

The Formation of *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*

Brandon P. Otto

October 27, 2014

Introduction

Orientalium Ecclesiarum, the Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches from the Second Vatican Council, is one of the minor documents of the Council in terms of length and document classification, yet it is more often overlooked than some of the other minor documents, such as *Nostra Aetate* and *Dignitatis Humanae*. For instance, in a popular guide to reading and studying the documents of the Second Vatican Council, it is the only document listed as an optional reading rather than recommended.¹ There are also few journal articles dedicated to the document. Like the Eastern Catholic Churches themselves, the document is frequently ignored. This article is thus an attempt to encourage study of the document by presenting a brief outline of the text's formation. This is by no means a comprehensive study, but I hope that it will prove useful to other scholars and that it will be a rudimentary tool for undertaking investigation of both *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* itself and its place in the history of the Eastern Catholic Churches, particularly in their relationships with the Roman Catholic Church.

Summary of the Document

The final text of *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* consists of an introduction, six main sections, and a conclusion. The introduction expresses the esteem of the Catholic Church for the Eastern Churches, stating that they share in the Church's undivided Tradition. The first section is on the particular Churches or Rites. This section calls for the tradition of each church or rite to remain whole. All Catholic Churches (Eastern and Western) are under the guidance of the Pope of Rome, and all Churches are of equal rank, with no superiority connected to rite. Each Church

¹ Alan Schreck, *The Catholic Challenge: Why Just "Being Catholic" Isn't Enough Anymore* (Ann Arbor, MI: Servant Publications, 1991), 66.

should have its own hierarchy wherever needed for the good of souls, and all (both clerics and laity) should be instructed regarding the various rites and Churches. All Catholics—as well as non-Catholics who enter the Church—must remain in his own Church, although there is allowance for recourse to Rome for a change of rite. The second section is on the preservation of the spiritual heritage of the Eastern Churches, which should hold to their own traditions and continue to grow deeper in them, and knowledge of the Eastern Churches should be spread. The third section is on the Eastern patriarchs. It defines the term patriarch and expresses that all patriarchs of eastern Churches are of equal rank (although it allows for the traditional precedence of honor). It highlights the honor due patriarchs and calls for the restoration of their rights and privileges. Where needed, new patriarchates can be set up by an ecumenical council or the Pope of Rome.

The fourth section is on sacramental discipline. In general, this section calls for the Eastern Churches to be faithful to their traditional sacramental disciplines, which are as valid and licit as the Latin disciplines. It gives details about faculties for hearing confessions and calls for the restoration of the permanent diaconate. The document states that, in the marriage of an Eastern Catholic to an eastern non-Catholic, Catholic canonical form is only required for liceity: a sacred minister's presence is sufficient for validity. The fifth section is on divine worship, calling for each Church to set up their own feasts and fasts, regulations regarding the Divine Office, and liturgical languages. It gives some input on the problem of the dating of Pascha (Easter), and it gives guidelines regarding when a member of a particular Church lives outside the territory overseen by their Church. The sixth section is on relations with the non-Catholic Eastern Churches, stating that non-Catholic Easterners only need to accept what the simple

confession of the Catholic faith requires, and it gives guidelines regarding *communicatio in sacris* (the sharing of Sacraments and worship between Catholics and non-Catholics). The conclusion looks forward to when Catholics and non-Catholic Easterners are once again united, and it calls for all to pray for unity. In summary, then, the document is almost purely canonical, laying down particular regulations for some issues and giving only guidelines to be expounded on for others.

Before the Council

As with many of the documents of Vatican II, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* began with proposals given to the Ante-Preparatory Commission.² Many Eastern Churches submitted proposals, but the most influential was the proposal of the Melkites, who were undoubtedly the most influential Eastern Church at the Council. In particular, the outspoken interventions of Patriarch Maximos IV had great effect on the Council, for instance, his intervention regarding the use of the vernacular during the debates on *Sacrosanctum Concilium* and the intervention regarding the pope as “the servant of the servants of God.”³ Maximos, along with the other Melkites present, was considered the principal link to the Christian East at the Council; as the Ecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras I told him in January 1964, “You were the voice of the East in the Council. You were the voice of our common hopes.”⁴ The Melkite proposal called for, in regards to the Eastern Churches, 1) a relaxation of the strict regulations regarding *communicatio*

² Herbert Vorgrimler, *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II*, vol. 1, trans. Lalit Adolphus, Kevin Smyth, and Richard Strachan (New York, NY: Herder and Herder, 1967), 307.

³ John W. O’Malley, *What Happened at Vatican II* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 2010), loc. 2680-2696, Kindle; Hans Küng, Yves Congar, Daniel O’Hanlon, ed., *Council Speeches of Vatican II* (Glen Rock, NJ: Paulist Press, 1964), 72-75.

⁴ Thomas E. Bird, *Patriarch Maximos IV Saygh, The Men Who Make the Council*, ed. Michael Novak, (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1964), 7-9; Xavier Rynne, *The Third Session: The Debates and Decrees of Vatican Council II September 14 to November 21, 1964* (New York, NY: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1965), 106.

in sacris, 2) unification of the date of Pascha, 3) a revision of Code of Eastern Canon Law, 4) reaffirmation in word and deed of previous documents on the Eastern Churches (especially regarding patriarchs), and 5) work towards reconciliation with the Orthodox.⁵ In response to their proposal, and the proposals of the other Eastern Churches, a preparatory Eastern Commission was named in 1960, and it had four main topics to discuss: 1) changes in the rite, 2) *communicatio in sacris*, 3) reconciliation with the Orthodox, and 4) the most important disciplinary questions.⁶ Among the members of the Eastern Commission were all the Eastern patriarchs and the following:⁷

Archbishop Ivan Bucko (1891-1974), Apostolic Visitor for Ukrainian Catholics in
Western Europe [Ukrainian]⁸

Archbishop Constantine Bohachevskyj (1884-1961), Archbishop of Philadelphia
[Ukrainian]

Archbishop Néophytos Edelby, B.A. (1920-1995), Counsellor to the Patriarch of Antioch
[Melchite]

Bishop Andrei Apollon Katkoff, M.I.C. (1916-1995), Apostolic Visitor for the Russian
Catholic Church in Exile [Russian]

⁵ *The Melkite Church at the Council: Discourses and Memoranda of Patriarch Maximos IV and of the Hierarchs of His Church at the Second Vatican Council*, accessed June 10, 2014, <https://melkite.org/faith/faith-worship/introduction>, Ch. 1.

