EASTERN CATHOLIC LITURGICAL DEVELOPMENT AND ECCLESIAL IDENTITY IN THE UNITED STATES

Thesis

Submitted to

The College of Arts and Sciences of the

UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

The Degree of

Master of Arts in Theological Studies

By

Emily Marie Lawrence

Dayton, Ohio

May 2025

EASTERN CATHOLIC LITURGICAL DEVELOPMENT AND ECCLESIAL IDENTITY IN THE UNITED STATES

Name: Lawrence, Emily M.

Approved by:

Timothy R. Gabrielli, Ph.D.
Faculty Advisor

Joseph S. Flipper (Apr 23, 2025 17:43 EDT)

Joseph S. Flipper, Ph.D.
Faculty Reader

William H. Johnston (Apr 23, 2025 19:21 EDT)

William H. Johnston, PhD
Faculty Reader

Jana M. Bennett (Apr 29, 2025 10:37 EDT)

Jana M Bennett, Ph.D.
Chairperson

ABSTRACT

EASTERN CATHOLIC LITURGICAL DEVELOPMENT AND ECCLESIAL IDENTITY IN THE UNITED STATES

Name: Lawrence, Emily Marie
University of Dayton

Advisor: Dr. Timothy R. Gabrielli

This thesis examines the history of Eastern Catholics in the United States, primarily as encountered in and through their liturgical traditions, to offer ways in which deeper awareness of the many particular Catholic Churches adds nuance to Latin Catholic (Roman Catholic) discussions of liturgy, Catholic identity, and relationships among the Churches. To accomplish this goal, this thesis uses a historical-theological method that situates Eastern Catholics in their place in the larger story of U.S. Catholicism and analyzes the themes that unveil themselves in that history. This thesis begins with the period between the 1850s and the 1950s, portraying the ways in which U.S. Eastern Catholics negotiated the influences of Americanization and Latinization in the practice of their own liturgical traditions and in their relationships with the Latin majority of U.S. Catholicism. This period reveals ecclesiological conceptions of Latin superiority and of unity in uniformity that, together, often resulted in failure to recognize and treat Eastern Catholics as true Catholics. Next, a reading of three Vatican II documents—*Sacrosanctum Concilium*, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, and *Unitatis Redintegratio*—affirms the Eastern Catholic Churches as true Churches equal in dignity with the Latin Church, encourages them to return to the sources of their own traditions to meet the needs of their

faithful today, and identifies them as having a particular ecumenical vocation to the Orthodox Churches. Returning to the U.S. context, this thesis examines progress in Eastern Catholic liturgical development and Latin-Eastern Catholic relations in light of the Second Vatican Council in the period from the 1960s to the 2010s. This period reveals that Eastern Catholics, by being who they are in and through their particular liturgy and theology, urge the Latin Catholic Church to consider itself, not as the universal form of Catholicism to which all Catholics must conform, but as a particular Church, shaped by its own historical and cultural influences, in the communion of the universal Church. The conclusion of this thesis takes the insights of unity in diversity, the local church, and inculturation and local theologies as found in U.S. Eastern Catholic history to uncover constructive resources that can be applied to Latin Catholic discussions about liturgy, ecclesiology, and ecclesial identity.

Dedicated to Saint Barbara the Great Martyr Byzantine Catholic Community in Dayton, Ohio; Saint Ignatius of Antioch Maronite Catholic Church in Centerville, Ohio; and all Eastern Catholic communities who welcomed me, taught me their ways, and made this project possible

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank, first of all, my advisor Dr. Timothy R. Gabrielli for his work in directing this thesis, for his general encouragement, and for helping me to find the connections between the Eastern Catholic story that I was telling and important points of contact with the Latin Catholic story. His feedback and advice in our many conversations have been invaluable. To my readers Drs. William H. Johnston and Joseph S. Flipper, thank you for your interest and insights over the course of this project. I greatly appreciate the support and prayers of my family, my friends from my undergraduate, and my friends and colleagues at the Unviersity of Dayton, especially the members of my master's cohort: Hunter Doiron, Vincent LoBiondo, Thomas Laveck, Mary Bryan, and Jordan McCormick. I am grateful to Drs. Laurie Eloe and Gloria Falcão Dodd for their help in making connections with some of the Eastern Catholic communities in Ohio. I would also like to thank Dr. Mark Ryan for our many conversations about my thesis topic and the writing process, starting at the time when I was his graduate assistant.

My time as a master's student at the University of Dayton placed me in a particular environment and formation, without which this thesis might never have come to fruition. For this academic and spiritual formation, I give special thanks to Dr. Ethan Smith. He introduced me to the Christian East as he taught my classmates and me how to read Scripture through the insights of the Greek and Syriac Patristic voices. This approach inspired the desire for greater knowledge of Eastern Christianity and the quest for unity that drove my thesis work.

The other crucial component of the formative environment in which I have spent the past few years has been the unique opportunities to share not only in ideas but also in a life with Eastern Catholic communities in Ohio and Pennsylvania. I cannot overemphasize the vital importance of these communities' hospitality, friendship, and prayers. For these gifts, I would like to thank, above all, Saint Barbara the Great Martyr Byzantine Catholic Community (Dayton, Ohio) and Saint Ignatius of Antioch Maronite Catholic Church (Centerville, Ohio). May your Churches continue to grow and build up the Body of Christ on earth.

Finding the resources to complete this project required some creative searches for the relevant literature, and I would like to thank the following professors for offering me resources or pointing me in important directions as my research took shape: Stephanie Shreffler (Marian Library, University of Dayton), Fr. Mark M. Morozowich (Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.), Prof. Edward F. Alam (Notre Dame University, Beirut, Lebanon), Dr. Yury P. Avvakumov (University of Notre Dame, South Bend, Indiana), Fr. Stelyios S. Muksuris (Byzantine Catholic Seminary, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania), and Dr. Andrew Hayes (University of St. Thomas, Houston, Texas). If not all of their suggested sources and contacts made it into the final direction of this particular project, let them be assured that I will return to their suggestions in future research.

Finally, I thank St. Macrina the Teacher, St. Isidore of Seville, and the Mother of God for their intercession in the research, writing, and successful defense of this work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Pope John Paul II, in his 1995 encyclical on the Catholic Church's commitment to ecumenism (*Ut Unum Sint*), famously said of the need for unity between Catholics and Orthodox, "the Church must breathe with her two lungs!"[1] Where I grew up in south-central Pennsylvania, we had no visible Orthodox presence, and the nearest Byzantine Catholic parish was more than forty miles away. I received a typical Catholic school education, and I commend my teachers for striving to be thorough while trying to accomplish such impossible tasks as covering the entire *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, all of Scripture, and all of Church history in a single year each. However, our curriculum relegated all discussion of the Christian East to the Great Schism of 1054. Our lessons on that event followed the typical Catholic narrative, which, as one may notice, parallels the common narrative about the Protestant Reformation: The Orthodox fell away from the Catholic Church, the one True Church that Jesus founded. The Catholic Church today recognizes that the Orthodox have valid sacraments and apostolic succession, but we await the return of the Orthodox Churches to Rome. The idea that there could exist Catholic communities who retain "Orthodox" practices and concepts was absent from our collective awareness. We did not exclude Eastern Catholics out of any sort of malice; we simply gave them no thought at all and were not aware that there were such communities that we were ignoring. Thus, without knowing it, I grew up breathing with only one lung.

1. John Paul II, *Ut Unum Sint* (May 25, 1995): 54, www.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_25051995_ut-unum-sint.html.

My peers and I came of age watching the American Roman Catholic Church polarize and drift into walled-off camps, marked by their responses to the papacy of Pope Francis, the presidencies of Donald J. Trump and Joseph R. Biden, the clerical sexual abuse crisis, the COVID-19 pandemic protocols, the Eucharistic Revival, and the Synod on Synodality. All of these events have levied claims against who we are as Catholics, destabilizing the image that at least some of us had of the constancy of the Church during the papacies of John Paul II and Benedict XVI. While the socio-cultural storms brewed in the United States, a sizeable demographic of Catholics sought refuge in the seeming stability offered by what we took to be orthodoxy and orthopraxy.

The liturgy has become a locus for questions of who we are as Catholics and what our responsibilities are in our current moment. This fact should surprise no one, since the Second Vatican Council considered the liturgy to be the primary reality that shapes Christians into people who manifest to others the mystery of Christ and His Church.[2] In other words, the liturgy makes us who we are and enables us to live our vocation in the world. In the Roman Catholic Church in the United States, opposing camps in the "liturgy wars" often draw the battle lines along the left-versus-right poles of politics and the "culture wars." I was no exception; I remember conversations from 2021 and 2022 in which I zealously defended the facing of the priest *ad orientem*, kneeling as the objectively "more reverent" way to receive Holy Communion, and the overall "superiority" of the Traditional Latin Mass even after the promulgation of Pope Francis's motu propio *Traditiones Custodes*. I failed to account for any historical or cultural nuance that formed the Roman Mass, past and present, and I, therefore, treated the liturgy as an

2. Second Vatican Council, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, in *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, ed. Austin Flannery, O.P., 4th ed. (Costello Publishing 1979), 2.

object detached from human life. Moreover, I was suspicious of any attempts to dialogue with "the world," taking any deviation from what I understood to be *the* Catholic Tradition—epitomized in liturgy—for a betrayal of Christ and of who we are as His Church.

My first experience with the Byzantine Divine Liturgy during my undergraduate studies in Greensburg, Pennsylvania, did not save me from my time as what some may call a "Rad Trad." My previous formation and the socio-cultural pressures of those years had given me no resources through which to understand the Divine Liturgy except for my increasingly near-sighted Latin eyes. In my purview, the Byzantines, after all, were exceptions in the life of the mainstream Catholic Church.

It was only when I moved to Dayton, Ohio, that I properly began to appreciate the richness and beauty of the Eastern tradition. Dr. Ethan Smith's Foundations of Biblical Studies course first opened my eyes to the spirituality of the Greek Church Fathers continued interpretation of their tradition in Eastern Orthodoxy. The next spring, I personally began visiting Eastern Catholic communities in the Dayton area. To my delight, I encountered in the flesh an Eastern tradition nearly, though not exactly, identical to that which I had just studied in my course texts, yet within visible communion of the Catholic Church. The truth that we Catholics of differing liturgical, spiritual, pastoral, and even theological traditions could be ourselves and yet be members of one communion finally gave me new means to consider who we are when we gather as the Body of Christ in liturgy.

Too many Roman Catholics in the United States have not yet had the opportunity to encounter the Eastern side of the Catholic communion. In doctrinal, liturgical, pastoral,

and theological scholarship, we are hardly aware of Eastern Catholicism. The typical American Catholic historical narrative reads as one of various Catholic ethnic groups immigrating to the New World, facing down Protestant anti-Catholicism and the pressures of integration and industrialization, and gaining a confident and united foothold as fully Catholic and fully American. Leslie Woodcock Tentler paints such an image of triumph at the dedication of the Basilica of the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception in Washington, D.C.: "[a] polyglot church, once deeply divided, had matured by 1959 into a cohesive body remarkable for its piety and seeming uniformity."[3] When discussing the specific impact of Vatican II in the United States, Colleen McDannell's work, while nodding to Eastern Catholics' presence in the country and at the Council, largely presents them as a foreign phenomenon that shows the "cultural diversity" and "global" character of the Catholic Church.[4] Both authors' scope of American Catholic history is incomplete, failing to take into account how Eastern Catholics have, by celebration and by suffering, contributed to the Catholic Church's ability to be *catholic*. Eastern Catholic authors, such as Victor J. Pospishil and Ivan Kaszczak, document numerous episodes of Latin Catholics' historic failure to recognize Eastern Catholics as true Catholics at all, along with disastrous, even church-splitting consequences.[5] Considering Tentler's and McDannell's sympathy toward a more ecumenical concept of the Catholic Church, this scholarship demonstrates a still-existing lacuna even in Latin

3. Leslie Woodcock Tentler, *American Catholics: A History* (Yale University Press, 2020), 239.

4. Colleen McDannell, *The Spirit of Vatican II: A History of Catholic Reform in America* (Basic Books, 2011), 77, 144.

5. Victor J. Pospishil, *Ex Occidente Lex: From the West – The Law: The Eastern Catholic Churches under the Tutelage of the Holy See of Rome* (St. Mary's Religious Action Fund, 1979), 26; Ivan Kaszczak, *Bishop Soter Stephen Ortynsky and the Genesis of the Eastern Catholic Churches in America* (pub. by author, 2016), 19-20.

awareness of Eastern Catholics, let alone in knowledge of the deeper significance of their distinct identities in the universal Catholic Church.

This thesis, then, aims to bring Eastern Catholic perspectives on liturgy, ecclesiology, and United States history more deeply into the Latin Catholic scholarly sphere. This work takes inspiration primarily from the following question: What does it mean that we have so many different liturgies and theological traditions, and yet we can all call ourselves Catholic? As I surveyed the literature, this question differentiated into the main ones which the thesis in its final form seeks to address: 1) What has been the relationship between Eastern Catholic liturgy and ecclesiological challenges in the United States context? 2) How has the Second Vatican Council's portrayal of the Eastern Catholic Churches impacted Latin-Eastern Catholic relations in the U.S.? 3) What implications do ongoing developments in the Eastern Catholic Churches have for the Latin Church's self-understanding? Throughout this work, I defend the argument that the past and present trajectory of Eastern Catholic liturgical development reveals a communion ecclesiology according to which particular Churches are united precisely in their diversity of liturgical and theological traditions, thus expanding the catholicity of the universal Church.

I approach this study through a historical-theological method, tracing the main movements in the history of Latin Catholics and Eastern Catholics' time together in the territory of the United States. As I sketch the history, I draw out the underlying theological currents that shaped those events, paying special attention to the role of the liturgy. At various points, I use primary sources to offer a close reading of important documents or to corroborate certain points made by my dialogue partners. I seek to be

representative, but not exhaustive, of the relevant historical and theological sources to give the reader a firm sense of the main issues in the scholarship pertaining to these questions.

I focus on the United States context because of its characteristic pluralism and the largely immigrant character of American Catholicism. The United States context yields a special opportunity to study questions of liturgical-ecclesial identity where both the Latin and Eastern Catholic Churches have taken root an ocean away from their points of origin. In order to represent effectively the breadth of U.S. Eastern Catholic experience, I focus on four main groups: the Ukrainians, the Ruthenians, the Melkites, and the Maronites. I chose these traditions, not because their Churches are necessarily the largest in the United States,[6] but because of the extent of the available literature, the complementarity of the insights that they provide, and their salient roles in U.S. Eastern Catholic history. The Ukrainians, Ruthenians, and Melkites all have sister Orthodox Churches, with whom they consider themselves to share the same mother traditions and to whom they turn as fellow interpreters of those traditions. In contrast, the Maronites have no corresponding Orthodox Church. Therefore, they are the sole interpreters of their Syro-Maronite Tradition and occupy a unique position between East and West. In selecting these Eastern Catholic Churches and referring to others where it is helpful to do so, I aim to represent differing approaches to liturgical development. This variety provides clearer insights on the liturgical and ecclesiological questions of this work than a study of one of those listed

6. For the most recent numbers of Eastern Catholics in the United States, see Ronald G. Roberson, C.S.P., comp., "Eastern Catholic Churches in the United States 2018," United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2018, www.usccb.org/issues-and-action/cultural-diversity/asian-pacific-islander/demographics/upload/Eastern-Catholic-Churches-in-the-U-S-2018-Pie-Chart.pdf.

Churches alone would. We will need future studies to expand this discussion within and across the rest of the U.S. Eastern Catholic communities.

In Chapter 1 of this present study, I examine the century from the 1850s to the 1950s. This period covers the arrival of Eastern Catholics in the United States during a time when Latin Catholics struggled to establish themselves as a united Church and as good Americans against the suspicions of the Protestant majority. In this context, Eastern Catholics' practice of their own liturgies and traditions along with more lay-oriented forms of parish life conflicted with the U.S. Latin bishops' efforts to unite Catholics under assimilation into American society, uniformity of rite, and concentration of authority in the clergy. In this context, Eastern Catholics had to navigate the Americanizing pressures of the Latin Catholic bishops while doing their best to assert their own canonical rights. This period of time reveals a prevailing ecclesiology of unity in (Latin) uniformity, which the Eastern Catholics resisted.

In Chapter 2, I engage in a close reading of three documents to discover the Second Vatican Council's vision for the identity and role of the Eastern Churches in communion with Rome. I begin with the Sacred Constitution on the Liturgy (*Sacrosanctum Concilium*), which establishes principles for liturgical renewal and contains statements about the intersection of liturgy, culture, and the Christian life that provide a springboard for discussing a plurality of traditions in Catholic liturgy. I proceed with the Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches (*Orientalium Ecclesiarum*) and the Decree on Ecumenism (*Unitatis Redintegratio*). These documents present the Eastern Catholic Churches as full Churches of equal dignity with the Latin Church (and not merely ethnic groups with differing externals) who have a particular vocation to foster

unity with the separated Orthodox Churches. Comments by Eastern Catholic bishops at the Council point to areas where the documents, while providing great progress on Catholic understanding of the East, still leave some issues unresolved.

In Chapter 3, I examine the progress in Eastern Catholic liturgical development and Latin-Eastern Catholic relations in the American Church between the close of Vatican II and the 2010s. In regard to the liturgy, I not only show concrete examples of the work of *ressourcement* and *aggiornamento* in Eastern Catholic liturgical changes, but I also discuss the scholarly and pastoral themes that underlie this work and demand careful discernment. As regards Latin-Eastern relations, I give an overview of the U.S. Latin Church's work to acknowledge its role in failing to recognize and appreciate the Eastern Catholic Churches as equal members of the Catholic communion; Latin efforts to provide better support to Eastern Catholics in a Latin-majority American Church; and ways in which the Eastern Catholic Churches assert themselves as not only equal Churches but *sister Churches*. These developments prod the Latin Church to consider itself as *sister*, too.

The concluding chapter synthesizes the main insights of the American Eastern Catholic story to construct a paradigm for understanding liturgy and culture as the grounds for ecclesial identity. Then, I offer suggestions for ways in which this paradigm bears on Latin Catholic discussions about liturgy, ecclesiology, and ecclesial identity. I explore these questions through three select case studies that address internal Latin Catholic questions of liturgical reform, inculturation, and relations with the other Catholic and Orthodox Churches.

As we continue to wrestle with the reception of Vatican II, this thesis represents one Latin Catholic's attempt to take up the tasks of honoring the tradition of the Christian East, promoting its full flourishing, and working toward Christian unity. It is my hope, then, that a deeper appreciation of Eastern Catholic witness in the Catholic communion will sharpen our ecclesial self-understanding, suggest more irenic parameters around discussions about ongoing liturgical development, and contribute to greater love for our Eastern brothers and sisters until the day that the prayer of Our Lord Jesus Christ "that they may be one"[7] sees its fulfillment.

7. Jn 17:11 NABRE.

A Note on Terms

Throughout this thesis, I do my best to reflect terms as they are used by the sources to ensure that I most accurately represent Eastern Catholic voices in their own history. Where I differ from the sources, I do so for the sake of consistency or clarity for my predominantly Roman Catholic audience. Below is an explanation of key words as I use them throughout the present work.

- Latin: I use this term to refer to Western Catholic traditions, primarily meaning the Roman Catholic Church. The term "Latin" follows the convention in the majority of my Eastern Catholic sources and the Vatican II documents. I use the term "Roman" when I wish to refer to the Roman Catholic particular Church by name or when I distinguish its liturgy from other Latin liturgies, such as the Mozarabic and the Ambrosian liturgies.
- Eastern: I use this term as the best available collective term for the Eastern Catholic Churches. Some writings use "Greek" or "Oriental" to refer to some or all of the Eastern Churches. I use these terms only when referring to Churches whose official names contain one of those words or in direct quotes from sources that use them.
- Rite: I exclusively use this term to refer to the order of the liturgy and sacraments and their surrounding theology and spirituality. For example, I refer to "the Latin rite," "the Byzantine rite," and "the Maronite rite."
- (Particular) Church: I use this term to refer to a group of laypeople and their clergy bound together in a certain rite, in contrast with the universal Church. Eastern Catholic sources prefer the term "churches" for these groups rather than

"rites." Therefore, I do not refer to "Eastern-rite Catholics" or "the Eastern rites of the Catholic Church" but rather "Eastern Catholics," "the Eastern Catholic Churches," etc. When discussing the Catholic Church as one entity on the universal level, I refer to "the universal Catholic Church" or "the Catholic communion" for clarity.

