



C H R I S T I A N I T Y



AD 2054 II

CREED AND THE CHALLENGES OF THE FUTURE

10 / 9 / 2025
Zagreb, Croatia

International conference

CHRISTIANITY AD 2054 ii
Creed and the Challenges of the Future

Faculty of Philosophy and Religious Studies
Jordanovac 110, Zagreb
10 / 9 / 2025

Organizer: Institute for Culture of Thinking

Co-organizers: Faculty of Philosophy and
Religious Studies, University of Zagreb / Faculty
of Orthodox Theology St. Clement of Ohrid, Ss.
Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje /
Faculty of Theology, University of Ljubljana

Program committee

- Assist. Stjepan Štivić, *Faculty of Theology, University of Ljubljana* (president)
- Prof. Milan Đorđević, *Faculty of Orthodox Theology St. Clement of Ohrid, Ss. Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje*
- Prof. Daniel Patafta, *Catholic Faculty of Theology, University of Zagreb*
- Valentino Findrik, *Institute for Culture of Thinking*

Organizing committee

- Valentino Findrik, *Institute for Culture of Thinking* (president)
- Prof. Daniel Patafta, *Catholic Faculty of Theology, University of Zagreb*
- Assist. Ante Belić, *Faculty of Philosophy and Religious Studies, University of Zagreb*
- Assist. Stjepan Štivić, *Faculty of Theology, University of Ljubljana*

Design: Valentino Findrik

Editors: Stjepan Štivić & Valentino Findrik

Institute for Culture of Thinking, 2025.





International conference
CHRISTIANITY AD 2054 ii
Creed and the Challenges of the Future

Christianity AD 2054 is an international conference on the past, present and future of Christianity. The conference is a part of a thirty-year long project of the same name, which started in 2024 and will run until 2054, with the aim of interdisciplinary and interconfessional research of old and new challenges for Christianity, in light of the millennial anniversary of the Great Church Schism in 2054.

The first conference was held in 2024, on the 970th anniversary of the Great Schism. As an introductory event, the conference gathered some of the prominent Christian thinkers today from across Europe and the US, and covered a wide range of topics as an overview of some of the main challenges for Christianity throughout the past, today, and in the upcoming future.

This year, as we commemorate the 1700th anniversary of the First Council of Nicaea, the main theme of the conference will be "Creed and the Challenges of the Future." Our aim is to shed light on the ecclesial and socio-political context of Nicaea, crucial motifs in the emergence of the original Creed, the impact of Nicaea and the Creed throughout the Church history, both in the East and the West, as well as the challenges of various ideologies as alternative "creeds" throughout the past, today, and in the world of tomorrow, among other topics.

Christianity AD 2054 conferences gather historians, philosophers, theologians and various other experts from across Europe and the world. This year's conference will host lecturers from: Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Hungary, Italy, North Macedonia, Serbia, and the United States of America.

The language of the conference is English. All times in the program schedule are in the Central European Time (CET).

PROGRAM



10:00 AM **Valentino Findrik** (*Institute for Culture of Thinking*, Director)
10:10 AM Greetings & introduction

I. Context, Politics, Impact

10:10 AM **Trpimir Vedriš** (Croatia)
10:35 AM *The Emperor and the Church: Constantine the Great Between History and Mythography*

10:35 AM **Ivica Miškulin** (Croatia)
11:00 AM *Grand Strategy: Constantine, Empire, and Christianity*

11:00 AM **Daniel Patafta** (Croatia)
11:25 AM *Historical-Theological Development of Arianism*

11:25 AM **Vladimir Cvetković** (Serbia)
11:50 AM *'There Was When He Was Not': A Neglected Aspect of the Nicene Creed*

11:50 AM Discussion
12:30 AM

12:30 AM Lunch break
2:00 PM

II. Legacy, Crises, New Challenges

2:00 PM **Daniel Heide** (Canada)
2:25 PM *The Consubstantiality of Wisdom: St Maximus' Logos in Light of Nicaea*