⁶ Vorgrimler, 307.

⁷ Melkite, Ch. 1; Neophytos Edelby and Ignace Dick, *Les Églises Orientales Catholiques: Décret «Orientalium Ecclesiarum»*, *Unam Sanctam* 76 (Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1970), 64. I thank Fr. Steven Hawkes-Teeple, S.J., for lending me Edelby and Dick's indispensable book. Edelby, a Melkite, was one of the key players in the formation of this document and in the Eastern presence at the Council in general.

⁸ Unless otherwise noted, All information regarding the full names and titles, dates, offices, and Church membership of personages mentioned in this article is taken from David M. Cheney's website *The Hierarchy of the Catholic Church* (<http://www.catholic-hierarchy.org/>). Titles and offices are given as of the time of the Council.

Bishop Ceslao Sipovic, M.I.C. (1914-1981), Apostolic Visitor for Belarusian Catholic Church in Exile [Belarussian]

Bishop Vasile Cristea, A.A. (1906-2000), Apostolic Visitor for the Romanian Catholic Church in Exile [Romanian]

Bejan [Romanian]

Archimandrite Teodoro Minisci (1907-1990), Abbot of Santa Maria di Grottaferrata [Italo-Albanian]

Bishop Alexandros Scandar (1895-1964), Bishop of Assiut [Coptic]

Bishop Ghebre Jesus Jacob (1889-1969), Apostolic Exarch Emeritus of Asmara [Ethiopian]

Archbishop Ignace Ziadé (1906-1994), Archbishop of Beirut [Maronite]

Bishop Pietro Dib (1881-1965), Bishop of Cairo [Maronite]

Archbishop Antun Hayek (1910-2007), Archbishop of Aleppo [Syrian]

Fr. Clément Ignace Mansourati (1917-1982) [Syrian]

Archbishop Raphaël Rabban (1910-1967), Archbishop of Kerkūk [Chaldean]

Bishop Garabed Amadouni (1900-1984), Apostolic Exarch of France [Armenian]

Archbishop Joseph Parecattil (1912-1987), Archbishop of Ernakulam [Syro-Malabar]

Archbishop Matthew Kavukattu (1904-1969), Archbishop of Changanacherry [Syro-Malabar]

Archbishop Benedict Varghese Gregorios Thangalathil, O.I.C. (1916-1994), Archbishop of Trivandrum [Syro-Malankar]

Cardinal Gustavo Testa (1886-1969), Secretary of the Congregation for Eastern Churches
[Roman]

The commission included the following specialists in Eastern Sciences, who were equal to members and had deliberative voices:⁹

Fr. Alphonse Raes, S.J., specialist in Eastern liturgy, Pontifical Oriental Institute in Rome

Fr. Maurice Gordillo, S.J., theologian, Pontifical Oriental Institute in Rome

Fr. Clément Pujol, S.J., canonist, Pontifical Oriental Institute in Rome

Fr. Pelopidas Stéphanou, S.J., historian, Pontifical Oriental Institute in Rome

Fr. Joseph (Jérôme) Cornélis, A.A. (1921-2001), director of the French edition of the review *Unitas*¹⁰ [Roman]

Fr. Daniel Stiernon, A.A., professor at the Pontifical Lateran University

Fr. Goesmann, O.S.A.

Fr. Japundzic, T.O.R.

Finally, the commission had *periti*, counselor-experts, known for their competence in Eastern matters. Some of the most active were:¹¹

Fr. Hanna Kaldany (1918-1996) of Latin Patriarchate of Jerusalem [Roman]

⁹ Edelby and Dick, 64-5. Most of the information regarding these specialists comes from Edelby.

¹⁰ “Joseph Cornelis – 1921-2001,” *Les Augustins de l’Assomption*, <http://www.assomption.org/fr/necrologies/joseph-cornelis-1921-2001> (accessed October 7, 2014). This site also lists Fr. Daniel Stiernon and Fr. Elpide Stéphanou, as Assumptionists assisting with the preparatory commission; however, Edelby states Fr. Stéphanou is a Jesuit.

¹¹ Edelby and Dick, 65. Most of the information regarding these *periti* comes from Edelby.

Fr. Garo of the Excharte of Athens [Greek]¹²

Dr. Remmers of the Apostolate of Reunion in Holland and professor of ecumenism at
University of Münster

Dom Thomas Becquet, O.S.B., Prior of Chevetogne Abbey

Fr. Wojnar, Basilian [Ukrainian], professor of canon law at Catholic University in
Washington

Archimandrite Athanase Hage, B.C., Superior General of the Basilian Chouerite Order of
St. John the Baptist [Melkite]

Fr. Maurice (Pierre) Benoît, O.P. (1906-1987), of L'École Biblique in Jerusalem
[Roman]¹³

Fr. Basilio Talatinian, O.F.M. (1913-), of the Custody of Holy Land [Armenian]¹⁴

Fr. Alfons Maria Mitnacht, O.S.A. (1894-1976), director of the review *Der christliche
Osten* ¹⁵ [Roman]

Fr. Michael Lacko, S.J., Pontifical Oriental Institute in Rome

Archimandrite Maurice Blondeel, M.Afr., rector of Melkite Seminary of St. Anne in
Jerusalem [Melkite]

Fr. Malak [Coptic]

¹² This may be the Fr. Grigoriou Garo mentioned in the *The Tablet*, 6/27/1964:

<http://archive.thetablet.co.uk/article/27th-june-1964/11/from-our-notebook>.

¹³ “Pierre Benoit (archaeologist),” *Wikipedia*, March 3, 2014, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pierre_Benoit_%28archaeologist%29 (accessed October 7, 2014).

¹⁴ “Surviving Armenian genocide, Fr. Basilio, OFM, turns 101-years-old,” *Preserving a Christian Presence*, February 11, 2014, <http://ffhl.blogspot.com/2014/02/surviving-armenian-genocide-fr-basilio.html> (accessed October 7, 2014).

¹⁵ “Alfons Maria Mitnacht,” *Würzburg Wiki*, May 28, 2014, http://wuerzburgwiki.de/wiki/Alfons_Maria_Mitnacht (accessed October 7, 2014).

