as "ASV Seg. di Stato (1920) 9/3: 12" would meant that the referenced data is held in the Vatican Secret Archives, in the sub-holdings for the Secretary of State in the year 1920, in box #9/folder #3, on page 12. The archives held at The College of the Holy Cross in Worcester, MA, and the archives of the Congregation of the Eastern Churches (CEO) are, relatively speaking, small, and requests are made directly to the archivist and by appointment.

Documents in the AA.EE.SS, ASV, and CEO are predominantly reports made for internal consideration. They include internal memoranda, minutes of meetings, copies of letters to– and letters from– various ecclesiastical officials, copies of various *moto proprii*, and newspaper clippings deemed important to consider. When placed within the culture of the "*Romanitas*" of the Vatican, they are quite revealing of the motivations and practical business of the Eastern Mission of the Vatican.

This history of the PCpR should have wide appeal. The ecclesiological and intellectual themes should interest various scholars of religion: historians, anthropologists, and theologians, while the examination of Russia should interest various scholars of the region. That being said, the history of the PCpR really begins in the Levant.

Chapter 2
The Holy Land, Modernity, and Modern Nationalism: The Vatican Discovers Russia as Mission Territory

In Chapter 1, we saw how histories of the Catholic Church and Russia arise from and perpetuate soft-Orientalist dynamics which render Eastern Europe as an internal other, more civilized than the peoples of Asia or Africa, but less advanced than the peoples of Western Europe. While Larry Wolff argued that these dynamics developed during the Enlightenment,[1] they continued into the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and were qualified by modernity, nationalist movements, and the colonial project. The issue of modernity in Russia (or the accusation of its lack thereof), and the essential connection between Orthodoxy and Russianness (championed by the Slavophiles yet widely held in Russia), placed Russia– geographically and culturally– on the fringe of a modernizing Europe. The Westernizer-Slavophile debate confirmed the Russian acceptance of this ambiguous relationship to Europe. The Vatican, beset with its own problems with modernity and the nationalist movements of Western Europe, came to have an ambiguous relationship with Europe in its own way, also due to modernity, nationalist movements, and the colonial project.

Both the nationalist and colonialist movements utilized religion to further particular agendas; correlatively, the Catholic and Orthodox Churches contended independently with that interplay. The Russian-Orthodox identity and Russian characterization of Catholicism as "the Polish Faith" complemented the assertion that Orthodox Russia and the Roman Catholic Church were irreconcilable. Yet, within the long nineteenth century and particularly in the Eastern

[1]Larry Wolff, *Inventing Eastern Europe: The Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1994).

Mediterranean Basin, the Catholic Church realized the potential for, and developed an interest in, the conversion of Orthodox Russia to Catholicism.

From the Catholic perspective, such a union was theologically possible, although the language of union was spoken from a position of theological superiority; the dissident Orthodox Churches were to abandon their errors and return to the One, True, Church of Christ. Rome and Constantinople had been in communion in the early Church, so the possibility of re-union existed. Establishing communion between the Russian Orthodox Church and the Catholic Church was more problematic.

The Patriarchate of Moscow established in 1325, after the formal schism of 1054. Lines of communication between the Vatican and the Muscovite Patriarch were practically non-existent, although some communication did occur. Perhaps the most relevant example is when Ivan III (1440-1505) declined Papal overtures of union.[2] However, the Russian religious imagination– which thinks of Great Russia (Muscovy) as having an essential, historical connection to Little Russia (Ukraine) and White Russia (Belarus)– claims that all of Russia received Christianity in 988, with the baptism of Kiev. If this were the case, then Russia would have been in communion in Rome until 1054, because it was in communion with Constantinople. This logic was in fact asserted by Rev. Ivan Sergeevich Gagarin, S.J. However, Orthodox ecclesiology does not accept this style of thinking. In many instances, two autocephalous Orthodox Churches have excommunicated each other, but remain in communion with Constantinople. A recent example would be the mutual excommunications of the Estonian and

---

[2]Nicholas Riasanovsky, *A History of Russia*, 6th ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 107.

Russian Orthodox Churches, both of which remained in communion with Constantinople. Ecumenical language describes the union between the Catholic and Russian Orthodox Churches as reunion of Churches, while the historical record shows a much more problematic relationship between the Catholic and Orthodox churches.

However, the Union of Brześć (1596) demonstrated that Greek Orthodox Churches in the Polish *Kresy* could enter into communion with the Catholic Church, because they did. Yet, these Byzantine Rite Catholic Churches existed as Catholic Churches with great difficulty. Their Byzantine Rite made them less than Catholic to the Poles, and their communion with Rome made them anathema to the Russians until their forced return to Orthodoxy in 1839. Their fate was not only a barometer which measured the success or failure of Russian and Polish imperial aims, but also gave the impression that an irreconcilable dichotomy existed– and exists– between the Catholic and Orthodox worlds.[3]

Popularly, much has been made of the Schism of 1054. The sensational scene in which the Papal Legate, Cardinal Humbert of Silva Candida, acting with the full authority of Pope Leo IX, laid the bull of excommunication on the altar of *Hagia Sophia* on 17 July 1054, prompting Patriarch Michael Cerularius to respond in kind on 20 July, has been presented by historians and theologians as a watershed between the Photian Schism[4] (863-867) and the sack of

---

[3]Barbara Skinner, *The Western Front of the Eastern Church: Uniate and Orthodox Conflict in 18th Century Poland, Ukraine, Belarus, and Russia* (De Kalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 2009).

[4]Francis Dvornik demonstrates the genuine seriousness of the break between East and West in *The Photian Schism: History and Legend* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1948), pp. 292-93.

Constantinople by the western Crusaders in 1204,[5] in which political and theological differences became irreconcilable.[6] These dramatic events imply a definitive eccleisiologial break between the Catholic and Orthodox Churches. Indeed the practice of using the labels "Catholic" and "Orthodox to refer, respectively, to the Western and Eastern Churches, came in response to this break.

In spite of the *de jure* mutual excommunication between the magisteria, inter-communion among the laity remained a reality in the Levant. Serge Decsey began his study of *The Melkite Church* by observing,[7]

---

[5]Thomas F. Madden teases out the intensity of the fourth crusade and how it has become divisive, even to the present day, in "Outside and Inside the Fourth Crusade," *The International History Review* 17, no. 4 (Nov. 1995): 726-43.

[6]Brett Whalen reviews the historiography of the Schism of 1054, arguing the religious issues were not a catalyst for the supposedly more real and substantial political conflicts, but issues in and of themselves; *cf*. "Rethinking the Schism of 1054: Authority, Heresy, and the Latin Rite," *Traditio* 62 (2007): 1-24.

[7]The theologian Yves Congar, in his celebrated "Notes sur le 'Schisme oriental," chap. in *1854-1954. L'Eglise et les Eglises. Neuf siecles de douloureuse separation entre l'Orient et l'Occident*, vol. I (Chevetogne, 1954), pp. 3-95, has demonstrated that the rupture between Rome and Constantinople had begun well before the era of patriarchs Photius and Cerularius, that it had not been consummated with the latter, and even that it had never been totally consummated. He asserts that what is called the "Eastern Schism" cannot be treated historically as a homogeneous and monolithic whole, but as "the acceptance of a situation where each part of Christianity lives, behaves, and judges without taking the other into account" (p. 7). Congar therefore prefers to talk of progressive estrangement and gives its principal factors which are of a political, religio-cultural, and ecclesiastical nature. Finally it was above all in the domain of ecclesiology that the break was to affirm itself during the second thousand years. With the Gregorian Reformation, the Roman primacy became a universal monarchy of an ecclesiastical nature. See also in this connection: W. DeVries, *Orient et Occident. Les sturctures ecclesiales vues dans l'histore des sept premiers conciles oecumeniques* (Paris, 1974), and T. Ware, "Orthodox and Catholics in the Seventeenth Century: Schism or Intercommunion?" in D. Baker, *Schism, Heresy, and Religious Protest. Papers Read at the Tenth Summer Meeting and the Eleventh Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society,* Studies in Church History 9 (Cambridge, 1972), pp. 259-276.

> In the seventeenth century, we find a situation within the Turkish Empire so unprecedented that, in fact, one has every right to wonder whether it is possible to speak of a definitive schism between the Greek Churches and Rome during this period, in spite the long-existing rupture. For despite an anti-Latin hostility, more marked at Constantinople, Jerusalem, and Mount Athos, many Catholics and Orthodox, both educated clergy and simple faithful, behaved as if there were no schism at all between East and West. The innumerable cases of joint celebrations and of *communicatio in sacris* are striking evidence of this attitude.[8]

Decsey asserted that this was possible because: (1) the Christians of both confessions lived in the same areas and co-mingled, (2) the shared weight of the Ottoman yoke as non-believers gave them a shared identity, (3) the Antiochene patriarch, Peter III, though unsuccessfully, assumed the role of mediator between Michael Cerularius and Leo IX, (4) isolated acts of communion were made by subsequent Antiochene patriarchs, and (5) the Latin missionaries sent by *Propadanda Fide* successfully infiltrated the Levant (in what Decsey calls a "Trojan Horse" style of settlement), and were well-regarded for their preaching and teaching. The relatively positive relationship between Latins and Greeks did not last.

Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fide (the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith), commonly referred to as *Propaganda Fide*, was created by Pope Gregory XV in 1622, and was charged with preserving the faith of Catholics in non-Catholic lands and with proselytization of non-Christians. While initial missionary efforts did respect the Eastern Christian liturgical and theological heritage, the post-Tridentine centralization tendencies began to privilege Roman Catholicism. Latinization, i.e. the imposition of western liturgical practices and doctrinal beliefs upon non-Roman Catholic Churches, became the standard practice,

---

[8]Serge F. Decsey, *The Melkite Church: An Historical and Ecclesiological Approach*, preface by Archbishop Joseph Tawil (Newton, MA: Sophia Press, 1993), pp. 19-20.

embittering Eastern Rite Catholics, and it remained in practice in spite of Papal exhortations to the contrary found in *Allatae sunt* (1755).[9] While relations between the Eastern Catholic rites and the Roman rite remained problematic, the relations between Catholics and Orthodox took a turn for the worse in the 1840s.

By this time, transport by rail and steamship allowed substantial numbers of Catholics from Italy, France, and even the US to travel to the Holy Land. These pilgrims were relative newcomers to the area, while devout Russian Orthodox believers had been making pilgrimages for centuries. It was not merely the Russian presence that was important, it was the Orthodox Russian presence. The majority of the earliest Russian writings concerning the Near East were pilgrimage accounts.[10]

The connection between Russian-ness and Orthodoxy is virtually impossible to overstate. Russians believed that one could not be Russian unless she or he was Orthodox, and believed that the fullness of True Orthodoxy existed only in Russia. Even Orthodox Russian commentaries condemn a "pagan" Russian attack of Byzantium found in the Russian *Primary Chronicle,* because the Russians acted against Orthodoxy.[11] Carrying that logic to its conclusion, the mid-nineteenth century Russian theologian M.P Soloviev insisted,

---

[9]Benedict XIV, "*Allatae sunt,*" in *The Papal Encyclicals, 1740-1878*, ed. Claudia Carlen, I.H.M (Raleigh, NC: McGrath Publishing Co., 1981), pp. 51-73. As with all encyclicals, *Allatae Sunt* did not appear in a vacuum; it was written with a specific purpose to address a specific problem or issue. To defend the dignity of the Oriental Rites presupposes that they had been treated in an undignified manner.

[10]Derek Hopwood, *The Russian Presence in Syria and Palestine, 1843-1914: Church and Politics in the Near East* (London: Oxford University Press, 1969), p. 10.

[11]Eugene Vodolazkin, "The New Middle Ages," *First Things* August/September 2016: 33.

> Russia's name has been made known throughout every country by her statesmen and politicians. It is quite different in Palestine **which is our native land and in which we do not recognize ourselves as foreigners.** The participation of Russia in the affairs of Palestine and the Christian East has not been the result of temporary and transient political factors but from the beginning has been an affair of the people, who instinctively and enthusiastically claimed the Holy Land as their own just as much as Holy Russia.[12] (Emphasis mine.)

The Russian connection to the Holy Land was not merely a matter of theological principle, but also of practice. In 1842, the Russian Orthodox Church established an ecclesiastical mission which lasted until 1917, the aim of which was to teach Russian and Greek, oversee the use of Russian alms within the Orthodox millet in the Ottoman Empire, and support Russian pilgrims.[13] Over the next few years, this mission developed into a rather complex undertaking in support of these pilgrims, which included the construction and administration of a hospital, chapel, school, and marketplace.[14] In the wake of the Crimean War, Pan-Slavism contended with how to understand Pan-Orthodoxy, as it included non-Slavs and included the Christian East.[15] Indeed, the Russian Orthodox presence in the Holy Land was well-established, enjoying a measure of

---

[12]Derek Hopwood, *The Russian Presence in Syria and Palestine*, pp. 9-10. A brief connection between the Holy Land and Russia as its inheritor is made in Michael Cheniavsky, *Tsar and People: Studies in Russian Myths* (New York: Random House, 1969), pp. 102-03. A distant connection between Jerusalem as the composition of the body of Christ (the Church) and Russia can be detected in George P. Fedotov, *The Russian Religious Mind: Kievan Christianity, the 10th to the 13th Centuries*, vol. 3 (Belmont, MA: Nordland Publishing Co., 1973), pp. 73-4.

[13]David M. Goldfrank, *The Origins of the Crimean War* (New York: Longman, 1994), p. 78, and Hopwood, p. 33.

[14]Orlando Figes, *Crimea: The Last Crusade* (New York: Allen Lane (Penguin Books), 2010), p. 3.

[15]Denis Vovchenko, "Modernizing Orthodoxy: Russia and the Christian East (1856-1914)," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 73, no. 2 (April 2012): 295-317.

both civic responsibility and religious authority. Contemporaneously, the Catholic Church discovered a window into Russian Orthodoxy through Ivan Sergeevich Gagarin (1814-1882).

Gagarin, born into a traditional Russian Orthodox noble family, understood both Russia and Orthdoxy quite well. He also understood the west very well; he was well educated, traveled in Germany, France, and Italy as a youth, and spent years in Western Europe in the Russian diplomatic service. His conversion to Roman Catholicism in 1842 and his entrance into the Society of Jesus the following year provided the Catholic Church with a genuine expert. In regard to his conversion, Beshoner, his biographer, observed,

> We must remind ourselves that Gagarin's conversion took several years: even after the influence of Schelling in 1832, Chaadaev in 1835, and participation in Svechina's salon in 1838, Gagarin only converted in 1842. This decision did not come easily for him: he began with a belief in the superiority of Western civilization, then identified Western civilization with the Roman Catholic Church, and accept Roman Catholic theology as the divine truth. Only then could he accept conversion.[16]

As a Jesuit, Gagarin worked his entire life for the conversion of Russia, sometimes at odds with his superiors and flirting with disobedience because his zealous desire to convert his homeland.

We find in Gagarin not only the seeds of thought which influenced Soloviev and d'Herbigny (which will be identified in chapter 4), but ideas which the Vatican promoted during his own lifetime. Gagarin eventually became involved with the Christian Near East after a coup

---

[16]Jeffrey Bruce Beshoner, *Ivan Sergeevich Gagarin: The Search for Orthodox and Catholic Union* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2002), p. 37.

within the editorial board of *Études de théologie, de philosphie et d'histoire*[17] the journal he founded to promote the conversion of the Orthodox, sidelined him. In addition to the many theological and historical articles which addressed the possibilities and problems for reunion, Gagarin also thought practically. Broadly, over many years, Gagarin developed many ideas for the conversion of Russia in particular and Orthodox Christians in general, as well as for safeguarding the Byzantine Catholic Churches. Gagarin warned against the Latinization of Byzantine Churches, proposed the establishment of Byzantine-Rite scholasticates and seminaries for men from, or who wanted to work within, the Byzantine Rite, and advocated the use of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church as a doorway into Russia because it was a Byzantine-Slavonic Rite Church. Gagarin finally got a chance to work with the Bulgarian Orthodox Church in the early 1860s. The Levant, by that time, was a pitched spiritual battleground.

The first serious challenge came from a portion of the nearly 20,000 Catholic pilgrims in the Spring of 1846. That year, Easter fell on the same day for both Churches,[18] each of which wanted to use the holy sites. When the Orthodox would not leave the Holy Sepulchre on Good Friday, both Catholic and Orthodox pilgrims engaged in a deadly fight which left over forty people dead and many more seriously wounded.[19] Although subsequent antagonisms between Catholics and Orthodox were not as spectacular, antagonisms did indeed grow.

In 1846, a local Franciscan printing press was founded for the publication of Catholic

---

[17]The journal was popularly known as "*Études,*" even into the 20th century. Coincidentally, d'Herbigny later became the editor of this journal, and once again use it to promote Orthodox-Catholic unity.

[18]April 12 in the Gregorian calendar and March 31st in the Julian.

[19]Figes, *Crimea: The Last Crusade*, pp. 1-2.

literature, allowing for local dissemination of Catholic ideas which, of course, challenged the Orthodox position. In 1847, Pope Pius IX re-established the Latin Patriarchate of Jerusalem in Jerusalem itself, which had not been the case since the fall of the crusader states 1291.[20] The Pope appointed Giuseppe Valerga, who had been a member of the *Propaganda Fide*, as the Patriarch. The choice of a veteran of *Propaganda Fide* is important. It signaled that the primary work of the Latin Patriarch was that of proselytization. Additionally, Pius IX promulgated an impolitic general and generic encyclical letter in the following year (1848), urging the bishops and clergy of the Orthodox Churches to re-enter communion with Rome.[21] However, these Patriarchs rebuffed his overtures in their public letter in May 1848 to "all bishops everywhere... their most pious clergy... and to all... sons of the one, holy, apostolic church,"[22] citing the *filioque* as heresy and repudiating ultramontanism (examined below) as a legitimate exercise of Papal authority. Valerga immediately began to oppose the efforts of Cyril II, the Greek Patriarch of Jerusalem.

Cyril II moved the Patriarchal residence from Constantinople to Jerusalem itself. Ruling until 1872, he attempted to solidify his authority over Orthodox Christians in the general region of the eastern Mediterranean. He also sought to establish his authority over the Byzantine Catholics in the Ottoman Empire. While these Byzantine Catholics had traditionally oscillated between Catholicism and Orthodoxy, they recently found themselves more and more drawn to

---

[20]Goldfrank, *The Origins of the Crimean War*, p. 79.

[21]Beshoner, pp. 59-61.

[22]Modern History Sourcebook, last modified November 1998, accessed 2 September 2016, Fordham University. Stable URL: http://legacy.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/1848orthodox encyclical.asp.

the Catholic Church.[23]

Correlatively, the Pope had directed that *Propaganda Fide* be divided into two sections: one responsible for business pertaining to the Latin Rite, and the other responsible for business pertaining to the Churches of Oriental rites which had a stable hierarchy, including the Italo-Greek Church. This new oriental section, the *Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fide pro Negotiis Ritus Orientalis*[24] was not to concern itself chiefly or only with liturgy as *Propaganda Fide* had done previously, but with "doctrine, rite, discipline, direction, [and] the examination of the affairs of the bishops and means to promote union."[25] *Propaganda Fide* was reorganized officially on 6 January 1862. That same year, Pius IX promulgated *Amantissimus*,[26] reaffirming the respect of the Catholic Church for its diverse peoples and rites within it. Once again, Latinization was condemned. Pius IX had cast himself as a patron of the Christian East. While the Vatican sought to improve relations with its Byzantine Catholics, an opportunity arose to bring a group of Orthodox Christians into communion with Rome.

In December 1860 in Constantinople, some officials of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church approached Anthony Hassoun, the Armenian Catholic Primate, with the request to enter into

---

[23]George Stavrou Theofanis, "Russian Interest in the Lavant, 1843-1848: Porfirii Uspenskii and the Establishment of the First Russian Ecclesiastical Mission in Jerusalem," *Middle East Journal* 17, no. 1 (Winter-Spring 1963): 95.

[24]This is known popularly as the Division for the Affairs of the Oriental Rite (within *Propaganda Fide*).

[25]Michael Vattappalam, *The Congregations for the Eastern Churches: Origins and Competence* (Citta del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1999), pp. 42-44.

[26]Pius IX, "*Amantissimus,*" in *The Papal Encyclicals, 1740-1878*, ed. Claudia Carlen, I.H.M (Raleigh, NC: McGrath Publishing Co., 1981), pp. 363-67.

communion with the Roman Catholic Church. In return, the Bulgarians asked that a Catholic Bulgarian Patriarchate be created to preserve the Orthodox faith, and that their Byzantine liturgical life be preserved. The Vatican responded favorably, and Pius IX ordained Archimandrite Joseph Sokolski as archbishop for these new Bulgarian Catholics, who numbered about 60,000.[27]

The conversion of this Byzantine-Slavonic Rite Church gave Gagarin hope and confirmed for the Vatican that dissidents could return to the One, True Church. The hopes that Orthodox Christians were ready to return to the Catholic Church were built on false premises. Beshoner pointed out that both Gagarin and the Vatican mis-read the intentions of the Bulgarians. Their conversion had more to do with seeking independence from Constantinople for reasons of ecclesial prestige rather than accepting Catholic dogmatic and doctrinal formulations as the truth.[28] The Russian Orthodox Church, contrarily, would lose prestige– if not all of its followers– if it traded the patronage of the Tsar for the Roman Pontiff.

Nonetheless, Russia itself would lose what prestige it had with its loss in the Crimean War. At issue was the "Eastern Question," i.e. how to handle militarily and diplomatically the Ottoman Empire, the so-called "sick man of Europe."[29] Each of the European colonial powers

---

[27]Beshoner, p. 132-33.

[28]*Ibid*., p. 133.

[29]The standard interpretation argues the Ottoman Empire was shown to be in decline since the Russo-Turkish War of 1768-74, and the Great Powers struggled to manage the power vacuum created in that decline; *cf.* J.A.R. Marriott, *The Eastern Question: An Historical Study*, 4th ed. (London: Oxford University Press, 1940); M.S. Anderson, *The Eastern Question, 1774-1923: A Study in International Relations* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1966); and A.L. Macfie, *The Eastern Question, 1774-1923* (New York: Longman, 1996). Even Karl Marx agrees with the general contours of this study, but teases out the trade interest in managing a declining Ottoman

attempted to address the Eastern Question in conjunction with its colonial interests, advancing its own aims while hindering its rivals. The historiography of the Crimean War is complicated, but without distortion we can say that Western imperial interests, France domestic politics, and Russian religious attitudes brought Great Britain and France into open conflict with the Ottoman Empire and Russia. Without dismissing the colonialist dimensions of the conflict, Russian religious interest within the borders of the Ottoman Empire were germane to Vatican missionary ambitions.

Since the reign of Catherine II, Russian Tsars claimed the role of protector of Orthodox Christians within the Ottoman Empire, which, due to the structure of the millet system, practically meant involvement over all Christians. However, after the creation of a Catholic millet in 1831,[30] the Tsars could no longer claim a *de facto* concern over Catholics. The French Clerical Party took advantage of this situation to increase its influence within France and French influence abroad.

Emperor Napoleon III, in an effort to preserve his government with pressure from this French Clerical Party, posted one of its members, Charles de La Valleta, as the French ambassador to the Sublime Porte. A zealous Catholic, La Valleta pressured the Ottoman Sultan

---

empire in *The Eastern Question: A Reprint of Letters Written 1853-1856 Dealing with the Events of the Crimean War*, ed. Eleanor Marx Aveling and Edward Aveling (New York: Augustus M. Kelley, 1969). The opposing school of thought argues that the Ottoman Empire was in fact in recovery, thereby creating a crisis for the Great Powers which required a weak Ottoman Empire to maintain their interests. This position is best exemplified by Malcolm Yapp, *The Making of the Modern Near East, 1792-1923* (New York: Longman, 1987). This entire corpus is complimented, and perhaps challenged by the view that religious factors played a more important role than has been previously accepted; again, n.b. Orlando Figues, *Crimea: The Last Crusade*.

[30]Selcuk Aksin Somel, "Millet," in *Historical Dictionary of the Ottoman Empire*, 2nd ed., (Toronto: The Scarecrow Press, 2010), pp. 248-49.

Mahmud II to transfer the stewardship of some holy sites from the Orthodox Church to the Roman Catholic Church. Tsar Nicholas was quickly losing his authority in the Ottoman Empire over religious matters; this was finalized in the Russian defeat in the Crimean War.

The Treaty of Paris of March 1856 confirmed Russia as a European inferior. Politically, Russia was required to recognize the neutrality of the Black Sea and to surrender territories near the mouth of the Danube, effectively halting any territorial expansion it envisioned.

The subsequent Russo-Turkish War (1887-1888), while it dismantled the Ottoman Empire in the Balkans, did not help Russia regain religious and geo-political influence in the Eastern Mediterranean for which it had hoped. While the Treaty of San Stefano (March 1878) displayed Russian power and prestige– including its role of protector of Armenian Christians, the Treaty of Berlin (July 1878) which followed almost immediately clearly undid that. The new treaty nationalized the Armenian issue, allowing the Great Powers to play the role of protector as a weapon against the Ottoman Empire. The Armenian issue also signaled a shift in Great Power politics, marginalizing Russia and forcing it to find an ally to replace Germany.[31] Quintin Barry noted, "Russia had been militarily exhausted by the war, and reality compelled her [sic!] to give up some of the gains [it] had wrested from the Turks at San Stefano. In the end, the two empires [the Ottoman Empire and Russia]... ended [the war] by sharing... a feeling of humiliation."[32]

Although it had played a part in creating the map of nineteenth century Europe, Russia

---

[31]M. Hakan Yavuz and Peter Sluglett, eds., *War and Diplomacy: The Russo-Turkish War of 1877-1878 and the Treaty of Berlin* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 2001), pp. 42, 44, 126, 450.

[32]Quintin Barry, *War in the East: A Military History of the Russo-Turkish War, 1877-78* (Solihull, West Midlands, England: Helion and Co., Ltd., 2012), pp. 439-40.

found itself on both the geographic and political fringe. Religiously, the Tsar was required to renounce his claim of protective oversight over Orthodox Christians in the Ottoman Empire. In the midst of these difficulties, the Vatican saw more clearly the possibility to increase its influence in the Byzantine world. Success became all the more important for the Vatican with the rise of Modernism and its unavoidable participation in the nationalist projects across Europe.

While the Catholic Church enjoyed the loyalty of many faithful Catholics across Europe, it found itself in opposition to the major political and intellectual currents popular in the nineteenth century, in which much of the old political and social order, with its corresponding intellectual culture, was swept away. By the *fin-de-siècle*, the Catholic Church had accomplished its own renewal of sorts by internal reform, strengthening its position in the Byzantine world, and attempting to gain a spiritual foothold in Russia.

Broadly, Catholic reform in the nineteenth century was meant to resist the effects of modernity. Politically, that meant surviving the effects of the nationalist projects in Western Europe, which had as their aim transforming pre-modern conceptions of national identity to the modern conception based on ethno-linguistic factors. Western European nationalists generally cast the Catholic Church simultaneously as both an internal and external other, against which the nation could, in part, find its identity. The success of this strategy across western Europe was mixed and uneven.[33] Two important exceptions existed in regard to employing the strategy of

---

[33]Note, for example, Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837,* 3rd rev. ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009); Eugen Weber, *Peasants into Frenchmen: The Modernization of Rural France, 1870-1914* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1976); Margaret Lavinia Anderson, *Practicing Democracy: Elections and Political Culture in Imperial Germany* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000). Additionally, Owen Chadwick touches on political alliances between church and state (most notably in France during the 1850s) in which both nationalists and Catholics cooperated, in spite of rhetorical tradition; *cf.* Owen

othering: Poland and Italy.

The Polish nationalist Dmowski, who only incorporated Roman Catholicism as part of his nationalist program to woo Catholic peasants to his cause, created a program which proved, in the long run to be more popular in Poland than that of Józef Piłsudski. Rather than a Polish identity based upon loyalty to the state which would be available to any ethnicity or nationality but the Russian, adherence to Roman Catholicism and Polish as one's mother tongue became essential markers of Polish national identity.[34] Rather than using Catholicism as the image of the other, Judaism was the primary other through which modern Polish national identity was constructed.[35]

The Italian nationalist projects of Cavour and Garibaldi functioned much like those in western Europe: they sought to inculcate an Italian national identity within those people who spoke Italian or Italian dialects while claiming territory which was argued to be Italian.[36] The

---

Chadwick, *A History of the Popes, 1830-1914* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), *passim*.

[34]Brian Porter has challenged the widely held presumption that the conception of the Polish Nation by the *Endecja* was as Polish-speaking Roman Catholics in, "Who is a Pole and Where is Poland? Territory and Nation in the Rhetoric of Polish National Democracy before 1905," *Slavic Review* 51, no. 4 (Winter 1992): 639-53. Intended or not, the popular reception of this program by the masses was to define a Pole as a Polish-speaking Roman Catholic.

[35]Brian Porter, *When Nationalism Began to Hate: Imagining Modern Politics in Nineteenth Century Poland* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000).

[36]An historiographical review of the contours of Italian Nationalism is impossible within the confines of this dissertation. Suffice it to say that Martin Clark in *The Italian Risorgimento* (New York: Longman, 1998), pp. 1-5, argues that three general schools of thought exist: (1) a patriotic, Whiggish school which argues the inevitability of Italian Unification, (2) a leftist school heavily influenced by Antonio Gramsci which understands the Risorgimento as a lost opportunity for the benefit of the lower classes, hijacked by a small elite monopolizing power and (3) a rightist school influenced by Catholic historians who argue that this same small elite unjustly attacked the Church, thereby injuring Italian society. Antonio de Francesco agrees with

Catholic Church and Catholicism, initially, was not immediately and automatically cast as an other against which to construct modern Italy. Martin Clark noted that

> [b]efore 1848, no one [i.e. no Italian nationalist intellectual] supposed religion was incompatible with 'national' sentiment. Conceptually, it was and is difficult to separate the Catholic Church from Italian history, as the Protestant Reformation never made the gains in Italy as it had beyond the Alps. Many Catholic intellectuals favored a 'lay' state, but one in which the Church would retain a large social and cultural role.[37]

However, after 1848, sentiment changed for both Catholics and Italian nationalists.

The condemnation of the Austro-Piedmontese War (early 1848) over Austrian Lombardy by Pius IX, even after the participation of the armies of the Papal States against Austria, turned Italian Nationalist opinion against the Papacy. The Risorgimento became an anti-clerical movement, forcing moderates to choose between church or state in the effort to create an Italian nation.[38] This dichotomy was not inevitable. Many scholars argue that before 1848, Pius IX had been a liberal who both enacted reforms within the Papal states and accepted– at least to a

---

Clark, but highlights the use of the genealogical narrative by the nationalists in the construction of the Italian state in *The Antiquity of the Italian Nation: The Cultural Origins of a Political Myth in Modern Italy, 1796-1943* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013). Essays in *The Risorgimento Revisited* highlight the constructed nature of the Italian state in both political and cultural realms, with an eye toward gender, ethnicity, and religion: Silvana Patriarca and Lucy Riall, eds., *The Risorgimento Revisited: Nationalism and Culture in Nineteenth-Century Italy* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2012). Derek Beales and Eugenio F. Biagini distinguish between the Risorgimento and Italian Unification is offered as a corrective "to the main tradition of Italian historical writing," (p. 2), and attempt to explain that relationship in *The Risorgimento and the Unification of Italy*, 2nd ed. (New York: Longman, 2002).

[37]Clark, *The Italian Risorgimento*, p. 31.

[38]*Ibid*., p. 55.

degree– the political vision of Gioberti, the "neo-Guelph" vision in which Italy would be a federation of states with the Pope as its president.[39] However, with the loss of much of the territory of the Papal states after 1860 (which coincided with renewed, intense difficulties with the French government), Pius IX interpreted Italian nationalism as Italian secularization, and became an "uncompromising foe of liberalism and of democracy, inside or outside the church."[40]

Creating a link between nationalism, especially democratic nationalism, and secularization was an important move. While secularism initially meant the transfer of church lands to lay ownership during the Reformation and French Revolution, it came to have a wider meaning, especially after 1865, to connote the expanding diminishment of religious or spiritual outlook in the political, economic, artistic, and scientific spheres.[41]

While we see on the one hand that modern nationalism and secularization diminished the prestige of the papacy, on the other, nationalism and secularization was the catalyst by which nineteenth century Catholics re-imagined the papal office. Between 1820-1850, Ultramontanist

---

[39]Derek Beales and Eugenio F. Biagini, *The Risorgimento and the Unification of Italy*, 2nd ed. (New York: Longman, 2002). pp. 60-3, 85-91. R. Aubert asserts instead that Pius IX had always been an "enlightened conservative," whose position anti-liberal position only became clear after the loss of the Papal States in 1860; *cf*. Berard L. Marthaler, OFM Conv. *et al.*, eds. *The New Catholic Encyclopedia*, 2nd ed. (Washington, DC: Thompson Gale, 2003), s.v. "Pius IX," by R. Aubert.

[40]Hugh McLeod, *Secularization in Western Europe, 1848-1914* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000), p. 32. Note also Martin Clark, *The Italian Risorgimento*, p. 55; Derek Beales and Eugenio F. Biagini, *The Risorgimento and the Unification of Italy*, 2nd ed. (New York: Longman, 2002). pp. 152-56.

[41]McLeod,, *passim*.

movements emerged which advocated a strong, centralized papacy.[42] The ultimate success of Ultramontanism meant the defeat of Conciliarism– incidentally the governmental principle operative in the Orthodox Churches– which had taken the shape in France, Germany, and Austria as, respectively, Gallicanism, Febronianism, and Josephism.[43]

While Ultramontanists generally thought that they were restoring the prestige of the papacy, Klaus Schatz argued that the Vatican reaction against modernity in fact altered the papacy, reformulating its role.[44] Modernity, which keenly brought to consciousness the role of historical agency in human affairs, shifted the understanding of the magisterium from pre-modern shepherd-rulers "sustained by [the] stream of divine truth" to modern decision-makers concerned about the "faith as transmitted."[45]

This new understanding of the Papal Office prompted the magisterium to assert the centralized ecclesial authority of the papacy at an unprecedented level through *Pastor Aeternus*, the first Dogmatic Constitution of the Catholic Church (ratified during the fourth session of the First Vatican Council on 18 July 1870). Indeed, as the Church lost territory and temporal

---

[42]Jeffrey von Arx, S.J., ed., *Varieties of Ultramontanism*, (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1998).

[43]E.A. Livingstone, "Febronianism," "Gallicanism," and "Josephism," in *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 216, 233-34, 320.

[44]Historiographically, the assertion that reformers unwittingly revolutionized church order or practice has been made outside the modern era; n.b. H.E.J. Cowdrey, *Pope Gregory VII, 1073-1085* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).

[45]Klaus Schatz, *Papal Primacy: From its Origins to the Present*, trans. John A. Otto and Linda M. Maloney (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1996), p. 149.

authority, it asserted universal spiritual authority,[46] i.e. across the globe and across time, when it declared:

> ...the primacy of jurisdiction over the universal Church of God was immediately and directly promised and given to Blessed Peter the Apostle, by Christ the Lord. ...and it is known to all ages, that the holy and Blessed Peter, the Prince and chief of the Apostles, the pillar of the faith and foundation of the Catholic Church, received the keys of the kingdom from our Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour and Redeemer of mankind, and lives, presides, and judges to this day, always in his successors, the Bishops of the Holy See of Rome, which was founded by Him and consecrated by His Blood. ...[And we] must believe that the Holy Apostolic See and the Roman pontiff possesses the primacy over the whole world; and that the Roman pontiff is the successor of Blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and is true Vicar of Christ.[47]

Consequentially, the juridical primacy of the Pope extended toward Eastern Catholics, and theoretically, to all Christians, including the Eastern and Russian Orthodox. This assertion was unpalatable, even to Eastern Catholics. The Catholic Melkite Patriarch Gregory II, a participant at the First Vatican Council, left Rome before the vote on the Constitution took place. In the following year (1871), the Patriarch sent a letter of adhesion at the official demand of Rome, "but with the same reservation as that solemnly enunciated by the Council of Florence in the formula

---

[46]Note that the issue of infallibility was a separate issue. Even those opposed to Ultramontaine movements in the church could assent to the nuanced expression of infallibility. John Henry Cardinal Newman is perhaps the best example; n.b. Berard L. Marthaler, OFM Conv. *et al.*, eds. *The New Catholic Encyclopedia*, 2nd ed. (Washington, DC: Thompson Gale, 2003), s.v. "Newman, John Henry," by F.X. Connolly.

[47]"First Dogmatic Constitution on the Church of Christ," in *Dogmatic Canons and Decrees: Authorized Translations of the Dogmatic Decrees of the Council of Trent, the Decree on the Immaculate Conception, the Syllabus of Pope Pius IX, and the Decrees of the Vatican Council* (Rockford, Il: Tan Books and Publishers, 1977; Originally published by the Devin-Adair Co., New York, 1912), pp. 241-2, 244-45, 246-47.

'*salvis omnibus iuribus et privilegiis patriarcharum*.'"[48] Yet, three years later (1874), Pius IX affirmed the respect of Rome for the Ruthenian (i.e. Ukrainian) Greek Catholic Church, citing the value of diversity, and Vatican willingness to defend the Byzantine Rite when it had come under attack, citing specifically the Russian conduct in the Kholm/Chełm region.[49] While the theme of this encyclical was similar to that of *Amantissimus* promulgated a decade earlier, the post-Vatican I context gives this encyclical a different ecclesiological tone. The status of the papacy had never been higher or grander. Overall, the Papacy became not only a means, but a symbol, by which Catholics could reject modernity even as the temporal power of the church waned.

Modernity is a complex phenomenon, with many cultural, social, political, philosophical, and even religious roots and expressions which cannot be reconciled into a meta-system of belief. Although we can speak of the concept of modernity, modernity as a single phenomenon or idea does not exist. Nonetheless, modernity does take the individual autonomy of the human being seriously, even if such autonomy and individuality is denied. As such, modernity is ultimately rooted in the Cartesian "turn to the subject" which, in the attempt to create conditions for certitude in knowing, divorced the knower (*res cogitans*) from what was known (*res extensa*).[50]

---

[48]Decsey, p. 64.

[49]Pius IX, "*Omnem sollicitudinem*," in *The Vatican and the Eastern Churches: Papal Encyclicals and Documents Concerning the Eastern Churches*, vol. 1 (Fairfax, VA: Eastern Christian Publications, 1996), pp. 147-51.

[50]*Discours de la Méthode pour Bien Conduire sa Raison, et Chercher la Vérité dans les Sciences: Discourse on the Method of Conducting One's Reason Well and of Seeking the Truth in the Sciences, a Bilingual Edition and an Interpretation of René Descartes' Philosophy of Method*, ed., trans., intro., and indexed by George Heffernan (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994).

Broadly speaking, this Cartesian "turn to the subject" shifted the chief philosophical category of inquiry from metaphysics to epistemology. If knowledge were to be something other than opinion, some reasonable reconnection between the knower and the known needed to be established.

Immanuel Kant (1724-1804), in *The Critique of Pure Reason*,[51] launched a "Copernican Revolution" in European by providing a reasonable reconnection between the knower and the known. Kant, in contradistinction to pre-modern thinkers, (1) rejected the mind as a passive receiver of information from the world, instead emphasizing the active work of the mind in creating knowledge from phenomenological experience, and (2) rejected– its champions would say refuted– the pre-modern beliefs that metaphysics as a science was possible.

While Protestant thinkers embraced modern philosophy as a means to understand God, the world, and the place of humanity in it,[52] the Catholic Magisterium rejected two important premises of modern philosophy: the autonomous, individual, human person as a means to understand the person, and the rejection of metaphysics as a means to real knowledge. The

---

[51]Immanuel Kant, *The Critique of Pure Reason*, trans. Werner S. Pluthar and intro. Patricia Kitcher (Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishers, 1996). Both the atheist Bertrand Russell and the Jesuit philosopher-priest Frederick Copleston recognize the brilliance of the Kantian solution of the "problem of the bridge," i.e. the connection of the knower (the *res cogitans* to the external world (the *res extensa*); *cf*. Bertrand Russell, *History of Western Philosophy and its Connection with Political and Social Circumstances from the Earliest Times to the Present Day* (London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd, 1946), pp. 732-735, and Frederick Copleston, S.J., *A History of Philosophy: From the French Enlightenment to Kant*, vol. 6 (New York: Doubleday, 1994).

[52]Horton Harris, *The Tübingen School* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975).

Catholic Magisterium could cite the works of G.W.F. Hegel (1770-1831),[53] Ludwig Feuerbach (1804-1872),[54] Karl Marx (1818-1883),[55] and Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768-1834),[56] as examples of the problems of modernity. Hegel created a non-Christian theology, Feuerbach and Marx turned theology into religious anthropology, and Schleiermacher created a fundamental theology that was only meaningful and convincing for believers. Furthermore, the historical method, which was a product of modernity and popular at Tübingen, made miracles and the divine nature of Jesus problematic. *The Life of Jesus*[57] by David Friedrich Strauss (1808-1874) challenged traditional Catholic biblical criticism and *What is Christianity?*[58] by Adolf Von Harnack rejected traditional Christianity of all kinds by calling for a return to the religion of Jesus, rather than hold the religion about Jesus.

Some Catholic thinkers did engage and attempt to use modernism, especially the historical method; most if not all felt the displeasure, of one degree or another, from the Vatican. John Henry Newman (1801-1890), to whom d'Herbigny likened Vladimir Soloviev (examined in

---

[53]Georg W.F. Hegel, *Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. A.V. Miller, with analysis of the text and a foreward by J.N. Findlay (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977).

[54]Ludwig Feuerbach, *The Essence of Christianity*, trans. George Eliot, intro. Karl Barth, foreword by H. Richard Niebuhr (New York: Harper and Row, 1957).

[55]Karl Marx, *Introduction to a Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right*, trans. Annette Jolin and Joseph O'Malley (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982).

[56]Friedrich Schleiermacher, *The Christian Faith*, ed. and trans. H.R. Mackintosh and J.S. Stewart (London: T&T Clark, 1999).

[57]David Friedrich Strauss, *The Life of Jesus, Critically Examined*, ed. Peter C. Hodgson, trans. George Eliot (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1973).

[58]Adolf Von Harnack, *What is Christianity?,* trans. Thomas Bailey Saunders, intro. Rudolf Bultmann (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986).

Chap. 4), was a notable exception because (1) he wrote his modernist works before his conversion from Anglicanism to Catholicism on 9 October 1845, (2) his *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* maintains that through the incarnation of Jesus Christ, Catholic sacramentality, Church hierarchy, and asceticism which are the essential doctrinal elements of Christianity, were present in their fullness, and that only our understanding has changed historically,[59] and (3) after his conversion, his public *apologiae* for Catholicism were generally well respected by the Catholic church, as he worked to build[60] and to defend his "imagined community" as congruent with Englishness,[61] even as he was opposed by some within the Catholic Church.[62] While all of these Catholic modernists had precedent in the Church Fathers (who sought to explain Christianity in accord with Greek philosophical concepts rather than Jewish[63]), the Vatican did not think the use of Modernism was possible. Famously, Pius IX (r. 1846-1878) rejected Modernism itself in the *Syllabus of Errors.*[64] Subsequently, Leo XIII and

---

[59]John Henry Cardinal Newman, *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* (New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1949), pp. 33-34.

[60]Eileen Kane, "John Henry Newman's Catholic University Church in Dublin," *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review* 66, no. 262/263 (Summer/Augumn 1977): 105-20.

[61]Teresa Huffman Traver, "Losing a Family, Gaining a Church: Catholic Conversion and English Domesticity," *Victorian Review* 37, no. 1 (Spring 2011): 127-43, and Lawrence D. McIntosh, "An Unpublished Letter of John Henry Newman," *The Catholic Historical Review* 59, no. 3 (Oct 1973): 429-33.

[62]Brian W. Taylor, "John Henry Newman and a Catholic Presence at Oxford," *The Irish Journal of Education / iris Eireannach an Oideachiais* 27, no.1/2 (Summer/Winter 1993): 36-49.

[63]Werner Jaeger, *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University, 1961).

[64]Pius IX, "*Syllabus of Errors*," in *The Popes Against Modern Errors: 16 Papal Documents*, ed. Anthony J. Mioni, Jr. (Rockford, IL: Tan Books and Publishers, Inc., 1999), pp.

Pius X officially rejected any use of modernist thought and reaffirmed the pre-modern premises of Catholic Theology.

