CHAPTER ONE

THE SOURCES OF SHEPTYTSKY’S THEOLOGY

I. MISCONCEPTION REGARDING SHEPTYTSKY’S SOURCES

A misconception exists regarding Andrei Sheptytsky’s theology. Because at times he urged his Church to look Eastward again,¹ some have fostered the impression that the sources of his own theology were thoroughly Eastern:

Before finding solutions [to theological problems] [Sheptytsky] would consult the ancient philosophers (preferably Aristotle and Plato), then the Fathers (mainly Basil, Chrysostom, Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory of Nyssa, Athanasius, Cyril of Alexandria, Maximus the Confessor, Damascene, Theodore the Studite as well as Augustine and Ambrose); the teachings of Eastern ascetics (Hesychasts and Palamists), Western Scholastics; and further, recent Eastern philosophers and theologians such as Mohyla, Skovoroda, Chomiakov, Soloviov and others.²

Later, this same author states, “Sheptytsky, therefore, in his theological approach is a thorough Easterner.”³

Below we shall see that, in reality, Palamism is entirely absent from Sheptytsky’s writings (except when he con demns it)⁴ and authors like Skovoroda, Khomiakov and Mohyla are never cited.⁵ As for Greek patristic influence, except for Basil, it is frequently mediated via Thomas Aquinas. In general, Eastern sources are far less prominent in Sheptytsky’s writings than the Summa Theologicae or papal pronouncements.

Because this runs counter to accepted mythology, I have compiled a list of authors and texts cited in Sheptytsky’s reprinted works. This tally comprises Appendix A. An analysis of his unreprinted works shows that the reprinted

---

¹ See, for example, his “Вірність традиції” (Faithfulness to tradition), and “Про обрядові справи” (Regarding ritual matters) in Mor-Pastoral’ni, 96, and 97–103 respectively. Both of these are translated in Chapter 5 of the present work.

² Dacko, Rediscoverer, 3.

³ Ibid., 5. See also p. 50 and p. 163 of the same work. Another work reflecting a similar approach to this matter is Іван Гриньох, Слуга Божий Андрей – Блаженній єдності (The servant of God Andrei – the herald of unity) (Мюнхен: накладом автора, 1961) 58–59.

⁴ See pp. 180–82 of the present work.

⁵ The sole exception is when Sheptytsky refers to Mohyla’s liturgical work. See Chapter 5, p. 425 of Sheptytsky’s liturgical pastoral of 1942.
ones are entirely representative as regards sources. (One need not fear that Sheptytsky’s non-reprinted works might reveal influences not evident in my tally. Had I found even a mention of Khomiakov, Skovoroda, or a single “Palamist” in one of his non-reprinted texts, I would have especially noted this in the preface to the appendix.) Naturally, in searching for Sheptytsky’s sources I have also sought ideas and emphases that might be traced to others’ writings.

II. CATEGORIZATION OF SHEPTYTSKY’S SOURCES

In categorizing Sheptytsky’s sources, I shall rarely present an overview of his individual works. Anatol Bazylewycz and Lubomyr Husar have done much of this already. Bazylewycz has provided a lengthy sketch of his oeuvre according to genre: theologico-pastoral and ascetic works; monastic rules; works on Church unity; writings about ritual questions; historical works; views on art, both secular and religious; and writings regarding social issues. As for Husar’s study, it contains an English summary of many of Sheptytsky’s important theological writings. Other scholars, too, have provided detailed summaries, or even English translations, of individual texts by Sheptytsky and will be cited when appropriate. Of course, one finds real theology outside of Sheptytsky’s “theologico-pastoral and ascetic works.” Consequently, most of the other kinds of tracts listed by Bazylewycz will also be included in our search for the sources of Kyr Andrei’s theology.

Note in what follows that I begin my analysis of Sheptytsky’s sources with a category (scripture) and then shift to an examination of Sheptytsky’s two longest works, The Wisdom of God and Christian Righteousness. I do so because the latter are so dense with theology properly speaking that they can only be studied as homogenous wholes. I then return, however, to categories — liturgical sources, patristic fonts, etc.

My approach (the use of tables showing textual dependence, etc.) may seem pedantic. However, anyone questioning accepted mythology is obliged to demonstrate his case. This can only be done by painstaking (and tedious) text analysis. Quite frankly, I would counsel the more casual reader to proceed to Chapter 2 of this study and accept — at least for the time being —

---

6 My estimate is that approximately half of Sheptytsky’s published works have been reprinted. Most of his other works are readily accessible in Western libraries such as that of the Pontifical Oriental Institute, or the Ukrainian Catholic University, both in Rome.

7 Bazylewycz, B–9 to B–237.

8 Husar, Pioneer of Ecumenism, 238–351; 369–90; 395–407.
that Sheptytsky is far more indebted to the theologies of Thomas Aquinas, the Council of Trent and modern popes than to any Eastern Christian sources.