- Ukrainian and Ruthenian: In general, these terms refer to sometimes-overlapping people groups from Eastern and Central Europe. Different writings refer to them by the same term or by yet more terms with various shades of meaning: Ukrainian, Ruthenian, Rusyn, Carpatho-Rusyn, "Russian," "Little Russian," "Hungarian," Sub-Carparthian, Uhro-Rusyn, Galician, etc. My usage of the terms "Ukrainian" and "Ruthenian" represents my best attempts to reflect the language of my sources while consistently discussing these groups as they correspond to their official structures in the United States: the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church, with eparchial sees in Philadelphia (Pennsylvania), Stamford (Connecticut), Parma (Ohio), and Chicago (Illinois); and the Byzantine (Ruthenian) Catholic Church, with sees in Pittsburgh (Pennsylvania), Parma (Ohio), Passaic (New Jersey), and Phoenix (Arizona).
- Spelling: Because the work of this thesis synthesizes a general Eastern Catholic history, I spell certain terms as they most commonly appear across my bibliography. In other literature, one may see, for example, "Olha and Volodymyr," "Uzhhorod," "Sheptytskiy," and "Kyivan Rus'" where I use "Olga and Vladimir," "Užhorod," "Sheptytsky," and "Kievan Rus'." I do, however, where possible, refer to modern-day Ukrainian cities according to their Ukrainian

spellings rather than the Russian-derived ones, as they are now equally well-known or better known by these names in English: for example, “Kyiv” and “Lviv” instead of “Kiev” and “Lvov.”

CHAPTER I

AMERICANIZATION AND LATINIZATION: HISTORICAL AND ECCLESIOLOGICAL BACKGROUND FOR U.S. EASTERN CATHOLIC LITURGICAL DEVELOPMENT

Archbishop John Ireland (1838-1918), according to Leslie Woodcock Tentler's account, was "an ardent patriot" who "admired the openness of American society and the room it made for striving and initiative." He both "trusted its institutions" and was quite "liberal" on policies regarding issues like desegregation and workplace discrimination.[1] He became a prominent advocate, then, for a future in which Catholics enjoyed full participation and a worthy place in American life. In his numerous speeches as bishop, he encouraged Catholics to share this hope and to take action in the modern world. On the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the ordination of Cardinal James Gibbons (1834-1921), he said, "Our place is in the world as well as the sanctuary…Religious action to accord with the age must take new forms and new directions."[2] Just a few years later, in 1891, a widowed priest named Alexis Toth (1854-1909) had arrived from Eastern Europe to ask for permission to serve Ruthenian Greek Catholics in Ireland's archdiocese. Angry that Rome had clearly disregarded his wishes not to send married or even widowed priests to him, Ireland told Toth outright, "I do not consider that either you or this bishop of yours are Catholic." He did not need Toth and would not grant him

1. Leslie Woodcock Tentler, *American Catholics: A History* (Yale University Press, 2020), 196.
2. Tentler, *American Catholics*, 196.

faculties.[3] Some new forms and new directions turned out to be steps too far for the inspiring vision that he offered at Gibbons's ordination anniversary Mass.

Such fraught encounters were not isolated events in the history of the relations between Latin and Eastern Catholics in the United States. Latin and Eastern Catholics alike faced the challenges of creating their own communities and supports, navigating the landscape of religious pluralism, and dealing with the demands of a rapidly modernizing society. However, as this chapter will demonstrate, Eastern Catholics regularly met with hostility from Latin Catholics who did not recognize them either as distinct churches with their own rites and traditions or as legitimate members of the Catholic communion. Latin Catholic bishops' attempts to guide the unification and assimilation of the whole of U.S. Catholicism collided with Eastern Catholic attempts to assert their rights according to the terms of their union. The United States became an important testing ground for the ability of Latin and Eastern Catholics to work through the complications of living in communion in and through their canonical and liturgical distinctions.

Life in the Early Diaspora Communities

Eastern Catholic immigration to the United States began in the mid-nineteenth century, with Syrian and Lebanese immigrants first arriving in the 1850s and Byzantine Slavs in the 1860s. Immigration across all groups peaked in the decades between 1880 and 1920.[4] Like other immigrants during this time period, the ethnic groups that made up

3. Jay P. Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience: A History from Colonial Times to the Present* (University of Notre Dame Press, 1992), 187.

4. Georges T. Labaki, "The Maronite Church in the United States, 1854-2010," *U.S. Catholic Historian* 32, no. 1 (Winter 2014): 74; Kaszczak, *Bishop Soter Stephen Ortynsky*, 4; M. Mark Stolarik, "Slovak Immigrants Come to Terms with Religious Diversity in North America," *Catholic Historical Review* 96, no. 1 (2010): 57.

the Eastern Catholic Churches in the Americas tended to settle together, forming their own neighborhoods in major cities. Ukrainians, for the most part, followed this pattern. Later waves of Ruthenians settled in more ethnically diverse areas, even suburbanizing more quickly than other Eastern Catholic groups, giving rise to a unique opportunity for non-Byzantine and non-Catholics to encounter Byzantine Catholicism.[5] Syrian and Lebanese immigrants also stayed largely within their own ethnic neighborhoods in major cities, though many Maronites became traveling peddlers, selling wares in networks of peddlers across the East Coast and Midwest and, by the end of the century, the entire country.[6] Others in these groups, as was the case for some Slovaks, Rusyns, and Ukrainians, worked such manual jobs as those in textile factories, coal mines, and steel mills.[7] Forming communities with others of their same languages and ethnic groups allowed the early Eastern Catholic immigrants to preserve their cultural and religious identity in an unfamiliar environment.

Without pre-existing structures to accommodate them in the United States, Eastern Catholic immigrants often lacked access to social services and support. To ensure that their communities' needs were addressed, these immigrant groups established voluntary associations. Various ethnic groups of Latin Catholics also formed their own

5. Richard Renoff, "The Elko Episcopate: An Era of Conversions," *Diakonia* 26, no. 2 (1993): 110. An interesting case is Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, which represents a counterexample for the Ruthenians and perhaps an extreme example for the Ukrainians. Timothy Kelly notes that the physical geography of the city forced groups of many different ethnic and religious backgrounds into small neighborhoods, even though one might expect that the opposite should have occurred, with each group claiming its own hill, perhaps. Social factors, rather than geographical ones, kept these groups separate, and each one established its own house of worship. Parish closures forced these groups together by the 1960s and 1970s. For more information, see Timothy Kelly, *The Transformation of American Catholicism: The Pittsburgh Laity and the Second Vatican Council, 1950-1972* (University of Notre Dame Press, 2009), 4-8.

6. Labaki, "The Maronite Church in the United States," 75-76.

7. Labaki, "The Maronite Church in the United States," 76; Stolarik, "Slovak Immigrants," 57; Kaszczak, *Bishop Soter Stephen Ortynsky*, 6, 30.

versions of these voluntary associations,[8] the most famous among them being the multi-ethnic but predominantly Irish-led Knights of Columbus, founded in 1882.[9] These societies were especially popular among the Slavic immigrant groups. The Slovaks provide many examples of these voluntary associations, primarily mutual benefit societies like the Society of St. Stephen I, founded in 1884; the First Catholic Slovak Union, founded in 1890; and the First Coopers' Benefit Society, founded in the 1880s.[10] The First Cooper's Benefit Society stands out as a trade-based organization, which structured itself after the pattern of the craft guilds in Europe to protect its members labor rights.[11] In his 1891 encyclical *Rerum Novarum*, Pope Leo XIII (1810-1903) lamented that, after the medieval guilds disappeared, "no other protective organization took their place" to uphold the dignity of the working class and meet their material needs.[12] Leo XIII praised the critical role that these "societies for mutual help" and labor unions played in providing the stability, community, and support in the context of the Industrial Revolution.[13] Because life in a new place that could not yet accommodate the newer immigrant groups, the U.S. context gave rise to many ethnically-based mutual benefit societies that filled the void left in the wake of the guilds.

An important example of these dynamics at work is in the Slovak immigrant communities, to which both Latin and Greek (Byzantine) Catholics belonged. Working-class men in Slovak coal-mining neighborhoods set up "fraternal benefit societies,"

---

8. Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 174, 176, 257-258.
9. Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 257-258.
10. Michael Kopanic, "Slovaks in New Jersey: An Overview," *Naše Rodina* 24, no. 2 (June 2012): 2-3, www.academia.edu/37609105/Slovaks_in_New_Jersey_An_Overview. Kopanic does not provide a specific date for the founding of the First Coopers' Benefit Society.
11. Kopanic, "Slovaks in New Jersey," 3.
12. Leo XIII, *Rerum Novarum* (May 15, 1891): 3, www.vatican.va/content/leo-xiii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_l-xiii_enc_15051891_rerum-novarum.pdf.
13. Leo XIII, *Rerum Novarum*, 48-49.

complete with bylaws and officers, which pooled together funds and other resources to provide aid to its members in the event of injury or death.[14] Though Latin Catholics, Greek Catholics, Lutherans, and Calvinists tended to form their own associations, membership in these associations depended more on one's Slovak background than on religious adherence.[15] A common Slovak identity formed the basis for two nationwide Slovak-American associations: the nondenominational National Slovak Society (February 1890) and the First Catholic Slovak Union (September 1890).[16] Later iterations of these mutual benefit societies defined membership more strictly on religious lines in ways that the earlier associations did not, perhaps necessitated by later escalations in tensions between Catholics and Protestants and between Latin and Eastern Catholics in the United States.[17] A notable example of such an association for Ukrainians and Ruthenians was the Union of Greek-Catholic Ruthenian Brotherhoods, founded in Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, in 1892 to address the social and spiritual needs of its members.[18] These communal efforts enabled these groups to share news and advocate for themselves as a community with a collective consciousness, as evidenced by the Ruthenian-founded newspaper *Amerikansky Russky Viestnik*,[19] which was instrumental in communicating ecclesial actions to laypeople.

---

14. Stolarik, "Slovak Immigrants," 57.

15. Stolarik, "Slovak Immigrants," 57. Stolarik's account indicates that these associations were usually separated by religious affiliation, and some of these groups were more cooperative with each other than others. For example, Slovak Lutherans and Calvinists were usually collaborative and even shared worship spaces.

16. Kopanic, "Slovaks in New Jersey," 2.

17. See, for example, the case of the Passaic Convention of the Slovak Gymnastic Union Sokol, which became the Slovak Catholic Sokol when the Catholic members restricted membership to Roman Catholics out of "[f]ear of secular and anti-clerical freethinkers…as well as controversies over the distribution of communion to Slovak Lutherans." Kopanic, "Slovaks in New Jersey," 7.

18. Kaszczak, *Bishop Soter Stephen Ortynsky*, 56.

19. Kaszczak, *Bishop Soter Stephen Ortynsky*, 56.

Rerum Novarum represents official ecclesiastical support for the guild-style, materially- and spiritually-focused voluntary societies such as those established by Slovak Latin and Greek Catholics. This support contrasts with the suspicions against the Knights of Labor and other organizations that, in the eyes of the hierarchy, looked like Freemason-style secret societies. The Canadian Knights of Labor were condemned for this reason in 1885. A large proportion of the membership of the American Knights was Catholic, and there were calls to condemn these Knights, too.[20] Ivan Wolansky (1857-1926), the first Ukrainian Catholic priest in the United States, faced suspicion from some Latin bishops for being a member of the Knights, supporting strikes, and, allegedly, being involved in the 1886 Haymarket Square Massacre.[21] In 1887, Cardinal James Gibbons intervened to defend the right of American Catholics to join the Knights, assuring the Roman Curia that the Knights of Labor was not a secret society, that Catholics knew the difference, and that the mixed-religious environment would not harm the faith of Catholics.[22] Moreover, he warned, hasty condemnation of the Knights would make the Church appear as a tyrannical enemy of the people and, ultimately, "'un-American,' that is to say, alien to our national spirit…the most powerful weapon which the enemies of the Church know how to employ against her."[23] There was greater danger in alienation of the faithful than in exposure to mixed society with Protestants and secular humanists.

Removed from their homelands, Eastern Catholics depended on their faith community as their center of identity and communal life. Their ability to depend on this

---

20. Patrick W. Carey, *Catholics in America: A History*, updated ed. (Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2004), 58.

21. Kaszczak, *Bishop Soter Stephen Ortynsky*, 41-42.

22. James Gibbons, "Cardinal Gibbons Defends the Knights of Labor (1887)," in *American Catholic History: A Documentary Reader*, 2nd ed., ed. Mark Massa, S.J., and Catherine Osborne (New York University Press, 2017), 95-97.

23. Gibbons, "Cardinal Gibbons Defends the Knights of Labor (1887)," 99.

center was limited, especially in the earliest decades of immigration. Having settled in Protestant- and Latin-Catholic-dominated territory, Eastern Catholics tended to worship with nearby church communities. Ukrainian, Slovak, and Ruthenian Greek Catholics preferred Slovak and Polish Latin parishes, but some Slovak Greek Catholics also attended German and Czech Latin parishes.[24] Maronites likewise mostly preferred to attend nearby Latin parishes, but "they were anxious to preserve their own religious rite"[25] and could not do so effectively in the Latin rite. In order to preserve and pass on their own traditions, it was necessary for Eastern Catholics to establish their own parishes.

The same lay initiative that gave rise to the fraternal-benefit societies and similar support networks led to the founding of parish communities. Ivan Wolansky and his congregation completed the construction of the first U.S. Ruthenian/Ukrainian parish church in 1886 in Pennsylvania, and the Maronites built their first parish in 1890 in New York.[26] At the same time, laypeople from other Byzantine and Maronite communities were writing to their bishops in Europe and the Middle East to send priests to minister to their spiritual needs.[27] Even as more priests began to immigrate to the United States and parishes became more firmly established, laypeople continued to play a significant role in

24. Athanasius B. Pekar, O.S.B.M., *The History of the Church in Carpathian Rus'*, trans. Marta Skorupsky, vol. 322 of *East European Monographs* (The Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center, Inc., 1992), 165; Stolarik, "Slovak Immigrants," 58–59; Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 186.

25. Labaki, "The Maronite Church in the U.S.," 79.

26. Kaszczak, *Bishop Soter Stephen Ortynsky*, 40; Labaki, "The Maronite Church in the U.S.," 77.

27. Akram Khater, "'Like a Wolf Who Fell upon Sheep'; Arab Diaspora and Religion in America, 1880-1930," *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies* 21, no. 1 (2021): 6, doi.org/10.3138/diaspora.21.1.2020-06-15; Ivan Kaszczak, *Metropolitan Andrei Sheptytsky and the Establishment of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in the United States*, 2nd ed. (The Basilian Press, 2013), 32.

the running of the parish.[28] The growth of these non-Latin, lay-governed parishes escalated tensions between the Latin bishops and these immigrant groups.

The Entry of Eastern Catholics into the Latin-Majority U.S. Milieu

Despite the many sources of contention between the Latin and Eastern Catholics, a few signs of warm welcome were present from the beginning of the Eastern Catholic immigration. Welcoming gestures from the Latin hierarchy came most often in the form of aid in establishing parish life. For example, from 1884 through the turn of the century, Latin parishes lent liturgical books and vessels to immigrant Ukrainian Catholic priests, supplying whatever the priests were unable to bring with them for the celebration of the Divine Liturgy.[29] Another Byzantine community, the Melkites of Cleveland, Ohio, prayed and celebrated their sacraments in the local Latin churches St. Joseph Parish and St. John's Chapel.[30] That they were able to gather in a Latin church indicates that some accommodations had been made for them. However, the local Latin bishops resisted this same community's efforts to establish their own parish.[31] The amount of cooperation and assistance that Eastern Catholics experienced "largely depended upon the Latin bishops' temperaments and openness," especially in such matters as the establishment of separate Eastern parishes.[32] Confusions over the rights and identity of Eastern Catholics outside of

28. Constantine Simon, S.J., "The first years of Ruthenian church life in America," *Orientalia christiana periodica* 60, no. 1 (1994): 205.

29. Mark M. Morozowich, "The Liturgy and the Ukrainian Catholic Church in the United States: Change through the Decades," *U.S. Catholic Historian* 32, no. 1 (Winter 2014): 51.

30. Elias Kwaiter, B.S.O., *A Pioneer Melkite Parish on the Shores of the Great Lakes in Cleveland*, trans. Kenneth J. Mortimer (St. Elias Melkite Catholic Church, 1996), 51.

31. Kwaiter, *A Pioneer Melkite Parish*, 50.

32. Labaki, "The Maronite Church in the U.S.," 80.

their traditional homelands, as well as conflicts between various factions in the hierarchy, made the liturgical and spiritual life of Eastern Catholicism difficult to express in full.

Americanism, Americanization, and Latinization

One question facing the U.S. Catholic Church in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries was that of how to relate to the wider American culture. Early in the nineteenth century, French observer Alexis de Tocqueville (1805-1859) reported on how the U.S. democratic and pluralistic environment fostered lay participation in Church life and government, because all laypeople, rich and poor, were free and equal.[33] In the latter half of the century, the era of highest Eastern Catholic immigration, Archbishop John Ireland and other bishops, known as the "Americanists," encouraged adaptation of Church life to the needs of modern American culture and the participation of the laity in this process. They saw in the U.S. culture and governmental structures the best conditions for the operation of the Church among the characteristic religious pluralism of American society. Anti-Americanist bishops worried about the effects of the American ethos on Catholics' attitudes towards orthodoxy and episcopal authority and, therefore, on the unity of the Church.[34] In 1899, Leo XIII in *Testem Benevolentiae* condemned "Americanism" as a heresy that promoted relativism, individualism, and independence from the institutional Church.[35] Regardless of whether this representation of Americanist bishops' beliefs was

33. Alexis De Tocqueville, "Alexis de Tocqueville on American Catholics in the New Republic (1835)," in *American Catholic History: A Documentary Reader*, 2nd ed., ed. Mark Massa, S.J., and Catherine Osborne (New York University Press, 2017), 72-73.

34. Tentler, *American Catholics*, 196-198; Keith S. Russin, "Father Alexis G. Toth and the Wilkes-Barre Litigations," *St. Vladimir's Quarterly* 16, no. 3 (1972): 131.

35. Tentler, *American Catholics*, 199; Leo XIII, "*Testem Benevolentiae* Condemns 'Americanism' (1899)," In *American Catholic History: A Documentary Reader*, 2nd ed., ed. Mark Massa, S.J., and Catherine Osborne (New York University Press, 2017), 109-111.

accurate, condemnation of the Americanist impulse on the papal level contributed to the pre-existing tensions between Americanist and anti-Americanist bishops.

Between the end of the Civil War and the beginning of World War II, Catholic immigrants sought ways to gain a foothold in the turbulent landscape of anti-Catholicism, the Americanist crisis, industrialization, and ethnic conflicts. Bishops and laypeople had different ideas about how to best adjust to life in the New World while maintaining continuity with their Catholic identities from the Old World.[36] These pressures affected all Catholic ethnic groups, but they were reified differently between Latin and Eastern Catholics not only for cultural reasons but also for canonical ones.

Catholic immigrants on both sides of the canonical divide found refuge in separate ethnic parishes, where they could practice their own customs and have access to priests who could preach and minister to them in their own languages, even as Latin remained the language of the Latin Catholic Mass. Ethnic parishes were so critically tied to social, cultural, and religious identities of various Catholic groups that even in a city like Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, where the geography forced many ethnic groups into close quarters with each other, Germans, Irish, Slovaks, Poles, Italians, Lithuanians, and others attended their own parish churches, which were "located within easy walking distance of each other."[37] Throughout the country, German Catholics depended on German parishes and mutual benefit societies to preserve their language in a largely English-speaking environment.[38] For them, in a way that Irish immigrants, for example, did not need to

36. Carey, *Catholics in America*, 71-72; Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 191; Tentler, *American Catholics*, 97-98.

37. Kelly, *The Transformation of American Catholicism*, 4-5.

38. Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 168-169.

consider as carefully, preserving their language was key for preserving their faith.[39] Eastern Catholics, undoubtedly, shared this concern for language as a vehicle for faith. For those communities that had their own parishes, the church became the locus of cultural, linguistic, and religious continuity between the Old and New Worlds. Accordingly, "[t]heir very language was dear to them."[40] The establishment of Eastern Catholic parishes provided strongholds where the particular Ukrainian, Slovak, Rusyn, Syrian-Lebanese, Melkite (Antiochian), and other instantiations of Catholicism could flourish on American soil.

Irish immigrants and Americanist bishops, such as John Ireland, understood the need for access to the languages and cultural traditions that are most familiar to the faithful, but they cautioned against overidentifying foreign languages and cultural practices with their faith. This conflation could cause later generations to reject the faith as they grew up in American culture. Instead, they advocated for more rapid assimilation, seeing in American culture "the cultural forms that expressed Catholicism most adequately."[41] The optimal outcome, then, was for the immigrants to embrace the American ethos, the Latin rite, and English language of the majority.