Aeterni Pastor[65] promulgated in 1879 by Pope Leo XIII (r.1878-1903), advocated scholasticism– more specifically Thomism– as the preferred intellectual framework for Catholic philosophical and theological investigation, thereby preserving the pre-Kantian form and content of Catholic theology. Secondly, the *Oath Against Modernism* promulgated in 1910 by Pius X (r. 1903-1914) was "to be sworn by all clergy, pastors, confessors, preachers, religious superiors, and professors in philosophical-theological seminaries,"[66] made the rejection of (Catholic) Modernism, falsely held to be a single, comprehensive system,[67] explicit. While the oath is somewhat lengthy, the second paragraph gets to the heart of the matter:

> Furthermore, with due reverence, I submit and adhere with my whole heart to the condemnations, declarations, and all the prescripts contained in the Encyclical *Pascendi* and in the decree *Lamentabili*, especially those concerning what is known as the history of dogmas. I also reject the error of those who say that the faith held by the Church can contradict history, and that Catholic dogmas, in the sense in which they are now understood, are irreconcilable with a more realistic view of the origins of the Christian religion....[68]

27-39.

[65]Leo XIII, "*Aeterni Patris,*" in *The Papal Encyclicals, 1878-1903*, ed. Claudia Carlen, I.H.M. (Raleigh, NC: McGrath Publishing Co., 1986), pp. 17-27.

[66]Pius X, "*The Oath Against Modernism*," in *The Popes Against Modern Errors: 16 Papal Documents*, ed. Anthony J. Mioni, Jr. (Rockford, IL: Tan Books and Publishers, Inc., 1999), p. 271.

[67]Darrell Jodock, ed., *Catholicism Contending with Modernity: Roman Catholic Modernism and Anti-Modernism in Historical Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 2.

[68]Pius X, *Oath Against Modernism*, p. 271.

Officially, the Catholic Church rejected the contemporary movements of philosophy, democracy, and the dynamics of the modern nation state, while reaffirming the primacy of the Pope. On the one hand, this put them out of step with most of Europe. On the other, embracing the struggle against modernism provided– from a Catholic perspective– a dimension of philosophical sophistication that Orthodox theology did not have, and which was later embraced by the members of the PCpR. In the meanwhile, the Vatican set its sights once again on the Christian East, under the leadership of Pope Leo XIII (r. 1878-1903), who understood himself as its benefactor.

The most sensational Catholic effort in the Christian East was the Fourteenth Eucharistic Congress, held in 1893 in Jerusalem, Syria, from the Ascension through Pentecost (11-21 May).[69] Holding the congress in the Levant reinforced his attempt to have direct religious influence in the Christian East, replacing that of the French,[70] and instilled in many Catholic faithful a consciousness of the Byzantine world.[71]

Additionally, he founded the Armenian College in Rome (1893), a Coptic College in Cairo (1897), the Leonianum in Athens, and two Bulgarian colleges in Plovdiv and Edirne, as well as the Seminary of St. Anne in Jerusalem for the formation of Melkite clergy. He also restored the Athanasianum, a seminary for Greek Orthodox clergy, which was built by Gregory XIII. In regard to policy, Leo XIII also promulgated the apostolic letter *Praeclara*

---

[69]ASV, Seg. di Stato, (1900) 12/10: 142.

[70]Claude Soetens, *Le Congrès Eucharistique International de Jérusalem (1893): Dans le Cadre de la Politique Orientale du Pape Léon XIII* (Louvain: Bibliothèque de l'Université, Bureau du Recueil, 1977), pp. 5-6, 204.

[71]ASV, Seg. di Stato, (1900), 12/10: 63-81.

gratulationis[72] (20 June 1894) which called for the reunion of Christendom. In it, the Pope praised the Christian East while defending papal juridical primacy, attacking the subjugation of Orthodox Churches to state government, and evaluating the modern assertion of progress to be false. Finally, Latinization remained a problem, and Leo XIII promulgated the encyclical *Orientalium Dignitas* (1894) to attempt to renew a respect for Byzantine Church tradition. Ironically, issuing such an encyclical was itself Latinizing, as it reminded everyone that the Pope was more than first among equals; he claimed a juridical primacy even over the Christian east, which had not been an aspect of their tradition.

By the end of the nineteenth century, the Catholic Church was solidly ensconced in the Christian East. Insofar as the Holy Land was part of the Russian religious imagination, the Pope had placed himself on Russian spiritual territory upon which it no longer had any real influence. By the end of the nineteenth century, Catholic success in the Levant provided context to rethinking its relationship to Russia. Ivan Gagarin (1814-1882), the Russian nobleman who converted to Roman Catholicism in France, became a Jesuit, and worked his entire life for the conversion of Russia to Catholicism. Later, Nicholas Alekseivich Tolstoi (1867-1938), Leonid Feodorov (1879-1935), and a handful of others converted to Catholicism within Russia itself, in spite of the dangers of doing so. The conversion of these men not only suggested the possibility of more conversions in Russia itself, but illustrate soft-Orientalist dynamics at work.

Although aspects of the life and conversion of Gagarin have been treated earlier, it is important to revisit his conversion, especially in regard to his self-understanding and his

---

[72]Leo XIII, "*Praeclara gratulationis*," in *The Vatican and the Eastern Churches: Papal Encyclicals and Documens Concerning the Eastern Churches*, vol. 1 (Fairfax, VA: Eastern Christian Publications, 1996), pp. 163-78.

understanding of Europe. In his youth, Gagarin had substantial exposure to the culture of Western Europe. He played with French children, was educated by a French tutor, read widely (which included Catholic and western European texts), learned to speak French and Latin by the age of ten, and went with his family on a three year journey to Germany, Italy, and France. Beshoner asserted that Gagarin "received a favorable presentation of the West and of Western intellectual scholarship."[73] Correlatively, Gagarin received the traditional Orthodox and patriotic education. The interplay between these two strains defined Gagarin, which made him an enigma in the west and eventually a pariah in his motherland. Neither his French Jesuit confreres nor the his fellow Russian countrymen could imagine that he was both a Jesuit[74] and a Russian.[75]

On the one hand, his Orthodox patriotism made him amenable to the ideas of Friedrich Schelling (1775-1856), who advocated the notion that Russia had a great mission and was therefore itself destined for greatness. Correlatively, he believed firmly that Russia, and only Russia, could rightfully lead the Slavic nations.

On the other hand, the thought of Petr Chaadaev (1794-1856) was equally attractive. Chaadaev claimed at once that Russia was neither European nor Asian and that only western Europe possessed a common Christian heritage through the Roman Catholic Church. Russia was

---

[73]Beshoner, pp. 3, 26, 55.

[74]Michel D'Herbigny noted that Russians often used the word "Jesuit" to designate "any member of the Catholic clergy or of a religious congregation." D'Herbigny asserted that volume IX, article 459 of the 1899 Russian legal code justified its misuse as was printed, "Jesuits of all orders are forgbidden to enter Russia under any pretext." *cf.* Michel d'Herbigny, *Vladimir Soloviev, a Russian Newman (1853-1900)*, trans. A.M. Buchanan (London: R & T Washborne Ltd., 1918), p. 137 and fn.

[75]Beshoner, pp. 101-2.

lesser because it did not share in that heritage.[76] Gagarin framed his understanding of his missionary work as a Jesuit through Chaadaev. The appropriation of these soft-Orientalist dynamics by Gagarin represented, in a sense, the ideal conversion for the Vatican. The return of dissidents to the fold meant admitting one's imperfections and need of Rome, and the acceptance of the Roman Catholic faith. Even as Gagarin warned against the dangers of Latinization and promoted the union between a segment of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church to the Catholic Church, he did so as a Jesuit. Subsequent converts did not so readily accept the western style of Catholicism.

The situation in which Rev. Nicholas Alekseivich Tolstoi (1867-1938)[77] found himself confirmed the legitimacy of the soft-Orientalist attitudes of Gagarin and the Vatican. Tolstoi, a married man with children, had been ordained as an Orthodox priest in 1890, but his exposure both to the Church Fathers and to Aquinas while in the Moscow Theological Academy attracted him to the Catholic Church. After his graduation with honors from the Academy, he formally joined the Catholic Church in November 1894, and after having been secretly ordained,[78] was incardinated within the Melkite Church with the understanding that he would continue to function within Russia in the Byzantine Rite. This was necessary since the Russian expression of the Byzantine Slavonic Rite did not come into existence until after 1907, when Orthodox convert

---

[76]Frederick C. Copleston, S.J., *Philosophy in Russia: From Herzen to Lenin and Berdyaev* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1986), pp. 27-29.

[77]Unrelated to the writer Lev (Leo) Tolstoy.

[78]ASV, Seg. di Stato, (1903) 66/unico: 8.

Fr. Alexis Zerchaninov petitioned Metropolitan Sheptytskii for its establishment.[79] Unlike Gagarin, who by eschewing married life and the Byzantine Rite as a Jesuit, became "western," Tolstoi remained "Russian" as a married priest intent on remaining in the Byzantine Rite. Both Tolstoi and Vatican officials assumed this would be problematic.

Tolstoi returned to Russia in April (O.C.)/May 1895 under a pseudonym,[80] established a Byzantine Rite house church in Moscow, and spent time in both Catholic and Orthodox intellectual circles. However, the Holy Synod became aware of his activities, due mainly to complaints by Orthodox priests who did not like the Catholicization of the Russian faith.[81] Coincidentally, many local Latin priests did not like the Russification of Catholicism. Tolstoi was short on local friends and allies, and the Vatican noted that this Russian Orthodox convert was a victim, suffering at the hands of the Russians.

Tolstoi included the Pope in the canon during his celebration of the Divine Liturgy rather than the Russian Patriarch or even the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople, rendering his worship an anti-Russian act. Like Gagarin, Tolstoi believed that true Orthodoxy consisted in union with the Catholic church, the center of Christianity.[82] Celebration of the Divine Liturgy in this mode was therefore not an act of union, but reunion. The Orthodox church was considered

---

[79]Christopher Zugger, *The Forgotten: Catholics of the Soviet Empire from Lenin through Stalin* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2001), p. 82.

[80]ASV, Seg. di Stato, (1903) 66/unico: 24.

[81]ASV, Seg. di Stato, (1903) 66/unico: 16-19.

[82]"Vraie Orthodoxe consiste en union avec le Centre Catholique..." ASV, (1903) 66/unico: 11.

by Latin and Greek Catholics– including Sheptyts'kyi[83]– to be schismatic, and the assumption that Catholicism was the center of Christianity placed the Russian Orthodox Church and Russia itself on the periphery.

Managing Tolstoi was an *ad hoc* venture which confirmed, for the Vatican, Russia to be both a poor and a dangerous place for Catholics. Fearing the deportation of Tolstoi to Siberia, the Vatican sent a letter to the Holy Synod on behalf of Tolstoi, and in conjunction with French bishops, arranged for his probable exile in France which included, in part, financial support.[84] Although Tolstoi did spend time in France, he returned to Russia in 1898, where he lived for the rest of his life as a Catholic, partly dependent upon the continued financial support of the Vatican, which was maintained through his French connections.[85]

Leonid Feodorov[86] (1879-1935) was born in St. Petersburg into a poor Orthodox family, and as a young man, attended the Orthodox Ecclesial Academy in St. Petersburg with the intent of being ordained an Orthodox priest. However, during his studies he, like Tolstoi, became convinced that true Orthodoxy demanded union with the Catholic Church. With the urging and support of Fr. Stanislawski, the Polish pastor of St. Catherine's in St. Petersburg, Feodorov left the academy and traveled to Rome *via* Lemburg, where he met Metropolitan Sheptyts'kyi who encouraged him to remain steadfast in his Byzantine faith. Stanislawski, conversely, insisted that

---

[83]ASV, Seg. di Stato. (1903) 66/unico: 94.

[84]ASV, Seg. di Stato, (1903) 66/unico: 52, 70.

[85]ASV, Seg. di Stato, (1903) 66/unico: 70, 72, 75-77, 84, 86-88, 89.

[86]While this spelling is not the currently accepted standard transliteration from the Russian, it was used by Feodorov himself when writing in the Latin alphabet.

Feodorov be ordained as a Catholic priest in the Roman Rite, and Feodorov did not outwardly express any resistance to this idea at the time.[87] Feodorov was received into the Catholic Church by Stanislawski on 31 July 1902 at the Gesu in Rome, which in and of itself symbolized the precedence of the Roman church over the Russian: Feodorov was received into the Catholic church in the mother Church of the Society of Jesus, the anti-modernist and Roman Catholic religious order *par excellence*, on the Feast of St. Ignatius Loyola, the founder of the Jesuit order. He began his studies at the Jesuit Seminary in Anagni soon thereafter. Up to this point, his outward conduct and disposition was reminiscent of Gagarin. He too, embraced "the Truth" and having done so, placed himself in cultural and political opposition to Russia. This was not a minor or theoretical problem; Feodorov assumed pseudonyms to escape the notice of the Okhrana,[88] and had to transfer out of the Jesuit seminary or face permanent exile outside of Russia.[89] Thus, his conversion and life was understood to be heroic, and Russian government officials, once again, were villains. Russia remained not only dangerous, but poor. Like Tolstoi, Feodorov was financially dependent upon the Catholic Church for his livelihood.

However, Feodorov had no intention of abandoning his Byzantine Catholic identity, even if he participated in Roman Catholic religious and cultural expressions, such as being a member of the Marian sodality while at the seminary. Although he had the authority of *Orientalium*

---

[87]Paul Mailleux, *Exarch Leonid Feodorov: Bridgebuilder between Moscow and Rome* (New York: P.J. Kennedy & Sons, 1964), p. 32.

[88]*Ibid*., p. 27, 32.

[89]*Ibid*., p. 45.

Dignitas (1894) behind him, as well as the support of Popes Leo XIII and Pius X,[90] Feodorov experienced Othering dynamics.

Stanislawski expressed his disappointment to Feodorov in a letter for reverting to "'this Eastern rite which is associated with everything disgusting and retrograde in Russia,'"[91] a rite which Feodorov loved and felt was a part of his soul. While this statement is due more to Polish national sentiment than ecclesiology, Feodorov found life in Rome difficult. The style of life and studies at the seminary were completely foreign to him, and Russia was not at all a part of the ecclesial intellectual landscape of his colleagues or professors.[92] When Russia did emerge as part of the intellectual landscape, westerners attempted to reshape it to fit a Catholic perspective; the best example of this, in which Feodorov was involved, was the contest over the celibacy of Byzantine priests in America (examined in Chap. 5). Additionally, Feodorov had appropriated the western view that the West was the locus of rationality, while the East was the locus of inscrutable mysticism, framed as the difference in emphasis on dogma and liturgy.

> 'The Eastern Christian... only knows extremes; he is not conscious of the Western *distinguo*; he understands only *affirmo* and *nego*. Hence his **inability** to distinguish between faith and rite. If one tries to explain to him the distinction between rite and faith... he will exclude the rite completely from his religious practices and confine himself strictly to prayer and sermons. **This is how the Russian sects acted, and also the Muslims or the Buddhists of Burma, Siam, and Ceylon.'**[93] (Emphases mine.)

---

[90]*Ibid*., pp. 26, 40-41.

[91]*Ibid*., pp. 58-59.

[92]*Ibid*., p. 28.

[93]*Ibid*., p. 80.

In spite of appropriating these soft-Orientalist dynamics and in spite of his discomfort in Rome, Feodorov persevered, and was ordained on 26 March 1911[94] by the Bulgarian Byzantine Catholic archbishop Mikhail Mirov to serve as a priest in the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite. He spent time as a Studite hieromonk before returning to Russia on the eve of the First World War.

The Vatican had success in its ventures into the Christian East and had made a few Russian Orthodox converts to Catholicism. Perhaps it was time to venture into Russia itself. The re-imagining of the Papacy as a decision-making office rather than a conveyer of the faith had as a consequence the general overhaul of the Vatican bureaucratic machinery.

Pius X issued a major reform of the Roman Curia in 1908 in the Apostolic Constitution *Sapienti Consilio*. While many congregations lost their authority and responsibility in many areas, especially in regard to matrimonial issues, the Congregation for the Eastern Churches within *Propaganda Fide* did not. It not only retained its power, but was given authority to handle matters of the Latin Rite in territories traditionally understood to be Byzantine, as well as handle issues with dissident Orthodox Churches.[95] On 1 May 1917, Benedict XV issued the *Motu Proprio Dei Providentis* which both established the *Congregatio pro Ecclesiis Orientalibus* (the Congregation for the Oriental Churches) separate from *Propaganda Fide*, and proclaimed the suppression of the *Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fide pro Negotiis Ritus Orientalis*.[96] Canon 257 of the new (1917) Code of Canon Law bolstered the authority of the

---

[94]*Ibid*., p. 70.

[95]Michael Vattappalam, *The Congregations for the Eastern Churches: Origins and Competence* (Citta del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1999) pp. 47-51.

[96]Benedict XV, *Motu Proprio Dei Providentis*, 1 May 1917, and Michael Vattappalam, *The Congregations for the Eastern Churches: Origins and Competence*, p. 58.

Congregation for the Oriental Churches by making the Roman pontiff its prefect.[97] Its decisions automatically held the full authority of the pontiff without having to seek it through regular bureaucratic channels. A group of Russophiles, most notably Michel d'Herbigny, worked within this Congregation on the sub-commission, the Pontifical Commission for Russia.

The experience of the nineteenth century for the Catholic Church was tumultuous, changing the way the Vatican thought about the Church and about its missionary possibilities. The Vatican took a strong stance against modernity, both within and outside its walls. The nationalist project both eroded the temporal power of the papacy and bolstered its spiritual power. The ultramontane reaction across Europe transformed the Papal Office into a decision-making position. The Roman Catholic Church also found itself active in the Levant, through which it found itself in a position to take advantage of a weakened Russia. The conversion of some Russian Orthodox believers to Catholicism both confirmed soft-orientalist dynamics in operation and the possibility of the conversion of Russia itself.

The Byzantine world had the attention of the Pope, and Russia came into sharp focus with the end of the First World War. While the war might have shown Modernity to have failed,[98] the western European nation states themselves endured. The Vatican did not foresee any major political shift in the west. Contrarily, the Vatican, like many other governments, expected the

---

[97]Canon 257, Edward N. Peters, *The 1917 or Pio-Benedictine Code of Canon Law in English Translation with Extensive Scholarly Apparatus,* foreward by Most Rev. John J. Myers (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2001), p. 110.

[98]Given the high death tolls of both combatants and non-combatants and the mutilation of combatants due to financial, bureaucratic, and industrial systems which gave rise to "modern" war, and the subsequent rise of far right-wing politics which vilified democratization, many in interwar Europe began to lose faith in modernity. However, many historians argue that this crisis strengthened modernity in the long run.

new Bolshevik government to fall quickly. In the midst of great poverty, starvation, and suffering, the Catholic Church saw an opportunity to sow its seeds of faith on Russian soil. The members of the Russian Commission within the Congregation for the Oriental Churches found themselves busy in the years after the First World War.

Chapter 3
Structural Expressions of Soft-Orientalism

In chapter 2, we saw that the Vatican, due to the changing circumstances of the nineteenth century, bolstered its connection to the Byzantine Christian world as a means of strengthening the Roman Catholic Church. Particular expressions included: (1) the creation of the Congregation for the Eastern Churches (CEO)[1] to assist in communication with Byzantine Catholic Churches in order to prevent them from entering communion with the so-called "dissident churches" (i.e. Orthodox churches), (2) an effort to increase a Catholic presence in the Christian east, especially in the Levant both through the activity of CEO and through the 1893 Eucharistic Congress in Jerusalem, and (3) encouraging individual conversions of Russian Orthodox after the historical failure of reunion with the entire communion of Orthodox Churches through the Ecumenical Patriarch– last attempted in the Council of Florence– and the limitations and problems inherent in the conversion of local (i.e. diocesan) Orthodox Churches– as was done in the Union of Brześć. The evolution of existing Catholic ecclesial structures and creation of new ones strengthened the missionary ability of the Catholic Church in Russia, which not only conveyed soft-Orientalist attitudes, but were themselves symbols of soft-Orientalism.

In the wake of the First World War, the Vatican attempted to strengthen the moral position and institutional power of the Roman Catholic Church by working to alleviate the effects of the Great War. With about twenty million combatant and non-combatant deaths, thirty four million wounded, wrecked national economies, fallen governments, newly founded states, and the birth of serious anti-colonial movements, World War I acted as a catalyst for many

[1] *Congregatio pro Ecclesiis Orientalibus*

profound political and cultural shifts both within and outside of Europe.[2] In Russia, World War I acted as a catalyst for the Russian Revolution, the Civil War among the so-called reds, whites, and greens, the intervention of foreign powers in Russian domestic affairs, and wars with Poland, Ukraine, and other nationalists. The Catholic Church therefore had plenty of opportunities become socially and politically significant, and Vatican officials believed that Russia was vulnerable to conversion to the Catholic faith, thereby enacting a "return" to the Catholic Church. Throughout the 1920s, the Vatican refined its institutional structures to manage its Russian mission, ultimately creating an independent Pontifical Commission for Russia (PCpR) to address political, social, and ideological challenges, meet the material needs of the Russian people, and most importantly, to manage the conversion of Russia to Catholicism. The development of the PCpR occurred in three stages as it met these challenges: (1) the shift of practical control of the Russian mission from Lwów to Rome between World War I and 1925, (2) the creation of the PCpR as a formal congregation within CEO in 1925, and (3) its existence as an independent and autonomous commission between 1930 and 1933. The PCpR and the structures it managed were themselves expressions and conveyors of soft-orientalist values.

For the Pope, Michel d'Herbigny (recognized within the Catholic Church as a leading, if not *the* leading, Russian expert), and others interested in the conversion of Russia were brought

---

[2]S.L.A. Marshall, *World War I* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1964), pp. 456 ff.; John Keegan, *The First World War* (London: Random House, 1998), pp. 7-9, 444-56; Alan Kramer, *Dynamic of Destruction: Culture and Mass Killing in the First World War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 268 ff. Generally, historians of the First World War have shown an increasing interest of its effects outside of Europe, and have begun to include extensive analyses of cultural effects in addition to the traditional socio-political, economic, and military effects; n.b. Robin Higham, ed., *Researching World War I: A Handbook*, with Dennis E Showalter (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press 2003).

together to direct that conversion. During the course of their work, they would contend not only with theological issues, but with political and socio-economic ones as well. While the Catholic Church understood these issues to be theoretically related (ultimately due to the Doctrine of the Incarnation), the efforts between 1917 and 1925 to convert Russia and to provide material aid were unsystematic and generally lacked coordination. Even before the end of the war, Benedict XV inquired among various religious orders concerning the prospects for making personnel available for assignment to the Christian east, which stretched from the Levant into Russia.[3] No concrete plans were implemented at this point, and post-war missionary efforts were dictated more by circumstance than planning. Additionally, various plans were contradictory and worked at cross-purposes. For example, conversions of religious leaders like Feodorov could mean the *de facto* conversion of many, but the "sheep-steeling" strategy would anger the religious leaders of the flocks from whence these individual converts came. These tensions would be compounded by whether or not the Byzantine Rite would be respected, and whether or not Roman Rite Catholicism would be the dominant Catholic structural support for conversions. In spite of these issues, the erection and operation of the Pontifical Oriental Institute (PIO)[4] took the initial lead in both the concrete articulation of the Russian mission and preparation for it.

The mission of PIO was simple, and was articulated rather succinctly in February 1919, in a plenary session of the SCEO by its secretary,[5] Nicola Cardinal Marini.

---

[3]AA.EE.SS., Stati Eccl. 1429 P.O./572: 37-52.

[4]*Pontificio Istituto Orientale*.

[5]Because the Pope was the juridical head of the CEO, its secretary was vested with administrative authority to run daily operations of the congregation.

> The institute... is above all a center of apostolic formation and not a simple academic institution... it has as its essential scope the formation of learned apostles and not merely scholars.... It is a school of higher, practical studies to fulfill the apostolic vision [i.e, the reunification of the Christian east with the Roman Catholic Church] as schools of social and political science in Paris and Florence fulfill their vision in the formation of career diplomats, [and] as colonial institutes prepare agents, destined for the colonies, in the bosom of the modern state.[6]

The PIO would accomplish this mission by teaching its students the theology, canon law, history, and archeology of the various Eastern Christian Churches, as well as liturgical competency in the Eastern rites and the ability to preach in the local languages.[7] Marini was able to frame his understanding of the mission of PIO in colonialist terms because of the Catholic understanding of Orthodox Christianity and as the western European understanding of the Great War and its legacy.

By the interwar period, the Catholic and Orthodox Churches had produced historical, theological narratives which asserted their "self-sufficiency"[8] and refuted the "self-sufficiency" of all other churches. With regard to doctrine, the *filioque* and azymite/prozymite crises both

---

[6]"L'Istituto– afferma il cardinale– è primieramente un centro di formazione apostolica e non una semplice accademia [...] ha per scopo essenziale di formare degli apostoli dotti e non dei semplici eruditi [...]. È una scuola di studi superiori pratici dal punto di vista dell'apostolato, come la scuola di scienze morali e politiche di Parigi e di Firenze lo sono dal punto di vista della formazione alle carriere diplomatiche, come gli Istituti coloniali lo sono per la preparazione degli agenti destinati alle colonie in seno agli stati moderni." Quoted by Vincenzo, Poggi, S.J., *Per la Storia del Pontificio Istituto Orientale: Saggi sull'istituzione,i suoi Uomini e l'Oriente Cristiano*, in series *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, no. 263, ed. Robert F. Taft, S.J. (Roma: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 2000), 36. Poggi footnotes his source as ASCEO, Protocollo 1445.

[7]AA.EE.SS., Stati Eccl. 1429 P.O./572: 54, and A.S.V. Seg. di Stato (1923) 42/1: 122-25.

[8]This is the theological principle that a church– recognizable because of its structure– has all the necessary means for the salvation of its members and that all other churches– recognizable because of their structures– are lacking some or all of those necessary means.

illustrated and created difference.[9] With regard to church structure, the differing modes of governance of the church by its authorities and the relationship between ecclesiastical and secular authorities also illustrated and created difference between the Catholic and Orthodox Churches. The historical complexity of these issues– and many others– were over-simplified in order to create theological dichotomies to argue for "self-sufficiency" in the most advantageous manner.

In regard to church structure and modes of governance, the core issue was reconciling the local with the universal church. The local church could mean the parish, the diocese, and in very early ecclesiology, even the family. If counted this way, many local churches existed. The universal church, contrarily, was the amalgam of all local churches and all individuals within all of these local churches. Complicating this was the notion that the churches on every level were mystically joined to heaven. Through catechesis, preaching, and the participation in sacred rites (especially baptism and Eucharistic liturgies) the imagined community of the universal church was created, and it stretched across the earth and into the heavens. By the interwar period, the Orthodox Church asserted that the Church, properly understood, was the communion of local churches in a sort of confederatorial arrangement, wherein each bishop had full, unimpeded authority within his diocese, and a bishop leading a council was simply the "first among equals." Contrarily, the Catholic Church asserted that the Church, properly understood, was the Catholic

[9]These will be addressed in the following chapter. Suffice it to say now that the *filioque* controversy concerns the addition of the phase "and the Son" in regard to the procession of the Holy Spirit within the Trinity. The addition highlights theological differences between the Catholic and Orthodox Churches, and the manner in which it was added highlights ecclesiological differences. The differences in azymite (unleavened) and prozymite (leavened) bread highlight both theological and cultural differences.

Church, with the Pope of Rome[10] imbued with juridical authority over the universal church on earth as the Vicar of Christ in heaven. It would be awkward to speak of local Catholic churches.

These ecclesiological articulations created part of a common dichotomy which recognized the existence of both the local and universal church but respectively privileged one over the other. Liturgical differences in rite, language, dress, and calendar,[11] and even church architecture– broadly understood[12]– reinforced this dichotomy. Because this dichotomy was bridged in Byzantine Catholic Churches not only in Eastern Europe but in the Americas, they experienced Latinization.[13] The efforts at Latinization rightly suggest that the dichotomy created

---

[10]The ecclesiological role of the Pope will be examined in greater depth in the next chapter.

[11]The core calendar issues which reveal differences in cultic practice and therefore ecclesial character, are (1) the determination of the dates of Easter, (2) imagining Sunday as the beginning of the week as in the Catholic Church or its culmination as in Orthodox churches, and (3) the calendar of saints, some of which were shared between the two churches and some of which were not.

[12]While an architectural analysis utilizing the thought of Paul Ricour would offer insight, it is sufficient here simply to note that while exceptions always exist, general differences in architecture reflect engineering, economic, and theological differences between regions (e.g. onion-domed vs cruciform churches between east and west) and changes over time (gothic vs. baroque styles within western Europe). Greek Catholic Churches, both in Europe and North America, were often objects of Latinization, which distinguished them from Orthodox Churches. Margaret Visser, for example, proffers a religious anthropological analysis of the Roman Catholic Church "Sant'Agnese fuori le Mura" as an example to argue that engaging the space of a church blends *chronos* and *kairos* into a single spiritual experience in *Geometry of Love: Space, Time, Mystery, and the Meaning in an Ordinary Church* (New York: North Point Press, 2000). Although it is not a comparative study, she does note (on p. 102) traces of Byzantine influence, emphasizing universality of religious experience rather than difference.

[13]Barbara Skinner, *The Western Front of the Eastern Church: Uniate and Orthodox Conflict in 18th Century Poland, Ukraine, Belarus, and Russia* (De Kalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 2009). Correlatively, a Sarum Rite Orthodox Church exists. But because this dissertation concerns itself with the soft-Orientalist dynamics at work in the PCpR and other Catholic structures, it will not be analyzed.

by the Catholic and Orthodox Churches distorted not only their present, but their past as well. Practically, Metropolitan Archbishop Andrei Sheptyts'kyi thought that Orthodox Christians were convinced that the Catholic church thought the "Oriental Rite" inferior, and that they preferred converts to become Roman Rite Catholics, in order to be "truly Catholic."[14] This dynamic will be examined below, in regard to the creation of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite itself.

The relationship between secular and church authorities within the narratives of "self-sufficiency" correlatively helped create the dichotomies which distorted church history. Before the Establishment of the Christian Church (i.e. the church which professed the Nicene, and not the Arian, version of the faith), the non-cooperative, mutually-othering relationship between Church and State was rather starkly defined. After the Edict of Milan (313) of Constantine and the Edict of Thessalonika (380) by Theodosius, the relationship between the orthodox church(es) and the Empire and their spheres of authority– *sacerdotium* and *regnum/imperium*– were much more muddled and problematic.

Brian Tierney implies that the earliest example of this distinction is evident in 494, in a letter from Pope Gelasius I (r. 492-496) to the Eastern Roman Emperor Anastasius I (r. 491-518), in which Gelasius argues that each has its own sphere of authority.[15] Yet, Pope Leo the Great (r. 440-461) told "the orthodox Greek emperor that he is invested not only with *imperium* but with a priestly office (*sacerdotium*) and that by the Holy Spirit he is preserved from all doctrinal

---

[14]AA.EE.SS., Polonia, 40 P.O./48: 69-70.

[15]Brian Tierney, *The Crisis of Church and State*, 1050-1300, in series *Sources of Civilization in the West* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964), pp. 13-14.

error."[16] In the west, similar confusions existed between the papacy and the Carolingian kings.[17] However, by the interwar period, Orthodox and Catholic narratives glossed over these problematic issues, and in order to assert that their own church had maintained a proper relationship with secular authorities, but that the other Church had not.[18] The Orthodox Churches asserted the Pope had improperly gained secular power,[19] while citing that it had deposed Patriarchs of Constantinople for "aspiring to the purple." The Roman Catholic Church, contrarily, accused the Byzantine Emperors and Tsars with *Caesero-Papism*, the unjust interference of the secular rulers in church matters. With regard specifically to the Russian Orthodox Church, the Catholic Church cited the creation and operation of the Holy Synod by Peter I[20] as the logical consequence of such interference, ignoring the Russian Orthodox theology

---

[16]Henry Chadwick, *The Early Church* (New York: Penguin Books, 1993), p. 166.

[17]R.W. Southern, *Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages* (New York: Penguin Books, 1990), pp. 32, 174-75.

[18]Tangentially, the Photian Schism illustrated how these dynamics could be resolved with a degree of "economy," or good will intended to preserve church order. However, economy waned, especially after the Fourth Crusade, and the Photian Schism, like many other historical events, was distorted to fit into the narratives of self-sufficiency. Francis Dvornik did much to help scholars re-imagine the Photian Schism outside of these dynamics. Stephen Runciman, perhaps coopted by the dichotomy, proffered a more benign account for the schism between the Catholic and Orthodox Churches due to cultural and historical factors. Note Thomas F. Madden, "Outside and Inside the Fourth Crusade," *The International History Review* 17, no. 4 (Nov. 1995): 726; Francis Dvornik, *The Photian Schism: History and Legend* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1948); and Stephen Runciman, *The Eastern Schism: A Study of the Papacy and the Eastern Churches During the Xith and XIIth Centuries* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955).

[19]Aristeides Papadakis, *The Christian East and the Rise of the Papacy: The Church 1071-1453 a.d.* with John Meyendorff (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1994).

[20]James Cracraft, *The Church Reform of Peter the Great* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1971), pp. 163-64, and J.F. Maclear, ed., *Church and State in the Modern Age: A Documentary History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), pp. 17-24.

which sought to come to terms with this situation which they did not like.

On religious grounds, both the Catholic and Orthodox churches glossed over historical events which would have implied theological and structural similarity, and chose to create narratives which not only distinguished between, but helped to create the Catholic and Orthodox Churches in accord with the principle of "self-sufficiency." The dichotomy between east and west and the Orthodox and Catholic worlds was firmly in place, and Catholic rhetoric had established both its superiority and the need of the Orthodox to return to the "True Faith." Therefore, in 1919, after the colonial project had already reached its zenith, it was natural for Cardinal Marini to frame the religious mission of the Catholic Church in colonialist terms.

For the Catholic Church, the alien character of Russia, marked by its profession of what they believed was a deficient faith (examined in Chap. 4) guarded by a corrupted church structure was compounded by the experience and effects of the First World War. While the war inflicted unprecedented damage in combatant and non-combatant suffering and death, as well as massive economic losses across Europe, it had particularly devastating effects on the fringes of Europe. With the collapse of the Ottoman Empire came a general re-organization of the so-called Middle East, and in the former eastern German and western Russian lands, not only the effects but the violence of war continued. While recent scholarship has brought the violence and political instability in western Europe into greater focus,[21] western politicians of the time attempted to preserve the exceptional place and status of Western Europe. Perhaps the most obvious example is the remark by Winston Churchill to David Lloyd George on the eve of the armistice, when he

[21] *cf.* fn 2, especially the work of Alan Kramer.

declared, "The war of the giants is over. The quarrels of the pygmies have begun."[22] In the comparison, the western European powers are not only giants in comparison to the smaller powers, but these smaller powers are represented as the obvious Other, as pygmies: small rather than large, primitive and tribal rather than civilized, and therefore in the need of colonial-like guidance. Margaret Macmillan notes that for the diplomats at the Paris Peace Conference,

> [t]he war they had just survived [i.e. the Great War] made sense only if it produced a better world and an end to war. That was what their own governments had promised in the dark days, and that was what kept them going.... Harold Nicolson spoke for many of his generation when he said: "We were journeying to Paris, not merely to liquidate the war, but to found a new order in Europe. We were preparing not Peace only, but Eternal Peace. There was about us the halo of some divine mission. We must be alert, stern, righteous, and ascetic. For we were bent on doing great, permanent, and noble things."[23]

The continuation of war in Eastern Europe and the accompanying mass-scale suffering, even as the western powers intervened in Russia, distanced it culturally and politically from the west. Matthew Rendle noted in his examination of amnesties granted by the Bolsheviks, that "[h]orrific tales of acts of terror [by the Bolsheviks] dominate contemporary accounts..."[24] Bolshevik Russia therefore had to be lesser and more primitive. Consequently, its white inhabitants would have to resemble pygmies, even if they were physiologically European. Russia, beset by strife,

---

[22]Norman Davies, *White Eagle, Red Star: The Polish-Soviet War, 1919-1920*, foreword by A.J.P. Taylor (London: Orbis Books, 1983), p. 21.

[23]Margaret MacMillan, *Paris 1919: Six Months that Changed the World* (New York: Random House, 2001), pp. 85-86.

[24]Matthew Rendle, "Mercy Amid Terror? The Role of Amnesties during Russia's Civil War," *The Slavonic and East European Review* 92, no. 3 (July 2014): 449.

was a wild land inhabited by wild people and filled with danger. Catholic missionary activity in these lands was reminiscent, therefore, of nineteenth century missionary activity in Africa and Asia, and earlier missionary activity in the New World. The Walsh mission operated in conformity with these notions.

Although the whole of Europe experienced both post-war famine and epidemics,[25] the population of Russia was particularly hard hit. Russia experienced food shortages almost from the very beginning of the First World War. The famine was the result not only of the legacy and continuation of war which impeded economic and social recovery in both urban and rural contexts, but a trade embargo by the allies which lasted until 1920, a financial blockade which lasted until mid-1921, and two years (1920-1921) of successive drought. Bolshevik Russia had been a diplomatic pariah for the west since the October Revolution and the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, and its inability to provide basic food and medical care for its citizens further marginalized it in the western mind, especially after purported instances of cannibalism and scenes of piles of corpses in the streets. Wild Russia had become even more barbaric.

While churches and western governments sincerely wanted to alleviate the suffering of the Russian people, they did not want to support the Bolshevik regime. The project of relief therefore became a medium of political struggle between the Soviets on the one hand, and the

---

[25]Although the most notable was the "Spanish" influenza pandemic between January 1918 through December 1920, other communicable diseases were also widespread and were world-wide phenomena. Note Jeffery K. Taubenberger, "The Origin and Virulence of the 1918 'Spanish' Influence Virus," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 150, no. 1 (March 2006): 90-93, and the Association of Schools of Public Health, *Public Health Reports*. Notable is the report on "Public Health Administration in Russia in 1917," 32, no. 52 (December 28, 1917): 2191-2219 by the Association of Schools of Public Health, while reviewing the titular issue, the article also asserts the roots of scientific medicine in Russia were due to the import of English medical men by Ivan the Terrible and Peter the Great (p. 2192).

Russian Orthodox Church, the Catholic Church, and various governments (especially the United States through its American Relief Administration or ARA) on the other.[26] Historiographically, the contentiousness inherent in the relief project has been preserved within the scholarship.[27] For the Catholic Church, both at the time and in subsequent scholarship this contentiousness was articulated ideologically. Atheistic communism created wholesale suffering and death, while the Orthodox Church was unable to rectify this, the Catholic Church would, in conjunction with like-minded western governments, come to the material and spiritual aid of the Russian people.

Initial Catholic response was uncoordinated. The Vatican sent American Jesuit Edmund Walsh into Russia on a fact-finding mission (March 23rd - May 3rd 1921), who confirmed the seriousness of the famine and the general suffering of the population. Other sources confirmed

---

[26]Tangentially, it also was a tumultuous medium of western internal politics. For example, the French press "turned loose a torrent of picturesque charges, among them, that the proposal was part of an insidious plan to benefit American farmers by extending their market and to give American business interests an entering wedge in railroad and other concessions in Russia;" *cf.* H.H. Fisher, *The Famine in Soviet Russia, 1919-1923: The Operations of the American Relief Administration* (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1927), p. 18.

[27]For example, James J. Zatko, in "The Vatican and Famine Relief in Russia," *The Slavonic and East European Review* 42, no. 98 (December 1963): 54-63, downplays the leading role of Hoover and the American Relief Association. Histories which focus on the American Relief Association histories frame both American and Catholic efforts as an ideological struggle which prefigures the Cold War; n.b. Bertrand M. Patenaude, *The Big Show in Bololand: The American Relief Expedition to Soviet Russia in the Famine of 1921* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2002), Patrick H. McNamara, *A Catholic Cold War: Edmund Walsh, S.J. and the Politics of American Anti-Communism* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2005), and the earlier and rather hagiographic biography of Walsh by Louis J. Gallagher, S.J., *Edmund A. Walsh, S.J.: A Biography* (New York: Benziger Brothers, Inc., 1962). While the writings of Edmund Walsh were obviously not written from a Cold War perspective, they fit neatly into the Cold War narrative, especially *The Fall of the Russian Empire: The Story of the Last Romanovs and the Coming of the Bolsheviki* (Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1928), as does the diary of J. Rives Childs, *Black Lebeda: The Russian Famine Diary of ARA Kazan District Supervisor J. Rives Childs, 1921-1923*, ed. Jamie H. Cockfield (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 2006).

the Walsh report,[28] prompting the Pope to describe the conditions of the Russian people as a "catastrophe of history,"[29] suggesting that the historically-conscious Communist program to realize utopia was primarily at fault.

Benedict XV hoped that both Jan Cieplak, the apostolic administrator of the Archdiocese of Mogilev and Eduard Van Der Ropp, its exiled archbishop, would be able to direct Catholic relief efforts inside of Russia. However, this idea was soon abandoned, since it became clear that Ropp would not be allowed back into Russia (he had been arrested for anti-revolutionary activities, sentenced to death, and only allowed to leave Russia because of the intercession of the Pope), and the Soviets had begun a campaign of arrests which included Cieplak and the confiscation of church wealth and property in a simultaneous effort to fund its own famine relief, de-legitimize both Russian Orthodoxy, and, to an extent, de-legitimize Catholicism, the foreign– and predominantly Polish– faith. The Soviets, while claiming not to be "persecuting religion of any sort," defended their policy by claiming to arrest only clergy whose "political activity [was] directed against the internal or external safety of the Soviet Republic."[30]

Initial Catholic efforts were *ad hoc*. The Vatican sent fifty train cars of relief supplies into Russia, gave one million Italian Lire to the International Relief Commission in Switzerland, made an appeal to the League of Nations, and made general appeals to its own Catholic bishops

---

[28]One example is the report of the state of the Latin Rite Bishop of Lwów concerning his diocese, in which he describes (on p. 58) the Bolshevik conduct as barbaric ("*...barbaries bolshevicorum....*") in AA.EE.SS., Russia, 634 P.O./19: 55-71.

[29]AA.EE.SS., PCpR 1/1: 66.

[30]Jane Degras, ed., *Soviet Documents on Foreign Policy, 1917-1924*, vol. 1 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1951), p. 390.

and faithful.[31] Simultaneously, a long term plan was being worked out. Cooperation with the Soviets was absolutely out of the question. Working in conjunction with the Orthodox church, though a theoretical possibility, was eschewed in clear favor of working with the ARA; Edmund Walsh was assigned to direct Catholic relief within the ARA, and Louis Gallagher (another American Jesuit) was assigned as his chief assistant. The Catholic association with the ARA rather than the relief efforts of the Orthodox Church highlighted both the general effectiveness of the west and ineffectiveness of the Orthodox Church.

In part, association with the ARA was a good practical choice. The ARA was wealthy, relatively speaking, and most importantly, its mission was protected by the Riga Agreement which it had concluded with the Soviets. It was also well-administrated, alleviating the church of that responsibility. The ability of the west to give concrete aid to the Russian people stood in sharp contrast to the inability of the Soviet government, which was forced to confiscate church wealth.

This had a dual benefit for the Bolsheviks: economic gain and the de-legitimization of religious moral authority. The initial appeal for aid by Patriarch Tikhon and the solace offered by his church in the midst of suffering was eroded as he, along with Orthodox clergy, spoke out against the confiscation of church wealth (its land, icons, and most especially, its sacred liturgical vessels).

In spite of the fact that the Catholic Church also suffered similar trials, these problems confirmed the Catholic opinion toward the Russian Orthodox Church. Gallagher reflected on this state of affairs as they manifested themselves in December 1922, when Pontifical relief was

---

[31]Zatko, "The Vatican and Famine Relief in Russia," pp. 56-57.

in full operation:

> The great drive on the Russian State Church was coming to an end. The Orthodox churches had already lost over a hundred million dollars worth of sacred vessels, icons, and gold and silver ornaments. The Catholic churches, less ornate in decoration, had lost some hundreds of thousands of dollars worth in similar objects. The Bolshevik Government had the Orthodox Church well in hand and under control. With the Catholic Church there was no question of control because with that Church there was no room for compromise on fundamental principles.[32]

We will see below that this also included rare and important books.