This commission worked from the autumn of 1960 to the spring of 1962, having 56 plenary sessions grouped into 6 periods.¹⁶ The first period, November 14-17, 1960, divided the group into seven sections, each led by a member of the commission: theological (Gordillo), juridical (Pujol), historical (Stéphanou), liturgical (Raes), unionist (Sipovic), and pastoral (Bucko), with a special sub-commission for “non-Catholic Easterners,” which worked with the Secretariat for Christian Unity under Mgr. Testa.¹⁷ Three schemata were discussed in this period: on the Rites of the Church, on Eastern Patriarchs, and on *communicatio in sacris*.¹⁸ The second period, February 20-27, 1961, discussed *communicatio in sacris*, the commandments of the Church, the minister of Confirmation, the form of marriage, the Rites of the Church, and patriarchs. The third period, April 17-27, 1961, discussed the rites, the form of marriage, liturgical language, the Sacrament of Confirmation, the catechism, fasting and abstinence, reconciliation with the Orthodox, extra-sacramental *communicatio in sacris*, ecclesiastical habit, and the permanent diaconate. The fourth period, June 20 to July 13, 1961, discussed Eastern patriarchs, the faculties of bishops, the Eastern breviary, impediments of marriage, religious exemption in the East, and the faculties of the minister of Confirmation, as well as extra-sacramental *communicatio in sacris*. The fifth period, beginning October 10, 1961, reviewed the previous projects, with most of the schemata being considered virtually complete, while the schema on the unity of the Church was discussed. The sixth period, beginning May 3, 1962, discussed the Eastern code of canon law.

The resulting schemata (Text A) were as follows:¹⁹

¹⁶ Edelby and Dick, 66. Further detail on the preparatory commission’s work can be found in 66-68.

¹⁷ Ibid., 66.

¹⁸ Ibid., 68.

¹⁹ Summarized from Edelby and Dick, 69-71.

De ministro sacramenti sancti chrismatis (Of the minister of the Sacrament of Holy Chrism), 7 articles

De ministro sacramenti poenitentiae (Of the minister of the Sacrament of Penance), 8 articles

De diaconatu permanenti (Of the permanent diaconate), 4 articles

De forma canonica celebrationis matrimoniorum mixtorum (Of the canonical form of the celebration of mixed matrimony), 1 article

[These first four schemata were grouped under the general title of *De Ecclesiae Sacramentis (Of the Church's Sacraments)*.]

De Ritibus in Ecclesia (Of the Rites in the Church), 12 articles; article 6, related to the possibility of creating new rites, was suppressed

De Patriarchis orientalibus (Of the Eastern Patriarchs), 13 articles; articles 8-13 were later removed

De communicatione in sacris cum christianis orientalibus non catholicis (Of communicatio in sacris with Eastern non-Catholic Christians), 6 articles

De usu linguarum vernacularum in liturgiis (Of the use of vernacular languages in the liturgy), 4 articles

De Ecclesiae praeceptis (Of the Church's precepts), divided into five parts:

- I. *De diebus festis (Of feast days)*, 7 articles
- II. *De abstinencia et jejunio (Of abstinence and fasting)*, 9 articles
- III. *De communion paschali (Of Paschal communion)*, 9 articles

IV. *De decimis seu contributis (Of tithing or contribution)*, 2 articles

V. *De sollemnitatibus nuptiarum (Of the solemnizing of nuptials)*, 3 articles

De facultatibus Episcoporum (Of the faculties of Bishops), 4 articles

De catechismo et de catechetica institutione (Of the catechism and of the catechetical institution), 5 articles

De kalendario perpetuo et celebratione Paschatis (Of the perpetual calendar and the celebration of Pascha), 4 articles

De officio divino Ecclesiarum orientalium (Of the divine office of Eastern Churches), 8 articles; the first 3 articles were suppressed for being too general

De habitu clericorum (Of clerical habit), 5 articles

De Ecclesiae unitate: «ut omnes unum sint» (Of the Church's unity: "that all may be one"), 52 articles; this was the crowning glory of the preparatory commission's work, and it eventually became part of the decree *De œcumenismo (On ecumenism)*, which was the joint work of members of the Eastern commission and the Secretariat for Christian Unity

6 of these schemata were passed to other groups, and the other 9 remained with the Eastern Commission, until they were transferred to the Council Commission in 1962.²⁰ The schemata on the faculties of bishops, the Sacrament of Penance, and catechism were grouped into more general schemata, both Eastern and Western. The schema on the precepts of the Church was joined with the work on the Eastern code of canon law. The schemata on patriarchs

²⁰ Vorgrimler, 308.

and *communicato in sacris* were sent to Roman dicasteries to work. The 9 schemata remaining with the Eastern commission were:²¹

De Ritibus in Ecclesia, 11 articles

De Patriarchis orientalibus, 7 articles

De Officio divino, 5 articles

De ministro sancti chrismatis, 5 articles

De diaconatu permanenti, 4 articles

De forma matrimoniorum mixtorum, 1 article

De lingua vernacular in Liturgiis, 4 articles

De celebratione Paschatis, 1 article

De Ecclesiae unitate: «ut omnes unum sint», 52 articles

The final work of the preparatory Eastern commission was the *Textus emendatus et breviatus* of 96 articles (Text B).²²

Some of these schemata can be seen in summarized form in the final form of *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*. For instance, the section “Divine Worship” is almost entirely comprised of these schemata: *De kalendario* (§20), *De Ecclesiae praeceptis* (§21), *De officio divino* (§22), and *De usu linguarum vernacularum* (§23).²³ The 12-article schema *De ritibus in Ecclesia* eventually became the section “The Particular Churches or Rites” (*De Ecclesiis*

²¹ Edelby and Dick, 71.

²² Ibid., 72.