2:25 PM **Giulio Maspero** (Italy)
2:50 PM *Rethinking the Filioque from the Greek Fathers as an Ecumenical Opportunity*

2:50 PM **Dan Đaković** (Croatia)
3:15 PM *Give to God What is God's, to Caesar What is Caesar's, to the Church What is Church's, and to Me What is Mine*

PROGRAM



3:15 PM	Odilon-Gbènoukpo Singbo (Croatia)
3:40 PM	<i>Creed and Its Modern-Day Alternatives</i>
3:40 PM	Discussion
4:20 PM	
4:20 PM	Break
4:35 PM	
	III. East-West Divisions, Common Ground, Perspectives
4:35 PM	Iva Manova (Bulgaria)
5:00 PM	<i>Divisions over the Creed and the Project for Conversion of Southern Slavs to Catholicism in Krstjo Pejkić's Polemical Works</i>
5:00 PM	Milan Đorđević (North Macedonia)
5:25 PM	<i>The Primacy of Rationality in Byzantine Philosophy</i>
5:25 PM	Krisztián Fenyves (Hungary)
5:50 PM	<i>Nicaea and the West, or ὁμοούσιος and una substantia</i>
5:50 PM	Paul Gavriljuk (USA)
6:15 PM	<i>Can the Nicene Creed Unite Orthodox and Catholic Churches?</i>
6:15 PM	Discussion
6:55 PM	
6:55 PM	Stjepan Štivić (Institute for Culture of Thinking, Program Director)
7:00 PM	Concluding remarks



Trpimir Vedriš is Associate Professor at the Department of History at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb. His academic interests include history of Central and Southeast Europe in the early Middle Ages, history of Christianity, and hagiography and veneration of saints from late Antiquity to the late Middle Ages. He has authored several dozen scientific articles and book chapters. He is also author and editor of several books, including *The Saints of Rome. Diffusion and Reception from late Antiquity to the Early Modern Period*. In addition to his regular presence at academic conferences domestically and abroad, he is also an active participant in public debates, broadcasts, and podcasts.

Ivica Miškulin is Professor of history at the Department of History at the Catholic University of Croatia. His main academic interest is in political history, especially modern-day political history of Croatia, although he has written and lectured on a number of other subjects in political history, including the history of war in Croatia, history of Communism in Croatia, as well as history of the relationship of Church and state. He has authored a number of scientific papers and books, including *Mouth Wide Shut. The Offence of Thought in Communist Croatia 1980 – 1990*.

Daniel Patafta is Associate Professor at the Catholic Theological Faculty in Zagreb. He teaches courses in Church History, Early Christian Archaeology, and Controversies in Church History. His focus also includes the history of the Franciscan Order, the subject of his book *Franciscan 13th century. History, Theology, Spirituality*. He also published dozens of scientific articles and book chapters in the fields of history and the history of ideas. In addition to academic work, he is a frequent guest at live events and in the media.

Vladimir Cvetković is a Principal Research Fellow and a Research Associate Professor at the Institute for Philosophy and Social Theory, University of Belgrade. He has held research and teaching positions at the universities of Aarhus (Denmark), St Andrews (Scotland, UK), Oslo (Norway) and Niš (Serbia). His research interests include Patristics, Ancient and Byzantine Philosophy and Modern Orthodox Theology. He has authored and edited a number of books, while his publications also include over a hundred papers, reviews and book chapters.



Daniel Heide is a Research Fellow at the Institute for Philosophy and Social Theory, University of Belgrade. He holds a PhD from McGill University, with the thesis on “The World as Sacrament: The Eucharistic Ontology of Maximus Confessor”. He has authored a number of articles and reviews in international academic journals. His academic research focuses on Patristics, especially Maximus the Confessor, Dionysius the Areopagite, and Origen, as well as Byzantine and Ancient Greek Philosophy, among other subjects.