After the conclusion of the Papal relief mission and the show trial of Cieplak *et al.* (the mid- 1920s), Gallagher went on a lecture tour in Ireland and the United States to discuss Papal relief efforts. While he promised that he would include "nothing political"[33] in the lectures and would practically aim to ensure that Catholics would be willing to make donations for future charitable undertakings, the entire context of the lectures was political. The simple fact that the Russian people were starving to death in the most horrible conditions while the Soviets were, from the Catholic perspective, looting churches and passing laws to forbid the public religious worship, reinforced the Catholic world view in the minds of those attending these lectures. The Vatican secretary of State, Pizzardo, confirmed this in a letter to Gallagher when he wrote [in English], "the conferences which you propose to give on the Pontifical Relief Work in Russia will be most opportune, and will, I venture to hope, be effective in re-awakening political

---

[32]Edmund Gallagher, S.J. *Edmund A. Walsh, S.J.: A Biography* (New York: Benziger Brothers, Inc., 1962), p. 29.

[33]AA.EE.SS., PCpR, 73/332: 45.

sympathy with the grand mission of charity there in which you have taken so notable and devoted a share."[34] While it was possible to create feelings of sympathy for Russia in many western nations, this was not possible in Poland. The recent rebirth of the Polish *"feniks"* from the ashes of the empires which had partitioned it inspired the Polish population to renewed patriotism, which included a suspicion of any remnant of a legacy of those partitioning powers.

Perhaps the most obvious symbol of that legacy was Orthodoxy which was generally associated with Russia. The forced incorporation of the Greek Catholic Church into the Orthodox Church demonstrated to the Poles both the political ties of Orthodoxy to Russia and the non-Polish quality of Byzantine Catholicism. The decision by many former Greek Catholics to remain Orthodox rather than re-enter the Catholic Church after 1918 confirmed this non-Polish quality of Byzantine Catholicism.[35] Therefore, to be Orthodox was minimally not to be Polish.[36]

---

[34]AA.EE.SS., PCpR, 73/332: 44. [yes, they are not filed chronologically]

[35]Konrad Sadkowski, "From Ethnic Borderland to Catholic Fatherland: The Church, Christian Orthodox, and State Administration in the Chełm Region, 1918-1929," *Slavic Review* 57, no. 4 (Winter 1998): 816.

[36]The attempt to create an autocephelous Polish Orthodox Church (POC), which would shift Orthodox loyalty from Moscow to Warsaw, could not by any means be described as a success. Piłsudski publically acknowledged the effort to create the POC in 1922, and in 1924, during an interregnum of Russian patriarchs, the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople issued the canonical act establishing the autocephalous POC. A Russian monk subsequently assassinated Georgi, the new patriarch of the POC as an apostate, and many Orthodox regarded the church as illegitimate. The Polish courts were also filled with disputes between the Greek Catholic and Orthodox officials over property rites. Obviously, this Church was not recognized by the Russian Patriarchs until after WW II, when the patriarch of the POC was made to do penance before the Russian patriarchs and the POC was *de facto* brought under the authority of Moscow. Note John Meyendorff, *The Orthodox Church: Its Past and its Role in the World Today,* trans. John Chapin (London: Darton, Longman, and Todd, 1962), p. 179; Michael Burgess, *The Eastern Orthodox Churches: Concise Histories with Chronological Checklists of their Primates* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland and Co., Inc., 2005), pp. 203-204; Jerzy Kloczowski, *A History of Polish Christianity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 272; and

Consequently, after a lively debate between the "Cathedralites" and "Anti-Cathedralites" the Poles tore down the Alexander Nevsky Cathedral in Warsaw, "the largest and most conspicuous Orthodox Church in all of Poland,"[37] to demonstrate that Warsaw, as well as all of Poland, was free from Russian rule. Additionally, the existence of non-Polish speakers and non-Roman Catholics in Poland, as well as Polish-speaking Roman Catholics beyond the borders of Poland, necessarily politicized religion for both the Polish as well as the Soviet government.

This process of reconstruction of the Polish State in the years just after the "Great War" was mostly concluded by 1921 (the year in which the Constitution was ratified and the Treaty of Riga was signed), though minor conflicts (in several areas in the Carpathians, most notably Spisz/Spiš) persisted until 1925.[38] The borders of the II RP contained 388,000 square kilometers,[39] and according to the 1921 census, Poland counted 27,092,025 million people.[40] The census, which used language as the marker of nationality, showed that the II RP consisted of

---

Neal Pease, *Rome's Most Faithful Daughter: The Catholic Church and Independent Poland, 1914-1939* (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 2009), pp. 153-4.

[37]Neal Pease, unpublished paper delivered at PIASA Fifth World Congress of Polish Studies, Warsaw, June 2014.

[38]Norman Davies, *God's Playground: A History of Poland: Vol II., 1795 to the Present* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1982), p. 394.

[39]Tadeusz Glubiński, *Historia 8: Trudny Wiek XX*. (Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Szkolne i Pedagogiczne, 1992), p. 97.

[40]Adrian Webb, *The Longman Companion to Central and Eastern Europe since 1919* (New York: Longman, 2002), p. 231. It should be noted that these figures should be taken with a grain of salt, since Polish census-takers undoubtedly organized their demographic findings in a way most favorable to the Polish notion of the II RP.

about: 70% Poles, 14.3% Ukrainians, 7.8% Jews, 3.9% Belarussians, and 3.9% Germans.[41]

The 1931 census which also used language as the national indicator, showed only minor changes: of the 31.9 million citizens, 22.01 million were Poles (69% of the total population), 4.8 million Ukrainians (15%), 2.7 million Jews (8.5%), 1.5 million Byelorussians (4.7%), 700,000 Germans (2.2%) 80,000 Russians (0.25%), 80,000 Lithuanians (0.25%), and 30,000 Czechs (0.09%).[42] Of this total number, the census identified that roughly 64.8% of the population was Roman Catholic, 10.5% was Greek Catholic, 11.8% was Orthodox, 9.8% was Jewish, 2.6% was Evangelical (Protestant), and 0.05% practiced other religions.[43]

These numbers and percentages meant that roughly one-third of the citizens of the II RP were not ethnically Polish and were not Roman Catholic. In other words, the minority was small enough that they had virtually no hope of having any real effect in the *Sejm*, but large enough that they could not be ignored by the ethnically Polish majority.[44] Within the Greek Catholic population, the Ukrainians vastly outnumbered the Belarusians, and many of the discriminatory policies toward minorities were aimed at them.[45] Their champion was Andrei Sheptyts'kyi

---

[41]M.B.B. Biskupski, *The History of Poland* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2000), p. 83, and M.K. Dziewanowski, *Poland in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1977), p. 87.

[42]Davies, *God's Playground Vol II*, p. 406.

[43]Glubiński, p. 103. The discrepancy between ethnic and religious Jews is due to the fact that some Jews did not speak Yiddish, which was the nationality marker for Jews in the census.

[44]This is but one way to understand this situation. For example, Biskupski places this within the framework of Polish politics as a situation unfavorable to both the Dmowski-ite and Piłsudski-ite programs; *cf.* Biskupski, *A History of Poland*, pp. 82-3.

[45]Basil Paneyko, "Galicia and the Polish-Ukrainian Problem," *The Slavonic and East European Review* 9, no. 27 (Mar 1931): 579-87. The Polish perspective was, for example,

(1865-1944), the Greek Catholic Metropolitan of Halicz-Lwów and ardent Ukrainian nationalist.

The Sheptyts'kyi (or Szeptycki) family could trace its roots to Rus' as a boyar family that had long been culturally and linguistically Polonized. Sheptyts'kyi was christened "Roman" in the Roman Catholic Rite, but returned to the Byzantine Rite of his ancestors to champion Ukrainian nationalism.[46]

Although committed to Ukrainian nationalism, Sheptyts'kyi eschewed violence as a means of obtaining Ukrainian independence.[47] John-Paul Himka noted that Sheptyts'kyi "roundly condemned the murder [of a Polish count by a zealous Ukrainian nationalist in 1908] as a terrible sin, as 'politics without God.'"[48] Andrii Krawchuk argued that Metropolitan Sheptyts'kyi was first a man of the church whose social and political policies were not formulated to serve Ukrainian nationalist ambitions, but for a type of social justice which would serve all nations involved, Poles and Ukrainians alike.[49] For the government of the Second

---

articulated by Roman Dyboski, "Poland and the Problem of National Minorities," *Journal of the British Institute of International Affairs* 2, no. 5 (Sep 1923): 179-200, and "Miss M. A. Czaplicka," "Poland," *The Geographical Journal* 38, no. 6 (June 1919): 361-76.

[46]He took the name Andrei in 1888 when he entered a Greek Catholic monastery. While Andrei preferred Ukrainian national identity, his brother Stanisław was, conversely, an ardent Polish patriot and military hero, holding such posts as an army commander during the Polish-Soviet War, Minister of Defense, and Army Inspector, who only resigned his commission in 1926 in response to Piłsudski's coup.

[47]His later support of the SS Galizien is immaterial here, and not a simple matter of abandoning his earlier principles to become a collaborator with the Nazis.

[48]John-Paul Himka, "Christianity and Radical Nationalism: Metropolitan Andrei Sheptytsky and the Bandera Movement," chap. in *State Secularism and Lived Religion in Soviet Russia and Ukraine*, ed. Catherine Wanner (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), p. 95.

[49]Andrii Krawchuk, *Christian Social Ethics in Ukraine: The Legacy of Andrei Sheptytsky* (Toronto: Canadian institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 1997).

Polish Republic, such a distinction was meaningless, especially after the Polish-Ukrainian War of 1918-1919. The support of Ukrainian nationalism by any means– religious or secular, violent or non-violent– was a threat, and Sheptyts'kyi was a Ukrainian nationalist.

The tensions between the Polish government and Sheptyts'kyi created practical ecclesiastical difficulties for Rome in the summer of 1921, when the Polish government began strong protests of the earlier consecration of Josyf Bocian (the rector of the Greek Catholic Seminary of Lwów) in 1914 by Sheptyts'kyi as the Greek Rite bishop of Łuck. Although Łuck fell within culturally Polish lands in 1914, it was, legally and politically speaking, in Russia. However, after the Treaty of Riga in 1921, Łuck was again part of Poland. Sheptyts'kyi maintained that he had the right to consecrate Bocian by a private verbal agreement with Pope Pius X in 1907 claiming, "all faculties necessary for the restoration of Slavic [Rite] Catholicism in Russia and the acknowledgment of the rights which are maintained and prescribed to the Uniate Metropolitan of Halicz who has succeeded as the Metropolitan of Kiev."[50] He therefore claimed legitimate authority to have appointed Bocian, although no record existed within the archives of CEO or of those held directly by the Holy Father.[51] By July 1921, the Vatican decided that the extraordinary faculties granted to Sheptyts'kyi by Pius X– if they had indeed existed– had expired.[52]

Furthermore, Sheptyts'kyi had been in St. Petersburg during the special synod in late

---

[50]AA.EE.SS., Russia 636 P.O./23: 5. "...tutte le facoltà necessarie per ristabilire il cattolicismo slavo in Russia, e il riconoscimento dei diritti che asseriva competergli come metropolita unito di Halicia, succeduto al metropolita di Kiew..."

[51]AA.EE.SS., Russia 634 P.O./23: 6.

[52]AA.EE.SS., Russia 634 P.O./23: 16.

March 1917, convened to deal with the revolutionary atmosphere in Russia. Appealing to the authority he claimed had been given him verbally by Pius X, he led the synod to install Leonid Feodorov as the Exarch of the Russian Catholic Church.[53] The Polish government was uncomfortable at best with a connection between one of its citizens and Russia. Suspicion concerning the affinity between Byzantine-Rite Christians and Moscow was confirmed– or perhaps created– in the October 1921 discovery and arrest of supposed communists (described by the Polish government as a "Bolshevik-Communist Congress") which met in the Greek Catholic church of St. John in Lwów.[54] In the following December Grabowski, then the voivode of Lwów, accused 200 "Uniate" priests in Galicia as having sympathies with Russian Orthodoxy.[55] The Vatican began to doubt the ability of Sheptyts'kyi, the outspoken Ukrainian nationalist, to be effective in leading a Russian mission.

This became clear to the Vatican in the summer of 1923. Sheptyts'kyi had returned to Rome after a pastoral visit to Ukrainian communities and their Greek Catholic Parishes in the United States and Canada. Sheptyts'kyi intended to return rather quickly to Poland, but was impeded by the Polish government, which claimed that he had espoused anti-Polish propaganda.[56] This displeasure was heightened by a pastoral letter that Sheptyts'kyi wrote during his stay in Rome, which he promulgated on June 29th, the Feast of Sts. Peter and Paul.[57]

---

[53]AA.EE.SS., Russia 634 P.O./23: 6.

[54]AA.EE.SS., Russia 634 P.O./19: 21-32.

[55]AA.EE.SS., Russia 634 P.O./19: 35.

[56]AA.EE.SS., Polonia 40 P.O./49: 1.

[57]AA.EE.SS., Polonia 40 P.O./49: 18-22.

Sheptyts'kyi did not explicitly mention the anti-Ukrainian disposition of the Polish government or the chauvinism of Roman Catholic Poles in general, and citing Romans 13:1-2, he exhorted all Christians to be obedient to the government. However, his appeal to true Christians to render unto Caesar what is Caesar's, and unto God what is God's, was at once a clear condemnation of Polish governmental policies and a charge of hypocrisy against Poland. The response in Poland was outrage.

Almost immediately, the Polish press protested the return of Sheptyts'kyi to his diocese,[58] and by August, the Ministry of Religion forbade the publication of the letter in Poland even though Sheptyts'kyi had earlier gotten approval to write it.[59] Rev. Buczko, the secretary for the Ruthenian Rite consistory in Lwów, condemned the conduct of the Polish government when he wrote to Rome, "we are not in Bolshevik Russia, but in Poland."[60] Concurrently, the Polish government resisted the return Sheptyts'kyi to his diocese. They stalled on issuing (or renewing) his passport, and insisted that he remain in Vienna rather than try to return to his diocese.[61] When Sheptyts'kyi did cross the Austrian-Polish border on August 22, he was arrested, detained on the train (in his sleeping car), and then due to reasons of health, moved to a hospital run by religious sisters.[62] With the exception of *Przegląd Katolicki* which condemned the arrest, the

---

[58]AA.EE.SS., Polonia 40 P.O./49: 41.

[59]AA.EE.SS., Polonia 40 P.O./49: 37.

[60]AA.EE.SS., Polonia 40 P.O./49: 47. "...non siamo in Russia bolscevica, ma in Polonia."

[61]AA.EE.SS., Polonia 40 P.O./49: 8, 33.

[62]AA.EE.SS., Polonia 40 P.O./49: 49, 61, 72.

Polish press generally supported the government action.[63] Subsequently, Sheptyts'kyi was forced to make a public profession in which he not only affirmed his loyalty to the Second Polish Republic, but also recognized that his diocesan territory was an intrinsic or integral part of Poland.[64]

The Vatican did not like the intransigence of either the Polish government or Sheptyts'kyi.[65] The mutual antagonisms between them made it clear that neither would be helpful in realizing the Russian mission. Additionally, the general patriotic behavior of Roman Catholic bishops in Poland[66] (e.g. their general support of the *Endecja*, the recall of Nuncio Achille Ratti to Rome,[67] the unfolding of the Matulewicz Affair[68]) and the general difficulty in concluding a Concordat with the Polish government made a Polish-led mission to Russia unattractive. If the Russian mission was to succeed, it would have to be led by someone other than Sheptytsk'yi and outside of Poland.

The shift of the leadership of the Russian mission from Lwów to Rome was in many ways spearheaded by the Jesuit Michel d'Herbigny, who developed the PIO (which had been entrusted to the Society of Jesus in September 1922) as the institutional tool to manage the Russian

---

[63]AA.EE.SS., Polonia 40 P.O./49: 76.

[64]AA.EE.SS., Polonia 40 P.O./49: 52.

[65]AA.EE.SS. Polonia 40 P.O./49: 25-26, 43.

[66]Neal Pease, *Rome's Most Faithful Daughter*, *passim*.

[67]Neal Pease, "Poland and the Holy See, 1918-1939," *Slavic Review* 50, no. 3 (Autumn 1991): 522.

[68]Neal Pease, "God's Patriot: Jerzy Matulewicz as Bishop of Vilna, 1918-1925," *East Central Europe/Europe du Centre-Est* 18, no. 1 (1991): 68-79.

mission. Korolovsky noted that d'Herbigny "found professors, recruited students, began and indefatigably pursued the gathering of a unique library, such as did not exist in Rome...",[69] all of which helped to erode the considerations of Pius XI to close the PIO, beset by nationality-based discord and rivalries among members of various religious communities. The acquisition of the library is an important element not only in raising the value and prestige of the PIO, but it also demonstrates the underlying soft-Orientalist attitude of the CEO.

While the Vatican refused to work with the Bolshevik government in the project of famine relief, it paid the Soviets six thousand Italian lira to acquire important and rare Russian books,[70] which the government in turn used for famine relief. While d'Herbigny could argue that the purchase of these books both preserved an important aspect of Russian culture (since they could have been destroyed, for example, as part of the anti-religious campaign) and concretely aided the Russian mission, the Vatican took advantage of the weak position of the Soviet government to increase its own wealth.

Yet, the rhetoric of the PIO insisted that the Christian East– including Russia– was in need of Rome. *Orientalia Christiana* (currently *Orientalia Christiana Analectica*), a journal founded by d'Herbigny, published by the PIO, and dedicated to the exploration of issues concerning the Christian East, argued this point. While the articles in *Orientalia Christiana* were scholarly, their underlying logic was congruent with the "colonial" mission articulated by Cardinal Marini. Although d'Herbigny wrote many articles in the early 1920s concerning

---

[69]Korolevsky, p. 277.

[70]A.S.V., Seg. di Stato (1923) 42/1: 120.

ecumenism, "*L'unité dans le Christ*"[71] ("Unity in Christ," 1923), "*La Vraie Notion d'Orthodoxie*"[72] ("The True Notion of Orthodoxy," 1923), and "*L'Aiuto Pontificio ai Bambini Affamati della Russia*,"[73] ("Pontifical Aid to the Starving Children of Russia," 1925) collectively argued the for the necessity of the Russian mission.

In "*L'unité dans le Christ,*" d'Herbigny recognized that schism among the various Christian Churches was a collective sin, from which the Catholic Church was not excluded, and asserted that all Christians are obligated to work for unity. However, that unity is found in communion with the Pope, who has universal jurisdiction, rather than bishops of other places– he cited as examples the Patriarch of Constantinople and the Archbishop of Canterbury– who have local jurisdiction. He concluded his argument by quoting Soloviev, "Now, children, it is the time to fulfill the supreme prayer of Christ for his disciples: *Ut sint Unum!* [That they might be one!][74] That our brother Peter [The Pope] might gather us the lost sheep of the Lord."[75] Unity therefore demanded conversion to Catholicism.

In "*La Vraie Notion d'Orthodoxie,*" d'Herbigny, argued this point specifically with

---

[71]Michel d'Herbigny, S.J., "L'unité dans le Christ," *Orientalia Christiana* 1 (1923): 1-29.

[72]Michel d'Herbigny, S.J., "La Vraie Notion d'Orthodoxie," *Orientalia Christiana*. Vol. II, no. 7 (December 1923): 1-33.

[73]Michel d'Herbigny, S.J., "L'Aiuto Pontificio ai Bambini Affamati della Russia," *Orientalia Christiana* Vol. IV, no. 1 (Apr 1925): 1-75.

[74]The thought of Soloviev was the ideological and intellectual basis for much of the work of the PCpR. He will therefore be analyzed in depth in chapter 3.

[75]D'Herbigny, "L'unité dans le Christ," p. 29. "Maintenant, enfants, il est temps d'accomplire la suprême prière du Christ pour ses disciples: *Ut sint unum!* Que notre frère Pierre puisse paître les dernières brebis du Seigneur."

respect to the Russian Orthodox Church through a type of straw-man argument against a well-respected contemporary Orthodox theologian, Nicolas N. Gloubokovsky. Gloubokovsky argued that in spite of the historical co-development of Orthodox Churches and nations, such as in Greece and Russia, the Orthodox faith was universal. D'Herbigny claimed that Gloubokovsky, by making this claim, rendered the Christian faith as a transcendental abstraction, which in turn rendered the doctrine of the incarnation and the very existence of a church meaningless. In refutation, d'Herbigny proposed that the Catholic Church, as a truly universal church, has faithfully maintained the Christian faith. True Orthodoxy, therefore, is possible only in communion with Rome, and consequently, Russia stood in great theological need of Catholicism. It also stood in great material need, which the Church could provide.

In "*L'Aiuto Pontificio ai Bambini Affamati della Russia*," d'Herbigny described the response of the Catholic Church to the horrific conditions due to the famine, primarily utilizing descriptive text and graphic pictures. Minor consideration was also given to the show trials of Cieplak and Constantine Budkiewicz,[76] to demonstrate the barbaric, despotic behavior of the Bolsheviks.[77] While d'Herbigny portrayed the efforts of other western organizations positively, describing the overall effort as "a grand example of universal fraternity,"[78] the Bolsheviks– who

---

[76]D'Herbigny, "L'Aiuto Pontificio ai Bambini Affamati della Russia," pp. 57-58.

[77]Although anti-communist attitudes helped create the PCpR, they will be examined more thoroughly in chapter 4 as part of the ideology of the Catholic Church, and more specifically, the PCpR. Suffice it to say here that the Vatican believed the Bolsheviks were a genuine threat, and since the locus of this threat was Russia, the experts who became members of the PCpR were an important aspect of Vatican anti-communist policy.

[78]D'Herbigny, "L'Aiuto Pontificio ai Bambini Affamati della Russia," p. 31. "Un grand exemple de fraternité universelle."

were outside of this fraternity– were condemned as enemies of the church and the Russian people. This notion was supplemented with concrete images of refugees, on whom the Catholic Church spent thousands of lira since 1918, in an attempt to alleviate their suffering.[79] It rendered refugees powerless, pathetic, and in need of the west.

Additionally, the Ivanitzky case of the early 1920s reinforced the Vatican view of the Bolsheviks. Raphael Ivanitzky-Ingilo, a Georgian with a wife and ten small children, had fled into exile in Germany, leaving his family in Tiflis. Because he was an Orthodox ecclesiastic of some importance, he appealed to the Pope for aid through Eugenio Pacelli, the nuncio in Berlin. After careful deliberation, he was awarded 500 lira in October 1924, and in February 1925, the Vatican awarded him an annual pension of 3,600 lira.[80]

For d'Herbigny, who had the ear of the Pope, the spiritual and material needs of Russia which was suffering Bolshevik rule were great, and the Catholic Church had the obligation to meet those needs. The field of acceptable candidates to lead this venture was small. The nationalist disposition of the Polish bishops and the politically problematic Ukrainian nationalism of Metropolitan Sheptyts'kyi made them unacceptable. Catholic prelates either in or exiled from Russia were out of the question. Correlatively, the protracted and difficult negotiations with the Polish government concerning the Concordat, the unjust mistreatment of Greek Catholics in eastern Poland, and the Bolshevik view that Catholicism meant Polish interference, demonstrated to the Vatican that Poland would not be the ideal location from which to stage the Russian mission. Rome, however, offered a safe location easily managed by the

---

[79]AA.EE.SS., PCpR, 1/8: 82, and A.S.V. Seg. di Stato (1925) 362/1: 226.

[80]A.S.V., Seg. di Stato (1925) 362/1: 238-39, 241-43.

Pope, and contained the experts needed to pioneer this mission to Russia, most notably Michel d'Herbigny.

The Pontifical Commission for Russia (PCpR) was officially established on Palm Sunday (5 April) 1925 "in the bosom"[81] of CEO, and announced in *Osservatore Romano* immediately after Easter Sunday.[82] Its creation was somewhat of a departure of the general character of the working committees within CEO, which were organized by rite[83] rather than by specific missionary objective. D'Herbigny, in a series of private audiences beginning on the first of February, established the positions on the commission, the appointments to those positions, and the general areas of responsibility and authority.[84]

Because the Pope was the Prefect of CEO (which was the case until 1967), the PCpR was, juridically, directly answerable to him. However, the cardinal secretaries of CEO, Giovanni Tacci Porcelli (1925-27) and Luigi Sincero (1927-1930, and again 1933 ff.), oversaw the PCpR. Michel d'Herbigny, as *relatore* (supervisor) and the chief Russian expert, managed the practical daily business of the PCpR with Carlo Margotti as the secretary. Although members of the commission shifted, Bishop Isaiah Papadopoulos was a constant member until his death in January 1932. His personal history, which resembled that of Leonid Feodorov, made him a valuable but always junior member of the PCpR.

Papadopoulos, a Greek Orthodox priest, converted to Catholicism and eventually became

---

[81]AA.EE.SS., PCpR, 1/1: 52.

[82]AA.EE.SS., PCpR, 1/1: 52, 79-81.

[83]CEO (1918) 39/29.

[84]AA.EE.SS., PCpR, 1/1: 24.

the titular bishop of Gratianopolis and the head of the Greek Byzantine Catholic Church[85] which, like the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite Church, was very small in number, existed in a sea of Orthodoxy, had an uneasy relationship with the local Latin Rite Catholics, and defied the popularly held assumption that to be Catholic was to be a national Other. As such, he understood the difficulties of establishing Catholicism within geographic and conceptual territory which was constructed, in large part, by Orthodoxy. Additionally, he exemplified the ideal Orthodox convert in the imagination of d'Herbigny: not only did he "return to the true faith," but worked for the similar conversion of others.

Papadopoulos, by no means a Russian expert, was a native Orthodox Christian who entered communion with Rome, while the Roman Catholic d'Herbigny, who was merely granted faculties in the Byzantine Rite, was a Russian expert. The Vatican imagination concerning the Russian mission, greatly influenced by d'Herbigny, conceived of the Russian mission primarily as a mission to the Russians who were Orthodox, rather than as a mission to the Orthodox Christians in Russia. Since Russian identity was cast primarily as cultural and political and not religious, d'Herbigny was therefore the obvious choice as the *relatore*. However, the personal history of Papadopoulos provided him with the ability to speak authentically to Orthodox Christians who suffered war and were aware of the cultural difficulties of conversion. Even without expertise in Russia, Papadopoulos might very well have been a fine *relatore* of the PCpR. However, he would always be a convert and in Roman bureaucratic circles, an outsider drawn into the fold. On the contrary, d'Herbigny was a native Catholic whose political acumen

---

[85]Charles A. Frazee, *Catholics and Sultans: The Church and the Ottoman Empire, 1453-1923* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), pp. 254-55.

allowed him to negotiate Vatican bureaucracy with ease.

The PCpR was given authority over (1) all territory in Soviet Russia, Siberia (including Transcaucasia and Vlodivostok), and Georgia, (2) all rites within that territory, which included not only the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite, but also the Latin, Armenian, Georgian, and Calcedonian Rites, (3) the production and promulgation of propaganda for the conversion of non-Catholics, i.e. "dissident" Orthodox, Muslims, Jews, and pagans, (4) care of Russian refugees in various countries throughout the world, in whatever form was deemed necessary, and (5) any work connected to these responsibilities. The PCpR would also aid the SCEO in resolving canonical questions– such as matrimonial and baptismal difficulties and the appointment of bishops– and providing solutions for Russians who desired to study in the West.[86]

The PCpR worked vigorously to carry out this mission. Their work, in regard to points three through five, will be examined in subsequent chapters. However, none of that work would have been possible without the ecclesial structural apparatus to support and sustain that work. The most fundamental was the diocese.

The ratification of the Vatican-Polish concordat by the *Sejm* on 27 March 1927 allowed Pius XI to promulgate the bull *Vixdum Poloniae Unitas*, which reorganized the diocesan structure in Poland so that diocesan boundaries matched political frontiers. Lasting until the Second World War,

> [t]he decree divided the country into five Latin-rite metropolitanates..., the sees of Warsaw, Gniezno-Poznań, and Lwów joined by new archdioceses of Kraków and Vilna [recovered from Austria-Hungary and Russia, respectively]. In addition, Lwów retained its status as the archiepiscopal seat of the country's two Eastern-

[86]AA.EE.SS., PCpR, 1/1: 25.

rite congregations, the Armenians and Greek Catholics.[87]

The Polish dioceses had two practical effects for the PCpR: (1) Because the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite within Poland would not have its own parallel diocesan structure alongside the Latin and other Greek Catholic Rites, the Latin– and not Greek Catholic– Rite bishops became the ordinaries of Byzantine-Slavonic Rite parishes. (2) Unlike in Soviet Russia and in spite of the ethno-religious tensions, the Catholics of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite had administrative and material support of the Latin Rite bishops. (3) The eastern borders of the eastern-most metropolitanates of Lwów and Wilno[88] defined the western borders of the western-most dioceses of Russia.

The traditional Roman Catholic dioceses of Russia were considered missionary dioceses because they had existed in an Orthodox country; they included the archdiocese of Mohilev and the bishoprics of Wilno, Somogitia, Lutsk-Zytomir, and Tiraspol. Originally, Mohilev included all of Great Russia, the pre-war territories of Belarussia, Latvia, Estonia, and Finland, and parts of Ukraine, Siberia, and Central Asia. The Diocese of Samogitia had covered most of the Lithuanian territory, and the Diocese of Vilna included the rest of Lithuania. Lutsk-Zytomir included Volhynia, Podolia, and parts of the territory which had been part of the ancient principality of Kiev. Tiraspol covered Bessarabia, Odessa, the Crimea, the Caucasuses, and a section of territory between the Volga and Don Rivers. However, by 1926, because of the changes in boundaries and the difficulties with the Soviet Government, these ancient bishoprics

---

[87]Pease, *Rome's Most Faithful Daughter*, p. 72.

[88]Once again, the choice of name is not due to sympathies with the distasteful politics of the II RP, but because Vilnius was legally Wilno at this time.

were replaced by ten apostolic administrative regions,[89] technically overseen by Exarch Feodorov who was responsible for Byzantine Rite Catholicism throughout Russia. However, because he was an Exarch and not a bishop overseeing administrative regions rather than a diocese, he held a lesser ecclesial status, even below titular bishops who were often nothing more than administrative personnel. The necessity of administrative reorganization reinforced the Vatican view that Russian territory was wild, while the persecution of Catholics reinforced the view that Russia was barbaric.

Correlatively, the Orthodox Church also faced serious challenges to its institutional structure after the success of the October Revolution. Beginning in 1918, the Bolsheviks published general anti-religious decrees restricting religion and outlawing certain practices, such as catechetical instruction in schools or church ownership of property. These laws did, however, permit the performance of religious rites by adults, so long as they were deemed by the government not to interfere with the public order.

While Catholic historiography has generally portrayed Bolshevik anti-religious policy as a unified, systematic plan which unfolded over time– increasing in intensity as the Bolsheviks solidified power– their policies were in fact both flexible and shifting, depending upon the time-frame and the religion in question.[90] The manner of survival of the Orthodox Church depended

---

[89]AA.EE.SS., PCpR, 11/77: 99-102. We will see below that the missionary trip of Mgr. d'Herbigny was intended to shore up this structure by the consecration of bishops within Russia for some of these posts.

[90]Note, e.g., Heather J. Coleman, *Russian Baptists and Spiritual Revolution, 1905-1929* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2005) and Jennifer Jean Wynot, *Keeping the Faith: Russian Orthodox Monasticism in the Soviet Union, 1817-1939* (College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 2004).

primarily on the particulars of accommodation with respect to the Soviet government.

Accommodation is the willingness of a church to cooperate with a society and government which does not operate strictly according to "gospel values," implying that it understands itself to be somehow separated from the larger society. Accommodation functions on a spectrum, ranging from complete accord between church and state (as in a theocracy) to a relationship just short of complete discord and hostility, whereby the church is outlawed and persecuted, and the church judges the government unworthy of support. While this played out in Russia with many different Christian and non-Christian faith communities, the Vatican was chiefly interested in the mode of accommodation between the Bolshevik government and the Catholic and Orthodox Churches.

In regard to the Catholic Church, the Soviets viewed Catholicism as a means of Polonization and the Vatican viewed Soviet behavior toward the Catholic Church in Russia as a form of martyrdom. With Vatican-Soviet diplomatic stalled in the early to mid-1920s over these questions, Pius XI seized the opportunity for some improvement when Metropolitan Vvendensky, a leader of the Renovationist movement, invited Michel d'Herbigny to visit the Soviet Union. D'Herbigny entered the Soviet Russia with the claim that he was there for vacation and study. During this first in a series of often-portrayed "clandestine visits," d'Herbigny focused on Soviet political action.

While famine and violence were the chief mechanisms which had– from the point of the view of the west– rendered Russia wild and barbaric, the failure of Orthodox Christianity would, in a sense, demonstrate the pervasiveness of that barbarity. The Orthodox Church, led by Patriarch Tikhon, rejected any accommodation with the Soviet government on the theoretical

grounds of its atheism and the practical grounds that it had confiscated (or "looted," according to the Orthodox) a great deal of church wealth.[91] Edward Rosloff convincingly argued that the notion of "heresy" within the Orthodox Church prevented any real ability to reach an accommodation.[92]

While the majority of the Russian Orthodox population supported the Tikhonites, the public confession of guilt and oath of loyalty to the new regime by the Patriarch in June 1923 indicated to d'Herbigny and the Vatican that the Orthodox hierarchy was ineffectual. Hansjacob Stehle noted that overall, d'Herbigny found the Tikhonites "theologically rigid, religiously and politically implacable, and absolutely passive,"[93] but was more impressed with the Renovationist program.

In May 1922, a group of priests– with tacit support from the government– deposed Patriarch Tikhon and established the "Living Church," intent on extensive reforms. Most of these reforms were liturgical, and many had been previously and seriously debated by the traditional Orthodox hierarchy; e.g., the use of Russian rather than Church Slavonic in the Divine Liturgy, shortening the Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom celebrated universally in its monastic form, and opening the royal doors of the iconostasis at the beginning of the liturgy so

---

[91]Jane Swan, *Chosen for His People: A Biography of Patriarch Tikhon*, 2nd ed., preface Scott M. Kenworthy (Jordanville, NY: Holy Trinity Seminary Press, 2015), *passim*. It should be noted that this most recently published biography is highly hagiographic, pitting the "True Church" against the Bolshevik state.

[92]Edward E. Rosloff, "The Heresy of 'Bolshevik' Christianity: Orthodox Rejection of Religious Reform during the NEP," *Slavic Review* 55, no. 3 (Autumn 1996): 614-35.

[93]Hansjakob Stehle, *Eastern Politics of the Vatican, 1917-1979*, trans. Sandra Smith (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 1979), p. 82.

the faithful might see the sacred Eucharistic rites. Some reforms reflected an effort to come to a practical, working relationship with the Soviet government, which by the mid-1920s was stable and would clearly endure. Many of these reforms centered around social justice considerations, which justified the aims but not the means of the new government to remove oppressive social structures from Russia.

The Living Church– popularly termed "Renovationist"– had neither a unified program of reform nor a systematic means of implementing its reforms, relying instead on particular gains made on the local level. Many of the Russian Orthodox faithful were suspicious of the Renovationist program, as the fractured nature of reform indicated to them the lack of the Holy Spirit at the Renovationist councils. D'Herbigny, therefore, maintained that it "had 'no hopes of establishing permanent roots among the population.'"[94]

A major reason for disunity within the Living Church was disagreement on the degree to which it ought to have accommodated the Bolshevik regime. D'Herbigny identified a two-fold division by describing the "Church of the Revival," led by Metropolitan Antony, as "red," since it cooperated more fully with the Soviets than the Church of the Renovation, led by Metropolitan Vvedensky (with whom d'Herbigny was greatly impressed[95]), as "concordatory." Mgr. d'Herbigny was the first to frame the conflict between the churches as a political matter, missing the deep cultural problems of the Renovationist program, especially in regard to the liturgical

---

[94]*Ibid*.

[95]Christopher Lawrence Zugger, *The Forgotten: Catholics of the Soviet Empire from Lenin through Stalin* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2001), p. 228.

calendar.[96]

The Soviets had adopted the Gregorian calendar in 1918, as it was scientifically more accurate than the Julian, and used by the rest of the world. They demanded the Orthodox Church do the same. The willingness by the Renovationists and the brief consideration by the Tikhonists provoked a strong negative reaction among the general Russian population, principally because changing the calendar would undo the traditional way of life. Somehow, d'Herbigny missed this. He returned to Rome with favorable political impressions of the Renovationists, having in mind (1) their seeming willingness to work toward union with Rome– in contrast to the Tikhonites, and (2) the structural integrity of the Living Church, noting both an intact hierarchy and the existence of seminaries. He published some of his opinions in the December 1925 edition of *Etudes*[97] (a French Jesuit scholarly journal), in the form of a travel log. Both Tretjakewitsch and Zugger take care to explain how d'Herbigny was too naive to realize that the outreach by Metropolitan Vvedensky and the entire council was staged to give exactly this impression,[98] which worked toward the advantage of both the Renovationists and the Soviet government.

D'Herbigny subsequently convinced Pius XI that the time was opportune to plant

---

[96]Gregory L. Freeze, "Counter-Reformation in Russian Orthodoxy: Popular Response to Religious Innovation, 1922-1925," *Slavic Review* 54, no. 2 (Summer 1995): 305-39.

[97]Michel d'Herbigny, S.I., "Seize Jours à Moscou (4-20 Octobre 1925)," *Etudes* CLXXXV (1925): 513-40, 658-76. A more complete account was published as "L'Aspect Religieux de Moscou en Octobre 1925," *Orientalia Christiana* 5 (1926): 185-279. For commentary, n.b. Léon Tretjakewitsch, *Bishop Michel d'Herbigny S.J. and Russia: A Pre-Ecumenical Approach to Christian Unity*, preface Donald W. Treadgold (Würzburg: Augustinus-Verlag,1990), p. 140, fn. 48.

[98]Tretjakewitsch,, p. 141 and Zugger, p. 228.

clandestinely the seeds of the Catholic Church. From the political perspective, the Tikhonites were marginalized, and although the Living Church enjoyed structural integrity, the support from the Bolsheviks– such as it was– was not enough to overcome popular dislike. Furthermore, the hostility of the Soviet government toward the Catholic Church– often exemplified by the show trials of 1923 in which Feodorov, Cieplak, Budkiewicz, and fourteen other Catholic priests and one layman were convicted– demonstrated the importance of the clandestine character of the undertaking. Pius XI agreed. On 29 March 1926, Pacelli secretly consecrated d'Herbigny as the Bishop of Ilien (Troy in the classical world), and d'Herbigny clandestinely entered Russia twice more to take stock of the situation and, in turn, secretly consecrate bishops to provide a foundation for an underground Catholic Church.

Writing once more in the form of a travel log,[99] d'Herbigny shared remembrances of his April-May trip through Russia. Because *Paques 1926 en Russie* was meant for widespread public consumption, with the aim of edifying the faithful, d'Herbigny did not discuss his secret consecrations of bishops, most notably the Assumptionist priest Pie Eugene Neveu, whom he appointed as the Apostolic Administrator of the Catholic Church for the Archdiocese of Mogilev (replacing Jan Cieplak and supplanting Leonid Feodorov).[100] He did share his impressions of Russia in a way familiar to those in the metropole, overlaying a Catholic sense of sacred time on his travels in a non-Catholic space.

The title itself, *Paques 1926 en Russie,* framed the entire journey within the holiest of

---

[99]Michel d'Herbigny, S.I., *Paques 1926 en Russie, du Jeudi-Saint (1er Avril) au Surlendemain de l'Ascension (15 Mai)* (Paris: Editions Spes, 1926).

[100]Patrick A. Croghan, A.A., *The Peasant from Makeyevka: Biography of Bishop Pius Neveu, A.A.* (Worcester, MA: Augustinians of the Assumption, 1982), pp. 128-30.

liturgical seasons. The journey began on Holy Thursday and ended on the Feast of the Ascension. D'Herbigny employed images of healing a sick Russia and a sick Russian people to render the journey, and the work done therein, as holy. From a theological sense, the journey could be said to have occurred during a *kairos*, rather than ordinary *chronos*, because of the liturgical framework which connects his sojourn in Russia to that of Christ in the world. By overlaying a Catholic imaginative landscape upon the damaged physical landscape of Russia, d'Herbigny created a dichotomy between what Russia was and what Russia should be. It also helped to construct a sense of alienation from the space he was in, furthering the portrayal of his work as Christ-like. Russia was spiritually and physically Other.

The physical landscape itself was punishing; d'Herbigny noted that in the early part of April, temperatures reached well below zero during mass. He also expectedly related the condition of the Christian faith as deplorable. The anti-religious policies, the lack of priests, the arrests, and the suffering of the people (in the aftermath of the famine) rendered Russia as a place of hardship and danger. Although he noted that he could easily bring sacraments to people in their homes and in Soviet hospitals, he had to do it without the requisite solemnity due the sacrament, implying that even the seemingly easy things were still marred by Soviet policy. In spite of the difficulties, d'Herbigny gave his readers reason to hope in the success of his mission: there are even incidents in which Orthodox dissidents pray with Byzantine Catholics.[101] Although d'Herbigny portrayed this prayerful union as charitable, it was not a union of equality.

Mgr. d'Herbigny did understand the Russian people to be lesser. In "*L'âme religieuse des russes d'après leurs plu récents publications*," published a year before his missionary travels

[101]d'Herbigny, S.I., *Paques 1926 en Russie*, p. 7-8, 12, 17, 100.

into Russia as a bishop, d'Herbigny portrayed the Russian people to be psychologically beset with a folkloric religion, which was a blend of Orthodoxy, spiritualism, and occultism, which in turn made them vulnerable to Bolshevik anti-religious propaganda.[102] Though not part of the article, the folkloric description of general Russian society in general would implicitly place them, culturally and sociologically, behind western Europe on the time line of progress– a mark of soft-Orientalism. In this context, the Orthodox liturgical calendar was part of a corrupted Christianity which needed to be replaced by Rome. This viewpoint was confirmed by Feodorov, who noted that Orthodoxy had become such a part of Russian culture that one could claim, "I do not believe in God, but I am Orthodox."[103] This would, for d'Herbigny, justify his use of the Gregorian Calendar in his travels through Russia, on sociological as well as theological grounds.

The creation of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia (ROCOR) also demonstrated the lesser status of Russia to the PCpR. In 1920, Patriarch Tikhon had issued decree no. 362 in which he stated, "In the event a diocese...finds itself completely out of contact with the Higher Church Administration...the diocesan bishop immediately enters into relations with the bishops of neighboring dioceses for the purpose of organizing a higher instance of ecclesiastical authority."[104] That same year, without knowledge of this decree, thirty-four émigré Russian bishops (from Russia, Europe, Asia, and North America), with the blessing of the

---

[102]Michel d'Herbigny, S.J., "L'âme Religieuse des Russes d'après Leurs plu Récents Publications," *Orientalia Christiana* 3 (1924): 49-50.

[103]"Io non credo in Dio, ma io sono ortodosso." AA.EE.SS. Russia, 610 P.O., fasc. 5:37. We will leave aside the degree of appropriation by Feodorov of (western) Catholic attitudes toward the Orthodox.

[104]A Brief History of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia, 1922-1972, Stable URL: http://www.synod.com/synod/enghistory/enhis_rocorshukin.html.

Patriarch of Constantinople, convened a council and created the magisterial structure of ROCOR. They elected Metropolitan Antony of Kiev and Volyn– who had been a rival of Tikhon for the Moscow Patriarchate– as their hierarch and in 1921, and moved their headquarters to Yugoslavia. In 1927, ROCOR formally separated from the Moscow Patriarchate when its imprisoned Patriarch, Sergius, issued a declaration on the recognition of the Soviet state, in which he required that his clergy sign an oath of loyalty to the government. In response, a synod of the Moscow Patriarchate convened on 9 May 1928, and issued an ukase which declared the ROCOR and its activities invalid.

This schism between ROCOR and the Russian Orthodox Church reconfirmed the Roman view that the Russian Orthodox Church had been corrupted by Russian politics. Not only was it in schism, the schism within ROCOR (i.e. the Platon Affair) demonstrated to the Vatican the thoroughness of the structural corruption within Russian Orthodoxy. The institutional implosion of the Russian Orthodox Church confirmed the need for a Catholic, Byzantine-Slavonic Rite.