²³ Ibid., 326.

particularibus seu ritibus), §§2-4.²⁴ One schema began as a draft called *De Sacra Hierarchia*, which included articles on patriarchs, three articles on bishops, and two articles on synods; however, the articles on patriarchs became *De Patriarchalis orientalis* and eventually §§7-11 of the final document, while the articles on bishops and synods were delegated to the Commission on Bishops, which then became §8 and §38:6 in *Christus Dominus*.²⁵

The largest schema, *De Ecclesiae Unitate*, had an interesting history. After the preparatory time, it was transferred from the Commission for Eastern Churches and combined with other drafts to become *De Oecumenismo*. However, some chapters of the original schema were delegated back to the Commission for Eastern Churches, 10 articles under the title *De Unione Christianorum*, on March 29, 1963, by Cardinal Cicognani, president of both the Commission for Eastern Churches and the Co-ordinating Commission. These articles became Part II of the text at the time (Text C) of *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*. Eventually, Part II of the text was deleted, and the content became the section “Preservation of the Spiritual Heritage of the Eastern Churches” (§§5-6), while the remainder of *De Ecclesiae Unitate* was incorporated into the formation of *Unitatis Redintegratio*.²⁶

The Council Commission

In his motu proprio *Appropinquante concilio*, dated August 6, 1962, and promulgated on September 5, 1962, Pope John XXIII issued instructions regarding the Second Vatican Council, and the motu proprio was accompanied by a set of regulations (*Ordo Concilii Oecumenici Vaticani II Celebrandi*). Part One, Chapter III of these regulations discussed the

²⁴ Ibid., 314.

²⁵ Ibid., 322.

²⁶ Ibid., 308-309, 317.

conciliar commissions, and Article 7, §1, enumerated them, including the Commission for Eastern Churches (*de Ecclesiis Orientalibus*).²⁷ Cardinal Amleto Giovanni Cicognani (1883-1973) [Roman] was named the president of this commission; he had previously been named Secretary of the Sacred Congregation for the Eastern Church on November 14, 1959, but at the time he was the Secretary of State of the Vatican.²⁸ The secretary of the commission was Fr. Atanasij Hryhor Velykyj (Welykyj), O.S.B.M. (1918-1976) [Ukrainian], who became Superior General of the Basilian Order of St. Josaphat in 1963.²⁹ (Later, an adjunct secretary was chosen by the commission: Abbot Charles (Carlo) de Clercq (1905-1982) [Roman], a Belgian specialist in Eastern canon law.³⁰)

According to Article 6, §2, of the *Ordo*, each commission consists of 24 members, of whom two parts are chosen by the Council Fathers and one part by the Pope.³¹ The votes for the 16 members chosen by the Council Fathers took place on October 20, 1962, during the 3rd General Congregation of the Council.³² The 16 members of the Commission for the Eastern Churches chosen by the Fathers were:³³

Archbishop Ambrozij Andrew Senyshyn, O.S.B.M. (1903-1976), Archbishop of Philadelphia [Ukrainian]

²⁷ Floyd Anderson, ed, *Council Daybook*, vol. 1, *Vatican II, Sessions 1 and 2* (Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1965), 13-15; Pope John XXIII, *Appropinquante Concilio, La Santa Sede*, August 6, 1962, http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_xxiii/motu_proprio/documents/hf_j-xxiii_motu-proprio_19620806_appropinquante-concilio_lt.html (accessed October 7, 2014).

²⁸ Anderson, 1:12.

²⁹ Anderson, 1:95.

³⁰ Edelby and Dick, 74; “Charles de Clercq (1905-1982),” *ODIS - Database Intermediary Structures Flanders*, March 25, 2010, http://www.odis.be/pls/odis/opacuvw.toon_uvw_2?CHK=PS_5115 (accessed October 7, 2014).

³¹ John XXIII, *Appropinquante Concilio*.

³² Anderson, 1:42.

³³ Anderson, 1:43.

Bishop Giuseppe Perniciaro (1907-1981), Ordaining Bishop of Italo-Albanian Catholics
in Sicily [Italo-Albanian]

Abbot Johannes M. Höck, O.S.B. (1902-1992), Superior General of the Order of St.
Benedict [Roman]

Archbishop Antoni Baraniak, S.D.B. (1904-1977), Archbishop of Poznań [Roman]

Patriarch Maximos IV Saygh, S.M.S.P. (1878-1967), Patriarch of Antioch [Melchite]

Archbishop Gabriel Bukatko (1913-1981), Archbishop of Belgrade [Roman]

Archbishop Joseph Parecattil (1912-1987), Archbishop of Ernakulam [Syro-Malabar]

Archbishop Néophytos Edelby, B.A. (1920-1995), Counsellor to the Patriarch of Antioch
[Melchite]

Archimandrite Teodoro Minisci (1907-1990), Abbot of Santa Maria di Grottaferrata
[Italo-Albanian]

Archbishop Manuel da Silveira d'Elboux (1904-1970), Archbishop of Curitiba [Roman]

Archbishop Ivan Bucko (1891-1974), Apostolic Visitor for Ukrainian Catholics in
Western Europe [Ukrainian]

Bishop Andrés Sapelak, S.D.B. (1919-), Apostolic Visitor for Ukrainian Catholics in
Argentina [Ukrainian]

Cardinal Fernando Quiroga y Palacios (1900-1971), Archbishop of Santiago de
Compostela [Roman]

Archbishop Benedict Varghese Gregorios Thangalathil, O.I.C. (1916-1994), Archbishop
of Trivandrum [Syro-Malankar]

Bishop Bryan Joseph McEntegart (1893-1968), Bishop of Brooklyn [Roman]

Bishop Martien Antoon Jansen (1905-1983), Bishop of Rotterdam [Roman]

Of these members, Cardinal Quiroga y Palacios and Archbishop Bukatko were named Vice Presidents of the Commission.³⁴ During the 4th General Congregation of the Council, on October 22, 1962, it was announced that Pope John had transferred Abbot Minisci to the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, and thus he was replaced by Archbishop Matthew Kavukattu (1904-1969), Archbishop of Changanacherry [Syro-Malabar].³⁵

During the 9th General Congregation of the Council, on October 29, 1962, the 9 members chosen by Pope John were announced:³⁶

Patriarch Stephanos I Sidarouss, C.M. (1904-1987), Patriarch of Alexandria [Coptic]

Patriarch Paul Pierre Méouchi (1894-1975), Patriarch of Antioch [Maronite]

Patriarch Alberto Gori, O.F.M. (1889-1970), Patriarch of Jerusalem [Roman]

Patriarch Paul II Cheikho (1906-1989), Patriarch of Babylon [Chaldean]

Patriarch Ignace Pierre XVI Batanian (1899-1979), Patriarch of Silicia [Armenian]

Archbishop Joseph Rabbani (1889-1973), Apostolic Administrator of the Archdiocese of Homs [Syrian]

Archbishop Asrate Mariam Yemmeru (1904-1990), Archbishop of Addis Abeba [Ethiopian]

Archbishop Giovanni Battista Scapinelli di Légiugno (1908-1971), Assessor of the Sacred Congregation for the Eastern Church [Roman]

³⁴ *Acta Apostolica Sedis* [AAS] 55 (1963): 120.