Giulio Maspero is Professor of Dogmatic Theology at the Pontifical University of the Holy Cross (Rome), and holds a PhD in Theology and in Physics. He is a member of the Association Internationale des Etudes Patristiques (AIEP) and a full member of the Pontifical Academy of Theology (PATH). His research area includes Trinitarian Theology, Gregory of Nyssa, and the relationship between religion, philosophy and theology. He is the author of over two hundred articles, as well as several books on patristics and theology, including *Rethinking the Filioque with the Greek Fathers*.

Dan Đaković is an Assistant at the Faculty of Philosophy and Religious Studies, University of Zagreb. His fields of academic and research interest include metaphysics, anthropology, ethics, philosophy of religion, and political philosophy. He spent time at the University of Notre Dame in Indiana, USA, conducting research in the archives of the Jacques Maritain Center, culminating in his doctoral dissertation on Jacques Maritain, focusing on his political philosophy and philosophy of religion, particularly the problem of secularity.

Odilon-Gbènoukpo Singbo is Assistant Professor at the Department of Theology at the Catholic University of Croatia. His research interests include Theological Anthropology, Bioethics, Transhumanism, Artificial Intelligence, and the relationship between theology, modern-day society, and new technologies. He has published over fifty papers and chapters, as well as five books, including *Theological-Bioethical Assessment of Transhumanist Anthropology*. Alongside his academic work, he is an outspoken public intellectual and a sought after speaker at various public events and broadcasts.



Iva Manova is Assistant Professor at the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences. She holds a PhD in Philosophy and in History of Philosophy. She has been visiting researcher at Katholieke Universiteit Leuven and Moscow State Linguistic University, Advanced Academia Scholar at Centre for Advanced Study Sofia, and Fulbright Visiting Scholar at Dickinson College (PA). Her research is in the field of late Soviet philosophical culture and philosophical historiography. She has written and edited several books, as well as dozens of papers and book chapters.

Milan Đorđević is Professor at the Orthodox Faculty of Theology "St. Kliment of Ohrid" in Skopje, North Macedonia, where he teaches Philosophy, Pastoral Psychology and Orthodox Theology. His academic work focuses on Medieval and Byzantine Philosophy and Theology. He has published dozens of scientific papers and several books, including *Byzantium in Dialogue and Both in Heaven and on Earth*. He is a regular guest at public events, national broadcasts and other media.

Krisztián Fenyves is a Researcher at the School of Law at the Mathias Corvinus Collegium (Budapest, Hungary). He holds master's degree (Baccalaureate) and Licentiate in Sacred Theology at the Theological Faculty of Pázmány Péter Catholic University, master's degree (pianist) at the Liszt Ferenc Academy of Music, and Licentiate in Judaic Studies and Jewish-Christian Relations at the Cardinal Bea Centre of the Pontifical Gregorian University. He is currently developing his PhD research in the field of patrology. His research is focused on the exegetical interactions between the Church Fathers and the Rabbis, on interreligious dialogue and religious diplomacy.

Paul Gavrilyuk holds the Aquinas Chair in Theology and Philosophy at the Theology Department of the University of St Thomas (St Paul, Minnesota). Born in Kiev, Ukraine, he studied physics at the Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology in Russia. He specializes in early Christian theology and Russian religious thought. Published in nine languages, his works include *The Suffering of the Impassible God*, and *The Spiritual Senses: Perceiving God in Western Christianity*. He is the Founding President of the International Orthodox Theological Association (IOTA).