This Byzantine-Slavonic Rite, like the Chinese Rites of the Jesuits, was a conscious construction, but one which drew upon both historical elements and existent communities in its construction, unlike the Chinese rites. While the Chinese rites had incorporated "pagan" and Chinese cultural elements which ultimately brought about their prohibition,[105] the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite was an already existent Christian liturgy. Furthermore, the rite its roots in the conversion not only of Orthodox clerics, but also of lay women and men. Perhaps the most

[105]James S. Cummins, "Palafox, China, and the Chinese Rites Controversy," *Revista de Historia De América*, 52 (December 1961): 395-427.

notable lay converts were Anna and Vladimir Abrikosov,[106] who wished to be Catholic but continue worshiping in the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite. However, the Catholic expression of this rite was not officially established until after Fr. Alexis Zerchaninov, who after his conversion, formally petitioned Mgr. Sheptyts'kyi for the creation of such a rite. Sheptyts'kyi, whose authority rested in the claim of the verbal mandate by Pius X, responded by appointing Zerchaninov as the vicar general of the rite.[107] Unlike the Orthodox bishops who brought their entire dioceses into union with Rome at Brześć in 1596, Sheptyts'kyi– as well as other Catholic prelates– did not expect mass conversions, but hoped to gain individual converts to fill up this new rite.

Although this Russian Catholic Church of the Byzantine Slavonic Rite was new (hence "neounion"), it was constructed from historical elements. Its Divine Liturgy remained practically indistinguishable from that of the Russian Orthodox Church, including its tones, tropars, kondaks, and liturgical language– Old Church Slavonic– which was (and is) also used by the Bulgarian and Ukrainian Orthodox Churches.[108] Although the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite Church was not a product of the Union of Brześć, it became an indirect inheritor of its legacy.

The Greek Catholic Churches formed by the Union of Brześć were geographically and culturally situated between Russia and Poland. Timothy Snyder noted that this Union created a

---

[106]They converted in France in 1908 and 1909, respectively.

[107]Florentyna Rzemieniuk, *Kościoł Katolicki Obrządku Bizantyjsko-Słowiańskiego (Neounia)* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, 1999), pp. 23-24.

[108]Casimir Kucharek, *The Byzantine-Slav Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom: Its Origin and Evolution* (Combermere, Ontario, Canada: Alleluia Press, 1971), p. 188.

de facto state church, since both Catholic and Orthodox dioceses within Poland would henceforth be oriented solely toward Rome.[109] Barbara Skinner noted that even before the modern nationalist project of the nineteenth century, the Greek Catholic Churches helped to galvanize the politics of Poland and Russia. The so-called "Uniate" Churches were one means of Catholic expansion to the East, thereby becoming a target of Russian counter-expansion to the West.[110] Tsarina Catherine II, although regarded contemporaneously as politically tolerant, was nonetheless firmly anti-Greek Catholic in temperament. Insofar as Greek Catholics were Catholic– which included a Latinized Byzantine liturgy and western-style training of its clergy– they became Polish.

The political ramifications of Latinization first played out in their support of the November Uprising of 1830-31 within the Polish or Congress Kingdom. The Congress Kingdom was a semi-autonomous entity with a constitution which recognized the Tsar as the King of Poland with strong executive power. Yet, it had its own government (the Polish *Sejm* remained in existence and Polish was the official legal language), judiciary, civil service, many civil rights, and even its own army. The near taste of freedom, juxtaposed with the involvement– or perhaps interference– of the autocratic Tsar Nicholas I and his ministers– inspired the Poles to attempt to regain it wholly.

Although the uprising had an almost comical start, some initial successes made this a

---

[109]Timothy Snyder, *The Reconstruction of Nations: Poland, Ukraine, Lithuania, Belarus, 1569-1999* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003).

[110]Barbara Skinner, *The Western Front of the Eastern Church: Uniate and Orthodox Conflict in 18th Century Poland, Ukraine, Belarus, and Russia (*De Kalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 2009), pp. 228-29.

serious military action. The eventual Russian victory had equally serious consequences. The Congress Kingdom ceased being a semi-autonomous political body and insofar as it existed, it was solely a legal one. The Russian government suspended its constitution and many civil rights, abolished the Polish army and *Sejm*, implemented punitive taxes and a program of Russification, and closed universities and other institutions of higher learning.[111] Additionally, in the wake of the uprising, the Russian government "took note of the pro-Polish activities of the Uniate clergy and especially the Basilian order."[112]

As a consequence, in 1839, the Greek Catholic Churches outside of the former Congress Kingdom were reincorporated into the Orthodox Church, and it became illegal to be Greek Catholic or convert to Catholicism of any rite. Additionally, all of the Basilian monasteries in the area, with the sole exception of one in Warsaw, were closed. Astonishingly, the Greek Catholic Churches in Podlasie and Chełm/Kholm regions, which fell within the territories of the Congress Kingdom, were left untouched until the mid-1870s, in the wake of the January Uprising of 1864.

Unlike the uprising in 1830-31, the January Uprising was managed by a vast, well-organized underground state which had been formed and organized under the comparatively lenient rule of Tsar Alexander II. After several months of guerilla fighting, the Russians vanquished the Polish bid for independence, and discovered, perhaps unsurprisingly, that many of the key figures in the underground movement were Catholics. Norman Davies provided a list

---

[111]Davies, *God's Playground Vol II*, pp. 331-32.

[112]Theodore Weeks, "The 'End' of the Uniate Church in Russia: The 'Vozsoedinenie' of 1875." *Jarbücner für Geschichte Osteurpas* 44, vol 1 (1996): 29.

of twenty prominent figures who were tried, found guilty, and punished. Of the twenty, seventeen men and three women were listed. While the religion of all three women was not identified, sixteen of the men were identified as "Catholic," and one was identified as a "Jew."[113] Fifteen of the men, including the Jewish conspirator, were condemned to hang until dead. The rest of the conspirators, which included all of the women, were sentenced to other punishments. Additionally, the *województwa* of Congress Poland were dissolved and replaced by Russian gubernia, transforming the region into "Vistulaland." In a familiar move, universities and other institutions of higher education were closed, and a program of Russification was once again implemented.

The link between Catholicism and Polish nationalism was again established, but this time, the Greek Catholic Churches were not overlooked. Russian administrators voiced concern about them. Although the conduct of the Russian government outwardly suggests that it set out from the beginning to eradicate the Greek Catholics in the former Congress Kingdom, Theodore Weeks maintained that archival evidence does not support this.[114] The Russian government insisted in 1864 that Russian, and not Latin, be the language of seminary instruction. Although the Greek Catholic congregants had over time come to identify closely with and like their Latinized liturgy, the Russian government demanded in 1874 that all Greek Catholic priests celebrate the Divine Liturgy in Orthodox fashion. Additionally some peasants reported intimidation and violence to force them to sign petitions to join the Orthodox Church, and in the following year, about 50,000 Greek Catholic parishioners in Biała (in Siedlce) joined the

---

[113]Davies, *God's Playground Vol II*, pp. 361-62.

[114]Weeks, p. 33.

Orthodox Church. Subsequently, the Greek Catholic Bishop Popiel soon thereafter petitioned St. Petersburg for a complete reunion of his diocese to the Orthodox Church, in the hopes of preventing dissension among his parishioners. The union became official on 11 May 1875,[115] and the Russian government could now count these new Orthodox Christians as Russians.

In spite of the official 'return" of the Greek Catholics to the Orthodox Church, many of the former Greek Catholics would not go to the Orthodox Divine Liturgy or allow Orthodox clergy to baptize their children, conduct marriages, or bury their dead. About 20,000 of the 136,215 "Russians" in Siedlce province continued to consider themselves Catholic, and continued to go illegally to the Catholic Church. Their obstinance persisted well into the twentieth century, which earned them both the label as the "stubborn ones" or "persisters," and an almost constant inclusion in official documents from or about the region, even after the Edict of Toleration promulgated on 17 April 1905.[116] Unfortunately, the Greek Catholic loyalty to the cause of Poland and their fidelity to the Catholic faith and Church was not highly regarded by the Poles, even after the First World War.

As previously mentioned, the Belarusian ethnic identity and the confession of Byzantine Rite Christianity– in both Catholic and Orthodox forms– was problematic for the Polish government, which preferred its citizenry to be Roman Catholic and speak Polish. The long-time Russian insistence that Latinization meant Polonization held true within the II RP. From the

---

[115] *Ibid*., pp. 32-34.

[116] *Ibid*., p. 38.

perspective of the II RP, the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite was a means of Russification,[117] and because it was not included in the 1925 Concordat with Poland,[118] it did not enjoy the same protection as did other Catholic churches.

Insofar as it was problematic for the Polish government, it was problematic for the Vatican, which was also concerned about creating a pure Russian rite, unsullied with Latinized practices and forms, which would in turn be attractive to prospective Russian Orthodox converts. The solution acceptable to both the Polish government and the Vatican was to place Byzantine-Rite parishes under the authority of local Roman Catholic bishops, rather than under the authority of Greek Catholic bishops (such as Metropolitan Sheptyts'kyi) or create a parallel diocesan system for the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite. Even after centuries of loyalty to Poland, Belarusians of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite did not have the right to their church in its fullest expression, i.e. with its own bishops. And the flagship Jesuit mission of Albertyn included both Byzantine and Roman Rite churches; the Byzantine Rite Catholic Church could not stand alone.[119]

It is unclear whether d'Herbigny or Henryk Przeździecki, the (Roman Catholic) bishop of Siedlce, thought of placing Byzantine-Slavonic Rite parishes under the jurisdiction of the Roman bishops. Sadkowski provided a brief historiographical review, noting which historians favor

---

[117]Konrad Sadkowski, "The Roman Catholic Clergy, the Byzantine Slavonic Rite, and Polish National Identity: The Case of Grabowiec, 1931-34," *Religion, State, and Society* 28, no 2 (2000): 182, fn. 7. (175-84)

[118]Krzysztof Krasowski, *Episcopat Katolicki w II Rzeczypospolitej* (Warsaw: Redackja Naukowa, 1992), pp. 180-85.

[119]Walter Ciszek, S.J. *With God in Russia*, with Daniel Flaherty, S.J. (New York: Image Books, 1966), p. 34.

d'Herbigny, which ones favor Przeździecki, and which ones take no position at all.[120] Rzemieniuk claimed that Przeździecki acted in concert with Włodzimierz Ledóchowski, who handled the Roman Curial aspects, in the creation of the rite within Poland,[121] and Neal Pease agreed, citing the pastoral needs of his parish as inspiration.[122]

Although these Russian Catholic Churches were placed within the Roman (Latin) diocesan structure, their relationship with their fellow Roman Catholics was problematic at best. Archbishop Edouard de Ropp proposed that Roman Catholic priests with bi-ritual faculties staff the rite,[123] in contrast to the original conception of Sheptyts'kyi, who thought Byzantine rite priests ought to do the work. De Ropp believed that the Latin Rite was the essence of Catholicism, and argued that the Russia should fall within the sole jurisdiction of only one ecclesiastical authority.[124] He was not alone. Sadkowski demonstrated that the "Catholic clergy strenuously opposed the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite because of their intense opposition to the Orthodox Church, and convinced local Catholics to do the same."[125] The attitudes exhibited toward the Russian Catholics were remarkably similar to attitudes exhibited toward the Russian Orthodox.[126] These tensions emerged in the narrative of *Kościoł Katolicki Obrządku*

---

[120]Sadkowski, "The Case of Grabowiec," p. 182, fn. 5.

[121]Rzemieniuk, p. 92.

[122]Pease, *Rome's Most Faithful Daughter*, p. 156.

[123]Citation from archives. Also, Simon, *Pioneers and Witnesses*, p. 24.

[124]AA.EE.SS. Russia, 610 P.O., fasc. 5/ 2-3.

[125]Sadkowski, "The Case of Grabowiec," 176.

[126]Konrad Sadkowski, "From Ethnic Borderland to Catholic Fatherland: The Church, Christian Orthodox, and State Administration in the Chełm Region, 1918-1939," *Slavic Review*

Bizantyjsko-Słowiańska, which can be characterized as mechanical. The book explains the creation, administration, and sacramental ministry of Byzantine-Slavonic Rite churches. For example, both the local Russian Orthodox and Roman Catholic clergy claimed legal ownership of the former Greek Catholic Church, in which the Russian Catholics worshiped in the small village of Bubel Stary in Podlasie (within the Siedlce diocese of Przeździecki).[127]

If the measure of success of the Russian mission is quantitative, as the members of the PCpR assumed, then its accomplishments are difficult to assess without concrete numbers. Nevertheless, within a quantitative framework, the Russian mission was relatively unsuccessful. Within the Catholic Church, the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite was and remains small, almost negligible, even though it developed into a global phenomenon. Correlatively, its existence in Russia (as the Russian Orthodox Church in Communion with Rome) was and remains small, almost negligible.

If the measure of success is qualitative, a category which the members of the PCpR did not consider, its accomplishments remained unsuccessful.[128] Alongside the familiar nationalist themes which associated the Roman rite with Poland and the Byzantine rite with non-Poles, we can see soft-Orientalism at play.

57, no. 4 (Winter 1998): 813-39.

[127]Rzemieniuk, pp. 231-32.

[128]This assessment changes with a post-Vatican II perspective, which is tangential to the historical dynamics at play in the interwar period. With a shift in ecumenical theory in Vatican II, non-Roman rite churches are recognized as churches as well as rites, and ecumenism came to mean inter-communion rather than conversion to Catholicism. More generally, the existence of a Russian Catholic Church demonstrates that cultural and national boundaries, often considered to be firm, have been transcended. The possibilities exist for a greater Russian-Catholic communion because a Russian-Catholic communion already exist, though in a minimal way.

The zealous Polish nationalism of many Roman Catholic clergymen degraded people proven to be loyal to "Poland" over decades or even centuries. While the placement of these churches within the Roman Catholic diocesan structure practically preserved Byzantine-Slavonic Rite churches, it did so at the cost of their ecclesial dignity. Theologically, it is questionable whether or not an apostolic church without its own bishop is a church in its own right. The local Byzantine-Slavonic Rite churches, having been placed under the authority of the local Roman Rite bishop was a reflection of the ecclesiology which placed Byzantine Metropolitans and their churches under the juridical authority of the Roman pontiff. At the same time, the Roman Catholic magisterium knew that Roman Catholics in the region felt a "profound loathing" of the Byzantine Rite, and regarded only Latin Rite Catholics as "true Catholics."[129] At every level, the exercise of Roman Catholic ecclesiology reinforced the sense of Roman Catholic superiority over the Byzantine world.

Because both Roman and Byzantine Rite bishops wanted the neo-union to be attractive to prospective Russian converts, maintaining its liturgical purity was paramount. Although men like Feodorov and Sheptyts'kyi laid the foundation for the rite, its placement under Roman episcopal authority ironically implied that they could not or should not be trusted with it. Furthermore, placing this rite under Roman episcopal control suggested that Rome could better be trusted to maintain the purity of the rite, ensuring that the rite would not become corrupted with the Latinization that had generally seeped into Greek Catholic worship to varying degrees. The concern of maintaining a purity of space extended beyond the parish and into the flagship seminary for the Russian mission: the Russicum.

---

[129]AA.EE.SS. Russia, 610 P.O. 5: 3, ¶2.

The *Pontificium Collegium Russicum Sanctæ Theresiæ a Iesu Infante,*[130] informally known as the Russicum, was founded on 25 August 1929 to train candidates to be ordained in the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite for the so-called Russian mission overseen by the PCpR.[131] While the Russicum was not the first national college in Rome, it was the first founded by Pius XI. Generally, all of the Catholic national colleges were established in Rome to provide a place to train seminarians when Catholic priestly formation was all but impossible in their native countries.

The first Roman college was founded by Cardinal Capranica in 1417, the *Almo Collegio Capranica* (1417), simply for the benefit of young clerics.[132] Constantine Simon provided a brief historical outline of the Roman national colleges,[133] and noted the first Roman colleges were established in response to the Protestant Reformation. These include: the *Pontificio Collegio Germanico-Ungarico* (German-Hungarian: 1552/1580), *Collegio Inglese* (English: 1579),

---

[130]The Pontifical Russian College of Saint Thérèse of the Child Jesus.

[131]A *collegio* (or college) in the Catholic seminary system does not have the same connotation usually associated with the English word "college." A Catholic *collegio* was not an institution of higher learning or a seminary, but a dormitory overseen by a religious superior (rector) and supplemented with a formation program which often contained spiritual, cultural, and sociological elements. Seminarians, scholastics, and other formal theology students are generally required to live at a "college" but take classes for their formal degrees at a Pontifical school. Residents at the Russicum would generally be expected to take their degrees at the Pontifical Oriental Institute.

[132]Because this precedes the Council of Trent, "seminarian" would be anachronistic. Additionally, this college was not a Pontifical college, i.e. a college in which the Pope was directly involved in its administration, usually by personally appointing its rector. Later, non-pontifical colleges included the *Inglese, Propaganda,* and *San Pietro Apostolo*.

[133]Constantine Simon, *Russicum: Pioneers and Witnesses of the Struggle for Christian Unity in Eastern Europe 2* (Rome: Opere Religiose Russe, 2002), pp. 14-17.

Pontificio Collegio Scozzese (Scottish: 1600), and the *Pontificio Collegio Irlandese* (Irish: 1628). During this time frame, the *Collegio Greco* (1576) and the *Collegio Marionita* (1581) were founded for Greek-speaking students from the Hellenic Christian east and the Arabic-speaking Maronites, respectively. Additionally, the *Collegio Urbano di Propaganda Fide* (1627) was founded to train missionaries.

Apart from the outline created by Fr. Simon, it should be noted that a Chinese college had been founded by Fr. Matteo Ripa as part of an Oriental Institute in Naples in 1727 and reorganized in 1888, in which Chinese language and culture was taught.[134] Since it was not a Pontifical college and existed outside of Rome, it is entirely reasonable that this– along with other types of colleges– was not included in *Russicum: Pioneers and Witnesses*. Yet, its inception, sustained existence, and reorganization has an affinity with the Russicum. While many Roman colleges were places of refuge and study for Catholics from anti-Catholic countries, both of these colleges were founded to prepare missionaries to inculturate into the exotic.

Simon contended that the second wave of the establishment of Roman colleges began about two centuries later. These include: the *Pontificio Collegio Belga* (Belgian: 1846), *Collegio Pio Latino Americano Pontificio* (Latin American: 1858), *Collegio Americano del Nord* (North American College: 1859),[135] *Pontificio Collegio Polacco* (Polish: 1868), *Pontificio Collegio Armeno* (Armenian: 1883), *Pontificio Collegio Canadese* (Canadian 1888), *Pontificio Collegio* Nepomuceno (Czechs: 1890), *Pontificio Collegio Ruteno* (Greek Catholics from Galicia Slavs: 1897), *Pontificio Collegio San Girolamo degli Illirici* (1901: Croats), *Pontificio Collegio*

[134]ASV, Seg di Stato (1920): 9/3: 80.

[135]The "NAC" became a pontifical institution in 1884.

Spagnuolo (Spanish: 1892), and the *Pontificio Collegio Portoghese* (Portugese: 1901).

Pius XI founded the Russicum in 1929, followed by the Ethiopian, Romanian, and Dutch Pontifical Colleges in 1930. Finally, Pius XII founded the College of St. Peter the Apostle (1947) for African missionaries and the College of St. Casimir (1948) for Lithuanians. In many ways, the Russicum was not unique. It was simply one of the many national Roman colleges which created an idealized space of prayer and study, and like the Greek College, it was meant to hasten the return of "schismatics" to the One True Faith. However, unlike many of the colleges, its idealized space included a cultural component constructed without sustained, authentic experience of the national region it purported to represent. While the bulk (if not the totality) of the students in the Polish College were Polish, the NAC American, and the Ruthenian College Ukrainian, the bulk of the students in the Russian college were almost anything but Russian.[136] Of the list of alumni of the Russicum assembled *ca.* 1951,[137] only thirteen[138] of its eighty-one graduates, i.e. 16%, were Russian. Tretjakewitsch noted that by 1938, only thirty-four of sixty-three, i.e. 53%, who began their course of studies persevered and were ordained.[139] In the 1930s, four Russians began studies but left for a variety of reasons within their first year.[140] These could

---

[136]A study whether or not a similar dynamic existed within the Greek College would be helpful, but must be left aside for the time being.

[137]Simon, *Russicum: Pioneers and Witnesses*, pp. 271-77.

[138]This includes one graduate whose ethnicity was questionable, but was ultimately identified as Russian, and one whose ethnicity was not identified, but whose surname Urusov) was Russian. If they are discounted, the percentage of Russians at the Russicum drops to 13.6%, a difference of 2.4%.

[139]Tretjakewitsch, p. 231.

[140]Simon, *Russicum: Pioneers and Witnesses*, p. 92, 94 99.

not have made a strong impact in the cultural mission to create Russians ordained in the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite.

Although these numbers are only very general, they nonetheless demonstrate the absurdity of the cultural mission, expressed in equal absurdity by Cyrille Korolevskij, "an Eastern Rite Frenchman whose real name was [Jean François] Charon."[141]

> ...I think that whoever was not born in Russia or of Russian parents, must make a real effort in every way to become Russian... this transformation should by no means stop at the superficial level but be tangible and palpable. The subject should try his best to become used to Russian cuisine, to the Russian way of life- but most of all should try to arrogate Russian psychology. Love for Russia should replace love for one's own country- to such an extent that the assimilated Russian is moved no longer by the joys and sorrows of his own fatherland but by the joys and sorrows of Russia... In other words, Russian– down to the marrow of his bones– without becoming a fanatic but in all sincerity.[142]

Simon took exception to this quote by focusing on the improbability of creating a non-fanatic missionary and the "Gallic" rather than "Slavic" concern with food. Yet, the main point was the desire to create a Russian psychology. With so few Russians in the Russicum itself and no Russians in charge of the program, the Russian psychology was that imagined by westerners: "the way of Solov'ev and his disciples who never flinched before sacrificing themselves for a cause,"[143] which might be better applied to nineteenth century Romantic Polish nationalists than many Russians.

---

[141]Tretjakewitsch, p. 125.

[142]Simon, *Russicum: Pioneers and Witnesses*, p. 106.

[143]*Ibid*., p. 107.

The common belief that Russian religious sensibilities were inclined toward mysticism[144] rather than the disciplined logic rooted in Thomistic training provided a context in which such an assertion appeared reasonable. Perhaps the Russians who attended the Russicum were zealous, but thirteen Russian Catholic men cannot be taken as representative of Russian society. Furthermore, sixteen percent of the student body simply cannot interact with the rest to create cultural experiences of real depth for the other eighty-four percent, especially since they were seminarians undergoing priestly formation. Ironically, while Mgr. De Ropp proposed that Roman Catholic priests be given bi-ritual faculties in the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite, the Russicum– due to a lack of Russian candidates– generally ordained Roman Catholic seminarians as priests of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite with bi-ritual faculties in the Tridentine Roman Rite.

Those charged with the Russian mission differed with respect to who could be transformed into their ideal type of Russian. Simon noted that Korolevskij, because of his antipathy toward Poles, preferred non-Polish Slavs to non-Slavs, and non-Slavs to Poles. Philippe de Régis (the second rector of the Russicum), who had lived in the *kresy*, preferred Slavs to non-Slavs.[145] Mgr. D'Herbigny– who tended to agree with his fellow Frenchman Korolevskij– was involved not only in building the Russicum, but had a strong hand in guiding the formation of its resident seminarians and scholastics. He believed that rather than instill a Russian soul into the young seminarian or scholastic, he demanded that a candidate for the

[144]AA.EE.SS., Russia, 610 P.O., fasc. 5: 13

[145]Simon, *Russicum: Pioneers and Witnesses*, pp. 106-7.

Russicum already possess a "Russian soul"[146] which could– and would– be further refined at both the Russicum and the PIO. At the PIO, for example, the final exams for the 1922-1923 academic year included competence "On the Current Religious Mentality among Dissidents" (i.e. the Orthodox).[147] With this type of logic, the exposure to idealized– rather than genuine– Russian culture in the Russicum was justified.

Simon noted that the idea of a Russian seminary emerged in 1917, the same year that the PIO was established, a correction of the assertion by Tretjakewitsch that the Russicum was first proposed in 1921.[148] Some proposed that it be joined to an existing institution, while others proposed that an institution be moved to Rome. It would also not be an isolated structure for the conversion of Russia; it would dovetail with other school and retreat houses tailored to wooing Russians out of Orthodoxy and into Catholicism.[149]

In 1923, d'Herbigny added his own thoughts, proposing the idea of a Russian college in "Rome itself" as a college for Serbian and Bulgarian converts studying theology in Rome.[150] In the basics of its conception by d'Herbigny, the Russicum resembled other national colleges. However, throughout the 1920s, the conception of the role of the Russicum shifted, due to the

---

[146]AA.EE.SS., PCpR 17/109: 75, and AA.EE.SS. PCpR 1/3: 88. This articulation was in response to the interest of a Dutchman, Willy van Houtte, who ironically stayed only one year at the Russicum before leaving for a doctorate and a missionary life in the Near East.

[147]"De hodioerna mente religiosa inter Dissidentes;" *cf.* ASV, Seg. di Stato (1923) 42/1: 122.

[148]Tretjakewitsch, p. 230.

[149]Simon, *Pioneers and Witnesses*, pp. 27-30.

[150]A.S.V., Seg. di Stato (1923) 42/1: 118.

understanding that diabolical work in Russia had been undertaken by the Bolsheviks, causing people to be infected by false doctrine and subjected to much suffering (addressed in Chap 4). Pius XI described the situation in Russia as desperate, and "hoping against hope," (Rome 4:18), the Russicum would prepare priests of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite for work in Russia and with Russian refugees.[151]

From 1923-1929, the Carmelite Sisters of St. Therese of the Infant Jesus donated over 1,030,00 French francs for the construction and establishment of the Russicum[152] as a means of supporting the missionary efforts of the Church.[153] Because of their substantial support, in accord with Catholic tradition,[154] "Lisieux" was inscribed on the front of the building, near the roof. Rather than referencing the financial contribution, the choice was justified by citing the similarity of Carmelite mysticism to Eastern Orthodox spirituality. Indeed, many Russians in diaspora found Carmelite spirituality attractive, and the Russicum was placed under the patronage of Saint Therese of Lisieux.[155] Accordingly, May 17th (the date of her canonization) became the feast day of the college.[156]

Once again, the incongruity of the western Gregorian calendar and the Julian calendar

---

[151]A.S.V., Seg. di Stato (1923) 318/2: 155-158.

[152]A.S.V., Seg. di Stato (1929) 318/2: 1.

[153]A.S.V., Seg. di Stato (1929) 318/2: 2.

[154]Perhaps the most relevant complimentary example would be the name "Farnesius" over the central doors of the Gesu, the Jesuit "mother church" in Rome.

[155]This will be qualified with an in-depth analysis of Russian spirituality in Chap. 5.

[156]Simon, *Pioneers and Witnesses*, p. 57.

presented itself. The sense of spiritual time was western, and not Russian. Similarly, the physical space was at its root western. Although the interior "incorporated many Russian and Eastern Christian ornamentals,"[157] it was designed by a non-Russian architect, Muñoz, employed by an Italian engineering firm, *Figli di Pietro Castelli* (Sons of Peter Castelli).[158] Similar observations may be made concerning the Byzantine Rite Chapel. The Church of St. Anthony, shoe-horned between the PIO and the Russicum, was not razed and replaced by a Byzantine style church. Rather, the edifice remained and its interior was remodeled, which included side chapels with iconostases, an architectural feature notably lacking in Byzantine Rite churches but common in Roman churches for private masses. Of course, liturgy within the space followed the Gregorian calendar.

In spite of the aim of forming Byzantine-Slavonic Rite priests with Russian souls, the physical, temporal, and intellectual spaces of the Russicum and its principal chapel were governed by western sensibilities which viewed Russia as mission territory upon which Catholic missionaries would suffer. In spite of the sense of religious superiority borne out of theological self-sufficiency coupled with need, Russicum graduates sincerely desired the good of those whom they served. Walter Ciszek, for example, wrote a rather judgmental letter to a friend– a Russicum drop-out of the now defunct New England Province of the Society of Jesus– in which he lamented the extreme poverty of the Albertyn region which attacked both body and soul.[159]

---

[157]*Ibid*., p. 61.

[158]*Ibid*.,, p. 59.

[159]New England Province Archives, Dinand Library, College of the Holy Cross. Letter, Walter Ciszek, SJ to McFarland, n.d.

By 1930, d'Herbigny and his collaborators had accomplished a great deal. To that end, the politicking of d'Herbigny was as effective as it was well known, as it exploited the successes of the Russian mission. They had succeeded in shifting the leadership and locus of the Russian mission from Sheptyts'kyi in Lwów to the PCpR in Rome. Additionally, the administration of the Byzantine-Slavonic rite by the PCpR practically discounted Exarch Feodorov, in part placing most of the functioning parishes of the rite under Latin bishops and smearing the character of Fr. Abrikosov,[160] who had come to Rome to advocate for Feodorov. Polish ecclesiastical intrigues and the Polish governmental stance against Russian Catholics helped to isolate those who had the greatest stake in the success of the Russian mission: Feodorov and his Russian Catholic congregation. The Russicum also shifted the locus of proper Russian-ness from Russia to Rome. Correlatively, we will see in later chapters how the PCpR oversaw the spiritual and material care of Russian refugees across the globe, which bolstered the view that the PCpR was the right ecclesiastical organ for the job, and d'Herbigny was the right man to oversee it.

Such opinion did not come from his formal role within the PCpR, as he was officially only a consultant, but through his informal avenue of power: his access to Pius XI. Mgr. d'Herbigny formalized this relationship in September 1927 when he was named a reporter, responsible for making at least two private reports per month to the Holy Father. By late 1930/early 1931, d'Herbigny was upgraded to *relator perpetuus*, which gave him the right of access to the Pope without prior appointment or notice. D'Herbigny reached the apex of his power with the promulgation by Pius XI of the Moto proprio *Inde ab inito* on 6 April 1930, which separated the PCpR from CEO. D'Herbigny was named its president, and remained so

[160]Tretjakewitsch, pp.. 231-33.

until his scandalous dismissal late in 1933.[161] On 21 December 1934, the PCpR was re-integrated into CEO *via* the Moto proprio "Quam sollicita,"[162] and remained there until 15 January 1993, when it was suppressed and merged into the Interdicasterial Commission for the Church in Eastern Europe within the Secretariat of State.

Consideration of the structures of the Russian mission, especially the PCpR are important for two reasons. First, they are the means by which values are conveyed in order to realize a goal.[163] Secondly, structures themselves are often symbols of the goals they attempt to realize.[164]

In regard to the former, the value of the Russian Mission was clearly important. The aforementioned ecclesiastical structures were both created and reorganized to meet those goals. Even in the midst of the depression, funds remained plentiful for the PCpR, unlike the situation with other Catholic works and commissions.[165] The ecumenical goal for which these structures existed was not the reunion of two apostolic churches (which had been attempted with the Orthodox world in the Council of Florence and partially realized in the Union of Brześć), but proselytization which would re-form individual Russian Orthodox believers into Roman Catholics.

---

[161]Tretjakewitsch, pp. 237-38; AAEESS, PCpR 38/223: 6.

[162]AA.EE.SS., PCpR, 38/233: 28.

[163]This theoretical link between structure, values, and goals was made by Rev. Michael W. Maher, SJ, in "The Marian Sodalities and their Transition into Christian Life Communities: Some Helpful Explanations of the Past and Some Suggestions for Conversations in the Future," a paper delivered at ARSI in Rome, Spring 2014, which I attended.

[164]Anthony D. Smith, *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*, 12th ed. (London: Blackwell, 1999), p. 36.

[165]AA.EE.SS,, PCpR, 1/6: 30-35.

In regard to the latter, these structures themselves conveyed the value of the superiority of the west over the east. Fundamentally, they maintained the dichotomy of east vs. west, even if the dichotomy was not geographically clear. Catholic dioceses constructed in Poland delineated the Roman Catholic from the Russian Orthodox world, yet the locus of the Catholic mission was not shifted from Lwów to Warsaw, but from Lwów to Rome. From the point of view of Byzantine-Slavonic Rite Russians and Belarussians, both the Poles and Rome behaved disrespectfully toward them. From the point of view of d'Herbigny and many of his collaborators, such as Korolovskij, both the Poles and the Russians were problematic. They could even blame the Poles of colonialistic behavior,[166] but they did not or could not see it in themselves. Although the fault line of the dichotomy was not clear, the dichotomy itself was: Orthodox Christians, living or having fled from wild, barbaric Russia needed to be saved by the Roman Catholic Church, gifted with the Truth and populated by those of non-barbaric, and therefore superior, western cultures.

The structures themselves created this dichotomy by conveying superiority of the west. Slavic ecclesiastical officials, such as Sheptytsk'yi and Feodorov, could not be trusted to manage the Russian mission; non-slavs in Rome were. No one from the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite could be trusted to be consecrated as bishop to manage the rite and maintain its Byzantine purity; Polish Latin Rite bishops were. Because it would be impossible to run seminaries in wild, barbaric Russia, Russian space was created in Rome. Structurally, the PCpR and the institutions it administered both created and conveyed at atmosphere of soft-Orientalism.

---

[166]AA.EE.SS., Russia 610 P.O. 5: 25.

Chapter 4
Doctrinal and Intellectual Expressions of Soft-Orientalism

In chapter 3, we saw how Vatican officials were able to use interwar nationalist and religious tensions in Eastern and East Central Europe to re-locate the center of the Byzantine Slavonic Rite from Lwów to Rome, and in turn, adjust old structures and create new ones which both symbolized and conveyed an atmosphere of soft-Orientalism. Broadly, interpretation of the schism between the Catholic and Orthodox churches created a dichotomy between East and West, from which each church demonstrated its superiority over the other church, which in its deficiency, stood in need. From the Vatican point of view, the PCpR itself, the marginalization of Exarch Feodorov and Metropolitan Sheptyts'kyi, the Latin management of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite, and the creation of the Russicum were necessary to respond to the need of the Russian people. The fundamental need, of course, was their conversion to Catholicism, specifically Byzantine-Rite Catholicism, in accord with the principles in the encyclical *Orientalium Dignitas*. While this encyclical (along with a few others) was meant to preserve the dignity of the Christian East and in spite of the professed respect of the Christian East by the Vatican, long-standing doctrinal differences between the Catholic and Orthodox Church meant that conversion required a reformulation of belief. The PCpR professed and taught a Catholicism which demonstrated to Orthodox converts the superiority of Catholicism, the inadequacy of Orthodoxy, and the evils of Communism.

This Catholic system of belief was comprehensive, and asserted a dichotomy between East and West in an attempt to demonstrate Catholic self-sufficiency. Succinctly, the Catholic Church taught that it was the One, True Church founded by Jesus Christ, whose locus of unity

was the Roman Pontiff, and that all other Christians churches were deficient in varying degrees due to their schism from the Catholic Church.[1] Professing the superiority of Catholicism begged the demonstration that non-Catholic churches were deficient, and subsequently, the deficiency of non-Catholic churches begged the remedy for such deficiencies: the Catholic Church. While the PCpR had no need to justify this position in its missionary outreach, it found intellectual assent, not validation, in the writings of Vladimir Sergeyevich Soloviev (1853-1900).[2]

Soloviev, whose intellectual biography began in unbelief and ended in Catholicism *via* Orthodoxy, was a dynamic literary critic, philosopher, and theologian with mystical aspects,[3] driven by a Slavophile assumption that the

> problem of all problems was whether humanity ultimately is to become an organism guided by spiritual forces from within, or a mere organization ruled (with a totalitarian iron rod, if necessary) from without. This is what the antithesis of Christ and anti-Christ meant to him symbolically.[4]

---

[1]We will leave aside difficulties related to non-Christian Russians, especially Jews and Muslims, currently classified as inter-faith, not ecumenical, issues.

[2]We will leave aside a literary analysis of Soloviev. It is important to note, however, that Soloviev was not the only integrative, syncretic, and mystical thinker during the prime years of d'Herbigny. Mikhail Bakhtin, for example, shared many of these characteristics; n.b. Caryl Emerson, "Russian Orthodoxy and the Early Bakhtin," *Religion and Literature* 22, no. 2/3 (Summer-Autumn 1990): 109-31.

[3]Paul Marshall Allen, *Vladimir Soloviev, Russian Mystic* (Blauvelt, NY: Steinerbooks, 1978).

[4]Janko Lavrin, "Vladimir Soloviev and Slavophilism," *The Russian Review* 20, no. 1 (Jan 1961): 15.

His interests were wide and varied. He wrote, for example, on history,[5] interfaith issues,[6] classical philosophy,[7] political theory,[8] and art & literature.[9] However, the work most relevant to the PCpR were his social, political, and ecclesial considerations which were, in turn, based upon an orthodox understanding of the hypostatic union, i.e. the union of the fully human and fully divine natures in the one person of Jesus Christ. While Soloviev did propose a Trinitarian principle[10] which teased out more metaphysical and mystical elements in order to understand society, the application of the notion of the hypostatic union to society yielded more concrete and pragmatic principles to understand the relationship between the church and civil society. This was an important fundamental theological premise, as both the Catholic and Orthodox Churches based their Christological thinking upon it. To do otherwise was to delve into heresy.

Very broadly, the early Church wrestled with the nature of Jesus Christ. Generally, the rejections of both the Docetist and Arian positions, which argued that Christ was respectively only divine or only a creature, brought the magisterium to the conclusion that Jesus Christ was

---

[5]Vladimir Soloviev, *War, Progress, and the End of History, including a Short Story of the Anti-Christ: Three Discussions* (London: n.c., 1915).

[6]Vladimir Soloviev, *Freedom, Faith, and Dogma: Essays by V.S. Soloviev on Christianity and Judaism* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2008).

[7]Vladimir Soloviev, *The Drama of Plato's Life* (Germany: Verlag Freies Geistesleben, 1980).

[8]Vladimir Soloviev, *Politics, Law, and Morality: Essays (*New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000).

[9]Vladimir Soloviev, *The Heart of Reality: Essays on Beauty, Love, and Ethics* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2003).

[10]Vladimir Solovyev, *Russia and the Universal Church*, trans. Herbert Rees (London: The Centenary Press,1948), p. 148.

both human and divine. However, the next logical step in Christian doctrinal development was how that could be. A complicated formula of the nature of Christ was created through deliberations at Ephesus in 431 and concluded at Chalcedon in 451.[11] What was relevant for Soloviev was that a full human nature co-existed with a full divine nature (of the Second Person of the Trinity) within Jesus of Nazareth, constituting not one but two persons.[12] This union, described as the hypostatic union by theologians, was beyond the ability of human logic and therefore a theological mystery, a mystical truth.

By analogy, Soloviev understood the ideal relationship between church and state in similar terms. As the hypostatic union is the expression of the perfect human being, so too the human and divine must be properly unified in society, to create the perfect– and universal– society. Soloviev thought that a socially-expressed hypostatic union was the only means to create a just society. In his analysis of Medieval Western Europe, he noted, "The close alliance and organic union of the two powers [secular and ecclesial] *without confusion and without division* is the indispensable condition of true social progress." [emphasis by the author]

Soloviev accounted for the fall of the Byzantine Empire, i.e. the Second Rome, because of its rejection of this socially-expressed hypostatic union. Succinctly, he accused the Orthodox church of the heresy of improperly granting church authority to the Byzantine emperor, which properly belonged to the papacy.[13] Because the emperor did not in fact have legitimate ecclesial

---

[11]J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1978), *passim*.

[12]John H. Leith, ed., *Creeds of the Churches: A Reader in Christian Doctrine from the Bible to the Present*, 3rd ed. (Louisville: John Knox Press, 1982), pp. 35-36.

[13]Solovyev, *Russia and the Universal Church*, pp. 17, 25.

authority, Soloviev argued, Byzantium fell into disarray. Its ecclesiastical component was false and corrupt. Furthermore, Soloviev asserted that the imperial court maintained its pre-Christian, i.e. "pagan," disposition, rendering its secular component corrupt as well. The two corrupt elements could never find a proper unity, so he therefore concluded that, "...the dualism of Nestorius, condemned in theology, became the very foundation of Byzantine life."[14] The fall of the Second Rome was logical to Soloviev, and he argued, "Indeed, it deserved to fall and still more it deserved to fall before Islam. For Islam is simply sincere and logical Byzantinism, free from all its inner contradiction."[15]

Soloviev therefore affirmed the assumptions of the Catholic Church in general[16] and of the PCpR in particular, toward both Byzantine and Roman ecclesiology. Soloviev recognized in the West the genuine commitment to the socially-expressed hypostatic union, even if it were not realized, in contradistinction to the east, which he accused of falling into a social Nestorianism. For Soloviev– and for the members of the PCpR– the Byzantine Churches needed the Papacy, and the Papacy, because of its continued and consistent orthodoxy, was in a position to reform the Byzantine Churches. And this included the Russian Orthodox Church.

Although the Orthodox and Catholic Churches share the same number and basic understanding of the sacraments, the same scripture, and share the same history until the Middle Ages, which include the foundational ecumenical councils and canon law, Soloviev believed that

---

[14]*Ibid*., p. 25.

[15]*Ibid*.

[16]New Advent, *Catholic Encyclopedia*, "Eastern Schism."

the all of the Orthodox Churches– including the Russian– had inherited a "pseudo-Orthodoxy"[17] from Byzantium. Therefore, it suffered the same problems as Byzantium which Rome did not have: illegitimate government control of the church (through the Holy Synod[18]) and a false understanding of True Christianity. It should be noted that this interpretation and evaluation of Russian Orthodox neither began with or was unique to him.[19] Soloviev, like many other Russians, believed that the Russian version of Orthodoxy defined Russia so thoroughly that they could not be separated.

Correlatively, Soloviev accepted the idea that Russia had a special mission and was destined for greatness. However, he differed from many of his fellow Russians on exactly how that special mission– and the corresponding Russian greatness– would appear. Soloviev proposed that the first step to Russian greatness occurred with the unification of Kievan Russia

---

[17]Solovyev, *Russia and the Universal Church*, p. 48.

[18]Created by Tsarist decree on January 25, 1721, the "Spiritual Synodical Administration" was headed by the Russian monarch as its "supreme judge." Its offices of president, two vice presidencies, four counselors, and four assessors were filled by eleven clerics appointed by the Russian monarch, three of which were three bishops. The rest were distributed among any combination of archimandrites, Egumens, and protopopes, none of whom could be under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of any of the three bishops appointed by the Russian Monarch. The Religious Regulations which followed on September 16, 1721 expressly defend this system as a permanent form of conciliar rule, superior to the rule of any one bishop. While it was left unstated, a theologically astute reader would be able to note that such rule was in contradistinction to either the Patriarch of Moscow or the Pope of Rome. Note J.F. Maclear, ed., *Church and State in the Modern Age: A Documentary History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), pp. 17-24.

[19]Lucjan Suchanek and Ann-Marie Tatsis-Botton, "Les catholiques russes et les procatholiques en Russie dans la première moitié du XIXe siècle," *Cahiers du Monde russe et soviétique* 29 no. 3/4 (July-December 1988): 361-74.

of St. Vladimir and Muscovite Russia of Ivan Kalista under Tsar Alexis.[20] This unification, when combined with the subsequent polices of Tsar Peter to learn from the "civilized peoples of the west,"[21] made Russia great for itself. Consequentially, he called to mind a fundamental question of the Slavophiles: in light of this westernization, what must Russia do now?

Soloviev proposed that true greatness was not living for oneself, but for others. He noted that unlike the Ashanti or Eskimos, Russia had an historic mission.[22] In making these assertions, Soloviev placed Russia on the historical time line of progress ahead of many primitive peoples, but still behind the west. Yet, he did not want to fall into "nationalism, [or] a perverted patriotism," as he believed it to be against the ultimate good of humanity.[23] Ecclesiologically, Soloviev believed that the schism between Rome and Moscow was due to "national particularism,"[24] which, correlatively, also insisted upon Russian superiority over the Orthodox Christians under Ottoman control. His attitudes were perfectly congruent with the attitude of western Europe in the wake of the Crimean War, engaged in the colonial project: Russia, both technologically and spiritually, was inferior. Soloviev asserted that if Russia were to make authentic progress, it would first have to abandon illegitimate government control of the Church and convert to "True Christianity," i.e. Roman Catholicism.

---

[20]*Ibid*., p. 44.

[21]*Ibid*.

[22]*Ibid*., p. 45.

[23]Michael Karpovich, "Vladimir Soloviev on Nationalism," *The Review of Politics* 8, no. 2 (Apr 1946): 183-91.

[24]Solovyev, *Russia and the Universal Church*, p. 48.