For the U.S. Latin Catholic bishops, the language issue was only one cause for fragmentation in the American Church in the 1890s to 1920s. While each immigrant group adamantly insisted on the use of its own language in communal life, the bishops had to confront the problem of how to effectively govern and minister to a Church that, by 1920, consisted of twenty-eight different national groups and at least as many

39. Carey, *Catholics in America*, 57.
40. Kaszczak, *Bishop Soter Stephen Ortynsky*, 8.
41. Carey, *Catholics in America*, 57.

languages, cultural backgrounds, and traditions.[42] Waves of immigration that contributed to this shape of the Church triggered waves of anti-Catholic fears among Protestants,[43] which elevated the urgency of the need to prove that Catholicism was compatible, even beneficial, and not inimical to being American. Bishops were divided amongst themselves over how and to what extent to embrace the democratic and pluralistic values of American culture. In this environment, effective government and coherent unity gained an existential importance.

From the perspective of the Americanist bishops, the crucial task was to incorporate immigrant Catholics into American life while maintaining a distinct Catholic identity. Their goal for assimilation, then, was to create a strong and recognizable Catholic form of life through standardizing parish structure and religious practice. This push for unity in uniformity reflected a vision of the universal Church in which the authority of the bishop guarantees its unity. Carey describes this vision in the context of European bishops sending missionaries to the territories of the U.S. during its early nineteenth-century expansion into the frontier. He gives the following interpretation of the bishops' mindset regarding ecclesial unity:

> In spite of their cultural and personal differences, immigrant and American bishops shared a common Tridentine vision about the church. Although they tried to meet the ethnic-based needs of their diverse peoples, they were concerned about unity and even uniformity of religious life and practice than they were about legitimate cultural diversity. Many bishops also saw themselves as Tridentine reforming bishops. In their reactions to lay trustees, clergy, religious orders, or popular folk religious practices, they intended to establish their own authority and the post-Tridentine parish-centered sacramental tradition of Catholicism.[44]

---

42. Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 135, 190.
43. Tentler, *American Catholics*, 97.
44. Carey, *Catholics in America*, 34.

This vision of unity continued to be applicable in the latter half of the nineteenth century and into the twentieth, because, whether a given bishop saw the American experiment as providential or dangerous for Catholicism, this "Tridentine vision" transcended the dividing lines of the Americanism controversy. This Tridentine vision of unity provided a sense of stability and security that Catholics at this time needed. However, the pursuit of this universal standard downplayed the role of local particularity in shaping the faith of the various Catholic immigrant groups to deleterious effect especially, though not exclusively, for Eastern Catholics.

With this Tridentine approach to uniting the various ethnically-divided groups of Catholics, it was easy for the bishops to overlook the fact that not all Catholics under their care were Latins. A singular standard way of parish life would not be practically or canonically applicable to the Eastern Catholics who, according to their union agreements, had the right to continue to practice their own liturgies, sacramental forms, and ecclesial traditions which differed from the Latin forms. This effect could be considered tame in comparison to the reactions of bishops like Archbishop John Ireland. A lack of understanding of Eastern saints led to the founding of Ss. Cyril and Methodius Parish in Minneapolis, Minnesota, under the official name of "St. Cyril Parish," because, in the estimation of Archbishop Ireland, "one saint was enough." This parish was Slovak Roman Catholic, but they shared the Byzantine Catholic tradition of venerating the two saints together. From this example, in which even a Latin parish was affected, it can be inferred that Ireland's ignorance of at least some Eastern and Slavic traditions was innocent,[45] though M. Mark Stolarik claims that Ireland consciously "refused to

45. Stolarik, "Slovak Immigrants," 63.

recognize the Union of Užhorod"—the 1646 agreement by which some Ruthenian Orthodox parishes entered into union with Rome on the condition that their tradition would be respected—"for fear that such a move would slow the Americanization movement."[46] Far more damaging, however, was Ireland's and other bishops' rejection of married Byzantine Catholic priests in their territories, as greater detail will show later. Such errors restricted Eastern Catholics' abilities to live out their liturgical and sacramental life even within the limited set of rights that the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith (the *Propaganda Fide*) had codified for their parishes in the Americas.

Among the bishops, some were apparently more aware of the canonical difference between Latin and Eastern Catholics. These bishops found themselves divided over the question of how much to conform Eastern Catholics to the customs of the Latin Church as part of the greater Americanization effort. In their minds, uniting the Church as true Catholics and true Americans all but required that all U.S. Catholics follow the same rite. As Jesuit scholar Constantine Simon describes the situation, "American bishops had already met with the Archbishop of Baltimore [Cardinal Gibbons] and decided that the practice of another rite in America other than the Latin rite did more harm than good."[47] Most, if not all, of the bishops were in favor of some sort of assimilation; the question was merely one of pace. Some, such as Archbishop Ireland and Cardinal Gibbons, were in favor of Americanizing Eastern Catholic immigrants right away, while Archbishop Patrick J. Ryan (1831-1911) and others favored a more gradual approach.[48] Especially

46. Stolarik, "Slovak Immigrants," 65; cf. Kaszczak, *Bishop Soter Stephen Ortynsky*, 1-2.
47. Simon, "The First Years," 194.
48. Simon, "The First Years," 192.

according to the perspective of Ireland, Eastern Catholics were not assimilable as they were.[49] Instead, Ireland, in a letter to the Propaganda, "suggested that at least some of the immigrants…might profit by a change of rite," that is, from abandoning Eastern Catholicism altogether and becoming Latins.[50] In this way, the bishops imply that adopting the local disciplines would have been more beneficial to an Eastern Catholic than would have been following his or her own rite that was—and in their minds, belonged to—the Old World.

Authority and Lay Control of Parishes

Questions of authority soured relationships between Latin and Eastern hierarchy and between Latin bishops and Eastern laity. Eastern Catholics assumed that their own bishops in Europe and the Middle East—the bishops who had sent them to the New World—held the final authority over them.[51] It was these bishops, not the local Latin ordinaries, to whom laypeople addressed their requests for clergy and resources.[52] The Latin bishops, in contrast, believed just as firmly that the local Latin ordinary was, after the pope, the final authority over all Catholics, regardless of rite, in their territory. A common complaint in the latter half of the nineteenth century and the early decades of the twentieth was that Eastern Catholic priests would not obey the Latin ordinary.[53]

The controversies over Eastern Catholic authority in the Latin-dominated territories in the United States—both on the national level and on the parish level—were

---

49. Victor J. Pospishil, *Ex Occidente Lex: From the West – The Law: The Eastern Catholic Churches under the Tutelage of the Holy See of Rome* (St. Mary's Religious Action Fund, 1979): 27.

50. Simon, "The First Years, 192.

51. Simon, "The First Years," 202.

52. Khater, "Like a Wolf Who Fell upon Sheep," 6; Kaszczak, *Metropolitan Andrei Sheptytsky*, 32.

53. Simon, "The First Years," 201, 206-207.

exacerbated by confusion over the very place of Eastern Catholics in the vision of the universal Catholic Church. The lack of appreciation (or even awareness, at times) of their distinct identities and rights led to demands that Rome more strictly subordinate the Eastern Catholic Churches to the Latin Church, just as with any Latin ethnic group.[54] In 1907, Cardinal Gibbons wrote to the Propaganda on the question of granting greater autonomy to Byzantine Catholics. He protested that elevating the Ruthenian Byzantine Catholics in this way would encourage Polish Latin Catholics to demand similar administrative autonomy.[55] Though ethnic and cultural differences played a role in his conflicts with both the Ruthenian Byzantine Catholics and the Polish Latin Catholics, Gibbons' complaints displayed a confused understanding of the canonical difference between these groups. The latter was a separate ethnic group with its own cultural traditions but still within the Latin rite; the former insisted on its cultural traditions by virtue of being a separate ritual church. Recognition of this difference existed on paper but proved difficult to respect in a practical way when other groups—who, in this case, shared the same tradition of self-governance with the Byzantine Catholics—vied for greater degrees of autonomy than the prevailing ecclesiastical structure would allow.

Conflicts over authority were not just a matter between priests and bishops but also between laypeople and clergy. The biggest source of contention on the latter level was lay control of parishes. This phenomenon was not unique to Eastern Catholics but was a feature of the development of parochial life as both Latin and Eastern immigrant

54. Simon, "The First Years," 208.

55. Simon, "The First Years," 207. Simon notes that Gibbons was writing in a time when Polish and German Latin Catholics were in conflict with the Irish-majority hierarchy and "Irish interference in establishing national churches" in the United States. Gibbons' fears were not completely unfounded; on the grounds that "between the Poles and the Romano-Irish Church in America there can be no more understanding than between a lamb and a wolf," the Polish National Catholic Church was formed in Scranton, Pennsylvania, in the early twentieth century (208).

groups settled in the United States. Laypeople had gathered together in voluntary associations, bought property, built local churches, and requested priests, and so, naturally, they understood themselves as having a rightful say in the parishes' temporal affairs.[56] Priests were often, but not always, cooperative in these models of parish governance. Jay P. Dolan notes that "invariably the people would vote to dismiss their pastor" if he did not heed the desire of the laity to be involved in parish affairs.[57] Some priests and bishops—most notably Bishop John England (1786-1842) of Charleston, South Carolina—supported this style of governance.[58] Other bishops, as early as John Carroll (1735-1815), expressed concern about the chaos that might ensue if the laity ran the parish. In a 1786 letter to a New York City parish, Carroll warned that lay governance would make a priest vulnerable to the whims of the people and compromise his ministry.[59] Despite Carroll's warning, practical necessity and American democratic impulses, possibly inspired by neighboring Protestant congregations,[60] ensured that the laity would continue to find ways to participate actively in running their parishes.

Lay-trustee and congregational models continued to exist alongside hierarchical (clerical) models of parish governance until the decades around the First Vatican Council. With the 1870 declaration of the infallibility of the pope, followed by the emphasis on the authority of the bishop at the 1884 Baltimore Council, authority within the diocese and the parish grew increasingly centralized in the clergy. In effect, "[e]ach bishop became Pope in his own diocese," and each pastor "enjoyed a supremacy over the laity not unlike

---

56. Carey, *Catholics in America*, 27-28.
57. Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 166-167.
58. Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 167, 192; Carey, *Catholics in America*, 28.
59. John Carroll, "John Carroll's Letter on Lay Trusteeism in New York City (1786)," in *American Catholic History: A Documentary Reader*, 2nd ed., ed. Mark Massa, S.J., and Catherine Osborne (New York University Press, 2017), 29.
60. Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 114.

that of the pope over the entire church."[61] Starting in the period from 1860 to 1890, the hierarchical model also became the more practical option, offering stability and uniformity as parishes grew too large for effective lay collaboration in parish governance.[62] As the hierarchical model began to replace the congregational model, an Irish tradition of deference to the clergy became a standard for other ethnic groups and led them to transfer ownership of the parishes to the bishops.[63] Through the twentieth century, the congregational model, which emphasized cooperation between laity and clergy, gave way to the hierarchical model, which emphasized the central authority of the clergy and the duty of the laity to obey.[64]

The congregational model was especially popular among Slavic and Lithuanian Catholics, both Latin and Eastern. Polish, Slovak, Lithuanian, Czech, and Ukrainian/Ruthenian Catholic mutual benefit societies purchased property and built parishes.[65] For example, the Society of SS. Peter and Paul (Latin, founded in 1889) and the Society of the Blessed Virgin Mary (Byzantine, founded in 1891), both Slovak societies based in New Jersey, developed into parish communities of the same names.[66] In the Slavic countries, the lay founders of a parish commonly elected pastors and held great sway over parish governance, and immigrants from these countries insisted on continuing this tradition in the United States. The primary difference between Old-World and New-World parish life for these groups was that the founders were often the mutual benefit societies and not the state or the noble classes.[67] Therefore, the laypeople

61. Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 190.
62. Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 170.
63. Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 190-191.
64. Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 189.
65. Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 192-193.
66. Kopanic, "Slovaks in New Jersey," 4.
67. Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 182-183.

involved in governing Slavic parishes were usually the poor, the working class, and the uneducated rather than members of the middle class, unlike in Irish and German parishes.[68] The congregational parish model, then, was particularly adept at representing the spiritual and material needs of the congregation. Because the congregational parish model effectively addressed their local needs, these groups were much less willing to give it up in Irish-style deference,[69] causing further friction with the local Latin bishops.

The stakes were even higher for Ukrainian and Ruthenian Catholics, both because they were Byzantines in a Latin-majority territory and because of the especially tight association between their cultures and church life. Having their own parishes with their own priests, languages, and customs allowed them to preserve their religious and cultural identity in ways that they could not in a Polish or Slovak Latin parish.[70] If, like the Irish and other Latin Catholic groups, the Ukrainians and Ruthenians had accepted a hierarchical model of parish governance, it is very likely that they would have been pressured or forced into the Latin Church, Latin parishes, or at least heavily Latinized practices and parish life.[71] In fact, Dolan, citing historian Keith P. Dyrud, credits the "Ukrainian insistence on ownership of parish property" for being the singular factor that prevented the complete absorption of the Byzantine Catholics into the Latin Church.[72] However, conflicts with Latin bishops over parish governance also contributed to the conversion movements to Russian Orthodoxy in the 1890s through the 1920s.

68. Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 192-193.
69. Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 184-185.
70. Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 186.
71. Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 188.
72. Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 188.

In factors that led to later schisms among Slavic Catholics, Dolan considers lay governance to be the most critical factor. Patrick W. Carey's account shows that, not only did swaths of Ukrainian and Ruthenian Catholics prefer schism to the loss of this parish structure and the identity it fostered, but so did Slavic Latin Catholics, such as the Poles who went on to form the Polish National Catholic Church, which continues to exist today.[73] He writes:

> The loss of hundreds of thousands of Eastern-rite Catholics along with thousands of Poles, Lithuanians, and Slovaks illustrates how critical the issue of lay involvement in parish government was. Insistence of Catholic immigrants on preserving their authoritative role in managing local church affairs was such that they would accept excommunication, rather than give in on this point. At the same time, the Catholic hierarchy, along with the majority of the clergy, were so adamant that they were willing to allow an exodus of lay people, rather than give in to their demands on this issue. An irresistible force had met an immovable object, and the encounter produced bitter and prolonged conflict.[74]

Both the Polish and Byzantine schisms represent Slavic Catholics' drastic attempts to establish a place for themselves in the sea of Catholic immigration to the United States, preserving their own spiritual, ecclesial, and cultural heritage in a pluralistic and democratic society. For Eastern Catholics, the additional canonical layer to the issue made this end a more urgent imperative and, perhaps, should have made some measure of local autonomy a more pronounced right. Carey provides a sobering note of context regarding these early-twentieth-century schisms: "Although permanent schisms did occur here and there in American Catholicism, they were not the primary focus of Catholic immigrant attention during the first twenty or thirty years of the twentieth century." Rather, understandably, "[t]he primary problem for the numerous southern and eastern European Catholic immigrants was that of preserving their religious and social traditions

73. Carey, *Catholics in America*, 71.
74. Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 188-189.

while they adjusted to new conditions and tried to make a living."[75] Carey juxtaposes these two factors—schism and preserving tradition in a harsh new environment—but they are bound up together in the experiences of these Polish and Byzantine Catholic groups.

Clerical Celibacy

Mandatory celibacy for priests was a recurring flashpoint in tensions between the Latin and Eastern Catholic Churches. Whereas Dolan sees the breaking point in Eastern-Latin relations in issues of lay governance of parishes, Constantine Simon sees mandatory priestly celibacy as a more pressing issue.[76] Eastern Catholic priests serving in the United States in the earlier decades of immigration (1830s-1880s) were married or widowed, but these types of priests upset the Latin hierarchy. Bishop Winand Michael Wigger of Newark, for example, claimed that the presence of married Eastern Catholic priests, posing a direct contradiction to mandatory clerical celibacy, scandalized both Catholics and Protestants.[77] Further, the bishops were especially irritated that Eastern priests felt at liberty to act independently of the authority of the local Latin ordinary. Archbishop John Ireland, after discussions with Archbishop Patrick J. Ryan, wrote to Rome in 1888 to clarify whether the local Latin ordinaries or Sylvestr Sembratovyč (1836-1898), the Bishop of Lviv, held the ultimate responsibility for and authority over U.S. Ruthenian Catholics, adding that married priests were not to come to the United States.[78] Simon states that Ireland "expressed more than a personal opinion. He defined

75. Carey, *Catholics in America*, 71.
76. Simon, "The First Years," 204.
77. Simon, "The First Years," 190-191. Simon notes about this situation: "Actually, Protestants seemed more surprised and curious than scandalised" (191). Simon does not explicitly address the question, but it is possible that Wigger was using the term "scandalize" in a technical sense of "leading someone into doctrinal error or sin."
78. Simon, "The First Years," 191-192.

the consistent position of the American bishops for several years."[79] Ireland, therefore, defined the terms on which the U.S. Catholic Church could achieve peace, order, and unity. These terms conflicted with Eastern ideas of unity without the loss of their traditions and identities.

In response to petitions from the U.S. Latin bishops, the Propaganda issued the 1890 encyclical *Aliquibus abhine*, which, among other stipulations, stated that any "priests of the Greek-Ruthenian rite" ("Sacerdotes ritus graeco-rutheni") who were sent to the United States had to be celibate.[80] To petition for the reversal of this decree, a group of priests and laypeople, including Fr. Alexis Toth, gathered in Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, in October of 1890.[81] This group's endeavor was unsuccessful, and the 1929 document *Cum data fuerit* doubled down on the celibacy mandate, extending the requirement to "all future American Eastern Catholic ordinandi."[82] Eastern Catholics perceived the celibacy mandate as a violation of the union agreements which had promised protection of the rights and traditions of the Eastern Catholic Churches. In response, organizations, such as the Greek Catholic Union and a group of three hundred laypeople from western Pennsylvania, raised funds, conducted meetings, and drafted documents to fight the requirement.[83] These efforts continued through the 1930s, even resisting the Ruthenian Bishop Basil Takach's (1879-1948) attempts to keep the peace.[84] Ultimately, these efforts to overturn mandatory celibacy were unsuccessful.[85]

---

79. Simon, "The First Years," 192.
80. Kaszczak, *Metropolitan Andrei Sheptytsky*, 111.
81. Simon, "The First Years," 210-211.
82. Joseph A. Loya, "'Cum Data Fuerit' Fallout: The Celibacy Crisis in the Byzantine Catholic Church, 1930-1940," *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia* 106, nos. 3-4 (Fall-Winter 1995): 149, jstor.com/stable/44211217.
83. Loya, "'Cum Data Fuerit' Fallout," 150-151, 155-156.
84. Loya, "'Cum Data Fuerit' Fallout," 167-169.
85. Loya, "'Cum Data Fuerit' Fallout," 170.

In Byzantine Catholic scholarship, Fr. Toth stands out as famous early casualty of the celibacy controversy. Toth, a highly-educated priest and former professor of canon law from the Eparchy of Prešov (modern-day Slovakia), was sent to minister to Ruthenian Greek Catholics in Minneapolis, Minnesota, and first had to report to the local Latin ordinary, Archbishop Ireland, to receive the necessary faculties to operate in his archdiocese.[86] When, at their meeting, Ireland learned that Toth was a widower with children, the Archbishop "lost his temper," declaring "'I have already written to Rome protesting against this kind [sic] of priests being sent to me!'" He refused to give faculties to Toth, asserting that it would be enough to give the Ruthenian Greek Catholics a Polish (Latin) priest.[87] Some scholars describe the rift in terms of Ireland's having "excommunicated" Toth,[88] and it may be that, effectively, he did. By refusing to grant Toth permission to operate in the Archdiocese of Minneapolis, Ireland cut off Toth's ability to operate in union with at least the local Latin Church. Keith S. Russin does not use the term "excommunication" to describe the break. Instead, he emphasizes Toth's contemplation of the possibility of operating independently of the Latin hierarchy but still under the authority of his Ruthenian bishop. As an expert on canon law, Toth knew the conditions of the Unions of Brest (the 1595/1596 agreement for the Ukrainians) and

86. Kaszczak, *Bishop Soter Stephen Ortynsky*, 19; Simon, "The First Years," 201, 204.

87. Keith S. Russin, "Father Alexis G. Toth," 133. In n. 8, Russin states that these quotes are excerpts from Fr. Toth's testimony in the case *Greek Catholic Church et al. v. Orthodox Greek Church et al.* (1894, Luzerne County, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania). About how the rest of this interaction proceeded, Fr. Toth simply states, "the thing had gone so far that our conversation is not worth putting on record." Cf. Kaszczak, *Bishop Soter Stephen Ortynsky*, 19-20. Kaszczak notes, "The argument was carried out entirely in Latin, a dead language, further illustrating a central conflict between two visions of the Church: 1) one held by the predominantly Irish Catholic hierarchy, which was drawn partially from the old Roman Empire; and 2) one held by the recent arrivals, who embraced a new vision of what it means to be an American Catholic" (20).