I. CONTEXT, POLITICS, IMPACT

Trpimir Vedriš (Croatia)

The Emperor and the Church: Constantine the Great Between History and Mythography

The paper explores differing perceptions of Church–State relations in the Christian East and West through two interrelated issues: the interpretation of Constantine’s beliefs, motives, and actions, and the evolving perceptions of his role in the Christian triumph, as shaped by his contemporaries and subsequent traditions. While the first issue is constrained by the scarcity of contemporary sources and thus vulnerable to overinterpretation, the second—dealing with “Constantinian legacies”—reveals a complex and often contradictory set of traditions. The analysis departs from examining key contemporary sources that testify to Constantine’s conversion and his relationship with the Church, interpreted in the light of recent historiography. It then traces the formation of the core of the “myth of Constantine the Great” and its subsequent developments in both Eastern and Western Christian traditions from the medieval through the early modern period. This “historical myth,” described by Amnon Linder as “a complex system of testimonies, legends, and popular narratives, ritualized and centred on Constantine’s historical persona,” served to personify abstract medieval ideals—especially the notion of a Christian state uniting religious and secular authority. The ultimate aim of the paper is to consider, in light of the “history of reception” (understood as the history of meanings ascribed to historical events in order to interpret, reveal, or impose interpretations of the past and present), the key moments in the transformation of this myth and their role in shaping the understanding of Church–State relations in the Christian East and West.

Ivica Miškulin (Croatia)

Grand Strategy: Constantine, Empire, and Christianity

This presentation seeks to evaluate the extent to which the political and ecclesiastical undertakings of Emperor Constantine can be interpreted through the conceptual lens of grand strategy, as



theorised and refined by the American historian and political scientist John Lewis Gaddis. Gaddis's model posits the alignment of aspirations with capabilities as the fundamental mechanism through which strategic objectives are effectively pursued and realised. Adopting this theoretical framework, the presentation examines key aspects of Constantine's reign, including his vision of empire, his conversion to Christianity, and the evolving nature of his engagement with the Christian faith. Particular emphasis is placed on his role in two events widely regarded as watershed moments in both political and ecclesiastical history: the Edict of Milan (313) and the First Council of Nicaea (325). By situating Constantine's political and religious agency within the broader strategic and historical context of the early fourth century, this presentation aims to reassess his leadership in light of contemporary strategic theory. In doing so, it also provides a concise overview of the political and ecclesiastical landscape of the period, thereby contributing to a more integrated understanding of Constantine's role as both ruler and religious actor.

Daniel Patafta (Croatia)

Historical-Theological Development of Arianism

In the 3rd century, the need for systematization of the Christian faith, which had been based on an individual basis until then, began to be felt. The first theological-catechetical school was established in Alexandria, a strong cultural and economic center in the Mediterranean. It was open to cultural, philosophical, and spiritual currents with pronounced syncretism, which was influenced by the strong Jewish colony in the city where the Septuagint was created. Christianity was then one of many religious communities and movements in the city, and in contact with all these realities, an urgent need arose to confront reason and faith. The Alexandrian school represented an idealistic-mystical direction, under the influence of Plato, and in this way an allegorical interpretation of the Holy Scriptures emerged, which became a characteristic of this school. The most important representative of this school was Origen. His Christology, that is, the theology of the Logos, which he developed, wanted to avoid the danger of modalism or adoptionism. According to Origen, the Logos receives its divinity from the Father. The Father transcends the Son more than the Son



transcends other beings (*logikoi*), which indicates the presence of subordinationism. Arius will use this scheme to prove the subordination of the Son to the Father, wanting to preserve radical monotheism. The world of logic is coeval with the world of the Logos, but God is absolutely transcendental and as such cannot come into contact with matter, therefore a mediator, the Logos, is needed who mediates between the created and the uncreated. In order to do this, the Logos must have a plurality, which helps it not to adapt to the differences and different natures of people. In Jesus Christ, there is a certain plurality of the so-called *epinoiai* (thought, purpose) - Christological titles - which refer to the eternal reality of the Logos and are called: Wisdom, Word, Truth and Way, Teacher, King of the Jews, True Vine, etc. During his public activities, Jesus presented himself to people as a plurality, which is different and dependent on nature. This compromises the relationship to the doctrine of the Holy Trinity - there is no Holy Spirit and subordination is obvious. Arius represents radical Origenism, his extreme version of the theology of the Logos. The traditional subordinationism of the Alexandrian church was radicalized under Arius to unacceptable limits. The local bishop Alexander's decision to condemn Arius was not personal but collegial. However, Arius does not give up his ignorance but spreads it and finds support outside of Egypt, which is a new aspect of the controversy that will have to be resolved by the First Church Council in Nicaea in 325, as a problem of the whole Church.