Because Russian Orthodoxy and the idea of Russia itself were so intertwined, Soloviev believed that Russia defined itself chiefly against Catholicism, and in doing so, perpetuated the pseudo-Orthodoxy inherited from Byzantium. Soloviev asserted,

> This pseudo-Orthodoxy of our theological schools, which has nothing in common with the faith of the universal Church or the piety of the Russian people, contains no positive element; it consists merely of arbitrary negations produced and maintained by controversial prejudice:
>
> 'God the Son does not contribute in the divine order to the procession of the Holy Spirit.' [the *filioque* controversy]
>
> "The Blessed Virgin was not immaculate from the first moment of her existence.'
>
> "Primacy of jurisdiction does not belong to the see of Rome and the Pope has not the dogmatic authority of a Pastor and Doctor of the Universal Church.'[25]

In qualification of these assertions, Soloviev maintained that for the Russian Orthodox Church, the first two points are "pretexts," and the "real bugbear" is the juridical primacy of the Roman Pontiff.[26] Overall, Soloviev has asserted that "Russia," however vaguely he used the term, has Othered the Catholic Church in an effort to define itself. Because he was primarily engaged with a religious analysis and not a political one, he did not include the traditional Roman Catholic enemy of Russia in his analysis: Poland. In this way, he was very much in the tradition of Ivan Gagarin, the nineteenth century Russian Jesuit who, along with many Orthodox critics, cited those three points as the essential obstacles to union.[27] Soloviev, like Gagarin, also

---

[25] *Ibid*.

[26] *Ibid*., p. 49.

[27] Jeffrey Bruce Beshoner. *Ivan Sergeevich Gagarin: The Search for Orthodox and Catholic Union* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2002), pp. 35, 98-100, 199-200.

maintained that union was about religious and not political matters. These main points articulated by Gagarin and Soloviev eventually became the main points of the Russian policy of the PCpR.

Soloviev summed up his critique of religion with a seafaring analogy, likening the different Churches to boats and describing the manner of their voyage. He likened the Catholic Church to the barque of Peter, "a large and seaworthy vessel built by a famous master [Jesus], navigated by a skillful pilot [Peter and his successors], and equipped with all that is necessary for the voyage."[28] He claimed that the Protestant Churches exhorted their followers to build instead individual vessels, which were ultimately unprepared for the voyage. Finally, with regard to the Orthodox, Soloviev asserted that they believe that "the best way of reaching [the] harbour [of heaven] is to pretend that you are there already, and... think that... they have the advantage of their Western brethren."[29] The analogy served to emphasize the inadequacy of Russian pseudo-Orthodoxy and the necessity of Catholicism for Russia. To supplement this religious analysis, Soloviev included a critique of the *Raskol*[30] to demonstrate, as it were, that the Russian Orthodox

---

[28]*Ibid*., p. 57.

[29]*Ibid*.

[30]The *raskol* is the schism which occurred within the Russian Orthodox Church in response to the liturgical and textual (which did not include doctrinal or dogmatic) reforms of the Moscow Patriarch Nikon. The traditional date is 1666, when the Russian Church council, also attended by the Orthodox Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch representing the entire Christian east, upheld the reforms of Nikon while, ironically, deposing him. *Cf*. Nicholas Riasanovsky, *A History of Russia*, 6th ed (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 199. Riasanovsky also notes the popularity of "Old Belief" with more well-to-do peasants. Georg Michels has demonstrated the complicated interplay of religious belief and social movements in "The Solovki Uprising: Religion and Revolt in Northern Russia," *The Russian Review* 51 no. 1 (Jan 1992): 1-15.

ship was a wreck.

Succinctly, Soloviev blamed the schism on the "inadequacies and pretensions"[31] of the Russian Orthodox Church itself, going so far as to say, "*there exists no truly spiritual government in the Greco-Russian Church*."[32] [Emphasis by the author.] As evidence, Soloviev referred to the many Old Believers– put to death for their heresy– as martyrs, at once condemning the Russian Orthodox Church and praising it, going so far as to call the Russian Orthodox Church the work of the anti-Christ while praising the simple, heartfelt Christian piety of the average Russian who has been left spiritually adrift.

Soloviev lamented both the lack of religious freedom (that of the individual believer to make a religious choice) and ecclesiastical freedom (emancipation of the church from government control) in Russia. To that end, he utilized the work of Ivan Aksakov, a Slavophile opposed to both the Old Believers and to Rome. However, while Aksakov maintained Orthodox Russia was the means to provide unity: "Russia=the nation=orthodoxy=unity,"[33] Soloviev, for reasons cited above, denied that such unity through Russia was possible. Unity would come when the Tsar, who headed all of Russian and the Russian Orthodox Church, placed it under the Roman Church. Soloviev maintained that this would bring about the Trinitarian restoration of

---

[31]Solovyev, *Russia and the Universal Church*, p. 51.

[32]*Ibid*., p. 52.

[33]Ethel Dunn, "A Slavophile Looks at the Raskol and the Sects," *The Slavonic and East European Review* 44, no. 102 (January 1966): 168. Dunn also maintains that Aksakov was most disturbed by the phenomenon of Latinisation, which rendered any Slav "western" and the Church an appendage of the "romano-Germanic" west. (p. 168.)

the ecumenical unity of state, church, and society,"[34] which in turn would purify state and society. This was the great mission of Russia.

Aksakov had compared the use of the Holy Synod by the Tsar to German bureaucracy "with all its inherent official insincerity."[35] Aksakov/Soloviev pointed out that the members were civil or military men nominated by the Tsar, and that the reports of the High Procurator of the Holy Synod were no different in form and style from other government reports. Because the government managed the church, especially through finances, and required it to behave in some respects as an arm of the government, Aksakov/Soloviev claimed that the Church was "robbed of her soul. The idea of a truly spiritual administration was replaced by that of a purely formal and external discipline."[36] Aksakov/Soloviev noted the bishops were only nominally in control of their dioceses.[37] Furthermore, the various offices in the clerical hierarchy were recorded in the List of Ranks, and

> were made to correspond exactly with the various military grades. A metropolitan is equivalent to a marshal ("full general") according to the Russian expression, an archbishop to a divisional general (or "lieutenant general"), and a bishop to a brigade general (or "major general'). Priests may wish with a little keenness reach the rank of colonel.[38]

---

[34]Metropolitan Hilarion Alfeyev, *Orthodox Christianity, Volume I: The History and Canonical Structure of the Orthodox Church*, foreword by His Holiness Alexei II, Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia, trans. Basil Bush (Yonkers, NY: St. Vladimir's Press, 2011), pp. 242-43.

[35]Solovyev, *Russia and the Universal Church*, p. 63.

[36]*Ibid*.

[37]Recall from chapter 3 that this is a gross oversimplification of the relationship between the Russian bishops and the Holy Synod.

[38]Solovyev, *Russia and the Universal Church*, p. 62.

Ignoring the historical record of medieval warrior-Popes and crusader warrior-priests who literally fought for their faith, the Roman church bureaucracy which managed Rome, and the wars in which the Papal States were involved, Soloviev claimed that the Catholic Church had the ideal situation: it did not depend upon but rather used western European states. In the end, Christian kings can serve the church, but they cannot be its head and act as its point of unity. Soloviev, expanding on the thought of Aksakov, maintained that for the church to be truly free, its "*point d'appui*" must be "outside the confines of the State and nation."[39] Soloviev maintained that only the papacy provides this through the assertions that (1) Christ builds the church, not churches, meaning that there is an inherent unity in the church, (2) the universality and unity of the church cannot be theoretical but concrete, given the nature of the incarnation and subsequently, the hypostatic union, and (3) such concreteness is found only in the Catholic Church, a visible universal church, because its unity is based in the succession of Popes, the successors of Peter, who was made the "rock" of the Church by Jesus Christ. The true Church of Christ was, therefore, the Roman Catholic Church.

Contrarily, Nikoley Onufriyevich Lossky (1870-1965)[40] maintained that although Soloviev received the sacraments from Rev. Nicholas Tolstoy, he never ceased thinking of himself as an Orthodox Christian. Lossky asserted that Soloviev believed that although the outward unity of the Catholic and Orthodox Churches was sundered, the mystical unity between them remained. He continued, "this is why, before receiving communion [from Tolstoy], Soloviev, having read the decision of the Council of Trent, could add his declaration that the

---

[39]*Ibid*., p. 75.

[40]The father of Vladimir Lossky.

Eastern Church is the true Orthodox and Catholic Church."[41] D'Herbigny noted that Soloviev, while making that claim, professed his obedience to the Apostle Peter and his successors, which made him Catholic.[42]

Whether Soloviev considered himself a Catholic, Orthodox, or a *sui generis* Orthodox-Catholic Christian, Michel d'Herbigny found in Soloviev a well-developed *apologia* of Catholicism which was intertwined with an argument for the inadequacy of Orthodoxy and layered with strains of soft-Orientalism. In spite of the ambiguity which Soloviev had concerning his relationship to the Catholic Church, both d'Herbigny and the PCpR could utilize his thought to demand that Orthodox converts submit to Roman Catholic doctrine. The biography of Soloviev by d'Herbigny, *Vladimir Soloviev, a Russian Newman*, portrayed Soloviev as a Russian Catholic. Indeed, d'Herbigny opens his biography with the claim,

> He [Soloviev] was a convert from Orthodoxy to Catholicism, and the one ruling passion of his life was to familiarize Russia with the idea of a Universal Church, monarchical in its constitution. This is the chief reason for calling him the Russian Newman. There were other striking similarities between the two men, although their divergences were even more striking and more numerous.[43]

For d'Herbigny, the portrayal of Soloviev– who was never ordained– as one who could renounce the Russian Orthodox faith so strongly associated with his nationality and become Catholic, was an iconic example to the rest of Russia. However, an Irish Jesuit writing officially in the name of

---

[41]N.O. Lossky, *History of Russian Philosophy* (New York: International Universities Press, Inc., 1951), p. 86.

[42]Michel d'Herbigny, *Vladimir Soloviev, a Russian Newman (1853-1900)*, trans. A.M. Buchanan (London: R & T Washborne Ltd., 1918), pp. 213-14.

[43]*Ibid*., pp. 1-2.

his province thought this analogy to Newman was spurious, asserting,

> His [Soloviev's] life-struggle was one between a country with a violent desire to stagnate, and a patriot who insisted that she should advance. He found his vocation in the effort to reconcile the Russian Church with the Church of Rome ...Yet, there was something immature and undeveloped in his doctrine. Unlike his English prototype, Newman, Soloviev was a patriot before he was a Christian.[44]

Again, to be both Russian and Catholic was an imaginative impossibility, at least officially for the Irish Province of the Society of Jesus. Perhaps to the credit of d'Herbigny, he thought that it was possible to be both Russian and Catholic, and to bridge East and West. Yet, his understanding of the divide between East and West was expressed in a dichotomy which ignored the historical complexities reviewed in chapter 2. D'Herbigny asserted, with strong soft-Orientalist tones,

> The great debate is the antagonism between East and West, that has lasted for centuries, and dates back almost to the beginning of Christianity. From the earliest time and for various reasons, many being utterly futile, a conflict of tendencies has separated the two halves of Europe. In the East man [sic!] is more contemplative, and willingly gives way to indolence and passivity; being selfish and lazy, he is apt to excuse his indifference towards his neighbours by pleading his devotion to God alone. In the West, on the contrary, man [sic!] thinks only of action, and would readily be satisfied with a purely human great--ness. He would be contented with a deified man, or even with the deification of humanity in the abstract, or of strength and genius. His innate tendency is to make human life, with its progress and activity, the object of his cultus.[45]

The dichotomy between East and West was unquestioned. Liam Brophy, writing in the mid-twentieth century, noted the aptness of the comparison, as Newman and Soloviev– both talented

---

[44]Irish Jesuit Province, review of *Vladimir Soloviev, a Russian Newman (1853-1900)*, by M. d'Herbigny and A Buchanan, in *The Irish Monthly* 46, no. 540 (June 1918): 362.

[45]Michel d'Herbigny, *Vladimir Soloviev, a Russian Newman*, p. 146.

men– aimed to convert their respective countries to Catholicism. However, Brophy contrasted "Byzantine frigidity" to "creative western thought" in his effort to describe the missionary efforts of Soloviev.[46]

D'Herbigny then argued that the principles of Christianity restrain the Westerner from deifying human beings or humanity. While he did not reference the official Catholic evaluation of Modernism, this statement was congruent with the Vatican critique of modernism examined in chapter 2. D'Herbigny did assert that these Western virtues, when tempered, "commend themselves to the Eastern mind."[47] Soloviev, d'Herbigny claimed, had accepted them, having been inspired by (1) the conversion of Ivan Gagarin, (2) the thought of Tchadaïev (Chaadaev), and (3) the friendship of Princess Elizabeth Volkonsky, who converted from Orthodoxy to Catholicism.[48] D'Herbigny utilized *Russia and the Universal Church*, treating it as the mature expression of a Russian Catholic theology. The qualities of the perfect Christian society, the deficiencies of Byzantine Christianity accepted by Russia, the *filioque*, the Immaculate Conception, and Petrine Primacy as an essential requirement for true Christian universality, the last of which garnered the bulk of his attention.

Through the editorship of *Orientalia Christiana* and his course on ecclesiology at the PIO, d'Herbigny promulgated the importance and necessity of the Papal office. Although the following articles which appeared in *Orientalia Christiana* were examined in chapter 3, a brief

---

[46]Liam Brophy, "Vladimir Soloviev: A Russian Newman," *The Irish Monthly* 75, no. 893 (Nov 1947): 478.

[47]Michel d'Herbigny, *Vladimir Soloviev, a Russian Newman*, p. 146.

[48]*Ibid*., pp. 42, 187 ff.

review is in order. "*L'unité dans le Christ*,"[49] echoing the consideration of Soloviev on Papal primacy and universality, asserted that unity is found in communion with the Pope, who is the only bishop with universal jurisdiction. Correlatively "*La Vraie Notion d'Orthodoxie*,"[50] argued that the Orthodox claim to universality was false and reaffirmed the assertions made in "*L'unité dans le Christ.*" Furthermore, d'Herbigny, once again echoing the consideration of Soloviev on the theologically impoverished situation of the Russian Orthodox Church, argued that Russia stood in great theological and material need of Catholicism, both of which the church could meet. These works were intended for a general educated audience interested in the Catholic mission to the east. However, the ecclesiology course which he offered at the PIO was meant for the future Catholic religious professionals, echoed these sentiments in a more intellectually sophisticated way.

The curriculum at the PIO was meant, as Nicola Cardinal Marini had articulated, to create missionaries trained in a matter akin to the colonial officers of the Great Powers.[51] The curriculum of the PIO[52] was clearly organized around this principle. Its courses in dogmatic theology were not wholly Byzantine in character, but comparative in their examination of the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Eucharist, and of Mary the Mother of God. This logic was further

---

[49]Michel d'Herbigny, S.J., "L'unité dans le Christ," *Orientalia Christiana* 1 (1923): 1-29.

[50]Michel d'Herbigny, S.J., "La Vraie Notion d'Orthodoxie," *Orientalia Christiana*, vol. II, no. 7 (December 1923): 1-33.

[51]Vincenzo, Poggi, S.J., *Per la Storia del Pontificio Istituto Orientale: Saggi sull'istituzione,i suoi Uomini e l'Oriente Cristiano*, in series *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, no. 263, ed. Robert F. Taft, S.J. (Roma: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 2000), 36. Poggi footnotes his source as ASCEO, Protocollo 1445.

[52]ASV Seg. di Stato (1923) 42/1: 122-125.

teased out with courses, both "on the formation of religious mentality among dissidents"[53] and "on contemporary religious mentality among dissidents."[54] Categorizing the Orthodox as "dissident" automatically put them in error, relegating them as lesser, and of course, in need of Catholic missionary effort eager to take on the burden of their conversion. The professors could assume the need argued in *Orientalia Christiana*, placing the Roman Catholic Church in the role of savior.

With the theoretical categories of theology established, the church history of the East was read in conjunction with the West. Photius, Cerularius, the Council of Florence, the "Synod" of Brest, were given special attention, as well as the opinions of the (medieval) scholastics and Greek Catholics. Courses on church history, the Eastern Fathers (i.e. those who were not quoted within Scholastic considerations of the early Church), the archeology of the near East, and the philology of the languages of the Eastern churches– Arabic, Greek, Russian, Old Church Slavonic, and Syriac– were meant to round out knowledge of the Byzantine world for these future missionaries.

It is important to remember that the discipline of philology, which in turn had its roots in religious textual criticism, especially that of the Bible, helped produce Orientalism.[55] The use of philology by the religious professionals at the PIO would be in the Orientalist tradition. Recalling from Chapter 3 that liturgy is not merely a cultic action which arises from a people but

---

[53] "*De formatione mentis religiosae inter Dissidentes*"

[54] "*De hidioerna mente religiosa inter Dissidentes*"

[55] Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (1978; repr., New York: Vintage Books, 1994), pp. 76-77, 135-36.

also helps to form them, the PIO liturgists understood Eastern liturgical languages as helping to form Eastern peoples. Furthermore, the inclusion of Russian as an Oriental liturgical language once again made Russians at least non-Western, if not Eastern, rendering Latin-speaking Rome as the metropole and the non-Latin speaking Christian east as its peripheral, missionary land.

Studies of Eastern (i.e. Byzantine) liturgy, sacramental theology, Eastern canon law, and languages– Latin and Greek in addition to Russian– ensured that the future missionary would have the practical skills to interact with the people of the Byzantine world. Nonetheless, the future missionary was cognizant of his role as an agent, albiet a spiritual agent, of the Catholic Church, most especially of the Pope. The course which d'Herbigny offered on ecclesiology bridged these two realities. On the one hand, it taught the dignity of churches not of the Roman rite. On the other hand, it preserved the superiority of both the Pope and of the Roman Rite.

The course conformed to the principles laid out in *Studiorum Ducem* (1923),[56] which reaffirmed *Aeterni Pastor* (1879),[57] which in turn advocated the use of Scholasticism in the formation of Catholic priests. The format of the course, preserved in published notes[58] *ad usam stricte privatum*, were organized and presented in the scholastic disputation format.[59]

---

[56]Pius XI, "*Studiorum Ducem*," in *The Papal Encyclicals, 1903-1939*, ed. Claudia Carlen, I.H.M. (Raleigh, NC: McGrath Publishing Co., 1986), p. 249, §1.

[57]Leo XIII, "*Aeterni Patris,*" in *The Papal Encyclicals, 1878-1903*, ed. Claudia Carlen, I.H.M (Raleigh, NC: McGrath Publishing Co., 1986), pp. 17-27.

[58]Michel d'Herbigny, S.J. *Theologica de Ecclesia: De Deo Universos Evocante ad Sui Regni Vitam*, tom I, editio secunda (Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne, 1920), and *Theologica de Ecclesia: De Deo Universos Evocante ad Sui Regni Vitam*, tom II, editio secunda (Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne, 1921).

[59]The format, briefly, is as follows: a thesis statement is made, followed, in turn, by (1) a few strong introductory statements either supporting or refuting the thesis, each accompanied by

D'Herbigny affirmed the Byzantine (and Catholic) Church structure in his defense of the formation of the Apostolic College, or the College of Bishops. Briefly, d'Herbigny argued that Christ established the twelve apostles as the original College of Bishops to which even St. Paul submitted.[60] However, d'Herbigny also argued that Christ preserved the full integrity and infallible teaching only of those who remained a part of the True (i.e. Catholic) Church. Therefore, only Catholic bishops could be rightly called the "Magisterium." This was no different from the systematic doctrine of papal and magisterial authority taught in western seminaries, novitiates, and scholasticates, as well as in schools of secondary and higher education.[61]

However, d'Herbigny also asserted that, insofar as elements of the Truth exist outside the Catholic Church (e.g. scripture) and that the Holy Spirit works throughout the entire world, the Church exists passively there. The only active Church was the Catholic Church, in which the church was present in its fullness[62] because of Peter[63] and the Petrine Office, i.e. the Papacy. Consequently, (1) the Catholic Church claimed the power of jurisdiction throughout the world,

---

general supporting statements, which contradict (2) a statement supporting or refuting the thesis, with several points of justification, and (3) point-by-point refutations of the introductory statements. The thesis statements themselves follow a logical format and are intended to support one another to make a general argument about a general subject, in this case the nature of the Church.

[60]Michel d'Herbigny, S.J. *Theologica de Ecclesia: De Deo Universos Evocante ad Sui Regni Vitam*, tom I, editio secunda (Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne, 1920), pp. 102-108.

[61]*Manual of Christian Doctrine, Comprising Dogma, Moral, and Worship*, 12th ed. (Philadelphia: John Joseph McVay, 1910), preface and pp. 126-30.

[62]d'Herbigny, S.J. *Theologica de Ecclesia*, tom I, pp. 108-24.

[63]*Ibid*., p. 107.

and (2) the schismatic Orthodox Church, in order to be a church in the fullest sense, had to return to the Catholic fold. No matter the Byzantine trappings of the curriculum or worship, the future missionaries understood the core of the Church was Petrine, a thoroughly Roman concept.

Correlatively, the creed which Russian Orthodox converts were to profess to enter the Catholic Church was the same creed required for heretics; it was entitled, "Short Form of the Profession of Faith for Heretics or Eastern Schismatics."[64] In order to situate this creed within soft-Orientalist dynamics these terms must be placed within the context of several others which denote states of belief and relationship to the Catholic Church.

It is important to note the importance of performativity for the Catholic Church in the examination of heresy and schism. Private matters were considered "occult" or hidden as part of the "internal forum," and were not considered legitimate matters to be judged officially in the "external forum." However, once a private matter was brought into the external forum, both official and unofficial public judgments could be made. Generally, the more serious and far-reaching the public performance of either virtue or vice, the more keen would be the interest of the Magisterium. It was important not only to acknowledge and praise those whose social performance reinforced the Catholic narrative, but to criticize, rebuke or even punish anti-Catholic narratives, both within and outside the Church. Treatment of heretics and schismatics, those whose group identity was in part a rejection and repudiation of a Catholic identity that they once held, was particularly neuralgic.

Pagans, in the broadest sense, believed in religions other than the true one revealed by

---

[64] "*Formula Brevior Professionis Fidei pro Haereticis seu Schismaticis Orientalibus*." (ASV Seg. di Stato (1927) 338/1: 130.)

Jesus Christ, and in a narrower sense, all religions other than Christianity, Judaism, and Islam (Mohammedanism in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*), the historically interconnected monotheistic religions born in the Near East. However, in practice, paganism was used in the narrower sense, emphasizing, *a la* Comte, the primitiveness of the peoples in question.

Apostasy was understood to have three modes: (1) *a Fide* or *perfide,* the abandonment of the faith, (2) *ab ordine*, the abandonment of the clerical state by a cleric, and (3) *a religione* or *monachatus*, the abandonment of the religious state by vowed religious person.[65] For the issue at hand, Apostasy *a Fide* is relevant, implying the denial of Christianity itself, *in toto*. A person could apostasy, becoming a pagan, Jew, Muslim, atheist, or agnostic.

A heretic differed from an apostate in that s/he denied only a part but not all of the revealed religion. Heresy in its fullest sense was "pertinacious adhesion to a doctrine contradictory to a point of faith clearly defined by the Church."[66] Any opinion opposed to an article of faith which had not been clearly defined or proposed was an opinion approached heresy, or *sententia haeresi proxima*. Doctrinal propositions which were not heretical in themselves but led to logical consequences which varied from revealed truth were classified as erroneous theological propositions, or *propositio theologice erronea*. Lastly, theological opinions which had only a probability of heresy which could not be demonstrably proven were labeled *de haeresi suspecta* or *haeresim sapiens*.

A schismatic differed from a heretic in that ecclesiastical union and unity is ruptured

---

[65]New Advent *Catholic Encyclopedia Online*, "Apostasy."

[66]New Advent *Catholic Encyclopedia Online*, "Heresy."

either by personal or communal choice.[67] The schismatic may or may not hold heretical theological opinions. This category is concerned about church order. The constant reference to the Orthodox as schismatics placed them in the gentlest category of the Other, but an Other nonetheless.

The formula intended for the official reception of heretical and schismatic converts was intended to highlight the corrective nature of the conversion to Catholicism. Unlike "pagans," the intended convert had been baptized, but into a church with deficiencies in truth and/or church order.

The introductory statement to the formula required the convert first to state explicitly, "I, [full name] hold the firm faith and profess wholly and particularly, that which is contained in the symbol (profession) of faith, which the Holy Roman Catholic Church uses, namely, 'I believe in one God, the Father almighty...'".[68] Overall, the formula which followed contained all of the elements which Soloviev identified as problematic for Russian Orthodox converts: the *filioque*, the Immaculate Conception, and the juridical primacy of the Pope.[69] It contained eight paragraphs, each of which demonstrated the deficiencies of Russian Orthodoxy, in contradistinction to the fullness of the Truth taught by the Catholic Church. It also contained other elements.

The first paragraph was simply the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed of 381 (commonly

---

[67]New Advent *Catholic Encyclopedia Online*, "Schism."

[68]*"Ego N.N. firma fide teneo et profiteor omnia et singula, quae continentur in symbolo Fidei, quo S. Romana Ecclesia utitur, videlicet: Credo in unum Deum Patrem Omnipotentem..."* (ASV Seg. di Stato (1927) 338/1: 130.)

[69]Solovyev, *Russia and the Universal Church*, p. 48.

called simply the "Nicene Creed"). It not only included the *filioque*, but the word *catholicam* to indicate the universality of the Church. Although this was (and remains) the standard word in the creed in the west, it would have stood out to the Russian Orthodox convert used to hearing the word "*sobornoye*"[70] to indicate the mark of church universality. Catholic, after all, was the descriptor of the papally-governed church of foreigners, especially the Poles.

The second paragraph was a summary of the essential elements of Christology formulated at Chalcedon and quoted above, with the addition of the belief in the Immaculate Conception of Mary. The inclusion of this notion, as well as the *filioque* above, rubbed against the Cappadocian and Alexandrian theological tradition familiar to Byzantine Christians and insisted on the Augustinian and Antiochene traditions favored by the Roman Catholic Church.[71] Furthermore, the production of this formula outside of a council and approved by the Pope demonstrated Papal juridical primacy, the assertion of which came in the sixth paragraph. By implication, conciliarism was dismissed.

The third paragraph dealt with the existence and legitimacy of the seven sacraments, which both the Catholic and Orthodox Churches held.[72] While familiar to an Orthodox convert, many– but not all– Protestant converts would be reminded of the deficiencies of their previous faith in this aspect of the formula. If an Orthodox convert were to convert to a Byzantine Rite

---

[70]"соборное," i.e. "conciliar ."

[71]Although this statement appears to construct a dichotomy, this is not the intent, as indicated by the use of the word "favored."

[72]Baptism, Confirmation (Chrismation in the Byzantine Churches), Eucharist, Penance (popularly "Confession"), Extreme Unction (popularly, "Last Rites"), Ordination, and Matrimony.

Catholic Church, the administration of the sacraments would feel familiar; however, in the Roman rite, differences in rite would feel alien. For example, while the Byzantine parish priest would confer all at once and usually at birth: baptism, chrismation, and Eucharist[73]– under both species of bread and wine, the Catholic priest would confer baptism at birth,[74] and the Eucharist only in the species of bread after the age of reason.[75] The local bishop would by custom confer confirmation at any time after the age of reason, ideally during Pentecost, and after sufficient instruction.[76]

The fourth paragraph dealt with the differences in understanding a practice between Roman and Byzantine Christians in the reception of the Eucharist. Both churches have held that both bread and wine must be consecrated at the Eucharistic celebration, but have differed in two practices. The first and less serious difference concerned the reception of communion by the laity. Both Byzantine Orthodox and Catholic Churches allowed the reception of communion under both species. Roman Catholic practice allowed the normal reception of communion only in the form of the bread.[77] The formula implied the importance of this practice as it included an expression of the theory of concomitance, i.e. that the "fullness" of the Eucharist is present under

---

[73]Tangentially, Donald Attwater highlighted the passivity in sacraments to accentuate the otherness of the Orthodox Church and imply their lack of full understanding of the sacraments; *c.f.* Donald Attwater, "Russian Spirituality," *An Irish Quarterly Review* 29, no. 113 (March 1940): 53-64.

[74]"As soon as possible." *cf. The 1917 or Pio-Benedictine Code of Canon Law*, trans. Edward N. Peters (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2001), canons 770-772.

[75]Seven years; *cf. The 1917 Code of Canon Law*, canon 88 §3.

[76]*The 1917 Code of Canon Law*, canons 786,788, 790.

[77]*Ibid*., canon 852.

both species. Thus, in a theological reductionist move, only one or the other of the species is truly necessary for full communion. The second difference, the use of unleavened bread, was a more serious difference between the two churches, as it evoked historical memory of the theological battles between Catholic azymites and Orthodox prozymites beginning in the middle of the eleventh century.

While many liturgical and ritual differences existed between the Latin and Greek Churches, their respective use of azyme (unleavened) or prozyme (leavened) bread was symbolic of serious theological differences. Metropolitan Hilarion Alfeyev noted,

> the Byzantines saw in this seemingly trifling detail a reflection of serious theological differences in the understanding of the essence of Christ's body, which is given to the faithful in the Eucharist: if leavened bread symbolizes the consubstantiality of Christ's body with ours, then unleavened bread is a symbol for the difference between Christ's body and ours. The Greeks viewed the use of unleavened bread as an attack on the very heart of eastern Christian theology: the teaching on deification [*apotheosis*], which was little known in the west.[78]

The fourth paragraph required the convert to admit the legitimacy of the azyme bread, and by extension, Catholic Christology. While this is a reasonable expectation of a convert, the lack of acknowledgment of the legitimacy of the prozymite position is significant; it subtly dismisses the Catholicity of Byzantine Rite Churches. For both Orthodox and Protestant converts, the Catholic Church is ultimately synonymous with the Roman Rite.

The following paragraph dealt with the consequential soteriological issue of purgatory, which developed in the Roman Catholic but not the Byzantine Church. Behind the doctrine was the assertion that purgatory had its root in the thinking of John Chrysostom, which Augustine in

---

[78]Alfeyev, *Orthodox Christianity*, p.112.

turn began to develop.[79] Unless the convert was exceptionally well-read in theology, s/he– even if remaining in a Byzantine rite church– was experiencing a subtle type of Latinization. Although the merit-based theology of grace rooted in the Roman church[80] would not be a necessary logical consequence, it could follow logically, further Latinizing the convert.

The final two paragraphs dealt with Church governance. The convert explicitly stated that s/he believed in the universal, juridical primacy of the Pope as the Apostolic successor to St. Peter, and that the magisterium, in union with the Pope, taught infallibly. As such, the convert professed belief in the "true faith," outside of which no salvation was possible.[81] Correlatively, the legitimate authority of the Catholic Councils beyond the first seven recognized by the Orthodox Church were recognized. Florence, Trent, and the Vatican Synod (Vatican I) were mentioned particularly; the Orthodox convert thereby professed an indirect belief and adherence to the Catholic interpretation of the neuralgic points of contention with the Orthodox Church: the theological justification for and formulation of the *filioque* (Florence), Catholic Church order (Trent), and papal primacy and infallibility (Vatican I). The convert, with his/her right hand

---

[79]Petrus Canisius, *Der Große Katechismus: Summa doctrinae Christianæ (1555)* trans. and commentary by Hubert Filser and Stephan Leimgruber (Regensburg, Germany: Schnell and Steiner, 2003), p. 175.

[80]Although the merit-based theology of grace is articulated in many ways, the members of the PCpR would have found the most authoritative expression in the Council of Trent. The decrees on justification were ratified on 13 January 1547, in the sixth session. Merit was considered in chapter 16 of the decrees, immediately after which 33 canons on grace followed; *cf.* Heinrich Denziger and Clemens Bannwart, S.J. *Enchiridion Symbolorum; Definitionum et Declarationum. De Rebus Fidei et Morum* (St. Louis, MO: Herder & Co., 1922), pp. 275-81.pp. This can be found in English translation; *cf.* Rev. H.J. Schroeder, O.P., *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent* (Rockford, Ill: Tan Books and Publishers, Inc., 1978), 40-46.

[81]"*Hanc veram fidem, extra quam nemo salvus esse potest...*" (ASV Seg. di Stato (1927) 338/1: 130.)

upon the bible, concluded the formula with the statement, "So, I (name) promise and believe. So may God and this Holy Word of God judge me."[82]

Taken in isolation, the formula is reasonable. It is rational to require a Catholic convert to recognize the authority the Pope and the magisterium, to submit to Church order, and to believe what the Catholic Church teaches, honestly and sincerely. Even the consideration to add a line or two concerning the impossibility of divorce[83]– possible in Orthodox theology but impossible for Catholics– is reasonable. However, taken within the context of the Catholic attitude toward Russia formulated chiefly by Soloviev, conversion was not a simple matter of recognizing the fullness of truth held and taught by the Catholic Church. Catholic priests and religious who guided conversions did so with a sense that the Russian Orthodox Church was corrupted by the tyrannical Tsarist government with which it collaborated, much like the Byzantine Church was corrupted by the Byzantine Emperor. Both Churches fell to powers portrayed as hostile to Christianity: Byzantium to the Ottomans and Russia to the Bolsheviks.

This is not an idle comparison; in 1929, d'Herbigny wrote an article in *Orientalia Christiana* on the psychology of Islam. While he focused on the birth and growth of Islam, d'Herbigny made infrequent references to the Bolshevik regime. The parallels to the Bolshevik Revolution and growth of Communism are clear in the article. D'Herbigny had presided over the PCpR, both as part of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches and as an independent commission, almost as long as the Bolsheviks had been in power. He understood the conflict

---

[82]"*Sic ego N. (ponit dextram supra S. Evangelium) promitto et iuro. Sic me Deus adjuvet et haec Sancta Dei Evangelia*." (ASV Seg. di Stato (1927) 338/1: 130.)

[83]AA.EE.SS., PCpR, 3a/21: 71.

with the Bolsheviks in ideological terms, i.e. the true Catholic faith in opposition to atheistic dialectical materialism or communism. For him, conflict with Muslims would be understood in similar ideological terms, i.e. the true Catholic faith in opposition to Islam, a monotheism which rejected the incarnation. While it is likely that his experience and understanding of Russia shaped his scholarly approach to Islam, his analysis of Islam helped harden the soft-Orientalist view of Russia.

D'Herbigny cribbed Soloviev in his explanation for the fall of Christianity in the region; it was "besotted by degrading paganism or even more abject materialism..."[84] Islam spread rapidly, and blended religious, social, and political power under a theocratic despotism. D'Herbigny asserted that while Muslims claimed to be dedicated to peace, by the end of the life of Mohammed, Muslim preaching was often bellicose, hateful, and fiercely vindictive and contemptuous.[85] The parallel to the Bolshevik situation is rather clear. Bolshevism also spread rapidly, and subsumed all social and political power under a despot. While the Bolsheviks claimed to be dedicated to a better and just world, their vindictiveness moved beyond rhetoric and into show trials. Islam had not been a genuine threat to European security at least since Tsar Nicholas I had supposedly called the Ottoman Empire "the Sick Man of Europe." But in the interwar period, Pius XI agreed with d'Herbigny that atheistic communism was a serious threat to civilization.

Although the historical actors of the 1920s and 1930s– including the members of the

---

[84]"...abrutie par un paganisme dégradant ou par un matérialisme encore plus abject..." in Michel d'Herbigny, SI, vesc. "L'Islam naissant. Notes psychologiques," *Orientalia Christiana* 14 (1929): 198. (179-325)

[85]D'Herbigny, "L'Islam," p. 273.

PCpR– and current post-modern thinkers have conceived of Communism in varied ways, they do agree that it has played out in global space, on socio-economic, cultural, and geopolitical planes. Communists existed across Europe, and attempts or accusations of attempts of Marxist revolution were made throughout the interwar period. Although the portrayal of the threat was serious, the importance of the Bolshevik Revolution was equally if not more serious, since the revolution was a success and the regime, after some time, was expected to endure.

The Vatican received reports of communist activity across Europe. A consideration in October 1920 (a mere two months after the "Miracle on the Vistula") by Louis de Maier, a former Imperial Russian Colonel,[86] confirmed for the Vatican the seriousness of the Communist threat first across western Europe, then specifically in Russia.[87] Piotr Isvolsky corroborated this assessment by claiming the communist threat was not only in Russia, but was universal.[88] The tactical eye of Maier provided a means of hope for the Vatican; he maintained that the Bolsheviks only had power in the important centers and the villages, and that approximately one hundred million Russian persons had remained faithful (Orthodox) Christians. In accord with the thinking of Soloviev, and citing the maxim that "unity is strength," Maier called for the "Roman Church, the mother of all Christian religions, to reach out to the Greek Church of Russia for a union under the supreme leadership of the Sovereign Pontiff."[89] Not only would this be one part

---

[86]AA.EE.SS. Russia, 993 P.O., fasc. 355 / 31.

[87]AA.EE.SS. Russia, 993 P.O., fasc. 355 / 32-34.

[88]AA.EE.SS. Russia, 626 P.O., fasc. 14 / 10.

[89]"...l'Eglise Romaine, mere de toutes les religions Chretiennes, tende la main a l'Eglise greque de la Russie en vue d'une union sous l'eguide supreme du Souverain Pontif..." *cf*. AA.EE.SS. Russia, 993 P.O., fasc. 355 / 33-34.

of the *raison d'être* for the eventual existence of the PCpR, the logic helped to define its mission. Anti-communism would be a necessary part of the evangelization of Russia, which would include both spiritual and worldly elements. (This mission will be examined in Chapter 5.) The next few years demonstrated the difficulty of accomplishing a reunion of the Churches within Bolshevik Russia.

In spite of whatever distaste a Russian Orthodox believer would have for the Bolshevik regime, Catholic clergy learned over the next few years that the historical enmity between Russian Orthodoxy and western/Polish/foreign Catholicism was not easily overcome,[90] especially since Polish priests– many of them bi-ritual– were hostile to Byzantine Christianity even among Byzantine Catholics.[91] Succinctly, religious rites were understood to be expressions of nationalism, making any kind of Catholic-Orthodox rapproachement nearly impossible, in spite of the common Bolshevik enemy. However, for the Vatican, religious confession was understood to be the prior identity, and nationalist appropriation of religious identity demonstrated the internal European otherness of these Slavic nations threatened by Marxism.

H.M. Waddams summed up the interwar assumptions made by scholars of Marxist theory and practice that carried over into the post-war period and which have been challenged by recent historiography:

> (1) Religion is the opiate of the people.
> (2) Religion is a conglomeration of outworn superstitions which will disappear in a fully developed communist state as the result of a scientific and materialist education.
> (3) The actual attitude of the Communist Party towards religion at any particular moment is a matter of expediency or tactics (though these principles have an absolute value

---

[90]AA.EE.SS. Russia, 626 P.O., fasc. 14/ 70-76.

[91]AA.EE.SS. Russia, 610 P.O., fasc. 5/ 6-12.

for Communists which we do not associate with them.[92]

The final point (3) has been an historiographical premise used both by members of the PCpR and many historians of the interwar period, from those who participated in events to those born after these events. For example, both Louis Gallagher,[93] who participated in these events, and Dennis Dunn,[94] born after them, both assume that Marxist Revolutionary strategy at its core works to root out religion thoroughly from society, as much as is expedient or possible. The notion that the Bolsheviks were as much reacting to circumstances as trying to implement a revolution, accepted by some notable current scholars,[95] was not within the historical imagination of the Vatican in the interwar period.

Given the attitude in the interwar period that Communists were ultimately looking to eradicate religion, Harold Laski, a noted political scientist at the University of London, found a parallel between Jesuits working to spread Catholicism and Bolsheviks working to spread Communism. Concerning the Bolsheviks, he noted

> They are, as a party, comparable to nothing so much as the Society of Jesus. There is, in both, the same rigorous and unyielding set of dogmas, the same iron rigour of discipline, the same passionate loyalty capable of unlimited self-confidence. The Jesuit who set out to preach his faith in China or the

---

[92]H.M. Waddams, "Communism and the Churches," *International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-)* 25, no. 3 (July 1949): 295. (295-306)

[93]Louis Gallagher, "Communism and Religion," *The Irish Monthly* 75, no. 852 (Oct. 1947): 422-26.

[94]Dennis J. Dunn, *The Catholic Church and Russia: Popes, Patriarchs, Tsars, and Commissars* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2004).

[95]*cf.* Catherine Wanner, ed., *State Secularism and Lived Religion in Soviet Russia and Ukraine* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012).

> unknown Arctic north-West is not dissimilar to the Communist who volunteers to bury the infected corpses in the cholera epidemic. Like the Jesuit, the Communist has no personal end to secure; he feels himself essentially the servant of a great idea. Like the Jesuit, also, the Russian Communist has the assurance that he works for a cause that is bound to end in triumph.[96]

This layered parallel between Catholicism and Communism was not lost on Catholic intellectuals[97] or the members of the PCpR; the common practice of referring to Communism as "atheistic Communism" reinforced the notion that it was an ideology, and a diabolical one at that.[98] Although shifts in the Bolshevik treatment of religion and specifically Catholicism are

---

[96]Harold J. Laski, *Communism* (London: Williams and Norgate, 1927), pp. 51-52.

[97]Lambert McKenna, S.J., "The Bolsheviks," *An Irish Quarterly Review* 10, no. 38 (June 1921): 218-38.

[98]Tangentially, the propensity to view communism as a type of belief and draw parallels to religion has influenced the consideration of communism as the "Civil Religion," in Soviet Russia/the USSR. Broadly, and hopefully not too simplistically, it has been argued that the social niche which Orthodoxy had occupied was replaced by Leninism and Stalinism. Dogmatically, the Bible and Orthodox Tradition, guarded by the bishops, were replaced by Marxist writings and revolutionary spirit, guarded by the party. The Julian Calendar was replaced by the Gregorian, replete with new festival days. Worship and processions were replaced by parades, party meetings, and even show trials. Icons were replaced by portraits of party leaders, and by historical accident, the color red, which had been important in the Orthodox Church, had been used by revolutionaries since the Jacobins raised the red flag in 1792. Not only did the form of religious narrative change, but the linguistic content did as well: a new terminology was created. Note especially Victoria E. Bonnell, *Iconography of Power: Soviet Political Posters under Lenin and Stalin* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), Michael Bourdeaux, *Opium of the People: The Christian Religion in the USSR* (New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1966), and the work of Moshe Lewin, "Popular Religion in Twentieth Century Russia," in *The World of the Russian Peasant: Post-Emancipation Culture and Society,* ed. Ben Eklof and Stephen Frank, 155-68 (Boston: Unwin Hyman, Inc. 1990), and "Society, State, and Ideology," in *Cultural Revolution in Russia, 1928-1931,* ed. Sheila Fitzpatrick, 41-77 (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1978). Although these sociologists did not engage "Octoberings" and diary-writing, it could be argued that the former functioned as a Communist baptism, even in some cases including revolutionary names, and the style and aim of the latter was akin to keeping a spiritual journal as a means of internal conversion. Finally, the

detectable, the members of the PCpR understood Bolshevik religious policy to be a comprehensive ideological struggle within the context of turmoil and suffering of the post-war. Ledóchowski, in a note to Secretary of State Gaspari in 1922, expressed this attitude when he emphasized the "flagrant systematic violations of conscience" (emphasis by the author).[99]

By 1922, officials in the Catholic Church accepted the fact that the power of the Bolsheviks was not only "not diminishing, but was growing,"[100] with the correlative claim that the "barbarities of the Bolsheviks were known everywhere."[101] Additionally, they feared that Communism would spread successfully into Hungary, Italy, and then to all of Europe,[102] given the unstated, temporary successes of Béla Kuhn in Hungary and the notable presence of socialism in Italy. Catholic strategy shifted from hoping for a widespread promulgation of the Catholic faith in Russia simply to working to maintain its survival. A report of 14 September 1922 noted that St. Catherine's Church in Petrograd had been reduced from 30,000 members to 5,000, and that similar massive declines in church participation was true in other parishes, some of which were reduced to only 50 members.[103] The show trial in the spring of 1923 of Jan Cieplak, Konstantin Budkkiewicz, Leonid Feodorov, as well as fourteen other priests and a layman, confirmed the desperate situation of the Catholic Church in Russia. Within the Catholic world,

---

planned Palace of the Soviets would have been a cathedral to the "new faith."

[99]Russia 626 P.O. 13 / 75.

[100]AA.EE.SS., Russia 610 P.O. 5 / 56, and AA.EE.SS. PCpR 1/1: 66-68.