88. Pospishil, *Ex Occidente Lex*, 26.

Užhorod (the 1646 agreement for the Ruthenians),[89] but he knew just as well his obligation to obey the Latin bishop, if only by order of his Ruthenian bishop.[90] In either case, Toth "was finally excommunicated" by the Roman Curia "for his refusal to send his children back or to abandon his flock and return himself to Europe."[91] Toth entered the Russian Orthodox Church in 1891, and the rest of his parish soon followed suit,[92] forming the seeds of what is today the Orthodox Church in America.[93]

Toth was not the first Eastern Catholic priest who was excommunicated or otherwise sanctioned for opposing the mandatory celibacy rule in the United States and other countries in the New World. Ivan Wolansky complained to the Metropolitan of Lviv in 1884 that he had been denied a request to speak with Archbishop Ryan before beginning his ministry in Shenandoah, Pennsylvania. The archbishop protested that "there was no room for a married priest in the United States."[94] Many priests were recalled to Europe because of their married status, leaving U.S. Eastern Catholic parishes with a priest shortage.[95] This priest shortage, resulting not from a lack of vocations or worthy candidates but from a lack of candidates acceptable to Latin sensibilities, restricted Eastern Catholics' access to their own liturgical rites, customs, and languages.

---

89. Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience,* 187.
90. Russin, "Father Alexis G. Toth," 133-134.
91. Pospishil, *Ex Occidente Lex*, 27.
92. Russin, "Father Alexis G. Toth," 135, 140-144.
93. Kaszczak, *Metropolitan Andrei Sheptytsky*, 22-23. Toth was not the only priest to bring an entire parish with him into Russian Orthodoxy, but he was the first. Other priests after him, such as Fr. Orestes Chornock, continued to bring their parishes with them, especially because of the decrees mandating celibacy and submission to the Latin bishops. Loya estimated that, between 1924 and 1938, up to 100,000 Ruthenian Catholics became Orthodox. See Loya, "'Cum Data Fuerit' Fallout," 172. In a 2014 decree that lifted the celibacy mandate, the Vatican gives an estimate of 200,000 Ruthenian Catholics who became Orthodox. See Laura Ieraci, "Vatican Lifts Ban on Married Priests for Eastern Catholics in Diaspora," *National Catholic Reporter*, November 17, 2014, www.ncronline.org/news/vatican/vatican-lifts-ban-married-priests-eastern-catholics-diaspora.
94. Kaszczak, *Metropolitan Andrei Sheptytsky*, 18.
95. Kaszczak, *Bishop Soter Stephen Ortynsky*, 246.

Deliberations over the question of whether to ordain married priests outside the traditional homelands of the Eastern Catholic Churches continued into the 2010s. In 2010, the Coptic Catholic Church asked Pope Benedict XVI (1927-2022) to reconsider the policy.[96] As late as 2012, Latin hierarchs, such as Cardinal Leonardo Sandri (b. 1943), were still promoting celibacy for the Eastern Catholic priesthood to encourage conformity to the local tradition of the United States.[97] The celibacy mandate did not end until 2014, when Pope Francis (1936-2025) approved—and Cardinal Sandri, as prefect for the Congregation for the Eastern Churches, signed—a decree lifting the ban on married priests and the requirement that Eastern Catholic bishops obtain Vatican approval to ordain married candidates for the priesthood outside of their traditional territories in Europe. "In recent years," reported journalist Laura Ieraci, "some Eastern Catholic bishops went ahead with such ordinations discreetly without Vatican approval" in order to honor their traditional sacramental discipline.[98] Latin clergy, acting according to their understood pastoral responsibility for every Catholic in their territory, needed to balance Eastern Catholic spiritual needs and sacramental tradition with Latin Catholic sensibilities in Latin-majority territory. However, their efforts toward unity of discipline, epitomized in the celibacy crisis, increased the pressure on Eastern Catholics to do what they could to preserve their own liturgical and sacramental life.

96. Kaszczak, *Bishop Soter Stephen Ortynsky*, 19.

97. David M. Petras, "Presbyteral Celibacy: Church Discipline or Divine Revelation?" *Studi sull'Oriente Cristiano* 17, no. 1 (2013): 297.

98. Laura Ieraci, "Vatican Lifts Ban on Married Priests for Eastern Catholics in Diaspora," *National Catholic Reporter*, November 17, 2014, www.ncronline.org/news/vatican/vatican-lifts-ban-married-priests-eastern-catholics-diaspora.

Identity Crises: Conversion and Continuity

Byzantine-Slavic

How the lay faithful responded to such struggles as Toth's excommunication and the centralization of power to the Latin bishops depended on how they believed they would best preserve their tradition and identity. While for some Greek Catholics, such as Toth himself, the decision to transfer from a Catholic jurisdiction to an Orthodox one was conceptualized in conscious terms of rejection of the "Unia" (official status of union with Rome), it was far more common for Greek Catholics to join either Catholic or Orthodox parishes based on local availability and familiarity of language and rite, that is, "continuity" with their Byzantine Christian traditions.[99] Furthermore, in such situations, Greek Catholics often did not realize that they had unofficially left one church and joined another, or they understood the jurisdictional difference but treated Catholicism and Orthodoxy as one and the same.[100]

In his study on the subject of Catholic-Orthodox conversions in these decades, Joel Brady analyzes examples of converts from both perspectives. When some of these immigrants were able to return to their homelands, rejoining their Greek Catholic parishes, it was not uncommon for returnees to acknowledge their "conversion" while insisting that they never actually changed faiths. For example, Joel Brady reports that, in an "interrogation" between a priest named Vlad Durkot and a returning layman named Andrei Repak, Repak explains that he received sacraments from both "Uniate" priests and Orthodox priests, depending on who was available. He insists, "I did not renounce

99. Joel Brady, "Becoming What We Always Were: 'Conversion' of U.S. Greek Catholics to Russian Orthodoxy, 1890-1914," *U.S. Catholic Historian* 32, no. 1 (Winter 2014): 25–26.

100. Brady, "Becoming What We Always Were," 39.

my faith. I retained that, which daddy-papa and mama taught me."[101] Another returnee named Petro Korba more consciously chose to reject the "Unia," which he believed to be imposed by Rome. The parish priest asked whether Korba acknowledged his "grave sin" in joining the "schismatic" Russian Orthodox Church and wished to reconcile with the Catholic Church, and Korba's responses were the following:

> My grave sin I do not recognize, because the Russko-Orthodox church and the Greek Catholic church I reckon as one…I do not ask [for reconciliation with the Greek Catholic Church], because I do not reckon myself for a transgressor (apostate). I consider our Greek Catholic church to be the same as the Russko-Orthodox/schismatic.[102]

It appears that, much to the dismay of Greek and Latin Catholic priests, lay Catholic converts to Orthodoxy, whether they later reverted or not, believed these two faiths to be the same (or, perhaps, close enough) and so prioritized liturgical and devotional traditions over Uniate status. Rather than promoting a mere indifferentism—the concern of Leo XIII against the Americanists—it seems that the perspectives of these Christians show a precursory vision that is related, though not identical, to the conciliatory approach toward Protestants and Orthodox that would be explored at the Second Vatican Council. Namely, these interview subjects perceived the Orthodox Churches not as fallen-away schismatics who need to return to Rome but as sharers of the religious tradition that they recognized as their own, regardless of their official status vis-à-vis Rome.

---

101. Brady, "Becoming What We Always Were," 37.

102. Brady, "Becoming What We Always Were," 46. In n. 51, Brady clarifies that it is unclear whether the words "schismatic" and "apostate" were inserted by Petro Korba or by his parish priest, who is not identified in the article. In either case, the use of such language in this and many such interviews implies that such language did not convince Catholic-Orthodox converts and reverts that they had done anything wrong. It seems that, no matter how the priest described the change, these laypeople believed that they had kept their faith in both churches in the difficult situation that was being a Byzantine Christian in the New World.

Though the views displayed by these reports may have been widespread, it is important to remember that they were not universal or evenly applied. The common Latin understanding was that Byzantine Catholics were "only semi-Catholic"[103] or were not Catholic at all.[104] This perspective contrasts sharply with the Ruthenian self-understanding of being fully Catholic while also having "always been" Orthodox, recognizing "little or no difference between Greek Catholicism and the Russian Orthodox Church."[105] Some Orthodox figures at the time shared a similar vision. For example, Bishop Alexander Nemolovsky (1876-1960) grew up and was ordained first in Russian Orthodoxy, became a Greek Catholic priest in 1916, and then was accepted back into Russian Orthodoxy twenty years later after having been excommunicated for his opposition to Rome's celibacy requirement.[106] When these Catholics converted to Orthodoxy, most accounts present a warm welcome as of seekers who had found the fullness of their faith, free from "'Irish' Catholic proscriptions on cherished liturgical traditions."[107] Nevertheless, as a mirror image of Latin attitudes, some accounts indicate wariness or suspicion on the part of Russian Orthodox hierarchy. Ivan Kaszczak notes that bigotry and political parties within the Tsarist-affiliated Russian Orthodox hierarchy sometimes limited Ruthenians' access to clergy and liturgy in the Rusyn language.[108] Such instances support the decisions of some Ruthenian Catholics to remain in Greek Catholic churches, despite tensions with the Latin hierarchy; for these Catholics, the risk of being "Latinized" was preferable to that of being "Russified." Others accepted

103. Renoff, "The Elko Episcopate," 109.
104. Pospishil, *Ex Occidente Lex*, 27.
105. Brady, "Becoming What We Always Were," 39.
106. Renoff, "The Elko Episcopate," 107.
107. Brady, "Becoming What We Always Were," 29.
108. Kaszczak, *Bishop Soter Stephen Ortynsky*, 68.

entering a Russian church if that arrangement protected their faith in the Byzantine forms in which it had been handed on to them. That Eastern Catholics had to make this choice at all represented a twofold tragedy: "rancor and division…within families and parishes"[109] and the loss of the promise of unity in catholicity expressed at the Unions of Brest and Užhorod.

Maronite

The mass conversion movements between Catholicism and Orthodoxy occurred mostly among Slavic Byzantine Catholics who chose between the two based on how to best preserve their own traditions from the pressures of Latinization. Questions of tradition and identity played out differently for the Maronites, because their church has never had any corresponding Orthodox church.[110] While loyalty to Rome is, to this day, a point of pride for Maronite Catholics,[111] this fact did not negate the central importance of the preservation of their own liturgical traditions in maintaining their Maronite identity for themselves and for their children.[112] Letters from Syrian and Lebanese immigrants to Patriarch Elias Howayek of Antioch (1843-1931) in the first three decades of the twentieth century report that, when for either practical or ecclesial reasons access to their own traditions was denied, some Maronites attended Protestant churches rather than Latin

109. Loya, "'Cum Data Fuerit' Fallout," 172.

110. *An Antiochian Catholic Church: The Maronite Rite: A Catechism* (Maronite Apostolic Exarchate, U.S.A., 1972), 31; Thomas J. McMahon, "'The Irish of the East,'" in *The Maronite Mass*, 103.

111. *An Antiochian Catholic Church*, 31; Thomas J. McMahon, "'The Irish of the East,'" in *The Maronite Mass*, 103. McMahon explains that the fact of Maronite Catholics' faithfulness to Rome is the reason why they are often called "The Irish of the East." This language was apparently common enough in 1957 that McMahon begins his pamphlet with the question, "Why do we call the Maronite people, 'The Irish of the East'?"

112. Labaki, "The Maronite Church in the U.S.," 79.

Catholic ones.[113] Experiences of resistance from the Latin bishops or apathy from the Maronite bishops would have threatened the ability of U.S. Maronites to remain united as a spiritual community.

The U.S. Maronite experience differed from the Byzantine experience in another key way: a secular-humanist movement that criticized the Maronite Church's seeming preoccupation with money and power over the spiritual welfare of its faithful. Such accusations featured in the Lebanese and Syrian diaspora in the decade between 1901 and 1910, continuing a secular humanist movement that began on Mt. Lebanon. Maronites in the United States met with internal and external challenges: They felt growing discontent with perceived mismanagement and neglect in ecclesiastical administration, and they were subjected to criticisms of their "superstitious" religious practices from their Latin Catholic and Protestant neighbors in the United States.[114] From 1900 through 1902, fierce competition broke out between two chorbishops (roughly equivalent to a Latin auxiliary bishop), Youssef Qirqmaz Yazbek and Istifan Khayrallah, over who was the head of the U.S. Maronite mission. This conflict split a large portion of the American Maronite population into factions around each bishop and aggravated further frustration with the poor leadership of bishops with inverted priorities.[115] Rather than transferring to an Orthodox Church (since the Maronite Catholic Church has no Orthodox counterpart),

113. Khater, "Like a Wolf Who Fell upon Sheep," 7, 17.

114. Khater, "Like a Wolf Who Fell upon Sheep," 1-2.

115. Khater, "Like a Wolf Who Fell upon Sheep," 12-13. Laypeople wrote to Patriarch Howayek, who sent the two chorbishops, blaming him for the disaster and warning him that he would have to answer for the souls of all Maronites on Judgment Day. However, the Patriarch was most likely limited in his ability to address the situation due to the strict division of authority between the traditional Eastern Catholic homelands and the Latin-dominated New World. Khater includes a passage from Naoum Mokarzel's November 17, 1901, article in *al-Huda*, quoting Archbishop Michael Corrigan (1839-1902) of New York: "The claim that a priest was authorized by the Patriarch to be Superior of the Maronite missions in the U.S.A. is false, null and laughable, because neither the Patriarch nor any bishop has the right to authorize such a matter outside his jurisdiction" (13).

some Maronites negotiated their Syrian/Lebanese/Maronite identities in the Latin Catholic Church, Protestant churches, and secularizing movements.[116]

The Development of the Liturgy in the U.S. Catholic Milieu

Earlier portions of this chapter demonstrated how Eastern Catholic immigrants established themselves and wrestled with their group identity in the setting of the United States. Liturgy and traditional rite played a unique and central role in their development. Special attention must be paid to the details of the Divine Liturgy as a typical Eastern Catholic would have experienced it, complete with the "Latinizations" that distinguished Eastern Catholic worship from Orthodox worship. While the list of liturgical Latinization cannot be exhaustive, key examples will demonstrate Latin influences that do not fit Eastern theology and that Eastern Catholic scholars have addressed in post-Vatican II liturgical reform discussions.[117]

These Latin influences began in the traditional homelands of the Eastern Catholic Churches, and their causes are many.[118] Cyril Korolevksy (1878-1959), a French-born Latin Catholic who became a Ruthenian bishop and the Consultator for the Congregation for Oriental Churches, catalogued eight causes for Latinization, of which only one is

116. Khater, "Like a Wolf Who Fell upon Sheep," 14-15.

117. It is to be expected that far more examples exist than those that will be discussed in this chapter. However, to avoid overidentifying similarities with previous or current Latin practices as "Latinizations," and especially problematic ones, this study will keep with those practices that Eastern Catholic liturgists have documented as being foreign to authentic Eastern liturgical development, as vindicated by their later correction.

118. David M. Petras, "The Liturgical Life of the Byzantine-Ruthenian Church: Its Past and Future," *Diakonia* 25, no. 1 (1992): 68. For a fuller discussion on the causes of and wrestling with Latinization in the Ukrainian and Ruthenian Catholic Churches from the time of the Unions of Brest and Užhorod, see Sophia Senyk, "The Ukrainian Church and Latinization," *Orientalia christiana periodica* 56, no. 1 (1990): 165-187.

official "Roman Catholic pressure."[119] Even for this factor, Korolevsky placed more blame on the bishops than on the popes.[120] Other causes on his list included near-total ignorance by Western Christians, political turmoil in the traditional homelands of Eastern Christianity, and the attractive stability of the post-Tridentine West and its modes of worship.[121] In the particular time period of Eastern Catholic immigration to the United States, the most important causes for this study are the tumultuous conditions of general American and American Catholic society, ignorance of Eastern Catholicism by Latin Catholic bishops, and the pressures of Americanization. These factors raised Latinized practices from already-controversial products of the history of the people to existential matters of identity within or outside of communion with Rome.

A feature that correlates strongly with pre-Vatican II Latin liturgical practice is the Low Mass/High Mass distinction. Some form of this distinction made its way into both the Byzantine Divine Liturgy and the Maronite Mass. While "the reading of the liturgy" had been permitted in the Ukrainian Catholic Church since the 1720 Synod of Zamość, the practice was not explicitly required.[122] Among the Maronites, widespread use of this practice is evidenced by worship aids that include instructions regarding the Leonine prayers at the foot of the altar. As late as 1957, Mass aids continued to include the prayers at the foot of the altar after a Low Mass, [123] even with growing movements to restore certain Eastern liturgical traditions. Even though this distinction did not

119. Christopher Todd, *Reclaiming Our Inheritance After Vatican II: Leadership Lessons from Eastern Catholic History and Liturgy* (Eastern Christian Publications, 2023), 26-27, 33.

120. Todd, *Reclaiming Our Inheritance*, 34.

121. Todd, *Reclaiming Our Inheritance*, 27-36.

122. Morozowich, "The Liturgy and the Ukrainian Catholic Church," 53.

123. Louis Khalil, *The Maronite Mass and Devotions* (Daughters of St. Paul, 1957), 65; St. George Maronite Catholic Church, *The Maronite Mass Service Book*, trans. John Trad (n.p., n.d.), 24.

correspond to traditional Eastern practice, this application of Latin liturgical thought may have helped prove the Maronite Church's loyalty to the Roman Pontiff.

Latin influence made itself felt very strongly on the times and manner of receiving the Eucharist. Latin sacramental practice at the time called for the reception of communion by lay participants under the Host only. This practice contrasts with the typical Eastern reception of communion under both species.[124] However, the 1957 Maronite Mass book by Louis Khalil indicates that only the Host was given to the people.[125] Because, in the Byzantine rite, both species are placed into the chalice and given by the spoon, the Latin practice of distributing communion by the Host only had limited, if any, influence on communion in the Byzantine churches. More influence on the manner of receiving communion was obvious, perhaps, on the posture in which a Byzantine Catholic was instructed to receive communion. In the 1954 *Liturgical Catechism on the Sacrifice of the Divine Liturgy*, the author, with the approval of the Byzantine Exarchate of Pittsburgh, states that a communicant can receive either kneeling or standing. However, it is interesting to note that the accompanying drawing depicts a communicant kneeling rather than standing, as standing is the traditional posture in Eastern liturgical practice.[126] From this book alone, no firm conclusion can be drawn about official ecclesiastical recommendations. However, presenting an image with a gesture more familiar to Latin Catholics may have at least demonstrated loyalty to Rome and welcomed Latin Catholics who were interested in learning more about the Byzantine liturgy.

---

124. *Liturgical Catechism on the Sacrifice of the Divine Liturgy* (Byzantine-Slavonic Rite Catholic Exarchate of Pittsburgh, PA, 1954), 86.

125. Khalil, *The Maronite Mass*, 61.

126. *Liturgical Catechism*, 85-86.

In the Latin rite, one's First Holy Communion and Confirmation were not and are not received at the same time as Baptism. Eastern traditions, especially that of the Byzantine churches, typically administer all three Sacraments of Initiation together at the time of Baptism.[127] It is telling, then, that many parish histories covering the early twentieth century feature prominent photos of First Holy Communion classes, including in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1912 and 1926.[128] Mark M. Morozowich explains that Bishop Constantine Bohachevksy (1884-1961) gave several directives for promoting certain Eastern liturgical practices, such as reviving the celebration of the Liturgy of the Presanctified during Lent, between 1924 and 1961. However, at the same time, Bohachevsky also encouraged certain Latinized practices, such as the reception of First Holy Communion at a separate time from Baptism and Chrismation.[129] Morozowich offers this context in a separate article: Although the practice of infant communion was never outright condemned, Eastern Catholics at this time followed the 1910 decree *Quam Singulari*. This document, while praising the Eastern practice, emphasized the Latin theological perspective on how important it is that children be able to distinguish between the Eucharist and ordinary food in order to be properly disposed to receive communion.[130] Bohachevsky's directives, then, serve as an example of Eastern bishops at times promoting Latinized practices as an affirmation of their Churches' union with Rome. At least in some parishes, the practice of delaying the reception of First Communion carried over at least into the first decade after Vatican II, as evidenced by a

127. *Christ – Our Pascha: Catechism of the Ukrainian Catholic Church* (Synod of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church, 2016), 428, 431.