³⁵ Anderson, 1:48.

³⁶ Anderson, 1:54-5.

Bishop Hyakinthos Gad (1912-1975), Apostolic Exarch for Greek Catholics in Greece
[Greek]

During the 72nd General Congregation on November 21, 1963, it was announced that Pope Paul VI had authorized a reorganization of the conciliar commissions, including increasing their members from 25 to 30; since 2 members had recently been named to the Commission for Eastern Churches, only 3 more were to be elected.³⁷ One of these two additional members was Cardinal Gustavo Testa (1886-1969), Secretary of the Congregation for Eastern Churches [Roman].³⁸ The other appears to have been Archbishop Josyf Ivanovich Slipyj (1892-1984), Major Archbishop of L'viv [Ukrainian].³⁹ During the 76th General Congregation on November 27, 1963, lists prepared by national bishops' conferences of candidates for election into the enlarged commissions were distributed, along with ballots, and the completed ballots were collected during the 77th General Congregation on November 28, 1963.⁴⁰ The newly-elected members, announced during the 78th General Congregation on November 29, 1963, were:⁴¹

Archbishop Maurice Baudoux (1902-1988), Archbishop of Saint-Boniface [Roman]

Archbishop Charles-Marie-Joseph-Henri de Provençères (1904-1983), Archbishop of

Aix [Roman]

Archbishop Ignace Ziadé (1906-1994), Archbishop of Beirut [Maronite]

³⁷ Anderson, 1:289. I have been unable to determine one of these two previously-appointed members.

³⁸ AAS 55 (1963): 120 lists Cardinal Testa as a member of the Commission.

³⁹ Slipyj appears on the list of the final commission members in Edelby and Dick, 74-75. The list in AAS 55 (1963): 120 only gives 26 members, plus Cardinal Cicognani, while the list in AAS 56 (1964): 350 only lists the 3 elected members, and he is not listed on either of these.

⁴⁰ Anderson, 1:309, 313.

⁴¹ Anderson, 1:316.

The Commission was composed of less than 50% Roman Catholics, with only 12 members, including the president, being Roman; the rest of the Commission's members belonged to Eastern Catholic Churches. The largest representation by a single Eastern Catholic Church was the Ukrainians with 4 members; the Maronites, Melchites, Syro-Malabars, and Italo-Albanians each had 2 members. In total, 13 Catholic Churches, of the 23 total, were represented in the Commission. The Conciliar Commission originally worked on the schema *De Unitate Ecclesiae* and 8 of the 14 schemata from the Preparatory Commission, but by the end of the first session of the Council, they only worked on the document that became *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*. In total, they met for 42 plenary sessions, beginning November 27, 1962, and ending November 14, 1964, when *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* was approved.⁴²

In addition to the members of the commission and the secretaries, there were also *periti* (experts) associated with the commission:⁴³

Fr. Clément Ignace Mansourati (1917-1982) [Syrian]

Fr. Emile Eid (1925-2009) [Maronite]

Fr. Alphonse Raes, S.J., specialist in Eastern liturgy, Pontifical Oriental Institute in Rome

Fr. Clément Pujol, S.J., canonist, Pontifical Oriental Institute in Rome

Fr. Pelopidas Stéphanou, S.J., historian, Pontifical Oriental Institute in Rome

Fr. Basilio Talatinian, O.F.M. (1913-), of the Custody of Holy Land [Armenian]

Fr. Ignace Abdo Khalifé, S.J. (1914-1998), of St. Joseph University in Beirut

⁴² Edelby and Dick, 76.

⁴³ Edelby and Dick, 75.

Fr. Daniel Faltin, O.F.M. Conv. (1927-2008), secretary of the commission for the revision of the Eastern Code of Canon Law⁴⁴

Before the Debates

At the 28th General Congregation on November 27, 1962, the Commission for Eastern Churches presented the schema *De Unitate Ecclesiae: Ut Omnes Unum Sint*.⁴⁵ After debates, the Fathers voted during 31st General Congregation on December 1, 1962, to combine this document with the documents drafted by the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity and the Theology Commission regarding ecumenism.⁴⁶ An analogous decision was made by the Co-ordinating Commission on January 30, 1963.⁴⁷

After the first session of the Council in autumn of 1962, the 15 original schemata had been compressed into one schema, which became Text B of *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, consisting of 96 articles. At the end of January 1963, the Co-ordinating Commission ordered a further abridgment of the document, which occurred from February to April 1963; the result consisted of 44 articles. The president of both the Co-ordinating Commission and the commission working on *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* (Cardinal Cicognani) then ordered that a second part be added to this document on March 29, 1963. This section, consisting of 10 articles, was given the title *De Unione Christianorum*, and it was a selection out of *De Ecclesiae Unitate*; the remainder of that schema joined other documents to become *De Oecumenismo*, a forerunner of *Unitatis Redintegratio*. The new Text C of *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, consisting of

⁴⁴ “Kňazi z Farnosti,” *Rímskokatolícka Cirkev Farnost’ Iľiašovce*, <http://www.kapitula.sk/iliasovce/knazi.html> (accessed October 7, 2014).

⁴⁵ Anderson, 1:97.

⁴⁶ Anderson, 1:102; Edelby and Dick, 77.

⁴⁷ Edelby and Dick, 78.

two parts and 54 articles total, was approved for dispatch by the Pope on April 22, 1963, and it was sent to the Council Fathers in May 1963.⁴⁸

Part I of Text C had a canonical character, and it had four chapters: 1) particular rites (Churches), 2) the sacred hierarchy (Patriarchs, bishops, synods), 3) disciple of the Sacraments (minister of Confirmation, the Eucharist, minister of Penance, permanent diaconate, mixed marriages), and 4) the divine cult (sacred times, Pascha, Divine Office, usage of living languages in the liturgy). The second part, entitled *Union of Eastern Christians*, was essentially the earlier schema on the unity of the Church pared down to only the parts dealing with the East. This text was formulated by a small group of members and *periti* residing in Rome, and the somewhat secretive formulation was criticized, particularly by the Melkites. Thus the commission in the end considered the text merely a basis for further discussion, susceptible to modification by simple majority.⁴⁹

After applying proposals submitted regarding Text C (about 400 were submitted by January 1964), in a series of 19 plenary sessions of the Eastern Commission between September 20 and December 3, 1963, another major abridgment occurred due to the so-called Döpfner Plan, proposed by Cardinal Julius August Döpfner, Archbishop of Munich and Freising. This plan was suggested before the Third Session of the Council, and it called for reducing many of the remaining schemata to a series of propositions in order to finish the Council quickly; the reduction of *De Ecclesiis Orientalibus*, as the document was known at that time, was ordered by the Coordinating Commission on January 15, 1964, leading to Text D of the document, which contained only 29 articles; in particular, the order of the Coordinating Commission called for the

⁴⁸ Vorgrimler, 308-9; Edelby and Dick, 72,76. Vorgrimler's Versions A, B, and C equate to Texts B, C, and D of Edelby and Dick. The latter labels the preparatory schemata as Text A.