Vladimir Cvetković (Serbia)

'There Was When He Was Not': A Neglected Aspect of the Nicene Creed

This paper examines the role of the concept of time in the Arian controversy of the fourth century, showing how the problem of temporality moved from a philosophical debate on creation into the very heart of Christian theological discourse. While early Christian thinkers in the third century had already addressed the problem of time primarily in the context of the world's creation, this issue became central to internal Church polemics following the Arian controversy. The dispute surrounding Arius's teaching was not merely a theoretical disagreement but concerned the very possibility of human salvation. Arius introduced temporality into the theology



of the divine by claiming that ‘there was when the Son was not’, thus subordinating the Son to the Father and challenging the traditional understanding of divine consubstantiality. Drawing on both Alexandrian and possibly Antiochene traditions, Arius attempted to resolve tensions inherited from Origen’s doctrine of the eternal generation of the Son and the eternal creation of the world. This paper analyzes the correspondence between Arius and Bishop Alexander of Alexandria, as well as other documents leading up to the Council of Nicaea, to reconstruct how temporality became a key theological issue in defining the divine being, ultimately prompting a redefinition of God’s freedom and transcendence.

II. LEGACY, CRISES, NEW CHALLENGES

Daniel Heide (Canada)

The Consubstantiality of Wisdom: St Maximus’ Logos in Light of Nicaea

My paper will explore the impact of the Council of Nicaea on Maximus the Confessor’s conception of the Logos as Christian formal principle. Prior to Nicaea, Origen was still able, in Middle Platonist fashion, to speak of a “first god” and a “second god”, of the Father as “God- Himself” (αὐτοθεός) and the Logos as simply god (θεός). This enabled Origen to safeguard the simplicity of the One God while relegating the formal content of the divine mind to the subordinate Logos as unity-in-multiplicity. After Nicaea this kind of hierarchical approach to the problem of unity and multiplicity is no longer possible. The Logos is declared homoousios with the Father marking an irreversible break with the Platonic model of mediated terms. While the Cappadocians are largely silent on the topic of the Ideas, St Maximus embarks upon a daring retrieval of Origen’s Logos-theology simultaneously restoring the Logos as Christian formal principle while bringing it in line with the consubstantiality proclaimed by Nicaea. The result is a divine Logos paradoxically at once transcendently simple and the source of multiplicity. Joining Pauline ecclesiology to Porphyrian logic, Maximus offers a new



model of unity-in-multiplicity – the One Logos is not a radical simplicity in line with the Neoplatonic One, but the fullness of Wisdom recapitulating all things in its unifying embrace.

Giulio Maspero (Italy)

Rethinking the Filioque from the Greek Fathers as an Ecumenical Opportunity

The question of the Filioque exploded in medieval times and is still one of the main causes of division between the Christian East and the Christian West. Going to the sources in the Greek Patristics of the 4th century and the theological work to fully formulate the divinity of the Holy Spirit at the Council of Constantinople in 381 reveals possibilities for rapprochement that do not yet seem to have been highlighted. In particular, the Cappadocian tradition offers an interpretation in which the Son has a non-causal, but a relationally active role in the procession of the Holy Spirit. This doctrine could offer a basis for rethinking contemporary Pneumatology in the search for unity, because it is absolutely absurd for Christians to be divided in the name of the third divine Person, which both the West and the East lead back to Love.