128. *Diamond Jubilee of Saints Peter and Paul Ukrainian Catholic Church in Cleveland, Ohio: June 1-2, 1985* (Sts. Peter and Paul Ukrainian Catholic Church, 1985), 34-35.

129. Morozowich, "The Liturgy and the Ukrainian Catholic Church," 55.

130. Mark M. Morozowich, "Eastern Catholic Infant Communion: Has Catholic Dogmatic Teaching Prohibited It?" *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Catholic Studies* 49, nos. 1-2 (2008): 83-85.

photograph of a 1971 First Communion class at St. John the Baptist Byzantine Catholic Church in Lansford, Pennsylvania.[131] The question of restoring the traditional practice regarding these sacraments would be addressed in the decades after Vatican II, but it possessed a certain staying power that other Latinized practices did not necessarily have in the spiritual formation of generations of Ukrainian Catholics.

The best example of Latinization in liturgical forms of prayer is the inclusion of the *filioque* clause in the Nicene Creed. Eastern traditions do not conceptualize the Trinity in such terms that it would be natural to say that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, but the Synod of Zamość mandated the inclusion of the *filioque* in the liturgy for Ukrainian Catholics. The inclusion of an "and-the-Son" phrase ceased to be mandatory in the 1940s.[132] It is significant that, despite the incongruity of the *filioque* with Byzantine theology and spirituality, the version of the creed that the people recited or chanted in their public prayer as a Byzantine Church required the *filioque* (most likely in Church Slavonic) for more than two hundred years.

Efforts to restore and develop the theology and spirituality of Eastern Catholic liturgy picked up momentum in the era after Vatican II. However, such efforts began in the twentieth century. In Europe, key figures like Andrei Sheptytsky (1865-1944) and Cyril Korolevsky contributed to revisions of the Ukrainian and Ruthenian liturgical books, which, for example, already incorporated vernacular translations or transliterations and removed the obligatory use of the *filioque*.[133] The twentieth century also saw the

131. St. John the Baptist Byzantine Catholic Church (Lansford, PA), *St. John the Baptist: Recall and Rejoice* (Custombook, Inc., 1972), 27.

132. Morozowich, "The Liturgy and the Ukrainian Catholic Church," 68.

133. Morozowich, "The Liturgy and the Ukrainian Catholic Church," 57; Todd, *Reclaiming Our Inheritance*, 27.

establishment of official Eastern Catholic administrative divisions, beginning in 1913 with the granting of full ordinary jurisdiction to Bishop Soter Stephen Ortynsky (1866-1916) over all "Greek Catholics" in the United States,[134] and continuing with the founding of the first U.S. Eastern Catholic exarchates (precursors to eparchies, the equivalent of dioceses) in 1925. These first exarchates were "Greek Catholic"; the Maronites would not receive their first U.S. exarchate until 1966.[135] The exarchates gave Eastern Catholics their own local bishops and their own stable structures for maintaining liturgical traditions and ecclesial identities outside the hegemony of the Latin bishops. These steps finally cemented Eastern Catholic presence in American life, and they laid the foundations for U.S. Eastern Catholic reception of the Second Vatican Council.

Conclusion

The U.S. Eastern Catholic story shares many of the same obstacles and challenges that the Latin Catholic story includes in more widely-known detail. However, their smaller populations, their minority status within the Catholic communion, and their perceived foreignness by the U.S. Latin Catholic hierarchy further complicated their ability to practice their own liturgy, theology, and spirituality and transmit them to future generations, even as their canonical status guaranteed them the right to do so. Eastern Catholics, like all Catholic immigrants, depended on the continuity of their liturgical and sacramental life to carry their sense of faith and identity into American life. Eastern Catholics placed high and enduring value on their faith life as it had been handed down to them through the centuries, whether they remained in the Catholic communion to weather

134. Kaszczak, *Metropolitan Andrei Sheptytsky*, 63.
135. Labaki, "The Maronite Church in the United States," 82.

disastrous misunderstandings by the Latin Church or they entered other communities to practice their traditions more freely. While the pluralistic and democratic environment of the United States presented opportunities to learn how live together with a multiethnic and multireligious population, the American Catholic Church did not yet have the bearings for fully, freely, and peacefully supporting both its Latin and Eastern branches for much of its history. In the time of Vatican II, the Church would reexamine the same issues of locality, universality, authority, and plurality that shaped the centralized, Latin-dominant ecclesiology that U.S. Eastern Catholics challenged by their insistence on keeping their own form of life.

CHAPTER II

THE EASTERN CATHOLIC CHURCHES IN THE VISION OF THE SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL

"What was said yesterday clearly demonstrates that the concept of the Catholic Church is still very inadequate," Melkite Archbishop Elias Zoghby (1912-2008) declared during the discussions on the schema on the Catholic Churches of the Eastern Rites.[1] Entering into the Second Vatican Council, Zoghby and the other Eastern Catholic bishops sought to make clear the authenticity and significance of their Churches' presence in the Catholic communion. Zoghby continued his speech by saying, "The universal Church consists of all the particular Churches, gathered together and united by the Holy Spirit, which, from the first, were structured around the great Sees," the central See being Rome, "the chair of Peter."[2] This statement brought his Eastern ecclesiology to bear on the debates among his mostly Latin coworkers, with whom he sought a concept of the Church that was wide enough to encompass all the Catholic Churches and soften the Catholic position toward the Orthodox. He gave a warning about an error that had soured the relationship between Latin and Eastern Catholics for centuries:

> This universal Church must not be confused with that "universality" of the Western and Latin Church, which did not begin to exist as such until later, notably at the time of Charlemagne and which, little by little, because of the canonical separation of East and West, found itself one day all alone.[3]

In other words, no particular Church, not even the Latin Church, can take itself to be the universal form of Christianity to which all others must conform. If a Church makes this

1. Elias Zoghby, "Separation Between East and West," in *Third Session Council Speeches of Vatican II*, ed. William K. Leahy and Anthony T. Massimini (Paulist Press, 1966), 134.
2. Zoghby, "Separation Between East and West," 134.
3. Zoghby, "Separation Between East and West," 134.

error, it will find itself unable to participate in the communion of the whole Church of Christ.

The Vatican II documents *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, and *Unitatis Redintegratio* represent an effort by an ecumenical council to envision anew the Catholic Church's relationship with the vast array of cultural, social, and political circumstances in which it encounters the faithful. These questions prompt reflective work that guides the Council's understanding of the Eastern Catholic Churches. These three documents together reveal the Eastern Catholic Churches to be Churches of full and equal dignity with the Latin Catholic Church and to have a particular ecumenical vocation to the Orthodox Churches. Furthermore, the liturgy is the locus where particularity and universality meet as the liturgy adapts to the language, culture, and historical circumstances of the peoples in order to draw them more deeply into the divine mysteries. The Catholic Church's broader openness to all that is good about the world enables the development of an ecclesiology that accepts the unity in diversity to which the Eastern Catholic Churches witness.

Sacrosanctum Concilium **and Liturgical Renewal in the Eastern Catholic Churches**

In *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, the Second Vatican Council most clearly expresses its vision for the renewal of liturgy in the Catholic Church, and this vision flows from an ecclesiology that provides greater space for the active role of the laity and for diversity of tradition and culture. These principles and norms outlined in *Sacrosanctum Concilium* not only take some inspiration from the Eastern Catholic Churches but also give a greater warrant to efforts toward Eastern liturgical development. Though the Council is clear that

this document outlines practical norms primarily for the Latin liturgy, the document also states that all other rites should apply to themselves those norms, "which, in the very nature of things, affect other rites as well."[4] Moreover, as Archbishop Charles de Provencheres (1904-1984) acknowledged in his Council speech on the schema on the Eastern Catholic Churches, Eastern liturgical traditions inspired several elements of Roman Catholic liturgical renewal, namely, "the restoration of the Easter Vigil; the tradition of concelebrations and the use of vernacular languages," which have "always flourished in the Eastern rites."[5] It is natural, then, that at least some elements of *Sacrosanctum Concilium* would also apply to the liturgical traditions of the Eastern Catholic Churches. Among the main principles of *Sacrosanctum Concilium* is the need to foster "full, conscious, and active participation" among the laity.[6] The movement to encourage fuller participation—the "right and obligation" of every Christian "by reason of their baptism" [7]—involves two elements that embrace the community's particularity into the liturgy: the use of the vernacular and the local adaptation of the Roman rite. These two elements are consistent with the project of promoting the rites of the Eastern Catholic Churches and asserting their equal dignity and worth with the Roman rite.

While a vision of uniformity of discipline—common in the Americas in the previous two centuries—included the universal use of Latin in the Roman liturgy,[8]

---

4. Second Vatican Council, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, in *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, ed. Austin Flannery, O.P., 4th ed. (Costello Publishing 1979), 3.

5. Charles De Provencheres, "The Heritage and Role of Eastern Catholic Churches," in *Third Session Council Speeches of Vatican II*, ed. William K. Leahy and Anthony T. Massimini (Paulist Press, 1966), 131-132.

6. Second Vatican Council, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 14.

7. Second Vatican Council, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 14.

8. Maxim Hermaniuk, *The Second Vatican Council Diaries of Met. Maxim Hermaniuk, C.SS.R. (1960-1965)*, trans. Jaroslav Z. Skira and ann. Karim Schelkens, vol. 15 of *Eastern Christian Studies* (Uitgeverij Peeters, 2012), 73. The primary advocate of maintaining the practice of celebrating the Roman Mass in Latin was Cardinal James McIntyre (1886-1979), Archbishop of Los Angeles.

Sacrosanctum Concilium suggests that a vision that embraces the equal dignity of the whole Catholic heritage must at least be open to the liturgical use of local languages. The document gives the following direction: "But since the use of the vernacular…may frequently be of great advantage to the people, a wider use may be made of it, especially in readings, directives and in some prayers and chants."[9] The Eastern Catholic representatives at the council were particularly influential on this point. Ukrainian Catholic Metropolitan Maxim Hermaniuk (1911-1996) reports in his Council diary that "most of the speakers…were in favour of the introduction, at least partially, of modern languages into the Latin Mass. The Eastern rites were cited as an example of this."[10] Eastern Catholic Churches have long made at least some use of the vernacular of the faithful, rather than exclusively using an ancient language like Church Slavonic or Syriac, even before Vatican II. For example, the Maronites had begun incorporating Arabic chants into the Syriac-language liturgy as early as the eighteenth century.[11] The Melkites in the United States had started celebrating the Divine Liturgy in English in the decades prior to the Second Vatican Council, following "the age-old principle of the Byzantine Churches to use whatever language, vernacular or not, was deemed pastorally most suitable."[12] Unsurprisingly, it was Melkite Patriarch Maximos IV (1878-1967) who championed the use of the vernacular in the Latin liturgy (among other changes) in the conciliar debates.[13] More specifically, Maximos insisted in his speech of October 23,

9. Second Vatican Council, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 36.2.

10. Hermaniuk, *Second Vatican Council Diaries*, 74.

11. Guilnard Moufarrej, "Ancient Sounds in the New World: Syro-Maronite Chant in Lebanese Maronite Communities in the United States," *Yearbook for Traditional Music* 51 (2019): 117, doi.org/10.1017/ytm.2019.8.

12. Robert F. Taft, S.J., "Eastern Catholic Theology – Is There Any Such Thing? Reflections of a Practitioner," *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 39, no. 1 (1998): 35.

13. Taft, "Eastern Catholic Theology," 34.

1965, that every language in use by the faithful is a liturgical language.[14] The language in and through which people understand the world around them and consider the things of God is suitable for the Church's public worship.

Sacrosanctum Concilium's recognition of the "advantage" of modern languages for the pastoral care of the people opens a greater opportunity for the Church, in its liturgy, to embrace more fully the peoples who share in the communion of the Church. Hermaniuk notes that "a bishop from Japan," who supported the use of the vernacular in the Roman liturgy, warned "that the culture of his country has nothing in common with the Latin language, and that further excessive insistence on the use of Latin in the Mass may become an obstacle for many Japanese becoming Christians."[15] The example of the Japanese bishop, together with the experience of the Eastern Catholic Churches, demonstrates that what is at stake in the question of liturgical language is the ability of the laity to involve their whole selves—complete with their own cultural and historical means of expression—in the liturgical and sacramental life of the Church. The testimony of these bishops warns the Church that insisting on the exclusive use of Latin raises a wall of foreignness that risks alienating the faithful.

A push for local adaptation of the Roman rite in *Sacrosanctum Concilium* already encourages the Eastern Catholic Churches to restore and develop their own ecclesial traditions. The Council, aware of the wide array of peoples and cultures that the Church has encountered throughout the world, does not will "[e]ven in the liturgy…to impose a rigid uniformity in matters which do not involve the faith or the good of the whole

14. Hermaniuk, *Second Vatican Council Diaries*, 73; Taft, "Eastern Catholic Theology," 37.
15. Hermaniuk, *Second Vatican Council Diaries*, 75. Hermaniuk did not record the name of this bishop.

community."[16] Instead, the Council promotes a vision in which the sensibilities, language, and symbolic systems of all cultures find a place in the Catholic liturgy. The following excerpt hints strongly towards such an embrace of culture and, further, inculturation of the Latin liturgy:

> Rather does she respect and foster the qualities and talents of the various races and nations. Anything in these people's way of life which is not indissolubly bound up with superstition and error she studies with sympathy, and, if possible, preserves intact. She sometimes even admits such things into the liturgy itself, provided they harmonize with its true and authentic spirit.[17]

This statement represents an important shift in the Roman Catholic Church's posture towards non-Latin forms of liturgical and sacramental life. Language and culture are not in and of themselves inimical to faith or to the unity of the Church; rather, they allow the Church's life to reach all corners of the world from within the communities that embrace it. As the things of a community's life can be elevated into their worship as the local Church, that community can then enter more deeply into the mystery of the life of the Church in the modes through which they best access it.

This importance of this shift in outlook cannot be overstated. During the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Rome imagined the role of the Church as one of resisting an ultimately inimical world marked by godless rationalism and humanism, deception, and violence.[18] In such a framework, the Church's posture toward the world was one of teaching the world while asserting its own authority over and against it. [19] The events of the Second World War and the resultant division of the world into either U.S.-

16. Second Vatican Council, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 37.
17. Second Vatican Council, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 37.
18. Veronika Yaz'kova, "Katolicheskaya tserkov' i kul'tura: novye puti starogo dialoga," *Nauchno-analiticheskiy vestnik IE RAN*, no. 3 (2018): 180, dx.doi.org/10.15211/vestnikieran32018179184.
19. Yaz'kova, "Katolicheskaya tserkov' i kul'tura," 180; Doyle, "The Concept of Inculturation," 2.

or U.S.S.R.-backed blocs perhaps would have been expected to more deeply entrench the Church's defensive stance. However, these conditions made it more evidently dire that the Council evaluate the relation of the Church with the world and culture so as to promote peace and unity.[20] During the Council, the Church took a position that Karl Rahner described as "inculturation," allowing the Council to approach the world less as an enemy and more as a dialogue partner. This more positive valuation of culture and the world coincided with the move to pay attention to the contributions of different cultures and particular churches.[21] Moreover, the Church has a responsibility to encourage the growth of what is good in "the abilities, the resources and customs of the peoples," knowing that, in doing so, "she purifies, strengthens and elevates them."[22] Pope John XXIII (1881-1963) recognized that culture and social justice are connected, believing that dialoguing with the cultures of the world and working within them would promote the dignity of each human person and solidarity among peoples.[23] A new openness to diverse cultural traditions, insofar as they edified rather than imperiled the faith of the people, contributed to the increased interest in and appreciation for the Eastern Catholic and Orthodox Churches by the Roman Catholic Church at the Second Vatican Council.

This document on the sacred liturgy sets the precedent for the rest of the Second Vatican Council regarding the guiding principles of attention to the particularities of the

---

20. Second Vatican Council, *Lumen Gentium*, 13. The Council asserted that promoting "universal peace" was the call of not only the Catholic Church but the whole world: "All men are called to this catholic unity which prefigures and promotes universal peace. And in different ways to it belong, or are related: the Catholic faithful, others who believe in Christ, and finally all mankind, called by God's grace to salvation."

21. Dennis Doyle, "The Concept of Inculturation in Roman Catholicism," *U.S. Catholic Historian* 30, no. 1 (2012): 2.

22. Second Vatican Council, *Lumen Gentium*, in *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, ed. Austin Flannery, O.P., 4th ed. (Costello Publishing 1979), 13.

23. Yaz'kova, "Katolicheskaya tserkov' i kul'tura," 180-181.

peoples, local decision-making, and diversity that aids in the unity of a given tradition (in this case, the Latin tradition) or of the universal Church. One must remember that the incorporation of the local language, symbols, and cultural forms does not add variety for variety's sake or permit any nationalistic self-aggrandizing. Rather, such local adaptations, foster "that full, conscious and active participation in liturgical celebrations which is demanded by the very nature of the liturgy,"[24] ultimately contributing to the fuller realization of the Body of Christ in and through the liturgy. The Council articulates this point in *Sacrosanctum Concilium*:

> In the restoration and promotion of the sacred liturgy the full and active participation by all the people is the aim to be considered before all else, for it is the primary and indispensable source from which the faithful are to derive the true Christian spirit.[25]

Before giving specific guidance for liturgical renewal, the document reiterates the importance and necessity of liturgical development, including attention to the local vernacular and cultural particularity, within the frame of Christian formation:

> In order that the Christian people may more certainly derive an abundance of graces from the sacred liturgy, holy Mother Church desires to undertake with great care a general restoration of the liturgy itself. For the liturgy is made up of unchangeable elements divinely instituted, and of elements subject to change. These latter not only may be changed but ought to be changed with the passage of time, if they have suffered from the intrusion of anything out of harmony with the inner nature of the liturgy or have become less suitable. In this restoration both texts and rites should be drawn up so as to express more clearly the holy things which they signify. The Christian people, as far as is possible, should be able to understand them with ease and take part in them fully, actively, and as a community.[26]

By focusing on the formation of Christians, the document further fosters the unity of the local Church with the universal Church. The "changeable elements," corresponding with

---

24. Second Vatican Council, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 14.
25. Second Vatican Council, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 14.
26. Second Vatican Council, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 21.

the current socio-cultural location of the community, ought to change over time as their ability to communicate the mystery changes. The "unchangeable elements," then, guarantee continuity between the liturgy today and the liturgy throughout time. This relationship parallels that of the particular Church and the universal Church. Both are truly "the Church" and foster the Church's unity and catholicity.

Ukrainian Catholic theologian Peter Galadza, speaking on the occasion of the publication of the new worship aid *The Divine Liturgy: An Anthology for Worship* fifty years after the promulgation of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, reflects on the "full, active, and conscious participation" that the Council emphasized. He points to a key problem regarding this participation: the extent to which, historically, the liturgy has not been "existentially integrated" with the life of the community. He clarifies his meaning by writing, "The bane of liturgy – especially among certain Eastern Christians – has been its divorce from life. I take the phrase 'full participation' to presume a vital fusion of the quotidian and the ritualized."[27] Adapting those parts of liturgy that *Sacrosanctum Concilium* calls "changeable" presents an opportunity for the liturgy and the daily life of the people to undergo this "vital fusion" that unites the local community with the universal Church.

In his reflection, Galadza cites a pre-Vatican II example in the Ruthenian Catholic Church to show the power of a community that actively and knowledgeably participates in the liturgy, particularly through liturgical chants. He writes that in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Subcarpathia (modern-day Slovakia and parts of western Ukraine,

27. Peter Galadza, "'Full, Conscious and Active Participation': *Sacrosanctum Concilium*'s Influence on an Eastern Catholic Worship Aid," *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 57, nos. 1-4 (2016): 253-254.

eastern Czech Republic, and eastern Hungary), in the congregations of the "Carpartho-Rusyn Church" (the Ruthenian Church), "the average villager not only owned the Slavonic equivalent of a *liber usualis* (minus the musical notation), but actually sang the ordinary and *propers* (!) of Byzantine offices as complicated as vespers and matins."[28] While it cannot necessarily be said that the Council Fathers took inspiration from the Eastern Catholic Churches in this regard, the concern for participation of the whole community reflects the same motivation that inspired later reforms to liturgical music in the Roman Catholic Church.