[101]"Barbaries bolchevicorum ubique nota est." AA.EE.SS., Russia 634 P.O. 19 / 58.

[102]AA.EE.SS., Russia, 634 P.O. 19 / 59.

[103]AA.EE.SS., Russia, 610 P.O. 5 / 56.

the view of Soviet Russia as a dangerous place hostile to Catholicism remained constant. By 1927, Adam Zielizinski, a Polish Catholic layman, volunteered to smuggle rosaries, (Latin) crosses, and books into Russia to help keep Catholicism alive.[104] Cardinals Dalbor and Kakowski, in the name of all Polish bishops, took the opportunity to condemn the action against these Catholics by the Soviets on humanitarian grounds.[105]

Although the Poles were vocal in their opposition and condemnation of Soviet behavior, the PCpR, even before its separation from SCEO in 1925, also had problems with Poles. The Poles were interested in missionary work in Russia, but while the language of mission was that of reunification with the schismatics (i.e. the Orthodox Churches), the Vatican interpreted Polish interest as imperial expansion into the far eastern *kresy*.[106] Tensions between the PCpR and the Poles reached a climax in the early 1930s, and remained a source of conflict for the PCpR for the near future.

Because both Greek Catholic dioceses and Russian Catholic Churches were found in the II RP, the PCpR administratively included Poland in its consideration of the mission to Russia.[107] The general Polish distaste for things Russian in turn made the work of the PCpR in Poland distasteful. The Poles wanted to take the lead in the missionary apostolic work in Russia, and were irritated that the Vatican had created the PCpR. The Polish bishops voiced concerns about "religious Russification" of non-Polish minorities in their dioceses, i.e. the Ukrainians and

---

[104]AA.EE.SS., PCpR, 42/245: 14

[105]AA.EE.SS., Russia, 644-645 P.O., 29/ 47.

[106]AA.EE.SS., Russia, 626 P.O., 13/ 30.

[107]AA.EE.SS., PCpR, 1/4: 44.

Belarusians, through the "oriental rites."[108] This charge was serious enough that d'Herbigny discussed it in an audience with Pius XI on 7 August 1930.

The Pope and d'Herbigny judged that such charges were rooted in Polish nationalist concerns and not proper religious sensibilities. If any "religious Russification" took place, it was because of Tsarist policy, and furthermore, Latin Catholics were not Russified. They affirmed that the choices the PCpR made to manage the churches were canonical, legal decisions.[109] In spite of the insistence by the Vatican that they were working for spiritual and not national ends, problems with the Poles persisted. Whatever ecclesio-political machinations occurred between the Polish bishops and d'Herbigny for control of the Russian mission, the PCpR found itself on the defense from the Poles as well as the Bolsheviks. We will turn first to the Poles.

In 1932, Polish newspapers, citing concerns of the Russification of minorities, charged the PCpR of being under the influence of the Russians and of having an anti-Polish character.[110] To soften public opinion, in early 1932 the Vatican seriously considered changing the name of the Pontifical Commission for Russia to one of the following: *Pontificia Commissio pro Russia, etc.* (meaning concerns of Russia and beyond its borders)*, Pontificia Commissio URSS, Russi, Estoni Christiani Orientalis in Pol. Maiore, Pontificia Commissio pro Russia, Estonia, ecc christianis orientalibus in Polonia Maiore,*[111] *Pontificia Commission Pastoralis pro Populis*

---

[108]AA.EE.SS. PCpR, 1/8: 15, 22.

[109]AA.EE.SS. PCpR, 1/8: 23.

[110]AA.EE.SS. PCpR, 1/6: 69.

[111]AA.EE.SS., PCpR, 1/6: 64. "The Pontifical Commission for Russia, etc., The Pontifical Commission for the USSR, and Russian and Estonian Eastern Christians in Great Poland, The Pontifical Commission for Russia, Estonia, and Eastern Christian Churches in Great

Russiae et Finitimis,[112] and the very non-descript *Commissio Reunionis dissidentum*[113] Through all of these considerations, which were never adopted, the Vatican officials continued to insist on the religious, and not the political nature, of their efforts.

The *Kuryer Codzienny Ilustrowany* in Kraków insisted on the hypocrisy of the PCpR asking why, if it is a commission for Russia, is it in Poland? Gustaw Lawina, the author, led his article with the header/quote which featured both the condescending attitude of d'Herbigny and an example of d"Herbigny's Polish: "'Naszem [sic!][114] zadaniem jest zbawienie dusz, a nie polityka!' -d'H."[115] If the interview between Lawina and d'Herbigny were verbal, the spelling of "naszem" might suggest that d'Herbigny displayed– if not simply a poor accent– an eastern one.[116] If d'Herbigny answered questions *via* telegraph or letter, his spelling choice might also have diminished his stature in the eyes of Polish readers, even though the written Polish language was not yet standardized.

In some sense, the Poles correctly understood the condescending attitude of the PCpR toward Poland, in spite of the nationalist-driven politics which fueled concerns over a Russian

---

Poland."

[112]AA.EE.SS., PCpR, 1/6: 72. "The Pontifical Pastoral Commission for the Russian People and their Neighbors"

[113]AA.EE.SS., PCpR, 1/8: 55. "Commission for the Reunion of Dissidents."

[114]In proper Polish, this would be rendered, "*naszym*."

[115]AA.EE.SS., PCpR, 1/6: 73. "Our task is the salvation of souls, not politics. -d'H"

[116]The Russian word for "our", "нашим," which would also take the instrumental case in this grammatical construction, and is identical except for the pronunciation; *cf.* Charles Duff and Dmitri Makaroof, *Russian for Beginners* (New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1973), p. 80.

commission in Poland. When D'Herbigny had the opportunity to alleviate the concerns of Poles about their former oppressor, he demonstrated a lack of his concern for the effects of historical memory. His answers were dismissive. When asked about non-Polish Byzantine Catholic priests not speaking Polish but Russian, Belarusian, and Ukrainian he simply answered that they speak the languages of the places they are assigned, including Polish. When asked about the preponderance of Byzantine Rite priests in Poland, d'Herbigny explained that Byzantine Rite priests were in France and Belgium as well, but that many Russians came first to Poland before moving farther west. When asked about calling the Byzantine rite "Eastern" rather than "Greek Catholic," he responded by saying the earlier term was a scholarly blunder, and that "Eastern" fit better than "Greek" due to the liturgical language used (Slavonic) versus the one that was not used (Greek).[117] Lastly, his insistence that the PCpR had a spiritual and not a political mission betrayed an ignorance concerning the importance of the relationship between religion and politics in the region. He simply repeated the assertions that Ivan Gagarin– a Russian noble and patriot– had made in the nineteenth century.[118] Tangentially Lorenzo Lauri and Bishop Van Der Ropp also held and repeated these assertions.[119]

D'Herbigny believed that political and cultural factors distorted their view of the Russian mission. While the PCpR wanted to preserve the native culture of converts, he believed that the Poles wanted to Latinize, and therefore Polonize, them.[120] This conflict with the Poles both

---

[117]AA.EE.SS., PCpR, 1/6: 73-74.

[118]Beshoner, pp. 98-99.

[119]AA.EE.SS., Russia 626 PO/13: 34.

[120]AA.EE.SS., PCpR, 1/8: 51.

reinforced and helped to construct soft-Orientalist attitudes of the PCpR. While the Poles, politicians and bishops alike, were driven by a nationalism cloaked in religiosity, the PCpR worked faithfully and truthfully for the conversion of Russia, supposedly keeping aloof of Polish politics. Concurrently the PCpR was engaged with the Soviet government concerning the anti-religious campaign, which the church insisted was primarily religious, and not political, in nature.

There was very little the Catholic Church could do, except express moral outrage at the behavior of the Soviets toward religion. The Pope had condemned Communism in a special elocution after the conclusion of the Papal relief mission to Russia in 1924, and again in the encyclical *Miserentissimus Redemptor* of 8 May 1928. He also called for prayers for those persecuted in Russia, and on March 19, 1930, the feast of St. Joseph, a special mass was held in Rome. Just preceding the event, on March 15, the Soviets "applauded the horrendous destruction of churches and [the] mass arrests of 1929.[121] To explain the rationale to both Catholics and non-Catholics alike, Edmund Walsh published a short book entitled, *Pope Pius XI Asked Prayers for Russia on March 19th*.[122] In it, he reviewed the Bolshevik anti-religious campaign, which he portrayed as both systematic and as an essential part of atheistic communism.

But in the following June, in the wake of the March 19th mass (attended by 50,000 people, including non-Catholic Christians and Jews[123]), the Sixteenth Congress of the Communist Party

---

[121]Zugger, p. 252.

[122]Edmund A. Walsh, *Why Pope Pius XI Asked Prayers for Russia on March 19, 1030: A Review of the Facts in the Case together with Proofs of the International program of the Soviet Government* (New York: Catholic Near East Welfare Association, 1930).

[123]Zugger, p. 252.

officially renewed the anti-religious campaign. In the following July, the newspaper *Bezbozhnik* (published by the League of Militant Atheists between 1922-1941) promulgated this June resolution. Even if the relationship is not causal, the coincidental timing is provoking.

Over the next few years, priests were arrested and exiled,[124] and sacred vessels were confiscated and– by the very nature of the confiscation– desecrated.[125] Again, Pius XI condemned Communism. He granted an indulgence for praying for the salvation of Russia with a holy card, in which red-shirted men with torches have set fire to an onion-domed church,[126] and he promulgated *Quadragesimo Anno* on 15 May 1931. The events were reminiscent of the confiscations and arrests in the early 1920s, and the church took advantage of the historical parallels.

By 1932, Socialist and Communist newspapers outside the Soviet Union supported the anti-religious campaign along with *Bezbozhnik*,[127] and Walsh reworked his *apologia* into an historical argument, in which contemporary events could be explained not because of immediate historical actors and exigencies, but because of the nature of Communism itself.

He created a periodization which could support the notion that the conflict between atheistic communists and believers was not about protagonists, but principles.[128] Walsh argued

---

[124]AA.EE.SS., PCpR, 11/72: 6-16, and AA.EE.SS., PCpR, 11/17:109: 44, 47.

[125]AA.EE.SS., PCpR, 17/109: 42.

[126]AA.EE.SS., PCpR, 38/226: 17.

[127]AA.EE.SS., PCpR, 38/226: 36.

[128]Edmund Walsh, "The Catholic Church in Present-Day Russia," *The Catholic Historical Review* 18, no. 2 (July 1932): 177-204.

that the Bolshevik attack began as a military one (1918-1924) which was transformed into a legal attack (1924-1928) when it was no longer expedient to use brute force. He explained away the relative lack of religious persecution between 1928-1932 as the closing phase of the legal attack. Walsh, either ignorant or dismissive of "institutional tension [between the Komsomol and the League of the Godless] and genuinely differing understandings of religion and its role in Soviet society,"[129] asserted that the communists were uniformly and militantly anti-religious, and were intent on communizing the world or destroying it. The unstated implication was that this renewed persecution, in which police rather than military force was used, was simply a renewal of the historical cycle.

Through it all, Pius XI attacked Communism. He published his displeasure with the Bolsheviks in *Osservatore Romano*,[130] complained to the Italian ambassador about the USSR,[131] and officially condemned communism in his encyclicals *Caritate Christi* (3 May 1932), *Acerba Animi* (29 September 1932), and *Dilectissima Nobis* (3 June 1933).

By the time d'Herbigny was dismissed in late 1933, anti-Communism had become an essential aspect to the Catholic missionary narrative, reflecting a Vatican "*realpolitik*" with the contemporary situation in the USSR. This, in turn, lent itself to the creation of the historiographical schools of thought which emphasized the necessity of clandestine activity, congruent with western Cold War narratives concerning the USSR. Interestingly, the PCpR was suppressed in January 1993, not too long after the Soviet Union gave way to the Russian

---

[129]Daniel Peris, "The 1929 Congress of the Godless," *Soviet Studies* 43, no. 4 (1991): 724.

[130]AA.EE.SS., PCpR, 11/72: 24-25.

[131]AA.EE.SS., PCpR, 11/72: 26-31.

Federation.

While the Soviet experiment cemented itself in Russia in the 1920s and 1930s, it took great hope to believe that eventually, the ideal society proposed by Soloviev, based upon the socially expressed hypostatic union, would exist. From the point of view of the PCpR and the Vatican, the corrupted and deficient Orthodox faith was supplanted by atheistic Communism, a faith more damaging to Christianity than even Islam. In the meantime, the PCpR worked to preserve the Catholic Church on Russian soil as best it could, and to make Catholic converts adhere with their western notion of the true faith. The final aspect of the work of the PCpR was to manage those converts, in accord with both spiritual and temporal concerns of the faith.

Chapter 5
Behavioral Codes and the Construction of Soft-Orientalism

In chapter 4, we saw how soft-Orientalism was intertwined with Catholic creedal belief. While anti-Communism became the means of dealing with a flawed and problematic USSR, the ideals of Soloviev were used to manage Catholics within that society– whether they remained in or escaped from it. The code of behavior which Russian Catholics were expected to observe reflected the soft-Orientalist laden Catholic creedal belief constructed for them.

The ideal society which Soloviev envisioned (examined in Chap. 4), based on the western medieval historical experience of the distinct but inseparable aspects of *regnum* and *sacerdotium*, which he understood to be a reflection of the distinct but inseparable human and divine natures of Christ expressed in the Chalcedonian formula (also examined in Chap. 4), would have to concern itself with both the physical and spiritual natures of each single human person. The Catholic magisterium had formulated the corporal[1] and spiritual[2] works of mercy as a general but practical code of service for Catholics to care for both aspects of human nature, and also expected that Catholics make use of the sacraments, especially Eucharist and Penance, to improve their spiritual lives. While this code of conduct was sufficient in normal circumstances, the PCpR believed that the situation in Russia called for more heroic behavior.

---

[1]They are: to feed the hungry, to give drink to the thirsty, to clothe the naked, to harbor the harborless (or shelter the homeless), to visit the sick, to ransom the captive (or visit the imprisoned), and to bury the dead; *cf.* www.newadvent.org, "Corporal and Spiritual Works of Mercy."

[2]They are: to instruct the ignorant, to counsel the doubtful, to admonish sinners, to bear wrongs patiently, to forgive offences willingly, to comfort the afflicted, and to pray for the living and the dead; *cf.* www.newadvent.org, "Corporal and Spiritual Works of Mercy."

D'Herbigny (as discussed earlier) had used the famine to portray Russia as a barbaric place in need of spiritual and material succor which the Catholic Church could provide, and this portrayal had helped to demonstrate the need for the PCpR itself and the subsequent importance of its work. However, apart from that agenda, the Vatican and the members of the PCpR were sincerely interested in helping the Russian people materially, both those in Russia and refugees. The Vatican spent a great deal of money on relief for refugees, even through the depression. Although its ledgers are not available for consultation,[3] some financial information is available from routine correspondence and memos.

In October 1925, in its first year of independence from SCEO, the PCpR received 325,000 Italian Lira to finance the commission and all of its works, drawing its funds from the Pope himself, the Secretary of State, the fund for seminaries and seminarians, the Commission for Religious Works, and from Propaganda Fide.[4] Available records imply that the Pope had a special interest in helping the multitudes of the poor, giving 15,000 Italian lira to the PCpR in 1925, and designating that it be used for their relief.[5] In April 1926, he ensured that the Secretary of State specifically earmarked 20,000 Italian lira for the same purpose.[6] Even in the depths of the depression, the Pope did not allow the financial resources of the PCpR to diminish, even

[3]AA.EE.SS., PCpR, scatoli 33-36, covering the years 1922-1935, are listed in the index as unavailable for consultation.

[4]AA.EE.SS., PCpR 2/10: 41-42, 51.

[5]AA.EE.SS., PCpR 2/10: 39.

[6]AA.EE.SS., PCpR 2/10: 46.

though the budgets of many other dicastaries had been reduced.[7] While many historians note the importance of Russia for Pius XI, his concern specifically for the Russian poor– including refugees– appears equally important.

The type of outreach which the PCpR performed toward the Russian poor was not unique to them. They were aware of other philanthropic organizations, and did many of the same things. The French organization "*Les Amities Franco-Russes,*"[8] for example, worked to foster friendship between the French public and Russian refugees, as well as engender into the former a sympathy for the plight of the latter. The organization held public lectures, supported education for Russian immigrants, and provided monetary relief for them. The PCpR functioned similarly, but understood these things from a religious perspective. Insofar as both organizations were providing out of their cultural and material largesse for a people in need due to their historical circumstances, soft-Orientalist dynamics were at play. For the PCpR, class dynamics were clearly in operation as well, as it aided the upper class Russians differently from those who were poor. The PCpR handled the former personally and directly, while it handled the latter impersonally and indirectly.

The PCpR helped the lower classes who presented themselves in need in various modes. In 1923, the PCpR (still within SCEO) sent 90 lira over two years to help Russian refugees in the Levant and Constantinople.[9] Clearly, the grand hold that the Russian Orthodox Church had in the Levant discussed in chapter 2 was gone; the Soviet government, with the consent of the

---

[7]AA.EE.SS., PCpR 1/6: 30.

[8]ASV Seg. di Stato (1920) 9/3: 17-18

[9]ASV Seg. di Stato (1923) 42/1: 144-56.

general Russian population, had to resort to the confiscation of Church wealth for famine relief at home. The PCpR also sent aid to a Russian girls' gymnasium in Harbin, China in 1929, partly to relieve them from the afflictions of poverty, and partly to preserve their virtue within the context of poverty in which such virtue–the church claimed– could be easy to lose.[10] That same year, the PCpR sent aid to mutilated and invalid Russian expatriate Great War veterans in Paris.[11] Similarly, in 1932, the PCpR sent 13,000 Italian lira– roughly the equivalent of 5,000 złoty– to Wilno, to be doled out over two years to war invalids there.[12] While the aid was sincere, it also reinforced soft-Orientalist attitudes: the PCpR aided Russian refugees when the Soviet government and the Russian Orthodox Church would not or could not. Furthermore, the aid spanned geographical boundaries from the western European Metropole to the periphery, both in Eastern Europe and in the traditional colonial areas of the Levant. It also found its way to Africa.

In 1930, d'Herbigny sent aid to a medical mission in Nigeria, and personally conveyed encouragement to its head: Maria Lenganeur (neé Lubov), a doctor.[13] Lenganeur was a member of the Congregation of the Holy Child Jesus and oversaw a rather international group of sisters in Nigeria. While the financial aid which the PCpR doled out often reinforced an Orientalist attitude toward Russia, the work of Dr. Lenganeur demonstrated the softness of this soft-Orientalism. Although Russia was in need, those Russians who had established themselves in the west– especially as Catholics– had ceased being the subjects of care– especially because they

---

[10]AA.EE.SS., PCpR 1/3: 69.

[11]AA.EE.SS., PCpR 1/3: 73.

[12]AA.EE.SS., PCpR 16/103: 8-12.

[13]AA.EE.SS., PCpR 38/226: 26-33.

were integrated into the very structure of the Catholic church– and instead became the instruments of care.

While the PCpR aided poor Russian refugees through intermediate structures, it aided upper class Russians personally and directly. One of the first was the former (and final) Russian ambassador to the Holy See, Lyssakovsky, who at age 46, petitioned the Vatican for help getting settled in Paris. Lyssakovsky asked his contacts in the Vatican to help him make connections in industrial, commercial, and banking interests in France. The PCpR, while still under CEO, took great care to note his many accomplishments in the Russian diplomatic service.[14] He had been the attache and secretary in Tokyo, Beijing, Brussels, Berne, and Washington, and had been responsible for business in Bucharest and Bangkok. He had also been the deputy head of the Department of the Near East, and later head of the Department of Information for Foreign Affairs. Finally, he was made the Extraordinary Envoy and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Holy See in 1917. The PCpR left unstated that Lyssakovsky would have been vetted by the Holy Synod for his Vatican posting, and that the revolution had destroyed the Orthodox Russian government. They did note, however, that Lyssakovsky did not represent the current (Bolshevik) government of Russia.[15] It is unclear whether or not the Vatican helped Lyssakovsky; no remarks were made in his file. What was clear that the situation in Russia had left him without any real material resources. Both Orthodoxy and Bolshevism had failed him, and he was left to beg for help from the Vatican. Subsequent cases dealt mostly with women, though some men also petitioned for aid. Often, those requesting aid had contacts who interceded for them with either

[14]ASV Seg. di Stato (1924) 181/1: 18-20.

[15]ASV Seg. di Stato (1924) 181/1: 23.

someone in the PCpR directly, or to someone in the Roman curia who would forward the request for aid to the PCpR.

Luisa Elena Pienkowska– living in Rome, interceded in 1927 on behalf of her sister, Jadwiga Mankowska– living in Warsaw-- to Monsignor Raspanti, who in turn enlisted the help of Lorenzo Lauri,[16] who finally forwarded her letter to the PCpR, noting on a business card that they should deal with the request. Mankowska had married into a wealthy Ukrainian noble family, which was left destitute in part by the war and in part by the Bolsheviks, who had killed her older daughter sometime in 1926. She was widowed with a teen age girl (Wanda), and afflicted with a neurological disorder. She framed her request for money by arguing that she took jobs, but that they were not enough to pay to keep her daughter in the boarding school of the Benedictine Sisters in Kraków. At the end of the year, the PCpR awarded her 3,600 lira, to be paid over time at a rate of 300 lira per month.[17] The PCpR decided in a meeting on February 1, 1928 that d'Herbigny ought to convey their gratitude to the Holy Father for the money that made such charity possible, as well as recognize two other monsignors who helped practically get the money to Mankowska. He did so on February 12.[18]

Some cases were not so involved. In 1930, Alicia Baszkiewicz, a Russian refugee in Poland, petitioned for aid, and was recognized as being a good Christian from a pious family. After some deliberation, the PCpR recommended that she take advantage of local charity

---

[16]AA.EE.SS., PCpR 16/101: 4.

[17]AA.EE.SS., PCpR 16/101: 11-13, 15, 22.

[18]AA.EE.SS., PCpR 16/101: 24.

organizations, and informed Francesco Marmaggi, the Papal nuncio to Poland, of their decision.[19] Because Baskiewicz had contacts in Rome, the PCpR did give her individual attention. However, because she was not part of an important family, the commission paid little attention to her. The PCpR neither gave her money nor included a detailed biography with a pedigree, in her file.

Overall, without regard for social status, the PCpR sincerely helped Russian refugees. However, the so-called Soviet barbarity prompted a general exodus, prompting a need for aid; this confirmed and reinforced soft-Orientalist attitudes. The desperation of those fleeing Russia will be examined below, as part of the analysis of how the PCpR managed marriage cases. The necessity of aid confirmed for the PCpR the moral bankruptcy of the Bolshevik revolution and Soviet government, and so confirmed the necessity of the conversion of Russia to Catholicism.

The concerns of the PCpR with respect to evangelization shifted from an initial optimism for the growth and expansion of Catholicism to a guarded hope for the simple survival of Catholicism within Russia. Because much of this helped create and sustain the PCpR as an independent commission, this has already been previously examined. However, it is important to remember that Russia was portrayed as suffering under the yoke of the Bolsheviks and in need of the Catholic Church both materially–due to the famine– and spiritually– due to its spiritual authority, the deficiencies of the Orthodox Church, and the lies of Bolshevism. The situation in Russia gave the Vatican, including the members of the PCpR, a sense of urgency,[20] if not a feeling of desperation.

---

[19]AA.EE.SS., PCpR 16/102: 64-66.

[20]AA.EE.SS., Russia 626 PO/13: 30.

Yet, hope did exist. Even with the renewal of the so-called anti-religious campaign in the early 1920s, a group of Catholic and Orthodox students desired to learn about the Catholic faith with the explicit purpose of working against Bolshevism.[21] At the same time, such requests confirmed that the extraordinary threat to the faith was ordinary in Russia. The Pope, therefore, granted the PCpR a rather lengthy list of dispensations which could be granted[22] with accompanying instructions and admonitions.[23] Sacraments and rites concerning church membership differed for Catholics in Russia than those outside.

In regard to the latter, the fundamental sacrament, baptism, was shortened greatly from its regular form, which included elaborate questioning, rites of exorcism, and blessings in addition to the baptismal formula and anointing with the oil of catechumens (O.C.) and sacred chrism (S.C.).[24] Priests in Russia asked only the most fundamental questions concerning the faith drawn from the Apostles' Creed. They then baptized the infant or convert according to the regular formula and anointed him or her with the aforementioned oils.[25] For those baptized into the Catholic faith in Russia, a plenary indulgence was explicitly given with baptism,[26] suggesting that they were in peril. It is important to remember that the Catholic Church has recognized any

---

[21]AA.EE.SS., PCpR, 38/22: 8-9.

[22]AA.EE.SS., PCpR 32/204: 59-61, 64-68.

[23]AA.EE.SS,. PCpR 32/204: 62-63.

[24]New Advent *Catholic Encyclopedia*, "Baptism." Stable URL: http://www.newadvent.org.

[25]AA.EE.SS,. PCpR 32/204: 60-61.

[26]AA.EE.SS., PCpR 32/204: 65.

baptism as valid which was performed using water and accompanied by the Trinitarian formula. Thus, no Russian Orthodox convert to Catholicism was rebaptized. These conversions were important, as they confirmed the importance of the Russian mission. The most important were conversions to Roman Catholicism. However, conversions to Byzantine Catholicism also demonstrated the superiority of Catholicism over Orthodoxy, even if the conversion were from the Roman to the Byzantine Rite within the Catholic Church.

One such case concerned Henryk Makowski,[27] a man more than 50 years old who had converted to Roman Catholicism from Orthodoxy as a youth, and was in minor orders after studying for four years at the ecclesiastical seminary in Warsaw. Presumably feeling more comfortable with Byzantine Rite worship as he aged, Makowski petitioned to transfer to that rite in October 1923. It was granted by the CEO without fanfare two months later, as Przeździecki, his bishop, wrote to the PCpR in support of his request. On the one hand, the desire of Makowski to revert to worshiping in the Byzantine Rite could have been interpreted as a rejection of the better form of Catholicism, i.e. the Roman. On the other hand, he chose to remain a Catholic rather than return to his mother church– the Orthodox Church.

The case of Anatol Arciuszkiewicz was a more powerful symbol of Catholic superiority. Arciuszkiewicz, a 48 year old bachelor and Polish citizen, had served in the Polish armed forces as a member of the Russian Orthodox Church. His Polish father, a Roman Catholic, married a Russian Orthodox woman, and agreed to raise their children– including Anatol– in accord with the Orthodox faith. Anatol petitioned the PCpR in Rome in 1933 to become Catholic, in order to be more like his father, to blend in better with Poles, and to gain the indulgence for the 1,900th

[27]AA.EE.SS., PCpR 42/245: 32-35.

anniversary of the resurrection of the Lord.[28] Of course, the PCpR did not acknowledge the nationalist reasons for his conversion, and directed that he present himself to his ordinary in Poland to be admitted into the Latin Rite of the Catholic Church.[29]

Even if the mission in Russia was precarious, conversions like that of Henryk Makowski and Anatol Arciuszkiewicz affirmed the conviction of the PCpR that Catholicism was the True Faith, and that hope existed for the Russian mission. The aforementioned dispensations were the institutional expression of that hope, which did help Catholics in difficult situations. Those Catholics in Russia who could not keep the fast were dispensed from them,[30] and *Viaticum* could be carried to the dying in secret,[31] rather in a large burse in front of the chest of the minister visible to all. Latin priests who did not have faculties from Byzantine bishops were given the authority to hear confessions of Catholics of any rite who were in extraordinary need.[32] The response to the dangers to the faith and to the faithful in Russia reinforced the image of Russia as a dangerous place in need of reform.

The rhetoric of desperation concerning Russia succeeded in moving the hearts of many Catholics, including Elsa Wengel, a thirty-five year old German-born immigrant to the United States. As a younger woman, she had been a member of the Carmelite order, but left it, claiming that God had told her that this was not her true vocation. After spending time in various other

---

[28]AA.EE.SS., PCpR, 16/103: 96.

[29]AA.EE.SS., PCpR, 16/103: 100.

[30]AA.EE.SS., PCpR 32/204: 60.

[31]AA.EE.SS., PCpR 32/204: 60.

[32]AA.EE.SS., PCpR 32/204: 60.

congregations, she emigrated to the United States and began working in a tubercular hospital, St. Anthony's, in the Woodhaven section of Queens, NY. While there, Wengel– who had begun calling herself Sister Mary Immaculata– claimed that God had told her to found a congregation for the conversion of Russia, and that she should begin by going to Franklin Square (on Long Island), where she would find a house. She did in fact find one, and purchased it.[33]

Convinced that this experience confirmed this as her vocation, she traveled to Rome in the summer of 1931 to meet with d'Herbigny, with the desire to obtain permission to open a house for third order Carmelite missionaries to Russia in Berlin, and if this were to be impossible, in Monaco, Bavaria. He was sufficiently impressed with her social work on Long Island and her zeal to serve the Russian mission, that he also arranged an audience for her with Pius XI. Wengel interpreted these experiences as tacit approval of her plan; the Vatican, however, claimed that she did not receive such approval.

The magisterium found Wengel suspicious and her work problematic because she claimed direct inspiration from God, and did not have a religious superior. Because her house fell within the Diocese of Brooklyn, Wengel fell under the authority of Bishop Thomas Molloy (1884-1956), who was consecrated its auxiliary in 1920 and became its bishop the following year. He reacted unfavorably to her plans for a Russian mission, and rather than tell her "no," he referred her the director of the Catholic Near East Welfare Association, Rev. James O'Reilly. He, in turn, consulted consulted Patrick Cardinal Hayes (1867-1938), whose opinion was also negative. He asserted that, "this woman ought not to receive encouragement. Women of her

[33]AA.EE.SS., PCpR 38/225: 56-58.

type... bring the church into disrepute and cause serious trouble with the civil authorities."[34]

O'Reilly wrote, not to d'Herbigny under whose authority this situation fell, but to Mgr. Cicognani, the assessor to CEO. The subsequent action of Cicognani, whatever it was, elicited a politically expedient response from the PCpR in November 1932: Wengel would have to procure the permission of her local ordinary for any work she would undertake.[35] Thus, the PCpR neither approved of nor forbade her work. D'Herbigny, given his initial enthusiasm, thought it best to require local ordinaries, rather than the PCpR, to tell her that should could not proceed.

Wengel responded to this stonewalling by attempting to make herself, and therefore her project, more acceptable to the magisterium. Early in 1933, she petitioned Mother Maria Josaphata, the superior of a Greek Rite Convent of the Sisters of St. Basil the Great in Fox Chase, near Philadelphia, PA, for temporary residence. Wengel desired to live and experience Byzantine Catholicism for only a few weeks, with the hope that it would demonstrate her ability to adapt to the cultural and spiritual requirements of the mission. The logic behind this was not unlike that which justified the official program for seminiarians studying at the PIO and living at the Russicum (analyzed previously).

Mother Josaphata agreed, with the proviso that Wengel bring with her a letter from her religious superior or ordinary granting her permission. It is unclear whether or not Mother Josaphata was aware of the church politics surrounding Wengel. Nonetheless, her demand that Wengel produce official permission was tantamount to a rejection.

---

[34]AA.EE.SS., PCpR 38/225: 57.

[35]AA.EE.SS., PCpR 38/225: 59.

Meanwhile, Vatican officials had kept tabs on her. Francis Peter Bucys, M.I.C.[36] (1872-1951), the titular bishop of Olimpus residing in Rome, had earlier been charged by Pius XI to study the situation of Russian immigrants in the United States.[37] His opinion was an important factor in permanently marginalizing Wengel. In August 1933, Bucys argued that the Franciscan Friars and Sisters of Greymoor in Garisson, NY, already had both the people– 102 professed sisters and 17 novices– and the means to undertake a Russian mission. He also noted that other institutions, though not as capable, also existed: the aforementioned convent in Fox Chase, and another in Factoryville, PA.[38] By the time d'Herbigny was dismissed from the PCpR, Wengel had been effectively precluded from establishing her version of a Russian mission in the United States, let alone Europe. Tardini, who succeeded d'Herbigny as the president of the PCpR, continued the policy of forcing Wengel to petition local ordinaries for permission, and made it explicit that she did not have the support of the PCpR.[39]

The case of Elsa Wengel demonstrates that maintenance of Catholic structural, institutional integrity was a concern that was prior to service. When Rev. O'Reilly confronted Wengel with the difficulties that come with founding a new order, she rightly responded that all new orders face such difficulties. Like Ignatius of Loyola, she began spiritual work as a laywoman and subsequently sought approval. Like Ignatius, she experienced institutional

---

[36]Marian Fathers of the Immaculate Conception of the Most Blessed Virgin Mary, est. 1673 in Poland.

[37]Loyola University Chicago: Archives and Special Collections Index: UA1980.34. Stable URL: http://www.luc.edu/media/lucedu/archives/pdfs/ccesrussian.pdf.

[38]AA.EE.SS., PCpR 38/226: 10.

[39]AA.EE.SS., PCpR 38/226: 20-21, 24.

resistance that highlighted her personal spiritual experiences as problematic. Unlike Ignatius, she did not procure a bull of institution from the Holy See for approval for her newly imagined order and its work. Likely, her practice of wearing a habit and calling herself Sr. Maria Immaculata was off-putting to the magisterium and their functionaries. These visual and audial public markers implied an authority the church claimed she did not have. Rather than correct her and insist on a conformity to canon law, church officials chose instead to marginalize her without proffering any explanation. Her public performance of piety was not meant to reject the values of the Church; rather, it was an overzealous acceptance which, when conflated with her belief that she was doing the will of God, could be used to label her as crazy. Ultimately, the unwillingness of Wengel to give up ownership of and responsibility for her Russian mission brought her into conflict with church authorities, unlike Maria Lenganeur (mentioned above), who operated within the Roman Catholic ecclesial structure in accord with established codes of behavior.

While the Roman curia and their appointees in various dicasteries and commissions codify and regulate expected behavior– as with the cases noted above, the most common agents who reinforced expected behavior have been local parish priests. The trust which has been placed in them by their diocesan and Roman superiors comes in part from the discipline of celibacy. The ability to remain continent, i.e. abstain from all sexual activity, has implied a strong dedication to the Church and its mission. Once again, the stricter discipline of the Catholic Church, in contradistinction from the "more lax" requirements of Byzantine priests, confirmed the superiority of Catholicism.

Clerical celibacy was one socially identifiable marker which easily distinguished Roman

Rite from the Byzantine Rite or Orthodox priests. Celibacy, i.e. chaste continence, was a long-standing intrinsic requirement which Rome demanded of its sub-deacons, deacons, priests, and bishops, that is, its clerics in major orders. Contrarily, the Byzantine Churches developed a theology which required only its bishops to be celibate. The PCpR would be able to claim the Catholic approach to celibacy was more spiritually rich, and therefore better, than that of the Byzantine Churches.

Although the Catholic and Orthodox Churches shared a common theological heritage until their late medieval schism, their management of clerical celibacy developed differently. Scholars of this issue tend toward two poles of thought, established by the debate between Gustav Bickell (1838-1906), who argued that clerical celibacy had divine origins which could be traced to the Apostolic period, and Franz-Xavier Funk (1821-1907), who later contended that clerical celibacy was only a matter of church order and ecclesiastical discipline.[40] Both Catholic and Orthodox thinkers tended toward the position Funk argued, and doctrinal formulations in both churches upheld the ideal of clerical celibacy.

Celibacy was meant to nurture the spiritual and starve the carnal aspects of human nature. While ecclesial authorities appealed to scripture as the theological foundation of celibacy, no certain conclusions can be drawn from scripture concerning the marital status of the Apostles,[41]

---

[40]Alfons Maria Cardinal Stickler, *The Case for Clerical Celibacy: Its Historical Development and Theological Foudnations*, trans. Fr. Brian Ferme (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1995), pp. 15-16.

[41]Christian Cochini, S.J., *Apostolic Origins of Priestly Celibacy*, preface Alfons M. Stickler, trans. Nelly Marans (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1990), pp. 82-83.

including Peter.[42] The ideal of continence was maintained to preserve the purity of clerics who served at Eucharistic liturgies, making them more clearly an *alter Christus*. Both Churches recognized the Council of Nicea (325), and its canon 3, which is as follows:

> The Great Council has strictly forbidden any bishop, priest, or deacon, or any member of the clergy from having a sub-introduced woman (*syneisaktos*) unless she be a mother, a sister, aunt, or a person who is above suspicion.[43]

Underlying this pronouncement was that clerics, in both major and minor orders, not only be celibate, but also beyond the possibility of reproach. However, the Eastern Churches disagreed with Rome concerning how to understand and to uphold clerical celibacy.

Both churches distinguished between doctrinal and disciplinary questions, and celibacy fell primarily, but not entirely, under the latter. East and West had different structural mechanisms to address failures of the major clerics to live in continence, in accord with canon 3. Papal authority either itself upheld clerical celibacy, or upheld the decisions of regional or local councils which upheld celibacy. Nonetheless, the benefice system– a product of feudalism– allowed unworthy men to become clerics, and hold office with a great degree of assurance that they would hold it for life. The Gregorian attempts at reform of this "Nicolaitism,"[44] as well as

---

[42]Matt. 8:14 speaks of his mother in law. However, that does not imply that Peter necessarily had a wife while an apostle of Jesus; he could have been– as was traditionally attributed to Paul– a widower.

[43]Roman Cholij, *Clerical Celibacy in East and West* (Worcester, England: Billing & Sons, Ltd., 1989), p. 78.

[44]The pejorative term used by Gregorian reformers to denote the practice of clergy either to be married or to have a concubine, which opposed the value of purity by not abstaining from sex.

simony and lay investiture,[45] became a stimulus for the complex canonical efforts upholding celibacy, which reached their maturity in the Second Lateran Council (1139).[46] While the Catholic Church portrayed the wide-spread practice of clerical marriage as "concubinage," it was nonetheless prolific and widely socially accepted. Roman success at instituting the discipline of clerical celibacy upheld not only the theological values expressed scripturally and in subsequent councils– most especially that of Nicea– but helped construct the nineteenth and early twentieth century Catholic narrative of the superiority of Catholic ecclesiology, especially the Papacy.

The Eastern Churches addressed issues of celibacy at a more local level, without universal promulgation of doctrinal teaching or canons governing the praxis of celibacy. Response to lapses in the discipline of continence was therefore varied. However, the Emperor Justinian II (685-711) convoked the Second Council of Quinsext or Trullo, which the Eastern Churches regarded as authoritative. There is much in a name. "Trullo" refers to the great hall in the imperial palace in which the council convened; this emphasizes imperial involvement over doctrinal formulation and promulgation. "Quinsext," contrarily refers to the purpose of the council: to complete the work of the fifth and sixth ecumenical councils by promulgating

---

[45]Treatment of these Gregorian reforms is a highly complex issue. Schafer Williams outlines the traditional historiographical schools of Gregory VII as a reformer, Gregory as a revolutionary, and Gregory as a nexus for German-Roman cultural conflict in *The Gregorian Epoch: Reformation, Revolution, Reaction?*. Problems in European Civilization series. (Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Co., 1964). More recent scholarship has a more layered understanding. Scholars now agree that while Hildebrand sincerely saw himself as a reformer, he introduced revolutionary structural changes into the Church. Gerd Tellenbach emphasizes the importance of the revolutionary aspects in *The Church in Western Europe from the Tenth to the Early Twelfth Century*, trans. Timothy Reuter (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), while (Anglican) Rev. H.E.J. Cowdrey emphasizes the movement of reform as a means of "libertas" for the church in *Pope Gregory VII, 1073-1085 (*Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).

[46]Stickler, pp. 44-45.

disciplinary decrees in support of those councils.[47] Although a few Roman bishops attended the council, Rome regarded it as a Byzantine affair, and has never recognized it as an ecumenical council,[48] likely due its latent anti-Roman tone.[49] While canons 3, 6, and 12 were in conformity to Roman doctrine and praxis, canon 13 is a marked departure from the practice of the Roman church. The inconsistencies that followed have not been a canonical concern in the east.

Canon 13 decreed that clerics in major orders could marry and utilize the rights of marriage, except during times when they would be engaged in Eucharistic celebrations.[50] Unlike the western church, which developed the practice of daily Mass, Divine Liturgy was, and continues to be, celebrated only on Sundays and other high-ranking feast days. The inclusion of a reference to the apostles as having been married, with the inference that they exercised their marriage rights, created a theology and praxis of a moderated, non-absolute clerical celibacy in contradistinction to Rome. The claim that Orthodox practice was in accord with the more ancient discipline reinforced the Orthodox narrative of theological superiority. The sexual politics of both the Catholic and Orthodox churches helped to create a false dichotomy, in which neither church admitted to error in doctrinal teaching concerning clerical celibacy or in its praxis.

This placed the Greek Catholic Churches in an impossible position. On the one hand, they were Catholic and officially accepted Catholic doctrine. On the other, they were permitted

---

[47]Cholij, p. 5.

[48]Stickler, p. 70.

[49]For example, canon 36 reinstated canon 28 of Chalcedon, which gave New Rome (Constantinople) privileges equal to that of Old Rome; *cf*. Cholij, pp. 5-6.

[50]Stickler, p. 71.

to retain the practice of marriage by deacons and priests.[51] Their Catholic identity made them anathema to the Orthodox Church, while their Byzantine identity made them second-class Catholics. In regard to the ambiguities of the canons of Trullo/Quinsext, Cholij notes that "the discipline of absolute continence for Slav priests, if it ever was observed as a general discipline, soon disappeared."[52]

Within the context of church order and the marks of legitimate church order, it is important to pause and consider the title "uniate." The title "uniate" connotes a Byzantine Rite Catholic, i.e. an Orthodox Christian who is in communion with, or united to, the Catholic Church. Thus, reference to the west is embedded in the term, implicitly making Byzantine Rite Catholicism valuable only in comparison to the west.[53] Insofar as a Greek Catholic resembled the west, s/he was more recognizable as a Catholic. The otherness of Greek Catholic Churches extended beyond a lack of clerical celibacy, to include the old problem of the use of prozymite bread as well as the general practice of wearing beards.[54]

Their otherness within the Catholic Church was particularly poignant within the borders of both the United States and the II RP. The Roman Catholic bishops in the US imposed

---

[51]It should be noted that Byzantine ecclesiology has portrayed bishops as being married to their dioceses, and therefore, they must be celibate. Thus, bishops are drawn from monastic communities (the black clergy) rather than from married men (the white clergy). We should recall that the Russian renovationists, discussed in chap. 3, wanted to relax the discipline of continence for bishops, in order to make bishoprics available to white clergy as well.

[52]Cholij, p. 131.

[53]Thus, the nomenclature has shifted to the preferred "Greek Catholic" against "uniate."

[54]AA.EE.SS., Russia 610 P.O./5: 3. Document 3 is a booklet, and the reference can be found on p. 23 of the compound document.

celibacy upon Greek Catholic clergy in an attempt to make them "more truly Catholic," and Greek Catholic bishops in the II RP argued over the imposition of mandatory celibacy for their clergy.

During the latter half of the nineteenth century, many Slavs immigrated to the United States. While the cultural stresses concerning these Slav immigrants within the Roman rite were profound,[55] the stresses between the Roman and Byzantine rites were even more so. Many Roman Rite Catholics, priests, and bishops in the United States had immigrated from, or held a heritage from, areas that did not include Byzantine Rite Catholicism. Furthermore, Greek Catholic priests did not immigrate in large numbers with their flocks; in 1890, only ten Greek Catholic priests were in the United States, who had come from Austrian Galicia under the authority of the bishops of "Lemberg, Peremysl, Munkacs, and Eperjes."[56]

The ignorance of both Roman Catholic clergy and laity manifested itself in a patronizing and intolerant attitude toward the Greek Catholic Church, such that eight of the ten Greek Catholic priests in the United States, who had gathered in a synod in Wilkes-Barre, PA, from 17-19 October 1890, begged Rome that they not be placed under the jurisdiction of the Latin bishops and that they remain under the jurisdiction of their respective bishops in Europe. Correlatively, they asked that their church property not be signed over to the Latin Rite bishops but be "deeded

---

[55]Anthony Kuzniewski, *Faith and Fatherland: The Polish Church War in Wisconsin, 1896-1918* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1980).