Dan Đaković (Croatia)

Give to God What is God's, to Caesar What is Caesar's, to the Church What is Church's, and to Me What is Mine

In this lecture we will try to sketch the answers to these few questions: What does the principle "give to Caesar what is Caesar's, and to God what is God's" mean today? Who is Caesar? Who is God? Who has the mandate or monopoly to interpret this principle? What about the Church in this context? Does the relationship between Church and state imply equality or does one side have primacy? Are God and the Church one and the same? Is there anything that is not God's? Does giving to the Church mean the same as giving to God? What about me and my conscience in this whole story? What belongs to me, if anything? What happens when an individual conscience is not only in conflict with the Emperor or the state, but also with the Church?



Odilon-Gbènoukpo Singbo (Croatia)
Creed and Its Modern-Day Alternatives

In prior times, arguments and divergences on matters of faith unfolded in a spirit of understanding of the essence of God and of his intent for the salvation of mankind. These arguments included diverse competing ideas on the ecclesiological structure of faith. Although many consequences of these arguments remain present, the source of challenge for faith today has shifted to another sphere. This sphere is characterized by all sorts of eschatological ambitions, as well as a drive for a complete secularization of the whole of reality. These ambitions arise from a techno-prophetic, techno-progressive approach to reality. The goal is no longer to understand God's essence and his plan, but to develop alternative gods with secular "salvation". These new gods are all sorts of transhumanist applications of technology through the so-called dataism and artificial intelligence. These are technological alternatives that put into question certain doctrinal statements of the Second Vatican Council, in particular of the *Gaudium et Spes*. Can different Christian communities find a common structure for the preservation of humanity? This is the crux of the challenge for theology today. It is no longer about understanding God's nature, but in understanding and preserving human nature as intended and shaped by God, and not as intended to be dissolved and disassembled by technology. In the epoch of dataization of the human reality, what can theology and Christian communities offer to humanity for its comprehensive and balanced development?

III. EAST-WEST DIVISIONS, COMMON GROUND, PERSPECTIVES

Iva Manova (Bulgaria)
Divisions over the Creed and the Project for Conversion of Southern Slavs to Catholicism in Krstjo Pejkić's Polemical Works

I would like to propose a paper of a predominantly historical nature. In it, I will present in broad terms the period of greatest growth and



the abrupt decline of Bulgarian Catholicism in the seventeenth century and will talk about its perhaps most particular figure: Krstjo Pejkić (1665–1730). He was an apostolic missionary trained in Rome, who, having definitively separated from his homeland, spent his life travelling between Italy and various places in central Europe, crossing peoples, languages and religious traditions. An operator of the Counter-Reformation, he carried out the work of evangelization in the border areas between Christianity and Islam, between Catholicism and the Orthodox peoples, among simple, poorly educated people, among converts and renegades. Those were ‘our Indies’ as the missionaries of the time used to say to denote areas, although geographically not so distant from the centre of Western Christianity, however culturally and socially very complex and challenging. Through his missionary activity and his polemical works, Pejkić tried to contribute to a political project that envisaged the conversion to Catholicism of the Orthodox peoples living under the Ottomans and, at the same time, their liberation by the Catholic powers to be finally incorporated into the Habsburg Empire. In this way, his works are a testimony coming from a period of deep division and hostility between the Eastern and Western Church, during which the discourse on doctrinal issues had the character of religious and political propaganda. Yet they may be enlightening for us today, because they offer a ‘horizontal’ view of the division of the Churches: not the view of an erudite theologian, but of a missionary ‘in the field’, whose attitude towards both the practice of faith and the ‘dialogue’ with the Orthodox hierarchy and people was very pragmatic.