III. SCRIPTURAL SOURCES

Not surprisingly, Sheptytsky frequently quotes scripture. Appendix A shows that Matthew is his favourite gospel, Romans his favourite epistle, and the Psalms his favourite Old Testament book. However, he encourages his clergy to memorize the epistle of James, for it "is such an infinite treasure for the learned theologian and practical pastor or confessor, that by itself it can substitute for an entire library."9

Regarding versions, before World War I Sheptytsky almost always quoted the Church Slavonic Bible. But after the War, along with his shift to modern Ukrainian orthography, came the use of vernacular scriptural citations. The only "complete" Ukrainian Bible available at the time was Panteleimon Kulish’s Bible Society version.10 Consequently, Sheptytsky occasionally did his own translating — from the Vulgate.11 None of the quotations from the Vulgate, however, buttress a particularism of Latin theology grounded in that version. On one occasion, Sheptytsky does give the Vulgate rendering of Romans 5:12, but this is only because it is part of a Tridentine Conciliar decree which he is translating in toto. In general, the question of Bible versions used by Metropolitan Andrei is insignificant, because he never engages in an interpretation of passages where differences in versions would be important.

Although Sheptytsky never penned a commentary on a whole scriptural book, he does at times dwell on individual biblical words, themes or pericopes. His tract "Naimohutanishyi orudnyk dushpastysko‘ pratsi" ("The Most Powerful Instrument of Pastoral Work"),12 is a detailed reflection on Philippians 2:1–11. The initial section of The Wisdom of God analyzes the use of different forms of the word "wisdom" in several scriptural books.13 Also, his lectures on asceticism present profound reflections on the life, pastoral psychology and spirituality of Saint Paul based directly on his epistles.14

9 "З викладів про аскетику" 132.
11 Asket-Moral'ni, 19, 21, 48, 62, 113, 181, 275, 278, 293. All of these are quotations that have been read in situ, and not in the context of the Summa or another Latin work.
12 NimOkupatsiia, 287–94.
14 "З викладів про аскетику" (From lectures on asceticism), Нива 28 (1933) 3–7, 89–92.
Finally, there are times when — without the artificiality of proof-texting — Sheptytsky literally “breathes the scriptures,” adducing one biblical phrase after another.\(^{15}\)

The following regulations may help explain his familiarity with the Bible especially as he was not inclined to issue dictates without following them himself. In 1917, the Petrograd Synod which Sheptytsky chaired, mandated that clergy read through the entire New Testament at least once a year, and the Old Testament once every three years.\(^{16}\) The 1940 Synod of the four exarchs for the territory of the USSR, also presided over by Sheptytsky, required the reading of the New Testament in two years and the Old in four.\(^{17}\) And Regulation 5 of the decrees of Sheptytsky’s 1940 L’viv Archeparchial Council stipulates: “Each priest is obliged to read through the entire holy Scripture of the New Testament with a good commentary at least once every two years, and the Old Testament in its entirety once every five years.”\(^{18}\) Sheptytsky expresses his reverence for the Bible thus: “In comparing human literature, even Christian human literature, with [the Scriptures] one not only can, but one must state that a single word of a divinely-inspired book is worth more than an entire work by a human mind.”\(^{19}\)

IV. SOURCES OF THE WISDOM OF GOD

The first part of Sheptytsky’s magnum opus, The Wisdom of God, is a reflection on wisdom and prayer. Published in 1932–33 in the L’viv Archeparchial News, it comprises 123 pages in the reprint edition. Andriy Chirovsky has presented a good overview of the work’s structure and contents,\(^{20}\) and its second part, dealing with the Lord’s Prayer, is available in English.\(^{21}\)

In the preface to The Wisdom of God Sheptytsky writes: “In Pidliute [the summer residence where the work was written] I did not have access to an adequate library. Not infrequently, I had to quote a scriptural text from me-

\(^{15}\) See BMudrist’, 53, 88–9; and DP’iadesiatnytsc, 424–25.

\(^{16}\) Resolution 50. All of the resolutions appear in Йосиф Сліпий, „Петроградський Синод 1917 р.” (The Petrograd Synod of 1917), Богословія 9 (1931). This resolution is on p. 296.

\(^{17}\) See Husar, Pioneer of Ecumenism, 635.

\(^{18}\) “Діяння і постанови Архіепархіального Собору 1940-го року,” (The proceedings and resolutions of the Archeparchial Council of 1940), НімОкупатія, 67.

\(^{19}\) BMudrist’, 13.

\(^{20}\) Chirovsky, Sophiology, 37–71.

\(^{21}\) Metropolitan Andrew Sheptytsky, Our Father Who Art in Heaven, trans., B. Kyba and J. Scharinger, Ukrainian Millennium Series no. 10 (Winnipeg: Central Jubilee Committee of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, 1986).