[56]John Slivka, ed., "Minutes of the Synod of the Greek Catholic Clergy, 17-19 October 1890," in *Historical Mirror: Sources of the Rusin and Hungarian Greek Rite Catholics in the United States of America, 1884-1963* (Brooklyn, NY: Privately Published, 1978), p. 4.

according to state law: two trustees, [a] local pastor, and a representative of the Bishop."[57] Two months later, the chairman of the synod, Fr. Alexius Toth, accepted a posting in Minneapolis, MN, and presented himself to Bishop John Ireland. He recalled the meeting later:

> ...acting on the advice of Bishop John Valyi, I presented myself to Archbishop John Ireland [on] December 19, 1890, kissing his hand (without a genuflection that was my great mistake, which I later recognized). I handed my accreditations to the Archbishop. I well remember as he just had read that I am a Greek Rite Catholic, his hands began to tremble. It took the archbishop about 15 minutes to read my accreditations, after that, he firmly questioned me (the conversation was in Latin). Do you have a wife? I replied, no, but I had one, I am a widower. When the Archbishop heard this, he threw my documents on the table and in a loud voice shouted: I have already sent a protest to Rome not to send such priests here. I asked the Archbishop what kind of priests do you mean? The archbishop's reply was, such as you are. I replied, after all I am a Catholic priest of the Greek Rite. I am a Uniate, [and] was ordained by a valid Catholic Bishop. The Archbishop: I do not consider you, nor your bishop as a Catholic. Furthermore, there is no need here for a Greek Rite Catholic priest. It is sufficient, we have a Polish priest, he can be the priest for the Greek Rite Catholics...[58]

While the Polish priest, Jacob Pocholski met affably with Toth, he nonetheless read from the pulpit the directives from Archbishop Ireland forbidding Catholics to receive the sacraments from Toth. Toth soon left Catholic communion, and joined the Russian Orthodox Church that would later be known as the Orthodox Church of America (OCA). Such attitudes prompted many other such defections. Although these defections did not form the OCA, they helped

---

[57]*Ibid*., p. 5.

[58]Slivka, "Father Alexius Toth Abandons Catholicism in Favor of Orthodoxy," in *Historical Mirror*, pp. 6-7.

solidify the church, as about a tenth of the members of the OCA were former Greek Catholics.[59]

It was clear to the Greek Catholics and to Metropolitan Sheptyts'kyi that a Greek Rite bishop was needed to tend to the pastoral needs of Greek Rite Catholics. Sheptyts'kyi involved himself in the necessary Vatican politics, and in 1907, Propaganda Fide appointed Fr. Soter Ortynsky, a Ukrainian nationalist. After his consecration, he arrived in America in August of that same year. He led the Greek Catholic Churches, beset with ethnic tensions among the Ukrainian, pro-Russian, and Rusin peoples, until his death in 1916.

A month after his arrival, the Vatican promulgated *Ea Semper*, which had been ghost-written in the United States.[60] Among other items, it forbade Greek Rite Catholics to have a married clergy, to be self-governing, to make particular church laws, to keep Byzantine holy days and fasts, to allow Latinized Rusins to return to their native Greek Rite, and to have the right to bring children up in the Greek Rite in cases of mixed marriages, i.e. marriages between partners of differing rites.[61] In regard to mixed rite marriages, a Greek rite woman or man could follow the rite their Latin rite partners, but not vice-versa. The marriage ceremony of the Latin rite husband had to be in a Roman church, but for a Greek Catholic man could be married in either the Greek or Latin rite.[62] Additionally, among other items, the bull required Greek Rite Catholic bishops to have written permission from the Latin ordinary to visit his flock, all future Greek Rite

---

[59]Theodore G. Stylianopoulos, "The Orthodox Church in America," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, vol. 387, The Sixties: Radical Change in American Religion (Jan 1979): 43.

[60]Slivka, "Our Fight in Self Defense," in *Historical Mirror*, p. 292.

[61]Slivka, "The Roman Curia Announces the Bulla," in *Historical Mirror*, p. 66.

[62]Slivka, "Our Fight in Self Defense," in *Historical Mirror*, p. 292.

seminarians were required to be educated in Latin seminaries, and all Greek Catholic Church property had to be transferred to the diocesan Latin Bishop.[63] The Greek Rite Catholics in the United States protested *Ea Semper* for years, but to no avail, even though Church history, as it were, was on their side. The Council of Florence, the Union of Brześć, the Bulls of Leo X (1521), Clement VII (1526), Paul V (1615), Urban VII (1724), and Benedict XIV (1751), all of which defended the legitimacy and richness of Byzantine Catholicism, were simply disregarded. In the United States, outside the context of Eastern Europe, the disdain for Byzantine Catholicism by Roman Catholics stood out more clearly than in Eastern Europe itself. However, it was present there nonetheless.

In the *kresy*, the Greek Catholic Ukrainians were contending with discriminatory Polish religious policies. Within the context of the status of Greek Catholicism, tensions were present as early as the 1890s. The Greek Catholic bishops referred to the Poles as "our enemies" in local synods held in Lwów in 1891 and 1897 and in Przemyśl in 1898, and characterized the Jesuits as their greatest adversaries with respect to the Ukrainian nation and Greek Catholic Rites.[64] As has been stated before, Latinization was understood to be a means of Polonization; the Vatican recognized this.[65]

In spite of the nationalist contours of Latinization, in 1920 some Ukrainian Greek Catholic bishops met in secret in Przemyśl to consider the introduction of mandatory celibacy for clergy of their rite; those Ukrainians opposed to the this "celibacy reform" accused those bishops

---

[63] *Ibid*.

[64] AA.EE.SS., Poloni, 61 P.O./71: 60.

[65] AA.EE.SS., Stati Ecclesiastici 350 P.O./236: 57.

of wanting to distance themselves from Orthodoxy in order to placate the fledgling Polish government.[66] By 1925 (after the creation of an independent PCpR), the situation had not improved.

The Ukrainian National Committee of Eastern Galicia appealed to the Vatican Secretary of State, Gasparri, to settle the matter in favor of maintaining the tradition. The committee argued that the imposition of mandatory celibacy directly opposed the order and ideals of Ukrainian society.[67] Henryk Przeździecki, the bishop of Siedlce who had many Byzantine-Slavonic Rite parishes within his diocese, argued that such charges were simply Ukrainian nationalist propaganda.[68] In spite of the nationalist contours present in the Greek Catholic Churches, the Ukrainians could correctly appeal to church history.

The Ecclesiastical-National Ukrainian Commission presented Pope Pius XI with a professionally-printed argument refuting the legitimacy of mandatory celibacy in the Greek Catholic Church. The commission referenced promulgated the Council of Florence and papal writings: *Magnus dominus* (Clemens VIII; 1595), *Etsi pastoralis* (Benedict XIV; 1742), *Demandum coelitus* (Benedict XIV; 1743) *Allatae sunt* (Urban VIII; 1755), and *Orientalium dignitas* (Leo XIII; 1894).[69]

The commission took care to note that the provincial synod of Zamość (1720) and Pope Benedict XII in *Apostolatus officium* (1724) confirmed the teaching of the Council of Florence

---

[66]AA.EE.SS., Polonia 61 P.O./71: 39, 41.

[67]AA.EE.SS., Polonia 61 P.O./71: 30-33.

[68]AA.EE.SS., Polonia 62 P.O./71: 67-68.

[69]AA.EE.SS., Polonia 61 P.O./71: 47.

and *Magnus dominus*, which explicitly confirmed the church order of the Ruthenian Episcopate and Clergy that had come into union in Rome in the Union of Brześć. Ukrainian clergy retained the option of marriage in Eastern Europe.

In spite of the victory to retain the tradition of a married clergy in the Greek Catholic Church, the very presence of the dispute indicates that the Roman Catholic Church regarded the church order of the Greek Catholics to be, at the very least, a less perfect order than their own. From the Vatican perspective, the nationalist contours of both the Polish and Ukrainian ecclesiological positions confirmed the necessity of a Vatican-led mission to Russia.

The PCpR also worked to encourage the development of the spiritual lives of the people entrusted to their care. In both the Catholic and Orthodox churches, prayer and meditation was understood to be an extension of liturgical prayer, making it personal, but not necessarily private. Both churches trace their connection between personal and public prayer to St. Irenaeus, who taught that "'our doctrine [of the spiritual life] is in agreement with the Eucharist and confirmed by the Eucharist.'"[70] However, it is unclear whether or not western monasticism developed in conjunction with or without influence from, eastern monasticism.[71]

Operating with the Solovievan presumption that Russian Orthodoxy, including its ability to teach authentic spirituality, was corrupted, the PCpR engaged in a spiritual mission to Russia. It was undertaken with some urgency, given the laws passed by the Soviets in January 1918

---

[70]Tomáš Špidlík, *The Spirituality of the Christian East: A Systematic Handbook*, trans. Anthony P. Gythiel (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, Inc., 1986) p. 7.

[71]Jordan Aumann, O.P., *Christian Spirituality in the Catholic Tradition* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1985), p. 57.

against religion, especially those barring youth from religious practices or instruction.[72] The youth needed both catechetical materials and teachers. In regard to the former, the Pope paid for religious and spiritual books to be printed in Russian.[73] They could be easily given to Russian refugees outside of Russia, and only with great difficulty distributed in Russia itself.

Correlatively, the importance of a well-trained clergy was again made manifest. As previously discussed, the PIO had an extensive syllabus which included courses on Russian ascetism, mysticism, monastic life, and the role of a *starets* in spiritual direction.[74] And, as discussed in chapter 3, the atmosphere of the Russicum was meant to russify candidates, both culturally and spiritually. In the meantime, d'Herbigny himself, though raised Roman Catholic and thoroughly imbued with Ignatian spirituality through his Jesuit formation, gave retreats to Byzantine Christians, including one for the seminarians at the Greek college.[75]

For the seminarians at the Russicum, the dedication of the college to St. Thérèse of Liseux was a spiritual oddity which stamped them as western as much as they would be eastern. As previously discussed, the practice of linking the dedication of a building to its financial benefactors was a long standing practice in the Catholic world. Despite the Russification of the "Little Flower," rendering her as "St. Teresa Lisijskaja," Elena Aleksandrovna Izvol'skaja[76]

---

[72]AA.EE.SS., Russia 626 PO/13: 78,79.

[73]ASV (1924) 181/1: 1-7.

[74]ASV Seg. di Stato (1923) 42/1: 122-125.

[75]AA.EE.SS., PCpR 1/3: 86. Arguments from silence are weak; however, I could not find a record of a reciprocal retreat of someone from the Greek college giving a retreat at the Russicum.

[76]More popularly known in the west as Hélène Iswolsky.

noted that the Little Flower and Carmelite spirituality to be too Latin for the average Orthodox Russian. Nonetheless, St. Thérèse did have a large number of Russian followers,[77] yet they were atypical. The very existence of a cult of St. Thérèse demonstrated the fullness of the Catholic faith. The loose resemblance of St. Thérèse to the early nineteenth century Russian St. Seraphim demonstrated that Russian spirituality could be reshaped to accommodate the western style.[78]

However, this did not deter the consumption of Russian spirituality by those promoting the Catholic mission to Russia. However, nothing Catholic would be abandoned by those consuming Russian spirituality; Russian spirituality would be an addition. The most fundamental item was the "Jesus Prayer." Thomas Aquinas described as 'the heart of Orthodoxy,' and it is as follows: "'Lord Jesus Christ, Son of God, have mercy upon me' ('a sinner,' the Russians add)."[79] The noted church historian of Byzantine spirituality, Špidlík, notes that western Christians came to know the prayer through *The Way of the Pilgrim*, acknowledged by tradition to have been written by a late-nineteenth century[80] Russian peasant who learns to pray without ceasing (1 Thess 5:17) under the guidance of a *starets*.

The story is organized according to the accepted progress and maturation of prayer: from

---

[77]Constantine Simon, *Russicum: Pioneers and Witnesses of the Struggle for Christian Unity in Eastern Europe 2* (Rome: Opere Religiose Russe, 2002), pp. 58-59.

[78]Paul-Marie of the Cross, O.C.D., *Carmelite Spirituality in the Teresan Tradition*, trans. Kathryn Sullivan, R.S.C.J., rev., ed. preface Steven Payne, O.C.D. (Washington, DC: ICS Publications, Institute of Carmelite Studies, 1997).

[79]Špidlík, *The Spirituality of the Christian East*, pp. 317, 321 fn. 22.

[80]Mention is made of the Crimean War.

oral prayer to mental prayer to the prayer of the heart.[81] Fedotov maintained that although the story is told from the first person perspective of a Russian peasant narrator, the author was much more sophisticated; he noted the presence not only of the "Russian idiom," but elements of Alexandrian mysticism and even Western romanticism,[82] all to promote the hesychastic method.[83]

The Way of the Pilgrim, translated into many languages at least since 1928,[84] was available to the seminarians of the Russicum, from which they gleaned simplistic lessons not only of the spiritual life, but of pre-Soviet peasant life. The preface, which the recognized spiritual authority Walter Ciszek[85] wrote for a 1978 translation of *The Way of the Pilgrim*,[86] suggests that he was at most unaware or at least dismissive of dangers and misuse which concerned many Orthodox authorities, and naive in his understanding of nineteenth century Russia.

---

[81]Špidlík, *The Spirituality of the Christian East*, p. 317.

[82]G.P. Fedotov, ed., *A Treasury of Russian Spirituality* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1950), pp. 280-82.

[83]The spiritual development of a person through solitary prayer, ideally in the desert.

[84]Špidlík, p. 325, fn. 41.

[85]Ciszek wrote two autobiographical accounts with the assistance of Daniel L. Flaherty, SJ: *With God in Russia* (New York: Image Books, 1964) and *He Leadeth Me* (New York: Image Books, 1975), in which he attempted to write about his own pilgrim wanderings and path to understanding and living more deeply the will of God. Posthumous writings are found in *With God in America: The Spiritual Legacy of an Unlikely Jesuit*, ed. John M. DeJak and Mark Lindeijer, S.J. (Chicago: Loyola Press, 2016.)

[86]*The Way of a Pilgrim*, trans. Helen Bacovcin with a preface by Walter J. Ciszek, S.J. (New York: Image Books, 1978), pp. vii-ix.

In regard to the former, many Orthodox had used the prayer as a sort of talisman, which is contrary to Orthodox spiritual practice. Orthodox spiritual masters advocated the use of a *starets* to ensure orthodoxy of prayer,[87] even as many readers of the novelette missed or dismissed the role of the *starets* in the novel itself. Ciszek did not mention these in his introduction, leaving the reader of the work to face the spiritual danger on his own. In regard to the latter, *The Way of the Pilgrim* presents an image of nineteenth century Russia to teach spiritual lessons, not to give an historically accurate portrayal.[88] Even with his many years in the Soviet Union, a country he even professed to love, the early imprint of westernized Orthodox spirituality taught at the Russicum remained.

As stated in previous chapters, by the late 1920s, it was clear the Soviet government was not going to collapse and that they had a firm hold on their territory. The historiographical cycle proposed by Walsh (analyzed in chap. 4) appeared to be accurate. From the perspective of the PCpR, Russia remained a dangerous place, and in need of prayer. The Catholic faithful had been praying for the conversion of Russia since the promulgation of the Fatima devotions, and indulgences were offered for those who prayed for those persecuted in Russia.[89] In a sense, salvation would come from the wellspring of Catholic prayer. But it would have to be accepted by the average Russian, who was often married.

Marriage has been and continues to be an important social institution, since it is the structure in which legal rights for both church and state, property and other economic rights, and

---

[87]Špidlík, pp. 319-20.

[88]Fedotov, pp. 282.

[89]PCpR 1/3: 74.

gender status intersect. Marriage is deeply personal for the couple involved, but placed within a social matrix which includes many people who the couple does not know. Both in the metropole and in the colony, marriage legislation was therefore an efficient means to exercise authority over society. While legislators often understood the metropole, they did not understand the colonial societies over which they exercised their authority. Although the insights by Marlene Dobkin arise out of second wave feminism, they are nonetheless useful for understanding the problems the PCpR faced when dealing with marriage questions. She observed that

> the expressed purpose of this [marriage] legislation was to alter the traditional role of women in French Africa to meet the standards of French society. Far too often, however, the French lacked knowledge of indigenous customs and ignored traditional patterns of behavior. They promulgated legislation which resulted in conflict, upheaval, and disorientation in many of those same societies who were to benefit from these laws.[90]

While the members of the PCpR had knowledge of Russian, Bolshevik, and Orthodox forms and principles of marriage, the soft-Orientalist shading of their understanding caused many of the same problems that the French colonialists had in Africa, prompting them to seek advice from canon lawyers concerning marriage problems of Russian converts and emigres.

The Soviet Russian government was quite open about its attitudes toward marriage and the family, as it published pamphlets on Soviet Marriage Law for western consumption. While an official government publication on marriage laws might give the impression of both a

---

[90]Marlene Dobkin, "Colonialism and the Legal Status of Women in Francophonic Africa," *Cahiers d'Études Africaines*, 8, no. 31 (1968): 390.

unanimity among and importance for Bolshevik party leaders with regard to marriage laws, Elizabeth Waters argues that this was not the case.[91] The prevalence of traditional Russian village life, much of which existed outside of party influence, meant that the old attitudes and customs remained, but were eclipsed by more pressing issues such as unemployment and land reform. Additionally, Bolshevik officials themselves were divided along various lines: higher vs. lower party rankings, urban vs. rural, Russian vs. non-Russian, and metropolitan vs. provincial.[92] This division within the party reflected the fractured discourse in Soviet society in general throughout the 1920s concerning love, marriage, sexuality, and the family. Opinions tended toward diametrically opposed positions, between a liberal, open position on the one hand and a conservative, almost puritanical attitude on the other.[93]

M.M. Wolff succinctly summarized and evaluated Soviet marriage law as it pertained to creating a new social order.[94] He noted that the marriage law from the old order, i.e. pre-revolutionary Russia, was rooted in the canon law of the Russian Orthodox Church, the contours of which will be discussed below, in conjunction with Roman Catholic canon law. For the moment, suffice it to say that no civil marriages existed in Russian law, and that divorce was difficult, but possible within a strict canonical framework. It is important to recall first that the

---

[91]Elizabeth Waters, "The Bolsheviks and the Family," *Contemporary European History* 4, no. 3 (Nov. 1995): 275-91.

[92]*Ibid*., p. 276.

[93]Ronald D. LeBlanc, "Trapped in a Spider's Web of Animal Lust: Human Bestiality in Lev Gumilevsky's *Dog Alley*," *Russian Review* 65, no. 2 (April 2006): 171.

[94]M.M. Wolff, "Some Aspects of Marriage and Divorce Laws in Soviet Russia," *Modern Law Review* 12, no. 3 (July 1949): 190-96.

religious tribunals which reviewed divorce cases fell ultimately under the authority of the Holy Synod, which was legally a part of Russian government administration, and secondly, the PCpR understood this arrangement to imply the problematic nature of Orthodoxy. With regard to private property, pre-revolutionary marriage law was the mechanism which maintained individual property rights.

The Bolsheviks began altering marriage laws in late December 1917, only a little more than a month after they came into power. While only civil marriages were recognized as legal, religious ceremonies were allowed– as in countries like France[95]– as a private affair between the couple, both of whom now had to be at least eighteen years of age. (Under the old regime, a man had to be eighteen years old, but the woman only needed to be sixteen.) The shift from a religious to a civil ceremony marginalized the social influence of religious authorities, especially the Orthodox, and the requirement that the marriage had to be registered civilly allowed the government to compile useful vital statistics.[96]

The new understanding of property changed marriage laws in two ways. Firstly, the legal rights of women were raised to be equal to that of men. Whatever chattel was hers before marriage did not transfer to her husband as "the community of property" in the marriage. Secondly, distinctions between the legitimacy and illegitimacy of children was abolished. Children born out of wedlock in Soviet Russia had the same rights, in every respect, as children

---

[95] *The Marriage Laws of Soviet Russia: Complete Text of [the] First Code of Laws of the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic dealing with Civil Status and Domestic Relations, Marriage, and the Family and Guardianship* (New York: The Russian Soviet Government Bureau, 1921), p. 9.

[96] *The Marriage Laws of Soviet Russia*, p. 10.

born within the confines of marriage.[97] Abortion was also made legal.[98]

Additionally, divorce was much easier. Mutual consent or even the desire of one spouse was sufficient grounds when presented before a local court to be granted a divorce. When the Soviet marriage code was revised in 1926, it was even easier to procure a divorce, as it did away even with this minimal court procedure.[99] Moving religion from the public to the private sphere also meant removing any and all religious contours from the legalities of marriage. Thus, from the perspective of the Soviet government, religious sisters and the black clergy (i.e. monks) were free to marry.[100] Contrarily, from the Catholic and Orthodox ecclesiastical point of view, this was not so.

If any general summary can be made in regard to Soviet marriage law, it is that with the abolition of private property and the relegation of religion to the private sphere, the government shifted responsibility of the relationship of marriage toward the couple, bound by nothing but their own consciences and desires. Even with later adjustments re-establishing inheritance rights of children in 1922 and 1926, marriage in Soviet Russia had underwent decidedly radical break from the older, pre-revolutionary codes. However, Andrea Stevenson Sanjian maintains that

> Family legislation was initially transformational in nature even though the laws

---

[97]*Ibid.,* pp. 12-13.

[98]Wolff, "Marriage and Divorce Laws," p. 293. Note, however, that in 1936, abortion was made illegal. Correlatively, assistance for expectant mothers became a legal right. This same year, changes in the laws for divorce became more strict.

[99]*Ibid*.

[100]Wolff, "Marriage and Divorce Laws," p. 291.

> themselves were rarely very radical: reforming pre-revolutionary practice usually brought Soviet law into accord with Western standards rather than exceeding them. A rare exception was the 1920 legalization of abortion."[101]

The reaction of the PCpR toward Soviet marriage law was one of abhorrence, and which was not compared to the situation in western Europe. Surprisingly, abortion was not what most abhorred the PCpR, but the ability to divorce and remarry, a phenomenon also present in Russian Orthodox canon law. The so-called Bolshevik attack on marriage, as the PCpR understood it, was another expression of the ideological conflict between Christianity and Bolshevism discussed in the previous chapter. The Bolsheviks had not only begun to undermine belief in the theoretical foundations of religion, but also the practical practices of belief. The PCpR, which knew Soviet marriage law well,[102] thought the ability to divorce was the chief means of undermining Christian values. This sentiment was echoed in the Jesuit journal, *The Irish Monthly*, which criticized the divorce decrees in the Bolshevik Family Code as turning men into beasts and rendering women desperate.[103] In another issue released two years later, an author goes so far to assert that, "Not only is the family not recognized as a social unit, but family life is positively discouraged."[104]

The PCpR saw a certain continuity between the lax approach to the sanctity and

---

[101]Andrea Stevenson Sanjian, "Social Problems, Political Issues: Marriage and Divorce in the USSR," *Soviet Studies* 34, no. 4 (1991): 631.

[102]AA.EE.SS., PCpR 86/418: 8-79, 86/419: 7-8, 24-25.

[103]Irish Jesuit Province, "Catholic Notes: Divorce in Bolshevik Russia," *The Irish Monthly* 54, no. 639 (Sep 1926): 460-61.

[104]E. Cahill, "Notes on Christian Sociology: The Bolshevik Regime (Continued)," *The Irish Monthly* 56, no. 661 (July 1928): 376.

inviolability of marriage by the Orthodox Church (in comparison to the Roman Catholic), and the licentious approach to marriage by the Bolsheviks. Although the Catholic and Orthodox Churches share a genealogical heritage of canon law, with historically divergent contexts and eventual schism came separate canonical codes based on separate sensibilities.

Experts of canon law of both east[105] and west[106] maintain that their legal traditions have their roots in the councils and documents of the early Church, especially the Council of Nicea in 325. As the Christian church moved from disfavor to official tolerance to its Establishment in the Roman Empire in the fourth century, its legal status with respect to the state also shifted. While church and state maintained authority in their own realms, i.e. *regnum* and *sacerdotium*, there were to work in harmony with one another, each mutually supporting the authority of the other.[107] However, with the fall of *regnum* in the west and the growing internal alienation between Rome and Constantinople within *sacerdotium*, the Church of the Empire, the canonical traditions of Rome and Constantinople developed independently from one another, and this included the issue of marriage and divorce.

G. Robina Quale noted that beyond exhorting married partners to fidelity and the unmarried to celibacy, the early Christian church "showed little interested in regulating

---

[105]John H. Erickson, *The Challenge of Our Past: Studies in Orthodox Canon Law and Church History* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1991), pp. 12-18.

[106]James A. Coriden, *An Introduction to Canon Law* (New York: Paulist Press, 1991), pp. 9-12.

[107]Coriden, pp. 12-13, and Erickson, pp. 46-47.

marriage."[108] Much later, in the late fourth century, Christians began to desire a priestly blessing upon a newly married couple, and that desire became universal much later, in the eighth century. Only in the ninth century, well after the fall of the western Empire, did the Roman Church construct a formal marriage ceremony. It is important to note that after this point until modernity, the Roman Catholic and Orthodox Churches and not the state held authority over marriage— and divorce. In the Eastern Roman Empire, a formal religious marriage ceremony was not required until later.[109] For couples who enter into marriage and remain married, the religious and legal particulars are not as important as for those couples who desire a divorce.

The Christian scriptures emphasize the impossibility of divorce, and canon law from east and west reflect this. Neither adultery nor many years of absence were sufficient reasons to dissolve a marriage. Quale noted that this contrasted sharply with the Imperial legal code, and in the sixth century, rather than the religious code adapting itself to the legal, the legal code partially adapted itself to the religious.[110] Over time, the western church recognized the possibility of the dissolution of a marriage for impotence, five years' absence in foreign captivity, or the desire of a spouse to enter religious life, i.e. "return" to the celibate state. In the east, adultery was later accepted as a reason for divorce (based on a particular interpretation of Matthew 19:4) as well as impotence and heresy.[111]

---

[108]G. Robina Quale, *A History of Marriage Systems* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1988), p. 170.

[109]*Ibid.*

[110]*Ibid.*, p. 171.

[111]*Ibid.*

Obviously, the Russian Orthodox Church falls within the tradition of the East, but additionally, developed its own canons with respect to marriage and divorce. Wolff noted that while Russian Imperial marriage laws were defined civilly, they had canonical origins and all marriages in Russia were legal only if they were performed by a Church.[112] With regard to divorce, ecclesiastical tribunals and not civil courts had jurisdiction, and divorces were chiefly granted on the grounds of adultery, incapacity, convictions for penal offenses in which the prisoner was deprived of civil rights, the decision to take holy orders or the veil, and unknown absences for five years.[113] Protestant marriages could be dissolved on slightly wider grounds. Divorce for Jews and Muslims was regulated by their respective religious laws. Roman Catholic marriages, in accord with Roman Catholic canon law, could not be dissolved, with the exception of an unconsummated marriage.[114]

Theologically, for the Roman Catholic Church, the existence of a marriage was– and is– rooted in Aristotelian metaphysics: the hylomorphic union of matter and form. The matter of the marriage consists in the will of those contracting marriage: the understanding that the union would be a unitive, loving, permanent union which would have the intention of producing children. The form of the marriage is much more complicated. For those whose religions– Christian and non-Christian alike– require a specific religious rite, then that rite is required to be validly married. However, because marriage has been considered to be part of the natural order, those who either do not confess a religion or those who confess a religion that does not require a

---

[112]Wolff, "Some Aspects of Marriage and Divorce Laws," p. 290.

[113]*Ibid.*

[114]*Ibid.*

specific marriage rite contract marriage validly in whatever form they chose. The Pio-Benedictine (1917) Code of Canon Law reflected these principles, laying out the practical laws of marriage in canons 1012-1143. While the Catholic Church has denied the possibility of divorce, it has acknowledged the possibility of annulment, reasoning that if matter, form, or both were lacking, then the presumed marriage did not exist, and the couple was free to (re-)marry.

Whatever marriage cases came to the attention of the commission before 1928 did not garner enough attention to warrant an extended consideration of the situation of marriage in Soviet Russia. However, in that year, a case of consanguinity of the collateral line involving an uncle and his nieces came to the attention of the PCpR.[115] Because that relationship was of the 2º of consanguinity, and canon law forbad marriage in the collateral line through the 3º,[116] the PCpR maintained that such a marriage would be invalid, leaving unsaid that a dispensation was simply impossible. Furthermore, the PCpR upheld the value prohibiting such marriages in order to care for souls and maintain the sanctity fo the family and Christian society– which Soviet Russia was not.

The marriage, if it were to have taken place, would have been incestuous and again suggested the barbarity of Soviet Russia and the inability of the Russian Orthodox Church to have taught proper morals. As the anti-religious campaign in Russia became more vibrant, the PCpR began analyzing marriage in Russia.

The overall practical concern was to determine, for couples wanting an annulment, was

---

[115]AA.EE.SS., PCpR 1/4: 74.

[116]*The 1917 or Pio-Benedictine Code of Canon Law*, trans. Edward N. Peters (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2001), canon 1076, §2.

whether the marriage was contracted validly or invalidly.[117] The former prevented remarriage, while the latter allowed for it. In order to address this issue, in 1930 Michel d'Herbigny sent letters to bishops who were caring for Russians in their dioceses and to select canon lawyers, concerning six issues which he considered pressing:[118] (1) those who were divorced with the approval of "schismatic" Russian Orthodox clergy, (2) those who desired to separate because of a state of unhappiness, assuming it would be possible because the "schismatic" Russian Orthodox Church granted divorce, (3) refugees who had married only for some convenience with the intention of divorcing after some time, a practice common among university students, (4) those who married to legitimize children or to please their relatives, (5) those who, "during the terror of the [Russian] revolution,"[119] married for help and comfort or to get a foreign passport more easily, and (6) whether or not dispensations for various impediments to marriage granted by the Russian Orthodox Church were valid, especially since by 1930 the Russian Orthodox Church had itself fell into schism, due to disagreements concerning accommodation (which were discussed in chapter 3).

D'Herbigny asked that those responding include historical, psychological, and canonical conditions in their responses. The PCpR, under the leadership of d'Herbigny, looked for useful principles by which they could judge marriage cases, not for information to create a comprehensive policy. Repeatedly, a concern for the individuals petitioning for annulment was maintained by insisting on judging *via* a case-by-case basis. Yet the ability to judge and the

---

[117]AA.EE.SS., PCpR 86/417: 37, 42.

[118]AA.EE.SS., PCpR 86/417: 40-41.

[119]AA.EE.SS., PCpR 86/417: 41.

actual exercise of judgment of these cases was a performance of superiority of the Catholic Church over the Bolshevik state and the Russian Orthodox Church.

While the PCpR regarded Soviet law to be dehumanizing, as it alienated people from contracting a genuine marriage which was their right through natural law, the commission nonetheless held out for the possibility that a couple could contract a valid marriage. Soviet marriages were judged to be invalid if a couple married with the understanding that this was a legal contract valid only as long as both desired the union. However, if a couple married with the understanding that the marriage was indissoluble, then it the possibility of validity existed.[120] However, the PCpR recognized that their attitude would be difficult to establish, since at the time of the marriage, only the legal registrar would have any meaningful interaction with the couple.[121]

The same logic held for those who married foreigners in order to escape "Soviet barbarity" or for those who married for comfort in order to face inescapable "Soviet barbarity." For those who married without the intention of permanence, then the marriages could be judged invalid. This sense of impermanence was more common for those marrying foreigners to escape Soviet Russia.[122] For those who married for comfort in the midst of a barbaric situation for which there was no foreseeable end, establishing the intention of an impermanent union was much more difficult. Linking the issue of dissolubility to validity emphasized the social character of marriage, which in turn made the implicit judgement upon the authority which upheld those values. The same held true with regard to the attitudes of the PCpR toward the

---

[120]AA.EE.SS., PCpR 86/417: 37.

[121]AA.EE.SS., PCpR 86/419: 28-29.

[122]AA.EE.SS., PCpR 86/417: 44, 47.

Russian Orthodox Church.

Official opinions from which the PCpR formulated its attitudes varied widely. The most hostile was a *de facto* dismissal of the authority of the Russian Orthodox clergy concerning the dispensation from impediments with the claim that the Holy See had neither explicitly nor implicitly extended faculties to dispense to the bishops or priests of the Russian Orthodox Church.[123] This claim is rooted in the belief that separation from the Catholic Church meant separation from all ecclesial authority. It was the minority opinion, if not a singular one.

More moderate condemnations of Russian Orthodoxy came from Henryk Insadowski of the Catholic University of Lublin, who argued that marriage in the Russian Orthodox Church was dissoluble, and, therefore, not truly marriage. This implied the problematic nature of Russian Orthodox theology and of the Russian Orthodox Church.[124] Przeździecki asserted in a more nuanced way that although matrimony was theoretically indissoluble, in practice, it was in fact dissoluble,[125] making the practice of divorce problematic, stopping short of condemning the essential belief of the Russian Orthodox Church.

The most favorable opinion came, unsurprisingly, from Metropolitan Sheptyts'kyi, who countered the popular opinion by asserting that divorce within the Orthodox Church functioned, in a practical sense, identically to annulment within the Catholic Church.[126] Consequently, the Russian Orthodox Church was not morally bankrupt, but held the same ideals and acted in the

---

[123]AA.EE.SS., PCpR 86/418: 3.

[124]AA.EE.SS., PCpR 86/418: 44.

[125]AA.EE.SS., PCpR 86/417: 57.

[126]AA.EE.SS., PCpR 86/418: 58.

same manner was the Catholic Church, making Russian Orthodoxy the moral equal of Catholicism.

Generally, the judgment concerning marriage in Soviet Russia, with respect to both Soviet law and to the legacy of Russian Orthodoxy, was negative. The PCpR maintained that Russian Orthodoxy had taught the people to accept a certain moral laxity concerning marriage because of the possibility of divorce, and in a sense, the Bolsheviks brought that laxity to its natural conclusion. This moral laxity concerning marriage was not unlike the moral laxity concerning clerical continence. Orthodoxy was regarded as being less disciplined, and when it gave way to the Soviet system, Orthodox Christians were morally unprepared to live properly, in contradistinction to the moral discipline of the Catholic Church. The judgment by the PCpR in the name of the Catholic Church demonstrated Catholic moral superiority, which in turn reinforced the superiority and rightful authority of the Roman Catholic Church.

The accusation of the spiritual and moral laxity of the Orthodox Church and the social depravity of the Soviets, in opposition to the self-sufficient and disciplined Catholic spirituality and morality, confirmed the superior nature of Catholicism for the PCpR. The necessity to provide not only spiritually but materially for the Russian people bolstered this conviction. If Russian civilization was to progress, it needed the Catholic Church.

Conclusion

With the discovery of Russia as mission territory in the late nineteenth century and the concurrent bureaucraticization of the Vatican, the need for a Papal commission to oversee a Russian mission emerged. Although it was at first a commission within the CEO which had regular work by 1922, the PCpR was made an independent commission in 1925 primarily through ecclesial politics. Mgr. d'Herbigny was a master at negotiating the political channels of the Vatican, and the difficulties surrounding Metropolitan Szeptyts'kyi helped justify the relocation of the mission center to Rome. Although the ambition of d'Herbigny and his colleagues was real, so was their desire to convert Russia, aid Russians in need both at home and abroad, and help those who had converted to become and remain good Catholics. With Papal approval, the PCpR oversaw the distribution of or themselves gave away a great deal of money, supported conversions, both individually or *en masse* at the parish level, created a systematic, doctrinal, theological rationale justifying conversion, and tried to help Russian Catholics be good Catholics, most notably by adjudicating marriage questions.

However, soft-Orientalist dynamics permeated both the creation and work of the PCpR. The ecclesial structures which the commission managed both conveyed and themselves symbolized soft-Orientalism. The creedal faith that the PCpR taught relied heavily on the thought of Soloviev, who had appropriated a soft-Orientalist view of Russia, and the code of behavior that the PCpR enforced was shaded with soft-Orientalist attitudes. While Christian churches during the interwar period commonly assumed self-sufficiency, that did not necessarily imply a lesser cultural status for the Other, especially when those churches existed within the

same culture. However, the comparisons between the Catholic and Orthodox Churches which the PCpR made rendered the Catholic Church as superior and the Orthodox Church as lesser.

Structurally, the Catholic Church in Russia, though a Christ-like suffering, was managing to survive in opposition to the Soviet government. The Orthodox Church, contrarily, fell under the control of the Soviets, and fell into schism because of it. In regard to both creedal belief and codes of behavior, the Catholic Church had preserved the fullness of the "Truth" handed down from the apostles through a strong discipline. The Orthodox Church, contrarily, had not done so; this weakened the faith and Christian behavior of the Russian people, which allowed them to fall victim to the corruption of the Soviet government, which d'Herbigny likened to the fall of Constantinople before Islam.

Much of this relied on maintaining the image of the Russian people as a barbaric race, lamented by Dostoevsky in the late nineteenth century. Rendering Russia as an exotic and dangerous place reflected the logic, but not the depth, of Western European colonial ventures, even to the extent that information about Russia was conveyed through the trope of a travel log. While the aim of the colonial project was to procure raw material to be used in production, the aim of the PCpR was, to put it bluntly, sheep steeling. Perhaps the difference between the two projects was the publically professed aim. The "White Man's Burden" was moral cover for economic interest, the sincerity of which has been debated. Contrarily and in spite of the soft-Orientalist attitudes of the PCpR, the Catholic Church sincerely wanted to save souls and provide aid to Russians when possible, both at home and abroad.

The shift from assuming self-sufficiency to a soft-Orientalist laden self-sufficiency lay not in religiously generated assumptions about Russia, but social and political ones. While

Orientalism has its roots in nineteenth century theological and archeological study, with corresponding assumptions of religious superiority of Christianity over Islam, the soft-Orientalist attitudes toward Russia would not have been possible without a secular disdain for Russia. These attitudes turned self-sufficiency into self-aggrandizement. Rather than creating theological dynamics which would encourage conversion, the existence of soft-Orientalism created or exacerbated those cultural dynamics which would discourage conversion. Indeed, such dynamics make the conversions of Russians heroic from a spiritual point of view, but could also make them dysfunctional from a psychological point of view. Within a longer time frame which includes the Second Vatican Council, the shift in ecumenical thinking from a self-sufficient disposition to a recognition of a need for an ecclesial, almost family unity imparts a reform motif to the Second Vatican Council a reform motif, in addition to its efforts to imbue the Church with *ressourcement* theology in a spirit of *aggiornomento*. However, the question of soft-Orientalism remains with respect to recent church history. While the Polish Pope Karol Wojtyła encouraged the Church to breathe with both lungs, selections from the work of Soloviev have been reprinted.

Although the dissertation focused on religious structures and themes, the importance of this study goes beyond religious history, and begs questions of interest to other sub-fields of history. The cultural anthropological perspective which underlies the work, avoids the victim-victimizer paradigm essential to religious and political histories which, respectively, narrate martyrdom or dangerous political intrigue. The fresh historiographical approach has complicated this traditional view; we no longer can speak about heroes and villains, but about people who can be both simultaneously. This may not be limited geographically. Perhaps such dynamics work in other areas of Europe, where the west gives way to a Europe that is in between "civilization"

and "barbarity": Spain begs a re-examination, as do the Balkans.

Those histories which portray martyrdom emphasize the ideological aspects of Communism, in effect rendering the Bolsheviks as clerics of atheistic, dialectical materialism. In other words, those histories understand the Bolsheviks in the way the that the PCpR understood them: as reflections of themselves, prophets thrust into the political arena. Those histories which emphasize political intrigue and espionage distort and ignore the available evidence, also assuming that the Soviets had a fully developed plan to secularize Russia from the beginning. They interpret the Bolsheviks in the way that the PCpR and Edmund Walsh understood them: ideologically committed people also committed to bringing history closer to its *telos*.

By analyzing the underlying attitudes and dispositions of the PCpR, it is possible to reinterpret not only the history of the Catholic Church and Russia, but the various other aspects involved. For example, the histories of Poland (problematic for the PCpR), Russian refugees (whose status shifted to displaced persons and then immigrants), and Byzantine-Slavonic Rite parishes outside of Eastern Europe can and should be recast. Lastly, while avoiding a Whiggish interpretation, the shift in attitude of the Catholic Church in Vatican II could and should be rethought with a consciousness of soft-Orientalism. On the one hand, a genuine respect for the Byzantine world is present. On the other, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, the decree on the Eastern Churches, was ghost-written by Rev. John Long, S.J., a Roman Catholic priest ordained in the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite rather than a bishop of one of the Eastern Churches themselves. Succinctly, the presence of soft-Orientalism extends beyond the PCpR, the specific subject of this dissertation, not only to other related subjects, but to complimentary histories. For example, a study of possible Occidentalist or soft-Occidentalist attitudes by the Russian Orthodox Church

would be useful.

This history of the PCpR is more than an historical footnote. It illuminates the historical intersection of religious and cultural attitudes meaningful beyond Catholic interwar missionary conduct, and it begs a historiographical shift to brighten that illumination. The history of the Catholic Church and Russia remains a story of conflict, but we have a better sense of why.

Bibliography

I. Archival Resources

Archives of the *Congregazione per le Chiese Orientali* (CEO). Rome, Italy.

Archives of the New England Province of the Society of Jesus.
Dineen Library, College of the Holy Cross. Worcester, MA.

Archives of the *Segretaria di Stato della Santa Sede per gli Affari Ecclesiastici Straordinari* (AA.EE.SS.). Vatican City State.

Pontificia Commissione per la Russia
Russia
Stati Ecclesiastici

Archivium Secretum Vaticanum (ASV). Vatican City State.

Segretario di Stato

II. Books

Alfeyev, Metropolitan Hilarion. *Orthodox Christianity, Volume I: The History and Canonical Structure of the Orthodox Church*. Foreword by His Holiness Alexei II, Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia. Translated by Basil Bush. Yonkers, NY: St. Vladimir's Press, 2011.

Allen, Paul Marshall. *Vladimir Soloviev, Russian Mystic*. Blauvelt, NY: Steinerbooks, 1978.

Alvarez, David *Spies in the Vatican: Espionage and Intrigue from Napoleon to the Holocaust*. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press, 2002.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. New York: Verso Press, 2006.

Anderson, Margaret Lavinia. *Practicing Democracy: Elections and Political Culture in Imperial Germany*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.

Anderson, M.S. *The Eastern Question, 1774-1923: A Study in International Relations*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1966.

Attwater, Donald. *The Christian Churches of the East, Volume I: Churches in Communion with Rome*. Milwaukee, WI: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1961.

_____. *The Christian Churches of the East, Volume II: Churches not in Communion with Rome* Milwaukee, WI: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1961.

Augustine. *The City of God: Against the Pagans*. Edited and Translated by R.W. Dyson. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Aumann, Jordan, O.P. *Christian Spirituality in the Catholic Tradition*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1985.

Baker, D. *Schism, Heresy, and Religious Protest. Papers Read at the Tenth Summer Meeting and the Eleventh Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society,* Studies in Church History 9. Cambridge, 1972.

Barker, John. "Marx." Chapter in *The Superhistorians: Makers of our Past*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1982.

Barry, Quintin. *War in the East: A Military History of the Russo-Turkish War, 1877-78*. Solihull, West Midlands, England: Helion and Co., Ltd., 2012.

Beales, Derek and Eugenio F. Biagini. *The Risorgimento and the Unification of Italy*. 2nd ed. New York: Longman, 2002.

Benedict XIV. "*Allatae sunt.*" In *The Papal Encyclicals, 1740-1878*. Edited by Claudia Carlen, I.H.M. Raleigh, NC: McGrath Publishing Co., 1981.

Berezhnaya, Lillyya. "Ruthenian Lands and the Early Modern Multiple Borderlands in Europe: Ethno-Confessional Aspect." Chapter in *Religion and the Conceptual Boundary in Central and Eastern Europe: Encounters of Faiths*. Edited by Thomas Bremer. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

Beshoner, Jeffrey Bruce. *Ivan Sergeevich Gagarin: The Search for Orthodox and Catholic Union*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2002.

Biskupski, M.B.B. *The History of Poland*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2000.

_____. *Independence Day: Myth, Symbol, and the Creation of Modern Poland*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Bonnell, Victoria E. *Iconography of Power: Soviet Political Posters under Lenin and Stalin* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.

Bourdeaux, Michael. *Opium of the People: The Christian Religion in the USSR*. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1966.

Breisach, Ernst. *Historiography: Ancient, Medieval, and Modern*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1983.

Burgess, Michael. *The Eastern Orthodox Churches: Concise Histories with Chronological Checklists of their Primates*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland and Co., Inc., 2005.

Canisius, Petrus. *Der Große Katechismus: Summa doctrinae Christianæ (1555)*. Translated and Commentary by Hubert Filser and Stephan Leimgruber. Regensburg, Germany: Schnell and Steiner, 2003.