⁴⁹ Edelby and Dick, 77.

Eastern document to mainly focus on “the discipline, in particular that which concerns *communicatio in sacris*.”⁵⁰ Some major changes included the addition, via the influence of Fr. Welykyj, of the section “Preservation of the Spiritual Heritage of the Eastern Churches” (§§5-6 of Text D), which is a summary of Part II of Text C (§§46-48 of C became §5, §49 of C became §6), the addition of the final introduction, and the removal of an introductory section on the patriarchate which weakened the institution.⁵¹ A group of experts in Rome, in 10 meetings, worked to create the basis of this text, which was finished in February 1964; a plenary session of the Commission met March 10-14, 1964, completing the text on the last day of the session.⁵² The parts of the text are as follows:⁵³

Preamble (§1)

De Ecclesiis particularibus (Of particular Churches) (§§2-4)

De spirituali Ecclesiarum orientalium patrimonio servando (Of preserving the spiritual patrimony of the Eastern Churches) (§§5-6)

De Patriarchis orientalibus (Of Eastern Patriarchs) (§§7-11)

De disciplina sacramentorum (Of the discipline of the Sacraments) (§§12-18)

De cultu divino (Of the divine cult) (§§19-23)

De conversatione ecclesiastica cum fratribus separatis (Of ecclesial conversation with separated brethren) (§§24-29)

⁵⁰ Rynne, 69, 95; Edelby and Dick, 79.

⁵¹ Vorgrimler, 317, 312, 319-20; Edelby and Dick, 79

⁵² Edelby and Dick, 79-80.

⁵³ Edelby and Dick, 80.

This version was sanctioned by the Pope on April 27, 1964, and it was then dispatched to the Council Fathers. Before the Third Session, about 80 proposals by 25 Council Fathers or groups of Fathers based on Text D were submitted, and they were treated by the commission (particularly Cardinal Cicognani and Archbishop Bukatko) during the first week of the Third Session; however, no new text was drawn up. Instead, a sheet of alterations was distributed to the Fathers before debates on the document began on October 15, 1964, which caused some confusion during the debates on the floor; when these amendments are inserted into the main text in the appropriate place, this yields Text E, the text debated at the Council Session. Two key topics of these amendments were the restoration of the authentic rights of patriarchs and concern for the internal canonical autonomy of the Eastern Churches.⁵⁴

The Debates

Debates on *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* took place on October 15, 16, 19, and 20, with the major debates being October 16 and 19. Respectively, each day had 3, 10, 14, and 3 speakers on the document.⁵⁵ It was presented on October 15 by Cardinal Amleto Cicognani, the Vatican Secretary of State and president of the Eastern Commission. He said the three major areas of difficulty in the document were 1) the issue of rite change, 2) mixed marriages between Catholics and Orthodox, and 3) *communicatio in sacris*. Archbishop Gabriel Bukatko, one of the vice-presidents of the Eastern Commission, presented a report on the draft, stating it had been prepared solely through suggestions by Council Fathers and not through theological or theoretical speculation, and he lamented that, because the document was so condensed and

⁵⁴ Ibid., 309; Edelby and Dick, 80-1.

⁵⁵ Rynne, 113-4, 191.

compact, it would be difficult to make changes to it. His tripartite address explained the history of the document, justified its importance, and discussed some of its important issues; in this last part, he particularly mentioned *communicatio in sacris* and mixed marriages, which he stated was the most difficult issue.⁵⁶

The topics that were most frequent in the actual debates at the Council were different from those mainly discussed by the Eastern Commission and mentioned by Cardinal Cicognani, besides the issue of rite change. The main topics discussed on the floor were 1) whether the Eastern Churches should have their own document at all, 2) the status of patriarchs, 3) jurisdictional pluralism,⁵⁷ 4) rite change, and 5) support of the Eastern Churches. Besides these, a few interventions discuss other topics: for example, Bishop Basilio Cristea, bishop of the Romanian Catholic Church in exile, pleaded for persecuted Eastern Christians and Catholics (October 16), Patriarch Ignace Pierre XVI Batanian, the Armenian Catholic Patriarch of Cilicia, supported lenient rules regarding mixed marriages (October 16), and Archbishop Charles de Provençhères of Aix, France, called for some degree of *communicatio in sacris* with the Orthodox (October 16).⁵⁸ Throughout the debates, one of the common themes was the conflict

⁵⁶ Floyd Anderson, ed, *Council Daybook*, vol. 2, *Vatican II, Session 3* (Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1965), 2:137; Edelby and Dick, 83.

⁵⁷ Jurisdictional pluralism is the situation in which two or more bishops oversee the same territory. In the early Church, this was against the canons, and one way to be a schismatic was for a bishop to set himself up as bishop of an already-occupied see. With the growth of multiple churches, each with their own hierarchies, and the increasing mobilization of the world (leading to, for instance, Roman bishops in Moscow and Assyrian bishops in Stockholm), jurisdictional pluralism has become an entrenched state of being. Thus one territory could now have, theoretically, 45 bishops overseeing it with overlapping sees, at least in a rough count: the 5 churches of the ancient Pentarchy, 22 Eastern Catholic Churches, 11 autocephalous Orthodox Churches, 6 Oriental Orthodox Churches, and the Assyrian Church of the East. The bishops' faithful are thus divided both by their churches and their location. I am uncertain if there are areas with the full number of possible bishops, but in any case, the issue of jurisdictional pluralism is one that is still with us today.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 2:141-143.

between different Easterners on various issues: as Edelby put it, the Council Fathers' main question, which seemed to have no clear answer, was, "What exactly do the Easterners want?"⁵⁹

