

Papal Primacy, Local Primacy and Episcopal Collegiality

Myroslaw Tataryn

Підсумок

У своїй статті п.з. «Папський примат, помісний примат і єпископська колегіальність», о. Мирослав Татарин, греко-католик, викладач Колегії св. Михаїла в Торонто, з'ясовує проблематику самозрозуміння Римського Престолу щодо папської влади, та реакції східних Церков. У першій частині статті, о. Татарин розглядає історію. Автор представляє розвиток поняття примату місцевого й папського, підкреслюючи особливе поширення папського першенства при понтифікаті Льва Великого. Далі стаття студіює розвиток патріархатів, відносини між церковними й державними властями в середньовіччі, та перехід до наголосу на силу, владу, і юрисдикцію в пізніших віках. Перша частина статті кінчається віднайденням поняття Церков-Сестер.

Друга частина реферату зосереджує увагу над життєвим досвідом Київської Церкви в її відношеннях з Римським Престолом, доходючи до модерних зусиль Митрополита Андрея Шептицького й Блаженнішого Патріарха Йосифа (Ісповідника), та до рішень Синоду УГКЦ в травні 1992 р.

В останній частині статті автор подає можливі реінтерпретації суттєвих еkleзіологічних питань, які можливо дозволили б зберегти водночас папський примат і євхаристійну еkleзіологію Церкви як спільноти Церков.

The topic assigned me, "Papal primacy, local primacy and episcopal collegiality," is somewhat daunting. Some might even

say it is the crux of what divides us. But it is also a topic which is central to the Church's self-definition, and at the core of so much exciting work being done in many of the current bi-lateral and multi-lateral Christian dialogues. Bearing this in mind, I do not presume to present to you any new and seminal insights; rather my paper will focus on three sub-themes: the current state of the question of primacy (Papal, Patriarchal and Episcopal); the lived experience of the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church as it struggles with the question; and some suggestions for accommodating the issue of Papal Primacy within the search for ecclesiastical union among Churches. Because at times, within my own ecclesiastical experience, one is "Orthodox" or "Catholic" by how one approaches this issue, I intend to lean most heavily on Catholic sources, or scholarship which is of uncontested validity. I make note of this so that it may be known that I speak from a Catholic perspective, but in doing so I mean no disrespect to other Christian scholars.

The State of the Question

We are, as seekers of Church unity, most blessed to live in an age when many share our vision and our goal. We are not alone as we face the many questions before us today. Perhaps in no area is this as clear as in the discussion of the role of primacy in the Church. This topic has been treated in many, if not most, bi-lateral dialogues. Of particular note are ARCIC I: The Final Report (1981),¹ the Dublin Agreed Statement (1984),² and most significant: the Fourth Ecumenical Consultation between the Roman Catholics and the Oriental Orthodox in Vienna in 1968.³

¹ Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission I. The statement is published as *Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission: The Final Report* (London: Alan C. Clark, 1982). For ARCIC I, I will refer to this edition.

² References will be to: *Anglican-Orthodox Dialogue: The Dublin Agreed Statement, 1984* (New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1985).

³ References are to: "Pro Oriente: Fourth Ecumenical Consultation. Vienna, Sept. 11-13, 1968" in *Wort und Wahrheit* Supplementary Issue no. 4, n.d. Henceforth, *Pro Oriente IV*.

In presenting my paper today, I will make many references to these documents, especially to the latter.

Today, it is universally accepted that primacy within the Church of Christ is a charism of the Episcopal office which has developed over time, within different historical and cultural contexts in order to better serve the needs of a particular Church.

The Early Church

Although at the time of the so-called Council of Jerusalem (48/49) a certain structure was already present to guarantee unity within the Church, the existence of a "primacy," understood as one person standing above the others to exercise decisive and effective jurisdiction, is questionable.⁴ Let me explain.

Paul comes to Jerusalem to defend his Gospel—clearly a sign of deference and respect. However, in Acts 15, we see various persons playing various roles: Peter is important because he had established a precedent by accepting the gentile, Cornelius, and he explained that God was "giving the Holy Spirit to them just as He did to us" (Acts 15:8). James' role is to judge this acceptable and offer advice. Finally "a decisive role is given to the apostles and elders who send the letter imposing James' judgement upon the Gentiles in Antioch, Syria and Cilicia" (15:23).⁵ If anyone exercised any primacy at this Council, one would have to suggest with Raymond E. Brown⁶ that it was James who functioned somewhat akin to an archbishop today, and seemed to have authority over the Churches of Palestine and Syria. However, as Paul's missionary activity grew and expanded, he was able to challenge the dictates of the Church in Jerusalem more effectively, and thus we can ask whether this authority of James could be

⁴ In this section I rely on such works as Raymond E. Brown, Karl P. Donfried and John Reumann, eds., *Peter in the New Testament* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Press & New York: Paulist Press, 1973); Raymond E. Brown, *Biblical Reflections on Crises Facing the Church* (New York: Paulist Press, 1975); and Frederick J. Cwiekowski, *The Beginnings of the Church* (New York: Paulist Press, 1988).

⁵ Brown, *Peter in the New Testament*, 50.

⁶ Brown, *Biblical Reflections*, 70.