Chadwick, Henry. *The Early Church*. New York: Penguin Books, 1993.

Chadwick, Owen. *A History of the Popes, 1830-1914*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Cheniavsky, Michael. *Tsar and People: Studies in Russian Myths*. New York: Random House, 1969.

Childs, J. Rives. *Black Lebeda: The Russian Famine Diary of ARA Kazan District Supervisor J. Rives Childs, 1921-1923*. Edited by Jamie H. Cockfield. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 2006.

Cholij, Roman. *Clerical Celibacy in East and West*. Worcester, England: Billing & Sons, Ltd., 1989.

Ciszek, Walter, S.J. *He Leadeth Me*. New York: Image Books, 1975.

_____. *With God in America: The Spiritual Legacy of an Unlikely Jesuit*. Edited by John M. DeJak and Mark Lindeijer, S.J. Chicago: Loyola Press, 2016.

_____. *With God in Russia*. With Daniel L. Flaherty, S.J. New York: Image Books, 1966.

Clark, Martin. *The Italian Risorgimento*. New York: Longman, 1998.

Clark, Victoria. *Why Angels Fall: A Journey Through Orthodox Europe from Byzantium to Kosovo.* New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000.

Cochini, Christian, S.J. *Apostolic Origins of Priestly Celibacy*. Preface by Alfons M. Stickler. Translated by Nelly Marans. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1990.

Coleman, Heather J. *Russian Baptists and Spiritual Revolution, 1905-1929*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2005.

Colley, Linda. *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837.* 3rd revised ed. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.

Congar, Yves. "Notes sur le 'Schisme oriental." Chapter in *1854-1954. L'Eglise et les Eglises. Neuf siecles de douloureuse separation entre l'Orient et l'Occident*. Vol. I Chevetogne, 1954.

Copleston, Frederick, S.J. *A History of Philosophy: From the French Enlightenment to Kant*. Vol. 6. New York: Doubleday, 1994.

_____. *Philosophy in Russia: From Herzen to Lenin and Berdyaev*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1986.

Coriden, James A. *An Introduction to Canon Law*. New York: Paulist Press, 1991.

Cowdrey, H.E.J. *Pope Gregory VII, 1073-1085*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.

Cracraft, James. *The Church Reform of Peter the Great*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1971.

Crampton, R.J. *Eastern Europe in the Twentieth Century– and After*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 1997.

Croghan, Patrick A., A.A. *The Peasant from Makeyevka: Biography of Bishop Pius Neveu, A.A.* Worcester, MA: Augustinians of the Assumption, 1982.

Danilevskii, I. IA. *Russia and Europe: The Slavic World's Political and Cultural Relations with the Germanic-Roman West*. Translated and Annotated by Stephen M. Woodburn. Bloomington, IN: Slavica, 2013.

Dawidziuk, Mikołaj. *Unia w Kuraszewie: Historia neounii w Kuraszewie na tle polityki państwa polskiego w latach 1919-1939*. Bielsk Podlaski: Stowarzyszenie Muzeum Małej Ojczyzny w Studziwodach, 2008.

Davies, Norman. *God's Playground: A History of Poland: Vol I., The Origins to 1795*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1982.

_____. *A History of Poland: Vol II., 1795 to the Present*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1982.

_____. *White Eagle, Red Star: The Polish-Soviet War, 1919-1920*. Foreword by A.J.P. Taylor. London: Orbis Books, 1983.

Decsey, Serge F. *The Melkite Church: An Historical and Ecclesiological Approach*. Preface by Archbishop Joseph Tawil. Newton, MA: Sophia Press, 1993.

Degras, Jane, ed. *Soviet Documents on Foreign Policy, 1917-1924*. Vol. 1. New York: Oxford University Press, 1951.

Deletant, Dennis and Harry Hanak, eds. *Historians as Nation-Builders: Central and South-East Europe*. London: Macmillan Press, 1988.

Denziger, Heinrich and Clemens Bannwart, S.J. *Enchiridion Symbolorum; Definitionum et Declarationum. De Rebus Fidei et Morum*. St. Louis, MO: Herder & Co., 1922.

DeVries, W. *Orient et Occident. Les sturctures ecclesiales vues dans l'histore des sept premiers conciles oecumeniques*. Paris, 1974.

Discours de la Méthode pour Bien Conduire sa Raison, et Chercher la Vérité dans les Sciences: Discourse on the Method of Conducting One's Reason Well and of Seeking the Truth in the Sciences, a Bilingual Edition and an Interpretation of René Descartes' Philosophy of Method, Edited and Translated, with and Introduction and Indexed by George Heffernan. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994.

Dornberg, John. *Central and Eastern Europe.* International Government and Politics Series. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press, 1995.

Dostoievsky, F.M. *The Diary of a Writer*. Translated and Annotated by Boris Brasol. New York: George Braziller, 1954.

Duff, Charles and Dmitri Makaroof. *Russian for Beginners*. New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1973.

Dunn, Dennis. *Catholic Church and Russia: Popes, Patriarchs, Tsars, and Commissars*, Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2004.

Dvornik, Francis. *The Making of Central and Eastern Europe*. Gulf Breeze, FL: Academic International Press, 1974.

_____. *The Photian Schism: History and Legend*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1948.

_____. *The Slavs in European History and Civilization*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1962.

Dziewanowski, M.K. *Poland in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1977.

Erickson, John H. *The Challenge of Our Past: Studies in Orthodox Canon Law and Church History*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1991.

Evans, Sir Arthur. *The Slavs and European Civilisation: A Lecture Delivered at Sion College, Feb. 23, 1878*. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1878.

Fedotov, George P. *The Russian Religious Mind: Kievan Christianity, the 10th to the 13th Centuries*. Vol. 3. Belmont, MA: Nordland Publishing Co., 1973.

Fedotov, G.P., ed. *A Treasury of Russian Spirituality* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1950.

Figes, Orlando. *Crimea: The Last Crusade*. New York: Allen Lane (Penguin Books), 2010.

[The] First Victims of Communism: White Book on the Religious Persecution in Ukraine. Rome: Analecta O.S.B.M, 1953.

"First Dogmatic Constitution on the Church of Christ." In *Dogmatic Canons and Decrees: Authorized Translations of the Dogmatic Decrees of the Council of Trent, the Decree on the Immaculate Conception, the Syllabus of Pope Pius IX, and the Decrees of the Vatican Council*. Rockford, Il: Tan Books and Publishers, 1977; Originally published by the Devin-Adair Co., New York, 1912.

Fisher, H.H. *The Famine in Soviet Russia, 1919-1923: The Operations of the American Relief Administration*. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1927.

Fitzgerald, Thomas E. *The Ecumenical Movement: An Introductory History*. Westport, CT: Praeger Conn, 2004.

de Francesco, Antonio. *The Antiquity of the Italian Nation: The Cultural Origins of a Political Myth in Modern Italy, 1796-1943*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Frattini, Eric. *The Entity: Five Centuries of Secret Vatican Espionage*. Translated by Dick Cluster. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2004.

Frazee, Charles A. *Catholics and Sultans: The Church and the Ottoman Empire, 1453-1923*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Feuerbach, Ludwig. *The Essence of Christianity*. Translated by George Eliot. Introduction by Karl Barth. Foreword by H. Richard Niebuhr. New York: Harper and Row, 1957.

Fukuyama, Francis. *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: The Free Press, 1992.

Gallagher, Louis J., S.J., *Edmund A. Walsh, S.J.: A Biography*. New York: Benziger Brothers, Inc., 1962.

Geanakopolos, Deno John. *Byzantine East and Latin West: Two Worlds of Christendom in the Middle Ages and Renaissance*. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.

Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. 2nd ed. Introduction by John Breuilly. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2008.

Glubiński, Tadeusz. *Historia 8: Trudny Wiek XX*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Szkolne i Pedagogiczne, 1992.

Goldfrank, David M. *The Origins of the Crimean War*. New York: Longman, 1994.

Graham, Robert, S.J. *Vatican Diplomacy: A Study of Church and State on the International Plane*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1959.

Gullovich, Stephen C. *Windows Westward: Rome, Russia, Reunion*. New York: Declan X. McMullen Co., 1947.

Halecki, Oscar. *Borderlands of Western Civilization: A History of East Central Europe*. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1952.

_____. *A History of Poland.* 9th ed. New York: David McKay Co., Inc., 1973.

_____. *The Limits and Divisions of European History*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1962.

Hamson. Knut. *In Wonderland*. Translated with and Introduction and Notes by Sverre Lyngstad. Brooklyn, NY: Ig Publishers, 2004.

Harris, Horton. *The Tübingen School*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.

Hegel, Georg W.F. *Phenomenology of Spirit*. Translated by A.V. Miller, with Analysis of the Text and a Foreward by J.N. Findlay. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.

d'Herbigny, Michel. *Paques 1926 en Russie, du Jeudi-Saint (1er Avril) au Surlendemain de l'Ascension (15 Mai)*. Paris: Editions Spes, 1926.

_____. *Theologica de Ecclesia: De Deo Universos Evocante ad Sui Regni Vitam*. Tom I. Editio Secunda. Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne, 1920.

_____. *Theologica de Ecclesia: De Deo Universos Evocante ad Sui Regni Vitam*. Tom II. Editio Secunda. Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne, 1921.

_____. *Vladimir Soloviev, a Russian Newman (1853-1900)*. Translated by A.M. Buchanan. London: R & T Washborne Ltd., 1918.

Higham, Robin, ed. *Researching World War I: A Handbook*. With Dennis E Showalter. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press 2003.

Himka, John-Paul. "Christianity and Radical Nationalism: Metropolitan Andrei Sheptytsky and the Bandera Movement." Chapter in *State Secularism and Lived Religion in Soviet Russia and Ukraine*. Edited by Catherine Wanner. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Hopwood, Derek. *The Russian Presence in Syria and Palestine, 1843-1914: Church and Politics in the Near East* (London: Oxford University Press, 1969.

Jaeger, Werner. *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University, 1961.

Jodock, Darrell, ed. *Catholicism Contending with Modernity: Roman Catholic Modernism and Anti-Modernism in Historical Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Kant, Immanuel. *The Critique of Pure Reason*. Translated by Werner S. Pluthar. Introduction by Patricia Kitcher. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishers, 1996.

Karolewski, Ireneusz Paweł and Andrzej Marcin Suczycki. *The Nation and Nationalism in Europe: An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011.

Keegan, John. *The First World War*. London: Random House, 1998.

Kelly, J.N.D. *Early Christian Doctrines*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1978.

Kipling, Rudyard. "White Man's Burden." In *The Complete Verse*. Foreword by M. M. Kaye. London: Kyle Cathie Ltd., 2002.

Kloczowski, Jerzy. *A History of Polish Christianity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Koehler, John O. *Spies in the Vatican: The Soviet Union's Cold War against the Catholic Church*. New York: Pegasus Books, 2009.

Krasowski, Krzysztof. *Episcopat Katolicki w II Rzeczypospolitej*. Warsaw: Redackja Naukowa, 1992.

Kramer, Alan. *Dynamic of Destruction: Culture and Mass Killing in the First World War*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Krawchuk, Andrii. *Christian Social Ethics in Ukraine: The Legacy of Andrei Sheptytsky*. Toronto: Canadian institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 1997.

Kucharek, Casimir. *The Byzantine-Slav Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom: Its Origin and Evolution*. Combermere, Ontario, Canada: Alleluia Press, 1971.

Kuzniewski, Anthony. *Faith and Fatherland: The Polish Church War in Wisconsin, 1896-1918*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1980.

Laski, Harold J. *Communism*. London: Williams and Norgate, 1927.

Leith, John H., ed. *Creeds of the Churches: A Reader in Christian Doctrine from the Bible to the Present*. 3rd ed. Louisville: John Knox Press, 1982.

Leo XIII. "*Aeterni Patris.*" In *The Papal Encyclicals, 1878-1903*. Edited by Claudia Carlen, I.H.M. Raleigh, NC: McGrath Publishing Co., 1986.

Leo XIII, "*Praeclara gratulationis*." In *The Vatican and the Eastern Churches: Papal Encyclicals and Documens Concerning the Eastern Churches*. Vol. 1. Fairfax, VA: Eastern Christian Publications, 1996.

Lewin, Moshe. "Popular Religion in Twentieth Century Russia." In *The World of the Russian Peasant: Post-Emancipation Culture and Society,* 155-68. Edited by Ben Eklof and Stephen Frank. Boston: Unwin Hyman, Inc. 1990.

_____. "Society, State, and Ideology," in *Cultural Revolution in Russia, 1928-1931,* 41-77. Edited by Sheila Fitzpatrick. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1978.

Lossky, N.O. *History of Russian Philosophy*. New York: International Universities Press, Inc., 1951.

Macfie, A.L. *The Eastern Question, 1774-1923*. New York: Longman, 1996.

Maclear, J.F., ed. *Church and State in the Modern Age: A Documentary History*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

MacMillan, Margaret. *Paris 1919: Six Months that Changed the World*. New York: Random House, 2001.

Mailleux, Paul. *Exarch Leonid Feodorov: Bridgebuilder between Moscow and Rome*. New York: P.J. Kennedy & Sons, 1964.

Manual of Christian Doctrine, Comprising Dogma, Moral, and Worship. 12th ed. Philadelphia: John Joseph McVay, 1910.

Marriott, J.A.R. *The Eastern Question: An Historical Study*. 4th ed. London: Oxford University Press, 1940.

Marshall, S.L.A. *World War I*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1964.

Marx, Karl. *The Eastern Question: A Reprint of Letters Written 1853-1856 Dealing with the Events of the Crimean War*. Edited by Eleanor Marx Aveling and Edward Aveling. New York: Augustus M. Kelley, 1969.

_____. "The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte." In *The Communist Manifesto and Other Writings*. Introduction and Notes by Martin Puchner. New York: Barnes and Noble Classics, 2005.

_____. *Introduction to a Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right*. Translated by Annette Jolin and Joseph O'Malley. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Maclear, J.F., ed., *Church and State in the Modern Age: A Documentary History*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

McLeod, Hugh. *Secularization in Western Europe, 1848-1914*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000.

McNamara, Patrick H. *A Catholic Cold War: Edmund Walsh, S.J. and the Politics of American Anti-Communism*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2005.

Meyendorff, John. *The Orthodox Church: Its Past and its Role in the World Today*. Translated by John Chapin. London: Darton, Longman, and Todd, 1962.

Nauman, Friedrich. *Central Europe: A Translation by Christabel M. Meredith from the original German of Mittel-Europa*. Translated by Christabel M. Meredith. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1917.

Newman, John Henry. *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*. New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1949.

O'Malley, John W. *Trent and All That: Renaming Catholicism in the Early Modern Era*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000.

Osipova, I.I. *Hide Me Within Thy Wounds: The Persecution of the Catholic Church in the USSR*. Translated by Malcolm Gilbert. Fargo, ND: North Dakota State University Libraries, 2003.

Papadakis, Aristeides. *The Christian East and the Rise of the Papacy: The Church 1071-1453 a.d.* With John Meyendorff. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1994.

Patenaude, Bertrand M. *The Big Show in Bololand: The American Relief Expedition to Soviet Russia in the Famine of 1921*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2002.

Patriarca, Silvana and Lucy Riall, eds. *The Risorgimento Revisited: Nationalism and Culture in Nineteenth-Century Italy*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2012.

Paul-Marie of the Cross, O.C.D. *Carmelite Spirituality in the Teresan Tradition*. Translated by Kathryn Sullivan, R.S.C.J. Rev. ed. Preface by Steven Payne, O.C.D. Washington, DC: ICS Publications, Institute of Carmelite Studies, 1997.

Pease, Neal. *Rome's Most Faithful Daughter: The Catholic Church and Independent Poland, 1914-1939*. Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 2009.

Peters, Edward N. *The 1917 or Pio-Benedictine Code of Canon Law in English Translation with Extensive Scholarly Apparatus. F*oreward by Most Rev. John J. Myers. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2001.

Pius X. "*The Oath Against Modernism*." In *The Popes Against Modern Errors: 16 Papal Documents*. Edited by Anthony J. Mioni, Jr. Rockford, IL: Tan Books and Publishers, Inc., 1999.

Pius IX. "*Amantissimus.*" In *The Papal Encyclicals, 1740-1878*. Edited by Claudia Carlen, I.H.M. Raleigh, NC: McGrath Publishing Co., 1981.

_____. "*Omnem sollicitudinem*." In *The Vatican and the Eastern Churches: Papal Encyclicals and Documents Concerning the Eastern Churches*. Vol. 1. Fairfax, VA: Eastern Christian Publications, 1996.

_____. "*Syllabus of Errors*." In *The Popes Against Modern Errors: 16 Papal Documents*. Edited by Anthony J. Mioni, Jr. Rockford, IL: Tan Books and Publishers, Inc., 1999.

Pius XI. "*Studiorum Ducem*." In *The Papal Encyclicals, 1903-1939*. Edited by Claudia Carlen, I.H.M. Raleigh, NC: McGrath Publishing Co., 1986.

Poggi, Vincenzo, S.J. "Pregudizio culturale e ricchezza dell'Oriente Cristiano." Chapter in *Per La Storia del Pontificio Istituto Orientale: Saggi sull'istituzione,i suoi uomini e l'Oriente*

Cristiano. *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* Series, 263 (Roma: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 2000.

Porter, Brian. *When Nationalism Began to Hate: Imagining Modern Politics in Nineteenth Century Poland*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Porter Szucs, Brian. *Faith and Fatherland: Catholicism, Modernity, and Poland*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Quale, G. Robina. *A History of Marriage Systems*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1988.

Ramet, Pedro. *Cross and Commissar: The Politics of Religion in Eastern Europe and the USSR* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1987.

Rancour-Laferriere, Daniel. *The Slave Soul of Russia: Moral Masochism and the Cult of Suffering*. New York: New York University Press, 1995.

Riasanovsky, Nicholas. *A History of Russia*. 6th ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Romanides, John S. *Franks, Romans, Feudalism, and Doctrine: An Interplay Between Theology and Society.* Patriarch Athenagoras Memorial Lectures. Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1982.

Rothschild, Joseph. *Return to Diversity: A Political History of East Central Europe Since World War II.* 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Runciman, Stephen. *The Eastern Schism: A Study of the Papacy and the Eastern Churches During the XIth and XIIth Centuries*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.

Russell, Bertrand. *History of Western Philosophy and its Connection with Political and Social Circumstances from the Earliest Times to the Present Day*. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd, 1946.

Russell, Jesse and Ronald Cohn. *[The]Russian Catholic Church*. Edinburgh, UK: Lennex Corp., 2012.

Rzemieniuk, Florentyna. *Kościoł katolicki Obrządku Bizantyjsko-Słowiańskiego (Neounia)*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Universytetu Lubelskiego, 1999.

Said, Edward W., *Orientalism*. 1978. Reprint, New York: Vintage Books, 1994.

Samsonowicz, Henryk and Antoni Mączak. "Feudalism and Capitalism: A Balance of Changes in East-Central Europe." Chapter in *East Central Europe in Transition: From the*

Fourteenth to the Seventeenth Century. Edited by Antoni Mączak, Henryk Samsonowicz, and Peter Burke. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Schatz, Klaus. *Papal Primacy: From its Origins to the Present*. Translated by John A. Otto and Linda M. Maloney. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1996.

Schleiermacher, Friedrich. *The Christian Faith*. Edited and Translated by H.R. Mackintosh and J.S. Stewart. London: T&T Clark, 1999.

Schroeder, Rev. H.J.,O.P. *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*. Rockford, Ill: Tan Books and Publishers, Inc., 1978.

Sherrard, Philip. *Greek East and Latin West: A Study in the Christian Tradition*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1959.

Simon, Constantine. *Russicum: Pioneers and Witnesses of the Struggle for Christian Unity in Eastern Europe 2*. Rome: Opere Religiose Russe, 2002.

Skinner, Barbara. *The Western Front of the Eastern Church: Uniate and Orthodox Conflict in 18th Century Poland, Ukraine, Belarus, and Russia*. De Kalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 2009.

Slivka, John, ed. "Minutes of the Synod of the Greek Catholic Clergy, 17-19 October 1890." In *Historical Mirror: Sources of the Rusin and Hungarian Greek Rite Catholics in the United States of America, 1884-1963*. Brooklyn, NY: Privately Published, 1978.

Smith, Anthony D. *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*. 12th ed. London: Blackwell, 1999.

Snyder, Timothy. *Bloodlands: Europe Between Hitler and Stalin*. New York: Basic Books, 2010.

_____. *The Reconstruction of Nations: Poland, Ukraine, Lithuania, Belarus, 1569-1999*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.

Soetens, Claude. *Le Congrès Eucharistique International de Jérusalem (1893): Dans le Cadre de la Politique Orientale du Pape Léon XIII*. Louvain: Bibliothèque de l'Université, Bureau du Recueil, 1977.

Soloviev, Vladimir. *The Drama of Plato's Life*. Germany: Verlag Freies Geistesleben, 1980.

_____. *Freedom, Faith, and Dogma: Essays by V.S. Soloviev on Christianity and Judaism*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2008.

_____. *The Heart of Reality: Essays on Beauty, Love, and Ethics*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2003.

_____. *Politics, Law, and Morality: Essays*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.

_____. *Russia and the Universal Church*. Translated by Herbert Rees. London: The Centenary Press,1948.

_____. *War, Progress, and the End of History, including a Short Story of the Anti-Christ: Three Discussions*. London: n.p., 1915.

Southern, R.W. *Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages*. New York: Penguin Books, 1990.

Špidlík, Tomáš. *The Spirituality of the Christian East: A Systematic Handbook*. Translated by Anthony P. Gythiel. Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, Inc., 1986.

Stehle, Hansjakob. *Eastern Politics of the Vatican, 1917-1979*. Translated by Sandra Smith. Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 1979.

Stickler, Alfons Maria. *The Case for Clerical Celibacy: Its Historical Development and Theological Foudnations*. Translated by Fr. Brian Ferme. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1995.

Strauss, David Friedrich. *The Life of Jesus, Critically Examined*. Edited by Peter C. Hodgson. Translated by George Eliot. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1973.

Stylianopoulos, Theodore G. "The Orthodox Church in America." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. Vol. 387, The Sixties: Radical Change in American Religion (Jan 1979): 41-48.

Subtelny, Orest. *Domination of Eastern Europe: Native Nobilities and Foreign Absolutism, 1500-1715*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1986.

Sullivan, Francis A. S.J., *The Church We Believe In: One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic*. New York: Paulist Press, 1988.

Swan, Jane. *Chosen for His People: A Biography of Patriarch Tikhon*. 2nd ed. Preface by Scott M. Kenworthy. Jordanville, NY: Holy Trinity Seminary Press, 2015.

Szvák, Gyula, ed. *The Place of Russia in Europe and Asia*. CHSP Hungarian Authors Series No. 5. Edited by Peter Pastor and Ivan Sanders. New York: Columbia University Press, 2010.

Tellenbach, Gerd. *The Church in Western Europe from the Tenth to the Early Twelfth Century*. Translated by Timothy Reuter. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Tierney, Brian. *The Crisis of Church and State*, 1050-1300. In series *Sources of Civilization in the West*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

Tretjakewitsch, Leon. *Bishop Michel d'Herbigny SJ and Russia: A Pre-Ecumenical Approach to Christian Unity*. Wüzburg: Augustinus Verlag, 1990.

Turnock, David. *The Making of Eastern Europe: From the Earliest Times to 1815*. New York: Routledge, 1988.

Van den Bercken, Wil. *Holy Russia and Christian Europe: East and West in the Religious Ideology of Russia*. Translated by John Bowden. London: SCM Press, 1998.

Vattappalam, Michael. *The Congregations for the Eastern Churches: Origins and Competence* Citta del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1999.

Visser, Margaret. *Geometry of Love: Space, Time, Mystery, and the Meaning in an Ordinary Church*. New York: North Point Press, 2000.

Von Arx, Jeffrey, S.J., ed., *Varieties of Ultramontanism*. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1998.

Von Harnack, Adolf. *What is Christianity?* Translated by Thomas Bailey Saunders. Introduction by Rudolf Bultmann. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.

Vovchenko, Denis. "Modernizing Orthodoxy: Russia and the Christian East (1856-1914)." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 73, no. 2 (April 2012): 295-317.

Walsh, Edmund. *The Fall of the Russian Empire: The Story of the Last Romanovs and the Coming of the Bolsheviki*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1928.

_____. *Why Pope Pius XI Asked Prayers for Russia on March 19, 1030: A Review of the Facts in the Case together with Proofs of the International program of the Soviet Government*. New York: Catholic Near East Welfare Association, 1930.

Walters, E. Garrison. *The Other Europe: Eastern Europe to 1945*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1988.

Wandyz, Piotr S. *The Price of Freedom: A History of East Central Europe from the Middle Ages to the Present*. New York: Routledge, 1992.

_____. "*Między Pluralizmem a Totalitaryzmem: Tematkya Ustrojowa.*" Chapter in *Historia Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej*, tom 2. Edited by Jerzy Kloczowski. Lublin: Instytut Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej, 2000.

_____. "*Wojna i Pokój*." Chapter in *Historia Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej*, tom 2. Edited by Jerzy Kloczowski. Lublin: Instytut Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej, 2000.

Wanner, Catherine ed., *State Secularism and Lived Religion in Soviet Russia and Ukraine*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.

The Way of a Pilgrim. Translated by Helen Bacovcin. Preface by Walter J. Ciszek, S.J. New York: Image Books, 1978.

Webb, Adrian. *The Longman Companion to Central and Eastern Europe since 1919*. New York: Longman, 2002.

Weber, Eugen. *Peasants into Frenchmen: The Modernization of Rural France, 1870-1914*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1976.

Wenger, Antoine. *Catholiques en Russie d'après les archives du KGB, 1920-1960*. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1998.

_____. *Rome et Moscou, 1900-1950*. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1987.

West, Rebecca. *Black Lamb and Grey Falcon: A Journey through Yugoslavia.* New York: Viking Press, 1963.

White, Hayden. *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth Century Europe*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973.

Williams, Schafer. *The Gregorian Epoch: Reformation, Revolution, Reaction?*. Problems in European Civilization Series. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Co., 1964.

Wolff, Larry. *Inventing Eastern Europe: The Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1994.

Wynot, Jennifer Jean. *Keeping the Faith: Russian Orthodox Monasticism in the Soviet Union, 1817-1939*. College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 2004.

Yapp, Malcolm. *The Making of the Modern Near East, 1792-1923*. New York: Longman, 1987.

Yavuz, M. Hakan and Peter Sluglett, eds. *War and Diplomacy: The Russo-Turkish War of 1877-878 and the Treaty of Berlin*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 2001.

Zatko, James J. *Descent into Darkness: The Destruction of the Roman Catholic Church in Russia, 1917-1923*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1965.

Zugger, Christopher Lawrence. *The Forgotten: Catholics of the Soviet Empire from Lenin through Stalin*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2001.

III. Periodicals and Papers

Association of Schools of Public Health. "Public Health Administration in Russia in 1917." *Public Health Reports*, 32 no. 52 (December 28, 1917): 2191-2219.

Attwater, Donald. "Russian Spirituality." *An Irish Quarterly Review* 29, no. 113 (March 1940): 59-70.

Brophy, Liam. "Vladimir Soloviev: A Russian Newman." *The Irish Monthly* 75, no. 893 (Nov 1947): 478-83.

Cahill, E. "Notes on Christian Sociology: The Bolshevik Regime (Continued)." *The Irish Monthly* 56, no. 661 (July 1928): 374-78.

Cummins, James S. "Palafox, China, and the Chinese Rites Controversy." *Revista de Historia de América*. 52 (December 1961): 395-427.

Czaplicka, M. A. "Poland." *The Geographical Journal* 38, no. 6 (June 1919): 361-76.

Dobkin, Marlene. "Colonialism and the Legal Status of Women in Francophonic Africa." *Cahiers d'Études Africaines*, 8, no. 31 (1968): 390-405.

Dunn, Ethel. "A Slavophile Looks at the Raskol and the Sects." *The Slavonic and East European Review* 44, no. 102 (January 1966): 167-79.

Dvornik, Francis. "Western and Eastern Traditions of Central Europe." *The Review of Politics* 9, no. 4 (October 1947): 463-81.

Dyboski, Roman. "Poland and the Problem of National Minorities." *Journal of the British Institute of International Affairs* 2, no. 5 (Sep 1923): 179-200.

Emerson, Caryl. "Russian Orthodoxy and the Early Bakhtin." *Religion and Literature* 22, no. 2/3 (Summer-Autumn 1990): 109-31.

Freeze, Gregory L. "Counter-Reformation in Russian Orthodoxy: Popular Response to Religious Innovation, 1922-1925." *Slavic Review* 54, no. 2 (Summer 1995): 305-39.

Gallagher, Louis. "Communism and Religion." *The Irish Monthly* 75, no. 852 (Oct. 1947): 422-26.

D'Herbigny, Michel. "L'Aiuto Pontificio ai Bambini Affamati della Russia." *Orientalia Christiana* Vol. IV, no. 1 (Apr 1925): 1-75.

_____. "L'âme Religieuse des Russes d'après Leurs plu Récents Publications." *Orientalia Christiana* 3 (1924): 1-117.

_____. "L'Aspect Religieux de Moscou en Octobre 1925." *Orientalia Christiana* 5 (1926): 185-279.

_____. "L'Islam naissant. Notes psychologiques." *Orientalia Christiana* 14 (1929): 179-325.

_____. "Seize Jours à Moscou (4-20 Octobre 1925)." *Etudes* CLXXXV (1925): 513-76.

_____. "L'unité dans le Christ." *Orientalia Christiana* 1 (1923): 1-29.

_____. "La Vraie Notion d'Orthodoxie." *Orientalia Christiana*. Vol. II, no. 7 (December 1923): 1-33.

Irish Jesuit Province. "Catholic Notes: Divorce in Bolshevik Russia." *The Irish Monthly* 54, no. 639 (Sep 1926): 460-61.

_____. Review of *Vladimir Soloviev, a Russian Newman (1853-1900)*, by M. d'Herbigny and A. Buchanan. In *The Irish Monthly* 46, no. 540 (June 1918): 362-63.

Kane, Eileen. "John Henry Newman's Catholic University Church in Dublin." *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review* 66, no. 262/263 (Summer/Augumn 1977): 105-20.

Karpovich, Michael. "Vladimir Soloviev on Nationalism." *The Review of Politics* 8, no. 2 (Apr 1946): 183-91.

Lavrin, Janko. "Vladimir Soloviev and Slavophilism." *The Russian Review* 20, no. 1 (Jan 1961): 11-18.

LeBlanc, Ronald D. "Trapped in a Spider's Web of Animal Lust: Human Bestiality in Lev Gumilevsky's *Dog Alley*." *Russian Review* 65, no. 2 (April 2006): 171-93.

Madden, Thomas F. "Outside and Inside the Fourth Crusade." *The International History Review* 17, no. 4 (Nov. 1995): 726-43.

Maher, Michael, S.J. "The Marian Sodalities and their Transition into Christian Life Communities: Some Helpful Explanations of the Past and Some Suggestions for Conversations in the Future." Archives of the General Curia of the Society of Jesus, Rome. Spring 2014.

The Marriage Laws of Soviet Russia: Complete Text of [the] First Code of Laws of the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic dealing with Civil Status and Domestic Relations, Marriage, and the Family and Guardianship. New York: The Russian Soviet Government Bureau, 1921.

McIntosh, Lawrence D. "An Unpublished Letter of John Henry Newman." *The Catholic Historical Review* 59, no. 3 (Oct 1973): 429-33.

McKenna, Lambert, S.J. "The Bolsheviks." *An Irish Quarterly Review* 10, no. 38 (June 1921): 218-38.

Michels, Georg. "The Solovki Uprising: Religion and Revolt in Northern Russia." *The Russian Review* 51 no. 1 (Jan 1992): 1-15.

Paneyko, Basil. "Galicia and the Polish-Ukrainian Problem." *The Slavonic and East European Review* 9, no. 27 (Mar 1931): 567-87.

Pease, Neal. "God's Patriot: Jerzy Matulewicz as Bishop of Vilna, 1918-1925." *East Central Europe/Europe du Centre-Est* 18, no. 1 (1991): 68-79.

_____. "Poland and the Holy See, 1918-1939." *Slavic Review* 50, no. 3 (Autumn 1991): 521-30.

_____. Unpublished paper delivered at PIASA Fifth World Congress of Polish Studies. Warsaw, June 2014.

Peris, Daniel. "The 1929 Congress of the Godless." *Soviet Studies* 43, no. 4 (1991): 711-32.

Porter, Brian. "Who is a Pole and Where is Poland? Territory and Nation in the Rhetoric of Polish National Democracy before 1905." *Slavic Review* 51, no. 4 (Winter 1992): 639-53.

Rendle, Matthew. "Mercy Amid Terror? The Role of Amnesties during Russia's Civil War." *The Slavonic and East European Review* 92, no. 3 (July 2014): 449-78.

Rosloff, Edward E. "The Heresy of 'Bolshevik' Christianity: Orthodox Rejection of Religious Reform during the NEP." *Slavic Review* 55, no. 3 (Autumn 1996): 614-35.

Sanjian, Andrea Stevenson. "Social Problems, Political Issues: Marriage and Divorce in the USSR." *Soviet Studies* 34, no. 4 (1991): 629-49.

Sadkowski, Konrad. "From Ethnic Borderland to Catholic Fatherland: The Churh, Christian Orthdox, and State Administration in the Chełm Region, 1918-1939." *Slavic Review* 57, no. 4 (Winter 1998): 813-39.

_____. "The Roman Catholic Clergy, the Byzantine Slavonic Rite, and Polish National Identity: The Case of Grabowiec, 1931-34." *Religion, State, & Society* 28, no. 2 (2000): 175-84.

Simon, Constantine, S.I. "I Gesuiti e la Russia." *La Civiltà Cattolica* 4 (1989): 355-67.

Suchanek, Lucjan and Ann-Marie Tatsis-Botton. "Les catholiques russes et les procatholiques en Russie dans la première moitié du XIXe siècle." *Cahiers du Monde russe et soviétique* 29 no. 3/4 (July-December 1988): 361-74.

Surkis, Judith. "When Was the Linguistic Turn? A Genealogy." *The American Historical Review* 117, no. 3 (June 2012): 700-22.

Szűcs, Jenő and Julianna Parti. "The Three Historical Regions of Europe." *Historica Academiae Scientarium Hungaricae* 29, no. 2/4 (1983): 131-84.

Taubenberger, Jeffery K. "The Origin and Virulence of the 1918 'Spanish' Influence Virus." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 150, no. 1 (March 2006): 86-112.

Taylor, Brian W. "John Henry Newman and a Catholic Presence at Oxford." *The Irish Journal of Education / iris Eireannach an Oideachiais* 27, no.1/2 (Summer/Winter 1993): 36-49.

Theofanis, George Stavrou. "Russian Interest in the Lavant, 1843-1848: Porfirii Uspenskii and the Establishment of the First Russian Ecclesiastical Mission in Jerusalem." *Middle East Journal* 17, no. 1 (Winter-Spring 1963): 91-103.

Traver, Teresa Huffman. "Losing a Family, Gaining a Church: Catholic Conversion and English Domesticity." *Victorian Review* 37, no. 1 (Spring 2011): 127-43

Vodolazkin, Eugene. "The New Middle Ages." *First Things.* August/September 2016: 31-36.

Waddams, H.M. "Communism and the Churches." *International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-)* 25, no. 3 (July 1949): 2295-306.

Walsh, Edmund. "The Catholic Church in Present-Day Russia." *The Catholic Historical Review* 18, no. 2 (July 1932): 177-204.

Waters, Elizabeth. "The Bolsheviks and the Family." *Contemporary European History* 4, no. 3 (Nov. 1995): 275-91.

Weeks, Theodore. “The ‘End’ of the Uniate Church in Russia: The ‘Vozsoedinenie’ of 1875.” *Jarbücner für Geschichte Osteurpas* 44. Vol 1 (1996): 28-40.

Whalen, Brett. “Rethinking the Schism of 1054: Authority, Heresy, and the Latin Rite.” *Traditio* 62 (2007): 1-24.

Wolff, M.M. “Some Aspects of Marriage and Divorce Laws in Soviet Russia.” *Modern Law Review* 12, no. 3 (July 1949): 190-96.

Zatko, James J. “The Vatican and Famine Relief in Russia.” *The Slavonic and East European Review* 42, no. 98 (December 1963): 54-63.

IV. Encyclopedias and Dictionaries

The Concise Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church. S.v. ”Febronianism” by E.A. Livingstone.

The Concise Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church. S.v. “Gallicanism” by E.A. Livingstone.

The Concise Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church. S.v. “Josephism” by E.A. Livingstone.

The New Catholic Encyclopedia. S.v. “Byzantine Rite” by G.A. Maloney.

The New Catholic Encyclopedia, 2nd ed. S.v. “Byzantine Christianity,” by G.A. Maloney, G.A. and B. Miller.

The New Catholic Encyclopedia, 2nd ed. S.v. “Newman, John Henry,” by F.X. Connolly.

The New Catholic Encyclopedia, 2nd ed. S.v. “Pius IX,” by R. Aubert.

Historical Dictionary of the Ottoman Empire. 2nd ed. S.v.. “Millet” by Selcuk Aksin Somel.

V. Online Resources

A Brief History of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia, 1922-1972. Stable URL: http://www.synod.com/synod/enghistory/enhis_rocorshukin.html.

Loyola University Chicago: Archives and Special Collections Index: UA1980.34. Stable URL: http://www.luc.edu/media/lucedu/archives/pdfs/ccesrussian.pdf.

Modern History Sourcebook. Last modified November 1998. Stable URL: http://legacy.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/1848orthodox encyclical.asp.

New Advent *Catholic Encyclopedia*. "Apostasy," "Baptism," "Corporal and Spiritual Works of Mercy," "Heresy," "Eastern Schism," "Schism." Stable URL: http://www.newadvent.org.

Papal Encyclicals Online. *Unam Sanctam*. Stable URL: http://www.papalencyclicals.net/Bon08/B8unam.htm.

Society of St. John Chrysostom of Ayatriada Rum Katoliki Kilise. Unofficial and Partial Directory of Russian Catholic and Other Byzantine-Slavonic Rite Churches and Institutions. Stable URL: http://rumkatkilise.org/listing.htm.

Curriculum Vitae

Rev. Michael A. Guzik, S.J.

Education:

Ph.D., History, University of Wisconsin– Milwaukee, August 2017.
S.T.L., Church History, Weston Jesuit School of Theology, December 2004.
M.Div., with distinction, Weston Jesuit School of Theology, May 2003.
M.A., Philosophy, Fordham University, May 1997.
M.A., History, State University of New York at Buffalo, May 1992.
B.A., History, St. John Fisher College, May 1990.

Certificates in the Italian Language, (Eurocentres, Florence, Italy), Spanish Language (Universidad de Guadalajara, Guadalajara, Mexico,1993), and Polish Language and Culture (Uniwersytet Jagieloński, Kraków, Poland, 1990).

Publications:

"Sarmatianism Recast: Piłsudski's Vision of a Federal Poland." *Proceedings of the New York State Association of European Historians*. Annual Conference, 2015. Forthcoming.
"Józef Piłsudski," *New Catholic Encyclopedia Supplement 2010*. Ed. Robert L Fastigii. Vol. 2. Detroit: Gale, 2010. 904-905. *Gale Virtual Reference Library*. Web. June 29, 2010.
"From Soldier to Saint: Ignatian Spiritual Elements in *Quo Vadis?*." *Polish Review*. Vol. LIII, no. 1 (2008): 3-24.
"Trent Recalled and Vatican II Prefigured: The Underlying Ecclesiology of 'Polyglot Bishops for Polyglot Dioceses.'" *Polish American Studies.* Vol. LIX, no. 2 (Autumn 2002): 17-28.
Review of: Jacek Nowakowski, ed. *Polish American Ways* (New York: Harper and Row, 1989). In *Polish American Studies*, Vol. L, no. 2 (Autumn 1993): 120.

Lectures, Conferences, and Other Professional Activity:

Academic Lecture, "Rev. Walter Ciszek, S.J.: A Review and Reconsideration." Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI. Wade Lecture, April 11, 2017.
Academic Lecture, "The Advent and Development of Modern Polish Nationalism." University of Wisconsin– Parkside, Milwaukee, WI. January 2016. [Forthcoming.]
Conference Paper, "Sarmatianism Recast: Piłsudski's Vision of a Federal Poland." New York State Association of European Historians, St. John Fisher College, Rochester, NY. October 2015.
Public Lecture, "Sarmatianism Recast: Józef Piłsudski's Vision of Poland." Polanki Women's Cultural Association, Milwaukee, WI, April 10, 2015.
Chair, Session, "Strained Psyches in the Neoliberal World: Contesting the Privatization of Mental Health and the Restriction of Human Rights." Mid-west Labor and Working-Class

History Conference, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, October 2012.
Academic Lecture, "St. Ignatius of Loyola and the Founding of the Society of Jesus." St. John Fisher College, Rochester, NY, October 21, 2004.
Academic Lecture, "General Historiographical Review of Pope Gregory VII." St. John Fisher College, Rochester, NY, February 6, 2004.
Public Lecture, "Fact and Fiction: An Historical and Theological Analysis of Dan Brown's *The DaVinci Code*." Tabor Center Retreat House, Oceanside, NY. January 7, 21, & February 4, 2004.
Public Lecture, "The Development of Papal Juridical Authority: A General Introduction" for the "Living Contemporary Catholicism Series." Blessed Sacrament Church, Cambridge, MA, December 22, 2002.
Chair, Session: "Topics in Polish Military History." Fiftieth Anniversary World Congress of Scholars, Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences, Yale University, June 1992.
Departmental Assistant, Department of History, St. John Fisher College, 1989-1990.
Research Assistant, Institute for Polish Studies, St. John Fisher College, 1987-1989.
Editorial Assistant, *East Central Europe*, 1987-1989.

Teaching Experience:

Wade Lecturer, Department of History, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Spring 2017.
Teacher of History and Religion, Canisius High School, Buffalo, NY, 2006-2007, 2008-2011.
Teacher of History and Religion, St. Peter's Preparatory School, Jersey City, NJ, 1997-2000.
Course Organizer and Teacher of English as a Second Language, Kollegium Jezuitów, Kraków, Poland, Summer 1996.
Teacher of English as a Second Language, Kollegium Jezuitów, Kraków, Poland, Summer 1995.
Adjunct Professor of History, University of Scranton, Scranton, PA, Spring 1994.
Teacher of English, St. Peter's Preparatory School, Jersey City, NJ, Summer 1993.
Co-designer of a strategic studies course, HIS 403, St. John Fisher College, Spring 1989.

Professional Memberships:

Member of the American Historical Association, 2001-present.
Member of the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America, 1992-present.
Member of the Polish American Historical Association, 1990-present.
Member of the New York State Association of European Historians, 2015-present.
Member of the Kościuszko Foundation, 1990-present.

Academic Honors and Distinctions:

Wade Scholar, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, 2016-2017.
Msgr. Alphonse Popek Award for Academic Distinction, Polanki Women's Cultural Association, Milwaukee, WI, Spring 2015.
Academic Fellowship, Kopernik Foundation (Annual Award), Utica, NY, 1992-1993.

Collegiate Award for Outstanding Departmental Assistant, St. John Fisher College, Rochester, NY, 1990.
Member of Phi Alpha Theta, the history honor society. Inducted Spring 1990.
Dean's List, St. John Fisher College, Rochester, NY, 1988-1990.
Regents' Scholarship, State of New York, 1986-1990.

Skills:

Research knowledge of Italian, French, Latin, and Polish.
Reading knowledge of Koine Greek.
Rudimentary skills in Russian, Hungarian, and Spanish.
Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) Certified in IRB Social and Behavioral Research, May 14, 2015.
Computer Literate.

References:

M.B.B. Biskupski, Ph.D., Stanislaus A. Blejwas Endowed Chair in Polish and Polish American Studies, Central Connecticut State University, New Britain, CT.
Carolyn Eichner, Ph.D., Associate Professor of History, University of Wisconsin– Milwaukee, Milwaukee, WI.
Rev. John O'Malley, SJ, Ph.D., University Professor, Georgetown University, Washington, DC.
Neal Pease, Ph.D., Professor of History, University of Wisconsin– Milwaukee, Milwaukee, WI.
James Skedros, Th.D. Cantonis Professor of Byzantine Studies and Professor of Early Christianity, Holy Cross Hellenic College, Brookline, MA.