The first speaker on the document on October 15, Cardinal Franz König, Archbishop of Vienna and ordinary of Eastern Catholics in Austria, began the discussion on whether this document should exist at all; in particular, he examined the document from an ecumenical point of view, as did Cardinal Giacomo Lercaro, Roman Archbishop of Bologna, on October 19th.⁶⁰

The speaker immediately following Cardinal König, Patriarch Stephanos I Sidarouss, Coptic Patriarch of Alexandria, as well as other Council Fathers, called for the entire discussion of Eastern Churches to be moved into other documents, such as *Lumen Gentium*.⁶¹ The majority of the Council Fathers who spoke about the issue of a separate document called for the abolishment of this document, or at least for the movement of parts of it into other documents instead. The main Father who seemed to truly appreciate the existence of the document was Bishop Josef Stangl of Würzburg, Germany, who, on October 16, lamented how compressed and small the document was, being little more than a sequence of canonical propositions; he mourned, "Nothing is left of the original text but a skeleton, where there should be a well-built body."⁶² He wanted the document incredibly expanded beyond its current size. In the end, the structure of the document was fundamentally the same as before the debates, causing Fathers of both mindsets to be disappointed.

The last speaker of the day on October 15 was Patriarch Maximos IV Saygh, Melkite Patriarch of Antioch, and the main point of his intervention was a call for the restoration of

⁵⁹ Edelby and Dick, 94.

⁶⁰ Edelby and Dick, 84,88.

⁶¹ Anderson, 2:138; Rynne, 113.

⁶² Edelby and Dick, 88; Anderson, 2:142.

patriarchal rights and honor.⁶³ Many other Council Fathers joined him in this call. In fact, of the Fathers who spoke about patriarchs, the only who opposed them was Bishop Raphael Bayan of Alexandria, an Armenian. On October 19, he lambasted the patriarchates as an anachronism and called for their elimination.⁶⁴ The results of the pro-patriarchal interventions of Patriarchs Maximos and Stephanos, along with others like Abbot Johannes Höck, president of the Bavarian Congregation of the Benedictine Order, on October 19, were somewhat reflected in the final text, but their effect was felt more in later documents and legislation, such as the 1990 *Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*.

The harshest speakers against jurisdictional pluralism were Bishop Michael Doumith of Sarba, Lebanon, and Archbishop Isaac Ghattas of Thebes, Egypt, both speaking on October 16. The former called it the “most crucial problem” facing Eastern Churches, and the latter warned against “pastoral anarchy” related to this issue.⁶⁵ In contrast, Archbishop Néophytos Edelby, counselor of the Melkite Patriarchate of Antioch, called on October 19 for the establishment of hierarchies of Eastern Churches wherever necessary for the good of souls.⁶⁶ The final document supported Edelby’s view, stating that “each [church] should organize its own parishes and hierarchy, where the spiritual good of the faithful requires it.”⁶⁷

The issue of rite change was the most contested on the floor, along with the issue of jurisdictional pluralism. Patriarch Ignace Pierre, on October 16, most eloquently argued against the possibility of rite change upon conversion: someone who converts to Catholicism from

⁶³ Rynne, 113; Anderson, 2:138.

⁶⁴ Anderson, 2:159; Edelby and Dick, 89.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 2:141-2.

⁶⁶ Ibid., 2:161.

⁶⁷ Second Vatican Council, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* [OE] §4, in Austin Flannery, ed., *Vatican Council II*, new rev. ed., vol. 1, *The Conciliar and Postconciliar Documents* (Northport, NY: Costello Publishing Company, Inc., 1998), 442.

Orthodoxy is like a “son who has wandered away from the family home. When he returns to his native city, it is natural that he go not to just any family, but to his own.”⁶⁸ On the same day, Archbishop Josyf Slipyj of L’viv, Ukraine, passionately denounced Western Catholics for inducing Eastern Catholics to become Western, and he lamented the effects of Latinization on the Eastern Churches: *Miseremini nostri, venerabiles Patres, quia orientales sumus* (Pity us, venerable Fathers, for we are Easterners)!⁶⁹ In contrast, also on the 16th, Patriarch Alberto Gori, O.F.M., Latin-rite Patriarch of Jerusalem, argued for allowing rite change to meet the needs of the individual; the necessity to make an appeal in order to obtain a rite change he considered a suppression of an individual’s freedom.⁷⁰ A majority of speakers called for freedom of rite, yet the formulation of Text D was, in general, retained: a convert “must retain each his own rite wherever he is...without prejudice to the right of appealing to the Apostolic See.”⁷¹

Finally, many spoke in support of the Eastern rites and Churches, calling for more study into their history and theology, calling for more work to bring Latin-rite Catholics into contact with the East, calling for more support of the rights of the Eastern Churches. Some of the strongest speakers in this regard were Bishop Stangl and Archbishop Slipyj, both on October 16. A corollary to this is the need to emphasize the Eastern Churches *as* Churches and to not equate the universal Church with the Latin Church; Archbishop Ghattas and Archbishop Elias Zoghby, the Melkite Patriarchal Vicar of Alexandria, both called for this on October 16.⁷²

⁶⁸ Anderson, 2:142.

⁶⁹ Edelby and Dick, 86.

⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁷¹ Anderson, 2:167; OE §4, 443.

⁷² Edelby and Dick, 86-7.

After all the debates, the Council Fathers voted on October 20 to have the document move on to its final votes and not to be returned to the Commission for review.⁷³ The document was split into eight sections for voting, with five votes on October 20 and three on October 21. A positive decision was not assumed: as Edelby put it, on the night of October 19, before the final day of debates and the Melkite push to defend the schema, it appeared the odds were 99:1 against the document's being approved.⁷⁴ However, every section passed the vote except the section on the change of rites, §§2-4.⁷⁵

After this vote, five sub-commissions were created to handle the various proposals for amendments on the document, and the full Eastern Commission had seven plenary sessions to finish the text and create the definitive form (Text F). Changes include adding a conclusion, changing the title to *De Ecclesiis orientalibus catholicis (Of Eastern Catholic Churches)*, and using the two phrases "particular Church" and "Rite" interchangeably (though "rite," in miniscule, was distinguished as the general liturgical tradition). The key alteration, though, was §4, on change of rite, as it was due to this that one section did not pass the first vote. The issue was the language that stated all non-Catholics who become Catholic must join the Church that corresponds to their original, baptismal Church. The final text added a caveat that allowed for a change of rite for the good of an individual's soul.⁷⁶

Definitive votes on Text F occurred on November 20 in three votes: on the introduction and §§2-4, on general amendments, and on the text as a whole. All votes passed, and the document was promulgated on November 21, 1964, after a ceremonial, public, final vote.⁷⁷

⁷³ Anderson, 2:163.