Milan Đorđević (North Macedonia)

The Primacy of Rationality in Byzantine Philosophy

In contemporary philosophical and theological medieval studies, the notion of a rational West contrasted with a mystical East still holds sway. It is not uncommon to encounter well-worn clichés such as: “the West is Aristotelian, the East – Platonic.” Yet this kind of generalization is not only ill-suited to the intellectual profile of Western Christianity; it proves equally untenable when applied to the Christian East. A striking counterexample is offered by the 14th-century theologian and philosopher St. Nicholas Cabasilas, a representative of the hesychast movement and, at the same time, one



of the early figures of the emerging Byzantine Thomism. He is best known for his sacramental-meditative writings *Commentary on the Divine Liturgy* and *The Life in Christ*. Following the main thread of Aristotelian philosophy – which was never forgotten or marginalized within classical Byzantine education – Cabasilas insists that reason (λόγος) is the ruling principle (τὸ ἡγούμενον) of the human soul. In a lesser-known text entitled *Quaestio on the Value of Reason*, he directly opposes the anti-rationalist currents that had begun to surface in the Byzantine society of his time. The conviction that faith can be expressed through comprehensible terms and concepts remained foundational from the era of the Ecumenical Councils down to the fall of Byzantium. The attempts to relativize the spoken or written word (λόγος) were not tolerated, while discursive theology and mystical experience were regarded as complementary and inseparable dimensions of the true life in Christ. This paper aims to explore these theses through a comparative reading of primary sources and to interpret them as a crucial point of convergence in the contemporary theological dialogue between Orthodoxy and Catholicism.

Krisztián Fenyves (Hungary)

Nicaea and the West, or ὁμοούσιος and una substantia

Alleged Western influences on the historical and theological proceedings of the first ecumenical council in Nicaea (325 AD) have long been a matter of scholarly discussion. The idea of Western influence on the Nicene creed – and even the Western origin – has found much support. Scholars have attempted to establish a relationship between the strong emphasis on the divine unity by the early Western theologians like Tertullian, on the one hand, and in the Nicene creed on the other. In the last forty years, the theory of Western influence has been seriously questioned and has suffered severe criticism. The following brief contribution will examine the word ‘homousios’, which is one of the most important terms in the Christian theological vocabulary, since it was used at the Council in Nicaea to express the divine consubstantiality of the Son with the Father. However, long and complicated debates have not yet produced any significant agreement among scholars concerning its origin and meaning. Following Theodor Zahn (*Marcellus von Ancyra*), Gustav Krüger (*Das Dogma von der Dreieinigkeit und*



Gottmenschheit), Jörg Ulrich (*Nicaea and the West*), and critical insights of Christopher Stead (*Divine Substance*) I would make emphasis on the possibility of the influence of the Latin tradition and especially Tertullian (cf. *Adversus Praxean*), examining also the apologetic roots of the Nicene Creed (cf. Leszek Misiarczyk), the debate between Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria and Dionysius of Rome (based on Athanasius' *De Sententia Dionysii, De decretis Nicaenae synodi*), when the term *ὁμοούσιος* appeared for the first time in trinitarian context, and the dispute between Callixtus and Hippolytus (cf. Wolfgang Bienert). The study's further aim is to demonstrate that the proceedings of the council of Nicaea took place with considerable involvement of Western theology. At the very least, the Western influence was not excluded, which would highlight the significance of the First Ecumenical Council for the understanding and practice of synodality and primacy.

Paul Gavrilyuk (USA)

Can the Nicene Creed Unite Orthodox and Catholic Churches?

The lecture discusses the problem of Orthodox-Catholic disunity by naming non-theological and discussing theological issues behind the issues in bilateral dialogues between the Churches. The main theological issue is the absence of agreement on which doctrinal differences should or should not count as church-dividing. The author proposes that the agreement on the 'Nicene faith' could function as a sufficient condition for the Eucharistic communion between the two Churches on two grounds of the use of the Creed in the rites of initiation and the liturgy. In response to potential objections, the author proposes a 'Nicene Formula of Reunion' on the model of similar formulas of the patristic period. The proposed Formula includes a commitment to seeking an increasingly greater convergence on doctrinal and ecclesiastical issues on which there is continuing, although not church-dividing disagreement.



NOTES





NOTES