The Identity and Vocation of the Eastern Catholic Churches

Orientalium Ecclesiarum*: Equal Churches in the Catholic Communion*

The most notable change in ecclesiology between Vatican I and Vatican II is the vision of the Universal Catholic Church as a communion of churches, united precisely in their diversity: "Between those churches there is a wonderful bond of union that this variety in the Universal Church, so far from diminishing its unity, rather serves to emphasize it."[29] This vision of the nature of the Church is fittingly described as a trinitarian or communion ecclesiology, expressing its fullness not only in the Universal Church (with Rome at the top) but also in the local or particular Church.[30] This ecclesiology entails an equality among the various Western and Eastern Churches in the

28. Galadza, "'Full, Conscious and Active Participation,'" 257.

29. Second Vatican Council, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, in *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, ed. Austin Flannery, O.P., 4th ed. (Costello Publishing 1979), 2.

30. Pablo Blanco, "Las Iglesias orientales católicas y ortodoxas en las enseñanzas del Vaticano II: Eastern Catholic and Orthodox Churches in the Teachings of Vatican II," *Scripta Theologica* 46, no. 2 (2014): 358. Spanish: "trinitaria" and "la eclesiología de comunión."

Catholic communion, as "none of them is superior to the others because of its rite."[31] Rather, though all particular churches are "equally entrusted to the pastoral guidance of the Roman Pontiff,"[32] the heritage of each particular church is of equal value, dignity, and goodness. The Council Fathers, therefore, saw it as necessary to "protect and advance all these individual churches," allowing them the authority to respond on their own terms to the needs of the faithful while maintaining communion with the other particular Churches.[33] Each of the *sui iuris* churches, then, remain particular while upholding the integrity of the Universal Church.

Orientalium Ecclesiarum defines a "particular church" as a group of faithful united by their rite and their hierarchy.[34] As all of these churches are equal in honor and dignity, the role of the Supreme Pontiff is understood as the guarantor of the unity of the Churches, not so much as a ruler over greater and lesser Churches. This reinterpretation of the pope's relationship to the Eastern Churches reveals a desire for the restoration of "the vision of 'union *with*' the pope of Rome" rather than "submission *to* him and his Curia,"[35] which had marked the lived reality of Eastern Catholicism for centuries. The inclusion of diverse traditions with their own liturgy and sacraments embodies the union

31. Second Vatican Council, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, 3. Compare with the language of *Etsi Pastoralis*, which specifically names the Latin rite as superior and, therefore, the rite to which all the others need to adapt (Pospishil 32).

32. Second Vatican Council, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, 3.

33. Second Vatican Council, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, 4.

34. Second Vatican Council, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, 2. The full quote is, "They [particular churches of the Mystical Body of Christ] combine into different groups, which are held together by their hierarchy, and so form particular churches or rites." This line seems to conflate "church" (the whole body using a particular rite) and "rite" (the manner of celebrating the liturgy and the sacraments). I offer a clarification on what I interpret the sense of this line to be, backed by Jalakh (*Ecclesiological Identity*, 90) and DeVille ("*Orientalium Ecclesiarum*," 327). DeVille also notes here that the term "rite," while interchangeable with "church" during the Second Vatican Council, has gradually been dropped in favor of the term "church."

35. Adam A. J. DeVille, "*Orientalium Ecclesiarum*," in *The Reception of Vatican II*, ed. Matthew L. Lamb and Matthew Levering (New York: Oxford University Press, 2017), 327.

of the Latin and Eastern Churches as equal, authentic, and honorable *eucharistic communities in communion with Rome*.[36] This model begins to remedy the superior-inferior attitudes of the past and steps toward living in a fuller sense of union, for which the various Eastern communions hoped when they entered into union agreements with Rome.

In this ecclesiological vision, a necessary step for affirming the equality of the Eastern Catholic Churches is the restoration of their theological, spiritual, and liturgical traditions. *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* acknowledges "the very great debt owed to the Eastern Churches by the Church Universal" for the preservation of various ancient apostolic traditions, which constitute "the heritage of the whole Church of Christ." Paralleling *Sacrosanctum Concilium*'s emphasis on the "full, conscious, and active participation" of the laity in the liturgy, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* highlights the role of the laity in the revival of each church's particular life and liturgical expression:

> All members of the Eastern Churches should be firmly convinced that they can and ought always preserve [sic] their own legitimate liturgical rites and ways of life, and that changes are to be introduced only to forward their own organic development. They themselves are to carry out all these prescriptions with the greatest fidelity. They are to aim always at a more perfect knowledge and practice of their rites, and if they have fallen away due to circumstances of times or persons, they are to strive to return to their ancestral traditions.[37]

Such statements reveal a newfound appreciation for the way in which the faithful living and organic development of each particular church's traditions contributes to the catholicity of the Universal Church: the unity of these Churches subsists in their common

---

36. Blanco, "Las Iglesias orientales," 360. Spanish: "comunidades eucarísticas en comunión con Roma."

37. Second Vatican Council, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, 6. Note that the Latin faithful are also to come to better knowledge of their rites and, therefore, participate actively and more fully, according to *Sacrosanctum Concilium* 14 and 19, with specific directions for achieving this end in section 27 et seq.

faith and sacraments, while manifesting in many distinct cultural and historical expressions.[38] The faithful are not only to move away from Latinizations but are also to strive for increasingly better knowledge of their own traditions (presumably, with an eye to the Orthodox Churches).[39] By perfecting their knowledge and practice of their liturgical and sacramental traditions—which arise from the unique history and cultures of various peoples—the Eastern Catholic Churches participate more fully in the stewardship of the patrimony of the Universal Catholic Church.

The Council, having emphasized the need for the restoration and promotion of Eastern Catholic tradition, specifies a concrete step toward this end in the sacramental life. The Council "confirms and approves the ancient discipline concerning the sacraments…and also the ritual observed in their celebration and administration."[40] This step includes the full restoration of the rights of Eastern priests to administer all the sacraments of initiation rather than reserving faculties for chrismation to a bishop.[41] For Eastern Catholics, one of the most deeply-felt effects of Latin dominance was the delay of First Communion and Confirmation (Chrismation) until the "age of reason," with some Catholics, according to Adam DeVille, going "so far to suggest that chrismating and communing infants was borderline sacrilege and must be forbidden." DeVille happily welcomes the verdict of *Orientalium*, which calls for moving away from the more Latin practice of waiting until the age of reason to administer communion and chrismation, favoring a return to the practice of celebrating these sacraments together with baptism.[42]

---

38. Blanco, "Las Iglesias orientales," 359; Jalakh, *Ecclesiological Identity*, 91.
39. Blanco, "Las Iglesias orientales," 360." As will be discussed in greater detail later, Michael Plishka takes issue with a strict interpretation of this injunction by the Council, and Mark M. Morozowich notes the pastoral difficulties that come with accomplishing such a task.
40. Second Vatican Council, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, 12.
41. Second Vatican Council, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, 13.
42. DeVille, "*Orientalium Ecclesiarum*," 328.

By approving the Eastern practice, the Council tacitly approved also the different modes of thinking that gave shape to both the Latin and Eastern practices, contributing to a model of unity that embraces both traditions without one being displaced or absorbed by the other.

In a major shift in the structure of Catholic ecclesiology, *Orientalium* spoke of the importance of restoring the rights and functions of the Eastern patriarchates: "Since the patriarchal system is the traditional form of government in the Eastern Churches, the holy ecumenical council wishes, where there is need, new patriarchates to be set up."[43] These patriarchates, along with major archbishoprics, are to function together with their synods as the highest authorities in each particular Eastern Church except for the right of the Supreme Pontiff to intervene as necessary.[44] Neophytos Edelby (1920-1995), a member of the so-called "Melkite lobby,"[45] emphasized that patriarchates, except for those cases in which the Roman Pontiff would intervene, should be subject to *no* other authority than their respective synods. They would rank higher than cardinals and, for this reason, should not be made cardinals but should still retain the right to vote for the next pope.[46] An interpretation like Edelby's, perhaps, was beyond the scope of the authority and power that the Council envisioned for the Eastern patriarchs, but the recognition and elevation of patriarchates and major archbishoprics, nevertheless, promoted a greater degree of autonomy and more local decision-making power than the Eastern Catholic

43. Second Vatican Council, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, 11.

44. Blanco, "Las Iglesias orientales," 367-368; *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* 7, 9.

45. Edward G. Farrugia, "The Patriarchate at Vatican II," *Naukovy zapiski UKU: Bohoslov'ya*, no. 8 (2021): 228n3, doi: 10.47632/2075-4817-2021-227-242.

46. Farrugia, "The Patriarchate at Vatican II." 229. Note that Josyf Slipyj, as Major Archbishop, was named a cardinal by Pope Paul VI in 1965, and, as least for "[o]ur people [the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church in Canada]," this measure was a hoped-for outcome (Hermaniuk, *Second Vatican Council Diaries*, 224-226), in contrast with Farrugia's analysis.

Churches had enjoyed in past centuries.[47] Even to this extent, the patriarchates serve as a model of both the equality of the Latin and Eastern Churches in full communion and of the equal importance of the local Church and the universal Church in enacting the life of the Church.

Unitatis Redintegratio*,* Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, and the Eastern Catholic Ecumenical Vocation*

The appreciation and promotion of the Eastern Catholic Churches is bound very tightly with a desire for dialogue with the Orthodox. In *Unitatis Redintegratio*, the Catholic Church at the Council recognizes the Orthodox as true churches with true faith and true sacraments.[48] Further, it recognizes that the traditions and disciplines of the Christian East are approved by ecumenical councils, and it refers to the relationships between particular Orthodox churches as "the preservation in a communion of faith and charity of those family ties which ought to exist between local Churches, as between sisters."[49] Ruthenian Catholic theologian David Petras notes an important change related to the "softened" attitude of the Church toward different cultural expressions and non-Catholic apostolic traditions. The Council "eschewed" the "[t]riumphalism" of some (such as the controversial pre-Conciliar figure Leonard Feeney) that insisted that there is no salvation outside the visible bounds of the Roman Catholic Church. The view of *Unitatis* is closer to the view that salvation can be available for those who act on a desire

47. A reader who has familiarity with Catholic Social Teaching will recognize in this latter condition an expression of the principle of subsidiarity.

48. Blanco, "Las Iglesias orientales," 363.

49. Second Vatican Council, *Unitatis Redintegratio*, in *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, ed. Austin Flannery, O.P., 4th ed. (St. Louis, MO: Costello Publishing 1979), 14.

to belong to the Church, even if they are not official members of the visible Church.[50] In Petras's analysis, *Unitatis* marks an expansion in the Roman Catholic imagination to include non-Latin expressions of liturgy, spirituality, and doctrine—even of the Eastern Churches not in communion with Rome—as part of "the full catholic and apostolic character of the Church."[51] Though the Council reaffirms that the full subsistence of the Church of Christ is the Catholic Church in union with Rome,[52] the ecumenical vision of *Unitatis Redintegratio* enables a clearer appreciation of the apostolic origins that are shared between East and West. This appreciation, in turn, opens greater possibilities for ecumenical encounter.

According to this understanding of the Christian East, the Church expresses gratitude that "many Eastern children of the Catholic Church," already in communion with the Roman Church, "preserve this heritage [shared with the Orthodox] and wish to express it more faithfully and completely in their lives."[53] Because of the shared origins and traditions between the Eastern Orthodox and Eastern Catholic Churches, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* names ecumenical outreach to the Orthodox as a particular prerogative of the Eastern Catholic Churches:

> The Eastern Churches in communion with the Apostolic See of Rome have the special duty of fostering the unity of all Christians, in particular of Eastern Christians, according to the principles laid down in the decree of this holy council, 'On Ecumenism,' by prayer above all, by their example, by their scrupulous fidelity to the ancient traditions of the East, by better knowledge of each other, by working together, and by a brotherly attitude towards persons and things.[54]

---

50. David Petras, "The Ecumenical Status of the Eastern Catholic Churches," *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 37, no. 3-4 (1992): 356.
51. Petras, "The Ecumenical Status," 356; Second Vatican Council, *Unitatis Redintegratio*, 17.
52. Petras, "The Ecumenical Status," 356.
53. Second Vatican Council, *Unitatis Redintegratio*, 17.
54. Second Vatican Council, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, 24.

The very existence of these Churches, then, is taken as a testament to the promise, hope, and future possibility of full unity between Western and Eastern Christianity. For this reason, the Council sees the Eastern Catholic Churches, "from the fact of being who they are," as especially fit and responsible for outreach in dialogue and sharing in sacred things (*communicatio in sacris*) with Orthodox Christians.[55] Because the Council recognizes the Eastern Catholic Churches as having a particular ecumenical vocation, it also reiterates the equal dignity of their tradition and their agency as full Churches rather than simply parts of the Roman Catholic Church.

Challenges in the Reception of the Documents

The Question of the Patriarchates: Primacy and Collegiality

As part of the wider *ressourcement* and *aggiornamento* that marked the Second Vatican Council, the Council Fathers considered it imperative that, as in the Latin Church, the authorities of the Eastern Catholic Churches exercise "the right and duty to govern themselves according to their own special disciplines."[56] The patriarchs and their synods are an important institution for this self-governance in the Eastern Churches.[57] The Eastern view of the patriarchates requires that each particular Church be treated as equal to the rest with minimal intervention of the pope, who ensures the unity among them. However, the actual implementation of the authority of patriarchates has been difficult and the tension unresolved.

---

55. Michel Jalakh, O.A.M., *Ecclesiological Identity of the Eastern Catholic Churches: Orientalium Ecclesiarum 30 and Beyond*, ed. Edward G. Farrugia, S.J., vol. 297 of *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* (Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 2014), 109.

56. Second Vatican Council, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, 5.

57. Second Vatican Council, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, 9.

The tensions regarding the conciliar statements about patriarchates revealed themselves even during the Council itself. From 1963 to 1965, a faction of the Ukrainian Catholic Bishops Conference in particular pushed for the creation of a patriarchate for their *sui iuris* Church. Metropolitan Hermaniuk of Winnipeg, Canada, and Metropolitan (later Major Archbishop and Cardinal) Josyf Slipyj (1892-1984) of Kyiv, Ukraine, were in favor of the establishment of a Ukrainian Catholic Patriarchate, with Hermaniuk as a particularly vocal advocate of the measure.[58] Metropolitan Ambrosij Senyšyn (1903-1976) appears to have been opposed to the creation of a patriarchate,[59] though Senyšyn denied this to reporters of the U.S. newspaper *Svoboda* (*Freedom*).[60] Those who supported a Ukrainian Catholic Patriarchate appealed to *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*. Pope Paul VI (1897-1978), according to Hermaniuk, ended the controversy outside of episcopal circles by demanding that the laity and the priests stop sending requests to the Holy See to create a patriarchate.[61] To this day, the head of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church officially bears the title of "Major Archbishop" rather than "Patriarch."[62] However, the Major Archbishops, beginning with Josyf Slipyj, have long claimed and exercised the authority of a Patriarch.[63]

---

58. Hermaniuk, *Second Vatican Council Diaries*, 132, 171, 174, 176-177, 179, 180, 181, 194, 202-203, 218, 233, 244.

59. Hermaniuk, *Second Vatican Council Diaries*, 220.

60. Hermaniuk, *Second Vatican Council Diaries*, 198.

61. Hermaniuk, *Second Vatican Council Diaries*, 233, 236.

62. See these Latin Catholic online articles: "Top Ukraine Prelate Says Vat Doc on Same-Sex Blessings Applies Only to Latin Church," Crux, Crux Catholic Media, Inc., December 23, 2023, cruxnow.com/church-in-europe/2023/12/top-ukraine-prelate-says-vat-doc-on-same-sex-blessings-applies-only-to-latin-church; "HUSAR Card. Lubomyr, M.S.U.," Press Office of the Holy See, Holy See, accessed February 17, 2024, press.vatican.va/content/salastampa/en/documentation/cardinali_biografie/cardinali_bio_husar_l.html.

63. Myroslaw Tataryn, "The Eastern Catholic Churches and the Paradox of Vatican II," *International Journal for the Study of the Christian Church* 13, no. 2 (2013): 84, doi.org/10.1080/1474225X.2013.781333.

Opposition to the idea of establishing a patriarchate seems to be largely about practical matters. For example, Rome's hesitancy to elevate an Eastern Catholic Church to a patriarchate if it does not already have one can be explained by practical concerns. The primary concern, following *Unitatis Redintegratio*'s desires for greater ecumenical relations and eventual reunion with the separated Eastern Churches, is that the establishment of Eastern Catholic patriarchates would disrupt relations with such dialogue partners as the Russian Orthodox Church.[64] For the Eastern bishops themselves, Edward Farrugia notes that Neophytos Edelby's strong promotion of the idea of an elevated patriarchate—one that was autonomous except in rare cases that required the intervention of the pope—raised suspicions about his loyalty to Rome.[65] If the pattern of the U.S. Latin Catholic hierarchy, established in the previous chapter, holds on this question, then these suspicions most likely sprang from worries about internal disunity in addition to damaged ecumenical prospects.

This Ukrainian Catholic perspective on the patriarchate expresses itself in the Ukrainian liturgy. In February 1965, shortly after Pope Paul VI named Major Archbishop Josyf Slipyj a cardinal, the Ukrainian Catholic Bishops Conference deliberated over what title to use to commemorate Slipyj in the liturgy. They resolved to commemorate him as "His Beatitude"[66] (Ukrainian: "*Blazhennishyj*"). Karim Schelkens, the annotator of the English translation of Hermaniuk's diary, notes that this title is typically reserved for patriarchs and that all Ukrainian Catholic Major Archbishops have been addressed in this way.[67] This custom holds outside the liturgical sphere. Even today, whereas Latin media

64. Tataryn, The Eastern Catholic Churches and the Paradox of Vatican II," 91.
65. Farrugia, "The Patriarchate at Vatican II," 228.
66. Hermaniuk, *Second Vatican Council Diaries*, 228.
67. Hermaniuk, *Second Vatican Council Diaries*, 228n762.

refers to the head of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church as "Major Archbishop," Ukrainian Catholic sources call him "Patriarch."[68] The authority to establish a new patriarchate belongs only to an ecumenical council or to the pope.[69] However, the inclusion of this title in the public prayer of the Church—notably, without any intervention on the part of the Holy See—reveals that the Ukrainian Catholic Church understands itself as a patriarchate in all but name (from Rome), having the proper authority, faculties, and rights of a patriarchate. The drive of the Council to restore the ecclesiological, liturgical, theological, and spiritual rights and traditions of the Eastern Churches, as detailed in *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*,[70] may be the very condition which creates the need for a patriarchate.

Some aspects of ecclesiological understanding that informed the discussion on patriarchates at the Council frustrate the goals articulated in *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*. One main issue is the difference between Latin and Eastern understandings of patriarchal authority. While *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* defines a patriarch and his synod as the highest authority in a given Eastern Church, Latin and Eastern bishops at the Council disagreed about whether the patriarch has universal jurisdiction or has limited to no authority outside the traditional territory of that particular Church.[71] While the Council

---

68. *Christ – Our Pascha: Catechism of the Ukrainian Catholic Church* (Synod of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church, 2016), 7, 280, 302, 322, 325; See also the use of the title "Patriarch" in the following Ukrainian Catholic online articles: "Memoirs of Patriarch Lubomyr Husar Presented in Kyiv," Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church, Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church, December 8, 2023, ugcc.ua/en/data/memoirs-of-patriarch-lubomyr-husar-presented-in-kyiv-797/; Julie Daoust, "Patriarch Sviatoslav Speaks at Sheptytsky Institute Banquet at University of Toronto," Homin Ukraini (Ukrainian Echo), Ukrainian Echo, June 6, 2014, www.homin.ca/news.php/news/13653/group/23; "Head of UGCC Would Like to Meet with Patriarch Kirill to Relieve Tension," RISU, Religious Information Service of Ukraine, risu.ua/en/head-of-ugcc-would-like-to-meet-with-patriarch-kirill-to-relieve-tension_n46251.

69. Second Vatican Council, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, 11.

70. Second Vatican Council, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, 5-6, 9.

71. Tataryn, "The Eastern Catholic Churches and the Paradox of Vatican II," 85-86; Hermaniuk, *Second Vatican Council Diaries*, 236.

defines the authority and rights of a major archbishop as equal to those of a patriarch,[72] neither fits the Eastern understanding, which Slipyj asserted in the example above. Clarifications on the level and reach of the authority of a patriarch would not be made until the promulgation of the 1990 Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches, which clarified the patriarch's authority as being over his particular Church throughout the world and defined the limits on a patriarch's authority as only his synod and, in limited cases, the pope.[73] These disagreements over patriarchal authority suggest that, though the Council desired to grant greater self-governance to the Eastern Catholic Churches in the interest of their organic development, Latin Catholic concepts of ecclesial structure did not yet have space for understanding Churches in communion with Rome but with little regulation from Rome.