⁷⁴ Edelby and Dick, 94.

⁷⁵ Anderson, 2:167, 171; Rynne, 192; Edelby and Dick, 97-98.

⁷⁶ Edelby and Dick, 98-101. This source lists the members and tasks of the five sub-commissions on 98.

⁷⁷ Anderson, 2:296, 299; Rynne, 284-5.

Conciliar Interventions Regarding *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*

October 15, 1964 (102nd General Congregation of the Council):

Cardinal Franz König, Archbishop of Vienna [Roman]

Patriarch Stéphanos I Sidarouss, Patriarch of Alexandria [Coptic]

Patriarch Maximos IV Saygh, S.M.S.P., Patriarch of Antioch [Melkite]⁷⁸

October 16, 1964 (103rd General Congregation):

Cardinal Jaime de Barros Câmara, Archbishop of São Sebastião do Rio de Janeiro [Roman]

Patriarch Alberto Gori, O.F.M., Patriarch of Jerusalem [Roman]

Patriarch Ignace Pierre XVI Batanian, Patriarch of Cilicia [Armenian]

Archbishop Josyf Ivanovich Slipyj, Major Archbishop of L'viv [Ukrainian]

Archbishop Isaac Ghattas, Bishop of Luxor [Coptic]

Archbishop Charles-Marie-Joseph-Henri de Provençères, Archbishop of Aix [Roman]

Archbishop Elias Zoghby, Patriarchal Vicar of Alexandria [Melkite]⁷⁹

Bishop Michael Doumith, Bishop of Sarba [Maronite]

Bishop Vasile Cristea, A.A., Bishop of the Romanian Catholic Church in Exile [Romanian]

Bishop Josef Stangl, Bishop of Würzburg [Roman]

October 19, 1964 (104th General Congregation):

Cardinal Giacomo Lercaro, Archbishop of Bologna [Roman]

Archbishop Joseph Elias Tawil, Patriarchal Vicar of Damascus [Melkite]⁸⁰

Bishop Alexandros Scandar, Bishop of Assiut [Coptic]

Abbot Johannes Höck, O.S.B., Superior General of the Order of Saint Benedict [Roman]

Bishop Raphaël Bayan, I.C.P.B., Bishop of Alexandria [Armenian]

Bishop Vittorio Maria Costantini, O.F.M. Conv., Bishop of Sessa Aurunca [Roman]

Archbishop Antonio Gregorio Vuccino, A.A., Archbishop Emeritus of Corfu [Roman]

Archbishop Néophytos Edelby, B.A., Counsellor to the Patriarch of Antioch [Melkite]⁸¹

Bishop Gerald Vincent McDevitt, Auxiliary Bishop of Philadelphia [Roman]

Bishop Stephen John Kocisko, Bishop of Passaic [Ruthenian]

Archbishop François Ayoub, Archbishop of Aleppo [Maronite]

Archbishop Pietro Sfair, Primate of Lebanon [Maronite]

Bishop Ceslao Sipovic, M.I.C., Superior General of the Congregation of Marian Fathers of the Immaculate Conception of the Most Blessed Virgin Mary [Roman]

Bishop Raphaël Bidawid, Bishop of Amadiyah [Chaldean]

October 20, 1964 (105th General Congregation):

Bishop George Hakim, Bishop of Akka [Melkite]⁸²

Archbishop Maurice Baudoux, Archbishop of Saint-Boniface [Roman]

Archbishop Dominic Romuald Basil Athaide, O.F.M. Cap., Archbishop of Agra [Roman]

List of interventions given during debates on *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, including appointments of each speaker at that time. Titular appointments are not included. The order is that given by Rynne, 113-4, 191. Summaries of these interventions can be found in Rynne, 95-108, Anderson, 2:137-166, and Edelby and Dick, 83-96.

⁷⁸ This intervention can be found in *The Melkite Church*, Chapter 6, and Rynne, 99-102.

⁷⁹ This intervention can be found in *The Melkite Church*, Chapter 11.

⁸⁰ This intervention can be found in *The Melkite Church*, Chapter 11.

⁸¹ This intervention can be found in *The Melkite Church*, Chapter 11, as well as (in French) Edelby and Dick, 91-3.

⁸² This intervention can be found in *The Melkite Church*, Chapter 11.

Conclusion

As mentioned in the introduction, this article is by no means a complete review of the entire formation of *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, particularly regarding the process of formation of each article of the final text.⁸³ My hope is that it spurs others to study this document and its place in Eastern Catholic history. At the time of the Council, there were polar opposite views of it. While Patriarch Maximos declared shortly after the Council, “On the whole we obtained what we asked from the Council,” Bishop Doumith lamented, “Reading the text of the document on the Eastern Churches, one finds all hopes for the Eastern Christians vanishing into thin air.”⁸⁴ The extent to which this “skeleton of a text,” as Bishop Stangl called it, affected the Eastern Catholic Churches is a topic I eagerly hope a scholar studies in depth.⁸⁵ I only hope that this work merely instigates the study of and discussion on *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, that its role in the history and life of those Churches from whom “has come a wondrously grand and powerful flood of benefits upon the other peoples of the world, no matter how far-flung,” may be deeply comprehended.⁸⁶

⁸³ Some information regarding the formation of the individual articles can be found in Vorgrimler; an in-depth history and analysis of each article can be found in Edelby and Dick, 105-499.

⁸⁴ *The Melkite Church*, Preface; Anderson, 2:141. As an interesting note, Yves Congar, in his preface to Edelby and Dick, quotes in full a letter prepared by Patriarch Maximos to Pope Paul VI, which was never sent, that called for the Pope to postpone the final vote and promulgation of this document, as it could be detrimental to ecumenical efforts; cf. Edelby and Dick, 15-16, n. 5.

⁸⁵ Anderson, 2:142.

⁸⁶ Pope Leo XIII, *Orientalium Dignitas*, in in *Vatican Documents on the Eastern Churches*, vol. 1 (Fairfax, VA: Eastern Christian Publications, 2002), 179.