A second issue regarding patriarchates is an underlying assumption that the patriarchate is or ought to be a distinctly Eastern prerogative. Adam DeVille calls such an assumption "arguably the most serious" issue that "the council did not address at all": that is, "Rome itself is a patriarchate, and needs to learn to act like one."[74] He writes that, while the Roman Church under Paul VI attempted to take on a more collegial structure, it did not give the synod of bishops any real voting power. Therefore, its "under-developed" concept of collegiality demonstrated a lack of understanding of the very patriarchal structure that the Council promoted for the Eastern Catholic Churches.[75] From this perspective, Pope Benedict XVI's (1927-2022) renunciation of the title of "Patriarch of the West" likely did not help establish a Latin understanding of its own Church as a

72. Second Vatican Council, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, 10.
73. Farrugia, "The Patriarchate at Vatican II," 234-235.
74. DeVille, "*Orientalium Ecclesiarum*," 338.
75. DeVille, "*Orientalium Ecclesiarum*," 338.

particular Church or as a patriarchate in a communion of other particular Churches and patriarchates.[76] Later developments on this topic will be explored in Chapters 3 and 4.

The Legacy of the Great Schism

In the process of embracing their twofold vocation defined by *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* and *Unitatis Redintegratio*, the Eastern Catholic bishops at the Council challenged the prevailing Roman Catholic ecclesiology by presenting to the Latin bishops the Eastern view of the Great Schism of 1054. During his speech on the schema on ecumenism, Joseph Tawil (1913-1999), the Melkite Greek-Catholic Patriarchal Vicar for Damascus, noted that "[d]ivisions are dealt with in a purely descriptive way, but nothing at all is said about the theology itself of division."[77] His suggested theology of division states: "The people of God has unity when, in quest of salvation by faith, it receives the Promise; on the contrary it is divided when, trusting in the flesh, it loses the Promise."[78] Whenever the Church "ran after the temptation to 'Judaize', to 'Hellenize' (5th century), to 'Latinize' (11th century), and finally to 'Romanize' (16th century)," separation occurred, because "[the Church] found she had the righteousness of the flesh and no longer that of faith."[79] This trust in "the flesh" to which Tawil refers seems to allude to a tendency to absolutize the particularities of a particular Church, a tendency which, as U.S. Eastern Catholic history demonstrated, had prevented Latin Catholics from even recognizing their Eastern Catholic brothers and sisters as fellow Catholics. Any view

76. Jalakh, *Ecclesiological Identity*, 102; Farrugia, "The Patriarchate at Vatican II," 230.

77. Joseph Tawil, "A Voice from the East," in *Council Speeches of Vatican II*, ed. Hans Küng et al. (Paulist Press, 1964), 193.

78. Tawil, "A Voice from the East," 193-194.

79. Tawil, "A Voice from the East," 194.

which equates Catholicity with Latinity or Roman-ness will be of no avail in promoting either the full flourishing of the Eastern Catholic Churches or reunion efforts with the Orthodox Churches.

An ecclesiology which is centralized in Rome, from the point of view of the Eastern Council Fathers, presents a stumbling block that both restricts Eastern Catholics' ability to live faithfully their own Eastern traditions and makes ecumenical relations difficult. Elias Zoghby, the Melkite Greek-Catholic Patriarchal Vicar for Egypt, observed in the history of the Church before the schism that the Church of Rome already had a tendency toward centralization and undue universalization and that the Churches of the East tended toward excessive decentralization and particularity.[80] With the schism, the Church of Rome lost "the most collegial segment of the episcopal college," and the East lost "communion with the center of unity of the whole Church which is the Bishop of Rome."[81] As both sides of the schism have differing concepts of Church unity and governance, Zoghby, in a later speech, described their conflicting ecclesiological interpretations of the schism itself:

> Therefore, when they speak of the separation of Churches, they use different languages and different concepts; they are not able to understand each other. The Orientals think of the separation from the Latin Church, as from a particular Church; the others, however, think of a separation from the universal Church, according to their own conception. [82]

Zoghby offered this analysis during his intervention on the schema on the Eastern Churches, since that earlier draft of the schema was "totally set up according to this second conception, as if the Eastern Catholic Churches were parts or appendices of the

---

80. Elias Zoghby, "Eastern and Western Tradition in the One Church," in *Council Speeches of Vatican II*, ed. Hans Küng, Yves Congar, O.P., and Daniel O'Hanlon, S.J. (Paulist Press, 1964), 50.
81. Zoghby, "Eastern and Western Tradition," 53.
82. Zoghby, "Separation between East and West," 135.

universal Latin Church" and needed to be changed.[83] Whether, after these interventions by these two Melkite bishops, the Roman Catholic Church is prepared to understand itself in terms of a sister Church to the Eastern Catholic Churches is a question that will may take decades to answer. Though these bishops contribute to the document's improvement, their inventions show that the Latin and Eastern Churches, even while drafting documents about their very relationships, are still developing their abilities to understand and fully accept the other.

The Stumbling Block of Latinization

Heeding the call to retrieve and adapt the traditions proper to their particular Churches and to serve as special partners in ecumenical dialogue with the Orthodox, the question of liturgical Latinization takes on greater importance not only within the life of a given Eastern Catholic Church but also in ecumenical efforts. Zoghby's criticism of Roman centralization and excessive Orthodox decentralization culminates in calls for dialogue "accompanied by an effort at decentralization in the Catholic Church, an effort which the Council has already begun" and appropriate centralization in the Orthodox Churches "around the successor of Peter and in the framework of traditional collegiality."[84] His recommendation for the Orthodox Churches is reminiscent of the canonical situation of the Eastern Catholic Churches but, due to their distinct historical growth, cannot make the two situations exactly identical. However, following with the principles of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, and *Unitatis Redintegratio*, he identifies Eastern Catholic liturgy and autonomy as key to true unity

83. Zoghby, "Separation between East and West," 135.
84. Zoghby, "Eastern and Western Tradition," 54.

with both the Latin Catholic Church and the Orthodox Churches. He names de-Latinization as the central Eastern Catholic contribution to the unity of the Churches:

> In de-Latinizing themselves, [Eastern Catholics] must come at last to live more fully in accordance with traditional Eastern forms, within Catholicism, in order to make Latin Catholics more familiar with those forms and make the dialogue easier and more effective. Indeed, for them this is the only way they can be of some use to the Church of Jesus Christ.[85]

As Chapter 3 will demonstrate, Eastern Catholics disagree about the best ways to go about de-Latinization of their rites and theologies and to what extent de-Latinization is desirable in the first place. However, the discernment necessary to determine these next steps in their current circumstances witnesses to the importance of offering the gift of a particular Church's liturgical-ecclesial life for the sake of unity in the sense of true catholicity.

Conclusion

The Eastern Catholic Churches, being heirs of an apostolic tradition that differs from the Latin tradition but is equal in dignity with it, shows the possibility of unity between the Catholics and the Orthodox and, by extension, between all separated Christians. They demonstrate the possibility that Christian groups with very different liturgical and theological traditions still share the same faith. They show forth the catholicity of the Church not in spite of these differences but because of them. The liturgy both forms the community and is formed by the community's life circumstances, and the liturgical-ecclesial life of each Eastern Catholic Church adds to the universal Church's understanding of the importance of the fusion of the local culture with the liturgy. The

85. Zoghby, "Eastern and Western Tradition," 54.

Eastern Catholic Churches' ability to fully embrace their own tradition and to adapt it to the current needs and circumstances of their faithful will impact their ability to live the promise of true union with the Orthodox. The next chapter will explore the ways in which Eastern Catholic liturgical development navigates these questions and responsibilities and the ways in which the Latin Church has grown in its appreciation and support for the flourishing of Eastern Catholicism.

CHAPTER III

ROOM TO BREATHE WITH BOTH LUNGS: EASTERN CATHOLIC LITURGY AND EASTERN-LATIN CATHOLIC RELATIONS IN THE PERIOD AFTER VATICAN II

In his pastoral letter for Christmas of 1970, Archbishop Joseph Tawil (1913-1999) wrote to his American Melkite Catholic faithful about the vocation of their church in this era of its history. The American Catholic landscape, he claimed, threatened the Melkite heritage with the pressures of Latinization and assimilation and the temptation of "the ghetto mentality."[1] The mission of the Melkite Catholic Church forbids both the surrendering of their own tradition and a self-preserving closing-off of their church from the world. Instead, he urged:

> [W]e can not think of our communities as ethnic parishes, primarily for the service of the immigrant or the ethnically oriented, unless we wish to assure the death of our community. Our Churches are not only for our own people but are also for any of our fellow Americans who are attracted to our traditions which show forth the beauty of the universal Church and the variety of its riches… We must be fully American in all things and at the same time we must preserve this authentic form of Christianity which is ours and which is not the Latin form. We must know that we have something to give, otherwise we have no reason to be. We must develop and maintain a religious tradition we know capable of enriching American life. Otherwise we would be unfaithful to our vocation… To be open to others, to be able to take our rightful place on the American Church scene, we must start by being fully ourselves. It is only in our distinctiveness that we can make any kind of contribution to the larger society. It is only by being what we are that we retain a reason for existence at all.[2]

By this letter, just five years after the close of the Council, Tawil declared an official embrace of the vision of Vatican II for the Eastern Catholic Churches with a particular

1. Joseph Tawil, "The Courage to Be Ourselves," Melkite Catholic Eparchy of Newton, Vianney Vocations, 2023, melkite.org/excerpt/the-courage-to-be-ourselves, paragraphs 12, 17.

2. Tawil, "The Courage to Be Ourselves," paragraph 14, 15, 19.

vocation in the democratic and multicultural setting of the United States. He saw in the Melkite Church the responsibility to be witnesses for the Latins and for all Americans. The interplay between tradition and culture, rather than being only a source of conflict, presents an opportunity for the enrichment of both. Abandoning the treasures of the Melkite tradition means impoverishing the Catholic Church and the United States.

American Eastern Catholics after Vatican II began to enjoy more established structures and somewhat more understanding treatment from their Latin Catholic neighbors. Commissioned with the task of living their unique apostolic traditions in the modern world, the Eastern Catholic Churches have taken steps to renew their liturgical expression, navigating both the desire to de-Latinize and the pastoral legacy of Latin-derived practices. Each *sui iuris* Eastern Church works toward answering the questions of tradition, culture, and ecclesiology implicit in their effort to renew their liturgical life from their own resources. The U.S. Latin Catholic Church, in response, has undertaken its own work of reorienting its relationship with the Eastern churches, though this work remains incomplete. Progress occurs in the tension between the perennial temptation toward an insistence on union on Latin terms and the Second Vatican Council's professed esteem for the traditions and rights of the Eastern Catholic Churches. Though *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* did not use the term "sister Churches" to describe the relationships among the particular Catholic Churches as it did for the Orthodox Churches, the Eastern Catholic Churches' liturgical work asserts their identities as Sister Churches to the Latin Church and challenges the Latin Church to recognize them as such.[3]

3. Adam A. J. DeVille, "*Orientalium Ecclesiarum*," in *The Reception of Vatican II*, ed. Matthew L. Lamb and Matthew Levering (Oxford University Press, 2017), 327; Michel Jalakh, O.A.M., *Ecclesiological Identity of the Eastern Catholic Churches: Orientalium Ecclesiarum 30 and Beyond*, ed.

Together, Eastern Catholic liturgical development and increased Latin Catholic respect for the Eastern Churches point toward a real, though imperfect, lived ecclesiology of communion in which each church maintains a unique identity and responds to the needs of their faithful, all while sharing a common core of faith.

Approaches to Embracing the Tradition

The reader will recall that the tensions in the relations between Latin and Eastern Catholics in the United States turned on what constituted the unity of Catholic faith and practice in a Protestant-majority nation. From the Eastern Catholic point of view, especially that of the Ukrainians and Ruthenians, the terms for communion with the Latin hierarchy demanded that they, to an unacceptable extent, conform to the standards of Latin expression, triggering mass conversions to the Russian Orthodox Church. The work before and during Vatican II took a fresh look at the contributions of the various particular cultures to the spread of the Gospel. This vision of particular cultures over time and culture writ large are exemplified in the documents *Gaudium et Spes* and *Lumen Gentium*.[4] Post-conciliar Eastern Catholic liturgical development in the United States, while not entirely contained in the categories of inculturation, has been greatly aided by the universal Catholic Church's official opening to culture as a means of expressing and spreading the Gospel. Post-conciliar Eastern Catholic development demonstrates paths forward in official sanction analogous to inculturation, but expanding the scope of the term and including a broader set of particularities than Roman Catholic academic

---

Edward G. Farrugia, S.J., vol. 297, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* (Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 2014), 305, 309, 314, 342-343.

4. Dennis Doyle, "The Concept of Inculturation in Roman Catholicism," *U.S. Catholic Historian* 30, no. 1 (2012): 1-13.

discussions tend to do. In their implementations of the Conciliar call to embrace what is proper to their own apostolic traditions, Eastern Catholics, importantly, are no longer required to follow practices that are "Catholic" (meaning Latin) in opposition to those that are "Orthodox" (meaning schismatic). That is, the Eastern Catholic churches are freer to witness to the catholicity of the Church; being Catholic does not require being Roman.

Although the Council directed *Sacrosanctum Concilium* primarily toward the Latin rite, the document's introduction affirms the "equal right and dignity" of all rites in the Catholic communion and states that some measures in the document can also be applied to the non-Latin rites.[5] *Sarcrosanctum Concilium* upholds each nation's heritage by declaring, "Even in the liturgy, the Church does not wish to impose a rigid uniformity in matters which do not involve the faith or the good of the whole community. Rather does she respect and foster the qualities and talents of the various races and nations."[6] This document provides a guiding principle for fostering what is good in the cultures of the world: "Anything in these people's way of life which is not indissolubly bound up with superstition and error she studies with sympathy, and, if possible, preserves intact," bringing them "into the liturgy itself, provided they harmonize with its true and authentic spirit."[7] The encounter of the Catholic faith with the cultures of the world, according to this principle, involves the elevation, where possible, of the elements of the local people's way of life into the sacramental life of that Church community. This move toward

5. Second Vatican Council, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, in *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, ed. Austin Flannery, O.P., 4th ed. (Costello Publishing 1979), 3-4.

6. Second Vatican Council, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 37.

7. Second Vatican Council, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 37. The next paragraph goes on to encourage such local traditions into the Roman Mass as appropriate.

inculturation parallels the call in *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* for the Eastern Catholic Churches to embrace those liturgical practices, devotions, and theologies that are proper to the traditions of their particular Churches.

In his 1988 apostolic letter *Euntes in Mundum*, in celebration of the one thousandth anniversary of the Baptism of Kiev Rus', Pope John Paul II (1920-2005) not only reaffirmed the goodness of the heritage of the Christian East, but also held it up as an excellent example of inculturation. While the Second Vatican Council presented both an appreciation of Eastern Christian traditions and principles for adapting the Roman liturgy to the local culture,[8] John Paul II goes a step further to expound on Eastern Christianity's relationship to Slavic cultures. The pope writes, "Kievan Rus' entered into the context of salvation and itself became such a context."[9] He recounts the missions of Cyril and Methodius and the conversions of Princess Olga and Prince Vladimir in what he calls the "'Slav inculturation' of the Gospel and of Christianity."[10] In his interpretation of the history, this inculturation begins with the use of Church Slavonic instead of Greek in evangelization and liturgy. He names Vladimir's motivation as "solicitude for the good of the Church and of his people,"[11] emphasizing the pastoral dimension involved in communicating the Gospel to another culture. This culture, then, fostered the growth of the Slavs' Christianity "in a form culturally and geographically closer to them."[12] John Paul II's description of this inculturation process provides an example of the principles of

8. Second Vatican Council, *Unitatis Redintegratio*, in *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, ed. Austin Flannery, O.P., 4th ed. (Costello Publishing, 1979), 14-15; Second Vatican Council, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 37-40.

9. John Paul II, *Go into All the World: Euntes in Mundum* (Office of Publishing and Promotion Services, United States Catholic Conference, 1988), 2.

10. John Paul II, *Euntes in Mundum*, 3.

11. John Paul II, *Euntes in Mundum*, 3.

12. John Paul II, *Euntes in Mundum*, 3.

Sacrosanctum Concilium at work in the Byzantine Churches, giving a glimpse of what is possible in liturgical development not only for the Latins but also for Eastern Catholics.

In light of the Church's hope for full union with the separated churches, John Paul II draws attention to the full communion that existed between the Churches of Rome, Constantinople, and Kievan Rus', "each of which had developed according to its own theological, disciplinary and liturgical traditions, with even notable differences."[13] He discusses how Byzantine Slavic Christianity "was gradually enriched on the basis of the local cultural patrimony, thanks to contacts with the neighbouring Christian countries, and came to meet the needs and the mentality of the peoples living in that great principality."[14] Important for his vision of inculturation, he describes the ways in which Byzantine Christianity enriched the Slavic cultures, particularly those of Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus, the direct heirs of the territory of Kievan Rus'. He names art, literature, music, and monasticism as "an indelible witness to the extraordinary religious and cultural flowering generated by the Baptism of Kievan Rus'."[15] He sees the Baptism of Kievan Rus' and the subsequent growth of its particular form of Christianity as the image of ecumenical hope, a return to the unity of "[t]he two forms of the great tradition of the Church, the Eastern and the Western, the two forms of culture, [which] complement each other like the two 'lungs' of a single body."[16] According to John Paul II's presentation of

13. John Paul II, *Euntes in Mundum*, 4.
14. John Paul II, *Euntes in Mundum*, 5.
15. John Paul II, *Euntes in Mundum*, 8.
16. John Paul II, *Euntes in Mundum*, 12. This "two lungs" language, made famous by Pope John Paul II, evokes the words of Russian poet Vyacheslav Ivanov in a 1930 letter to French essayist Charles du Bos. He uses this metaphor to describe his experience of making his profession of faith to enter the Catholic Church in 1926. For more context, see Anthony O'Mahony, "'...again to breathe fully from two lungs': Eastern Catholic Encounters with History and Ecclesiology," *The Downside Review* 134, no. 4 (2016), 107-108.

the development of Eastern Christianity, culture is not only the recipient of evangelization but also the vehicle by which it matures and flourishes.

Eastern Catholic efforts to restore and develop their own traditions and foster an Eastern identity flow from the same stream as Latin discussions about inculturation. Latin views on the relationship between the Church and culture have resulted in several "local theologies," which Robert Schreiter categorized as either "ethnographic theology" or "liberation theology."[17] One post-Conciliar Eastern Catholic response has been "Easternization," which Ukrainian Catholic scholar Michael Plishka identifies as "the systematic elimination, from those Catholic churches classified as 'Eastern,' of practices and thought patterns associated with the West."[18] In 1997, he responded to "a disturbing trend in 'Eastern' Catholic circles…and in some Orthodox circles to try to minimize these cultural boundaries and discourage the formation of local theologies."[19] Proponents of this trend, which he calls "Easternization," minimize those elements of a particular Church's tradition that are significant for them and are not universalizable. According to Plishka, Easternization, "Latinization's twin sister," fails to meet the very need for authentic expression of the unity in diversity that de-Latinization efforts have been working to achieve.[20] Dividing the Christian world into "the Eastern Church (in the singular) and the Western Church (in the singular)" creates artificial caricatures that frustrate true ecumenical dialogue.[21] For Plishka, any top-down method of renewing the

17. Doyle, "The Concept of Inculturation in Roman Catholicism," 9.

18. Michael Plishka, "From Easternization to Inculturation: Reinterpreting the Mission of the Eastern Catholic Churches," *Worship* 71, no 4 (1997): 319.

19. Plishka, "From Easternization to Inculturation," 318. Plishka states that even *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* and *Unitatis Redintegratio* imply constructs of "West" and "East" that overlook cultural, national, and ethnical particularity.

20. Plishka, "From Easternization to Inculturation," 318.

21. Plishka, "From Easternization to Inculturation," 321.

liturgy would be artificial and limit the involvement of the local church's life in its own liturgy.

Instead, he insists on inculturation as the way forward, "allowing a people's faith in Christ to be lived and expressed in ways indigenous to that people."[22] Whereas Easternization "deals mainly with externals," inculturation affirms, challenges, and transforms culture and faith.[23] Plishka encourages pastoral workers to move away from Easternization and toward inculturation, the creation of local theologies and traditions that respond to the needs of the people, even if they do not end up being perfectly "Eastern."[24] In fact, if the Latin and Eastern Churches are in full communion with each other, then all the devotions of the Church are available and valid for adoption by those who have need of them.[25] For the Church's liturgy to operate best as liturgy, it needs to involve the things of the local community's life as it is in its current time and place. An "Easternization" that overlooks these particularities and sensibilities risks frustrating a community's ability to contribute to the catholicity of the Church.

Another camp of Eastern Catholic scholars advocate for a measure of what Plishka would call Easternization, at least in the realm of liturgical rites. For example, Peter Galadza grants, "Naturally, anyone desiring to pray this devotion [the Stations of the Cross] – like the Marian rosary – can do so personally."[26] Morozowich comments, "The almost ubiquitous presence of the recited liturgy, Stations of the Cross, and other latinizations still require serious attention" in Ukrainian Catholic parishes in the United

22. Plishka, "From Easternization to Inculturation," 318.
23. Plishka, "From Easternization to Inculturation," 323.
24. Plishka, "From Easternization to Inculturation," 327.
25. Plishka, "From Easternization to Inculturation," 330-331.
26. Peter Galadza, "Ancestral Traditions': Particularities, Problems, and Challenges of Their Revival in Greco-Catholic 'Diasporas,'" *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 60, nos. 1-4 (2019): 227.

States.[27] At the same time, he cautions that, "All too often the zealous new pastor tries to purify the liturgical practice of a parish without being attentive to the spiritual needs of people who have lived a particular tradition for all of their lives."[28] For both Galadza and Morozowich, the problem is not as much the private practice of Latin devotions by Eastern Catholics but the replacement of Eastern practices by Latin ones, especially if parishioners are not even aware of the Eastern practices. In response, Galadza calls for greater liturgical and theological formation of clergy and laity,[29] and Morozowich calls for "[p]atient catechesis and prudent pastoral sensitivity" directing a gradual transition "away from other practices that are incongruous with the ethos of Byzantine liturgy."[30]

Plishka, Morozowich, and Galadza reveal the tension inherent in any discussion of liturgical development, even—or perhaps especially—those geared toward the restoration and updating of an ancient tradition. The changes that scholars may assess to be most organic or authentic to a tradition may appear utterly foreign to a congregation that is used to other practices. The vision of Vatican II for the Eastern Catholic Churches rules out complete resignation to Latinizations in Eastern liturgy, which may satisfy those who fear perceived "innovation." However, the wholesale excision of Latinizations, without regard for how they entered into an Eastern Catholic tradition or what spiritual need they met, may not be the solution either. Christopher Todd acknowledges the difficulty in assessing whether a practice even is, in fact, "authentic," "neutral," or "a corruption." Such work requires special attention to "the catholicity of the matter, both

27. Mark M. Morozowich, "Tradition or Innovation – An Analysis of Recent Liturgical Developments in the Ukrainian Catholic Church in the United States," *Worship* 86, no. 1 (January 2012): 39.

28. Morozowich, "Tradition or Innovation," 39.

29. Galadza, "'Ancestral Traditions,'" 226-227.

30. Morowowich, "Tradition or Innovation," 39.

within the history of the particular Church and of the universal Church. Not all liturgical practices hold the same weight regarding their origins, universality, and connection to Tradition."[31] Following the remarks of Robert Taft, Todd concludes that it would be nearly impossible to accumulate the required historical knowledge to fairly and definitively evaluate every liturgical and devotional practice and its place in every particular Church and the universal Catholic Church.[32] In Todd's analysis, then, completely removing every real or perceived Latinization from a particular Church's liturgical life would be impractical and not even necessarily desirable.

Whether prioritizing historical progressions, present pastoral needs, or distinctiveness of identity, all of these approaches wrestle with what it means to return to each particular church's "ancestral traditions," to preserve them, and to promote their organic development. In a pastoral setting, the conflict expresses itself as a tension between an aspirational vision of authentic Eastern identity and respect for the traditions with which a particular congregation is familiar. Morozowich diagnoses the issue as tension between the call of Vatican II and the reticence of those who "seek refuge in the comfort of the tradition of their immediate experience," a perception that the changes initiated at Vatican II constitute "a regression" or "an innovation" as congregations "remark that they have never seen such practices."[33] Christopher Todd, responding to perhaps overzealous proponents of change, urges such people to be charitable in their engagements with those who wish to hold on to Latinized practices. "Charity," he writes, "means that they (clergy or laity) must not be treated as a pest to be 'eradicated' but must

31. Christopher Todd, *Reclaiming Our Inheritance After Vatican II: Leadership Lessons from Eastern Catholic History and Liturgy* (Eastern Christian Publications, 2023), 25.

32. Todd, *Reclaiming Our Inheritance*, 24-25.

33. Morozowich, "Tradition or Innovation," 17.

be engaged with care for the interpersonal dimensions of evangelization."[34] Preserving Eastern Catholic traditions from one generation to the next cannot simply be the handing on of practices as they have just been done, as Taft warns: "…the church is never guided by a retrospective ideology. The past is always instructive but never normative."[35] The challenge of the Church's continued life and mission in the modern world requires both a respect for the past and an eye to the future, and the different Eastern Catholic Churches respond to this challenge in ways that imitate the movements of *ressourcement* and *aggiornamento* that drove much of the discussion at the Second Vatican Council.

Examples of Steps in Eastern Catholic Liturgical Development after Vatican II

Liturgical Language: Bringing Liturgy Closer to the People

An important question that Vatican II raised, for both East and West, was the subject of liturgical language. Some Eastern Catholic Churches have long made use of a vernacular language in their liturgies, rather than exclusively using a liturgical language like Church Slavonic, Koine Greek, or Syriac, even before Vatican II. For example, the Melkites celebrated the Divine Liturgy in the United States in English long before the Second Vatican Council, following "the age-old principle of the Byzantine Churches to use whatever language, vernacular or not, was deemed pastorally most suitable."[36] This move by the Melkites follows the principle that Patriarch Maximos IV (1878-1967) articulated at the Council: namely, that the language of the faithful—whatever language

34. Todd, *Reclaiming Our Inheritance*, 25.

35. Robert F. Taft, S.J., "'Eastern Presuppositions' and Western Liturgical Renewal," *Antiphon* 5, no. 1 (2000): 12.

36. Robert F. Taft, S.J., "Eastern Catholic Theology – Is There Any Such Thing? Reflections of a Practitioner," *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 39, no. 1 (1998): 35.

that may be—is suitable as a liturgical language.[37] The Maronites, drawing on this same principle, had begun incorporating Arabic chants into the Syriac-language liturgy as early as the eighteenth century.[38] In the 1960s and 1970s, the Maronite congregations in the United States translated their liturgical texts into English.[39] It appears that, to these churches, the most clearly practical approach to pastoral care was to celebrate the liturgy in the people's language. For this reason, within a year after the promulgation of *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* and *Unitatis Redintegratio*, the Ruthenian Greek Catholic Church approved English-language translations of liturgical texts and chants for use by the faithful.[40] Eastern Catholic experience shows that the language that is closest to the people is generally the most pastorally fitting choice for that people's public worship.

For the Ukrainian Catholic Bishops' Conference, however, this question proved more controversial, at least during the Council itself. Between Council sessions, the bishops deliberated over the whether to include modern Ukrainian in the liturgy. This measure passed with little resistance,[41] but most, though not all, of the bishops considered the inclusion of English, at this time, to be too extreme a change.[42] While Hermaniuk

---

37. Taft, "Eastern Catholic Theology," 34; Maxim Hermaniuk, *The Second Vatican Council Diaries of Met. Maxim Hermaniuk, C.SS.R. (1960-1965)*, trans. Jaroslav Z. Skira and ann. Karim Schelkens, vol. 15, *Eastern Christian Studies* (Uitgeverij Peeters, 2012), 73; Taft, "Eastern Catholic Theology," 37. See also Chapter 2 of this thesis.

38. Guilnard Moufarrej, "Ancient Sounds in the New World: Syro-Maronite Chant in Lebanese Maronite Communities in the United States," *Yearbook for Traditional Music* 51 (2019): 117, doi.org/10.1017/ytm.2019.8.

39. Georges T. Labaki, "The Maronite Church in the United States, 1854-2010," *U.S. Catholic Historian* 32, no. 1 (Winter 2014): 82.

40. See the pamphlet *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom* (Byzantine Seminary Press, 1965). This worship aid contains the order of the Divine Liturgy and the liturgical chants that the congregation is meant to sing along with the cantor. The texts were adapted entirely in English.

41. Hermaniuk, *Second Vatican Council Diaries*, 146, 194, 226, 250, 277.

42. Hermaniuk, *Second Vatican Council Diaries*, 170, 181, 227, 271. For example, a certain Most Rev. Andrej supported a translation of the liturgical books into modern Ukrainian, but Metropolitan Hermaniuk notes that Fr. Andrej would have preferred that English be included (170). Hermaniuk himself was opposed to the use of English, as indicated by this comment after a discussion in Canada on April 15, 1964: "Some (Edmonton) propose the creation in our eparchies/dioceses (in large cities) of separate

does not explicitly note any national-ethnic factor in these specific debates, he makes clear throughout his diary that he has a special concern for the good of "the Ukrainian nation,"[43] including the people both in Ukraine and in the diaspora. Against this background, the liturgical language issue reveals a tension between ministering to the faithful in the language that younger generations are adopting and preserving their Ukrainian national identity. When not all members of a given particular Church speak the same vernacular as a mother tongue, that Church may need to take different approaches to the language question in order to propagate a common identity across the different life circumstances of the faithful.

Georges T. Labaki addresses this question of identity through language from a Maronite perspective. He observes that the translation of the Maronite texts into English made the Maronite liturgical tradition more accessible to congregations where some or most people do not understand Arabic, meeting a strong desire to preserve the religious and cultural identity of the faithful.[44] However, Guilnard Moufarrej, while writing about the language of the hymns, observes that some Maronites "maintained that Arabic is their language, and if they lose it, they will lose their identity as Maronites; they insisted that the best way to preserve the language and the Maronite tradition would be to keep the hymns in Arabic."[45] The need to accommodate both Arabic- and English-speaking parishioners has led to the common practice of mixing the languages at the liturgy.

English parishes of our rite, with Divine Liturgies in English (A very dangerous proposal — it would be catastrophic for our Church)" (181).

43. Hermaniuk, *Second Vatican Council Diaries*, 119, 193, 248.
44. Labaki, "The Maronite Church in the United States," 79, 82.
45. Moufarrej, "Ancient Sounds in the New World," 127.

Changes to the Ordo: The Byzantine Churches

In the Byzantine Catholic Churches, efforts in liturgical renewal have placed an emphasis on recovering "a strong Eastern identity," following the directives of *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*.[46] Morozowich names some important changes that, as of 2012, Ukrainian Catholic parishes and eparchies had begun implementing. This portion of the study will largely recount his observations, while also including notes from the Ruthenian Catholic missal in use since 2006, because both Byzantine-Slavic Churches have undergone similar developments in their usages of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom. In Morozowich's evaluation, the most successful restorations of Eastern liturgical tradition are the discontinued use of the filioque in the Nicene Creed and traditional order of the Mysteries (Sacraments) of Initiation.

One of the most obvious places where the reclaiming of Eastern theology is visible in the liturgy is in the dropping of the filioque clause from the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed. The liturgical books had placed the filioque "in parentheses, denoting its optional nature" as early as the 1940s[47]; a 1965 worship aid published by the Ruthenian Catholic Eparchies of Pittsburgh and Passaic uses this same notation.[48] In 2004, the Ukrainian Archeparchy of Philadelphia published catechetical booklets that explained why the filioque would no longer be included in the creed. These booklets were responsible for educating the laity on how this version of the creed better expresses Eastern trinitarian theology, which "accentuates the monarchy of the Father."[49] The

46. Morozowich, "Tradition or Innovation," 16.
47. Morozowich, "Tradition or Innovation," 27.
48. *The Divine Liturgy*, 19.
49. Morozowich, "Tradition or Innovation," 27-28.

Ruthenian and Melkite worship aids likewise no longer include the filioque at all.[50] This movement away from the inclusion of the filioque in the Byzantine versions of the creed witnesses to the fact that the difference between the Latin and Eastern conceptions of the Trinity are not a matter of dogma and heresy. Latin and Eastern Catholics can profess their respective versions of the Creed and, in doing so, simply profess the same faith from different perspectives. Therefore, this particular theological difference need not be the church-splitting issue that sometimes heated interreligious discussion may suggest it to be.

The practice of celebrating all three Sacraments of Initiation at one time has been undergoing a gradual process of restoration in the decades following Vatican II, with the Ukrainian Catholic Eparchy of St. Joseph in Parma, Ohio, becoming the first Ukrainian eparchy in the United States to adopt the practice in 1991.[51] After completing a study in the 1980s, the Eparchy of Parma made a decision to include the Rites of Baptism and Chrismation in the place of the regular entrance rites of the Divine Liturgy, imitating the order of the Liturgy at the Easter Vigil.[52] Morozowich explicitly cites this change as an example of updating an older tradition: the practice "respects the integrity of the original pattern of Initiation at the Easter Vigil while adapting to the current situation of having

50. *The Divine Liturgies of Our Holy Fathers John Chrysostom and Basil the Great: Responses and Hymns set to the Carpathian Plainchant* (The Byzantine Catholic Metropolitan Church Sui Juris of Pittsburgh, USA, 2006), 52; Lawrence G. Gosselin, ed., *Prayers for Publicans* revised ed. (Holy Transfiguration Church, 1984), 7. Note that the second of these sources is an aid for services without a priest, such as the Divine Office, the Typika (a service in the place of the Divine Liturgy), akathists, and other communal prayers.

51. Morozowich reports that the Archeparchy of Philadelphia made the practice of the celebration of all the sacraments of initiation in one liturgy mandatory in 2005 and, as of the time of the writing of his article in 2012, the Eparchies of Chicago and Stamford (Connecticut) have yet to mandate the practice for their entire territories. However, even in these eparchies, this order is the practice in several parishes.

52. Morozowich, "Tradition or Innovation," 31-32.

baptisms throughout the year."[53] This updating of the tradition maintains continuity with the past but also enables the liturgy to draw the faithful into the mystery in ways that are more suitable for them.

One practice that has so far enjoyed mixed results, according to Morozowich, is the recitation of the anaphora aloud.[54] After the series of three invocations in dialogue with the faithful, priests previously prayed the anaphora "secretly," much like the practice according to the rubrics of the pre-1969 Roman Mass.[55] An increasing number of parishes pray it aloud,[56] and, in fact, the current Ruthenian worship aid includes chants for the dialogue between the priest and the faithful that continues through the consecration.[57] This practice more firmly draws the congregation into the "full, conscious, and active participation"[58] that allows the liturgy to incorporate them into the divine mystery of the Body of Christ.

Morozowich names some examples of elements where continued work is needed to restore the Eastern liturgical tradition where congregations had drifted away from it. He argues that, for example, more congregations should celebrate the Easter Vigil in the evening, rather than in the morning, of Holy Saturday, and this liturgy should include the Baptism, Chrismation, and First Communion of new members of the Church. These details would strengthen this particular liturgy's nature both as a vigil and as the celebration of the Paschal Mystery, with its "deep connection in the theology between the death and resurrection motifs in the readings together with the experience of the newly

53. Morozowich, "Tradition or Innovation," 32.
54. Morozowich, "Tradition or Innovation," 36.
55. *Liturgical Catechism*, 74-75.
56. Morozowich, "Tradition or Innovation," 36.
57. *The Divine Liturgies of Our Holy Fathers John Chrysostom and Basil the Great*, 55-61.
58. Second Vatican Council, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 14.

initiated taking part in the community for the first time in its fullness."[59] Morozowich also states that parishes should practice the "kiss of peace" before the Creed in the liturgy as a symbol of reconciliation and unity. Notably, some rites during the year, such as Forgiveness Vespers (Vespers on the evening of the Sunday that opens the Great Fast or Lent) and Resurrection Matins (Matins of Easter Sunday), include this practice, but few parishes actually implement it.[60] In some cases, even the church architecture of many Ukrainian Catholic Churches in the U.S. has undergone Latinization, for example, through what Morozowich calls "'Irish' penitential boxes." Latin-style confessionals do not correspond with the Eastern theology of reconciliation.[61] Continued study of these elements of Latinized practices, to the extent that they are still widespread in the life of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, will reveal areas where there is opportunity either for rapprochement with the practices of Ukrainian Catholics' sister Orthodox Churches or for the adaptation of Latin practices to the spiritual and pastoral needs of the Ukrainian Catholics.

Changes to the Worship Space: The Maronites

With a focus on communicating the divine mystery in a way that best suits the spiritual and pastoral needs of its faithful, liturgical developments in the Maronite Church have extended even to the physical space in which the liturgy takes place. The Maronite Church has renewed its icon tradition in the period after Vatican II. In the earliest centuries of the Maronite Church, the interior of a church was incomplete without rich

59. Morozowich, "Tradition or Innovation," 34.
60. Morozowich, "Tradition or Innovation," 37-38.
61. Morozowich, "Tradition or Innovation," 39.

iconography, and these icons served both liturgical and catechetical purposes. Gradually, many of these icons, even in Lebanon, were replaced or updated with Latin- and Byzantine-style icons.[62] The Maronite Patriarchal Synod passed a resolution in 1996 that explained the importance of icons in general and the need to embrace the Syro-Maronite icon tradition and to turn away from Latin and Byzantine influences on it.[63] A renewal of the Syro-Maronite iconography provides the opportunity for future generations of Maronite icon writers to offer windows into the mysteries of the life of Christ from their unique sources and perspectives, contributing not only to their development as a particular Church but also to the catholicity of the universal Church.

Anthony Salim offers a perspective on certain changes to Maronite liturgy and liturgical space from a catechetical perspective. In particular, he analyzes how these changes participate in the ways in which the Syriac Fathers wrote and taught the faith to their own disciples. For example, the texts of the pre-anaphoral prayers (*Ḥoosoyo*) often use typology, a common teaching device used by Jacob of Serug and Ephrem the Syrian, to interpret the readings at that day's liturgy. When Fr. Joseph Amar released a revised version of the Lectionary in 1976, he arranged the readings to better reflect the typology.[64] The embrace of the Syriac icon tradition in Maronite churches honors the role that icons played not only in worship but also in transmitting the faith even to those who could not read.[65] Salim reflects carefully on hymnody and the revival of Maronite chant, since Ephrem used Syriac chant to teach orthodoxy and to correct heresy, often relying

62. Anthony Salim, "Re-imagining Adult Faith Formation in the Syriac-Maronite Catholic Church," *The Quarterly Journal of St. Philaret's Institute*, no. 41 (Winter 2022): 138-140, doi-org.libproxy.udayton.edu/10.25803/26587599_2022_41_133.

63. Salim, "Re-imagining Adult Faith Formation," 140.

64. Salim, "Re-Imagining Adult Faith Formation," 137-138.

65. Salim, "Re-Imagining Adult Faith Formation," 138.

on the same typological mode of interpretation as in the liturgical prayer book.[66] Salim notes that Ephrem's chants included both sung hymns and homilies set to meter, and they were taught to the faithful by women's choirs directed by Ephrem.[67] The restoration of Maronite chant adapts Ephrem's catechetical strategies to the needs of Maronites, whether in Arabic or translated into English. This particular *aggiornamento* of Maronite hymnody and the icon tradition make a move of *ressourcement*, managing to use ancient methods to communicate the faith and the life of the Church to the present generation. This approach to liturgical development, then, contributes to the catholicity of the Church in time as well as in place and culture.

Toward a Lived Communion Ecclesiology: Progress in Eastern-Latin Catholic Relations

In 1999, Bishop (now Cardinal) Wilton D. Gregory gave an address to the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, in which he set out on two main tasks: 1) to recognize the ways in which the Latin Church in the United States has historically failed to respect the worth and dignity of the Eastern Catholic Churches and 2) to propose paths for greater cooperation between Latin and Eastern Catholics on the local, diocesan, and national levels. He begins with the history of Latin-Eastern relations, highlighting the Latin hierarchy's conviction that uniformity was the way to maintain ecclesial cohesion and Catholic identity during a century marked by anti-Catholicism. Gregory acknowledges the harm that this conviction inflicted on Eastern Catholic communities in the United States, who were expected to "all pass to the Latin rite" once settled and

66. Salim, "Re-Imagining Adult Faith Formation," 142-143.
67. Salim, "Re-Imagining Adult Faith Formation," 144-145.

whom Latin bishops treated harshly in the very name of unity.[68] He notes that the attitudes of the U.S. bishops were, unfortunately, often reflective of a wider Roman Catholic Church that upheld the "preeminence of the Latin rite," precluding any concept of a communion of Roman and non-Roman Catholic Churches.[69] In the middle of his presentation of this history, he takes responsibility for such actions and moves toward peace on behalf of the American Latin Catholic hierarchy:

> There can be no question that much of the blame for this unhappy chapter in our relations lies with my predecessors in the Latin hierarchy of this country. There was little appreciation for the legitimate and ancient traditions of the Eastern Churches, for the richness of the liturgical, spiritual, canonical and theological heritage that is yours. Rather than receiving your faithful and long-suffering ancestors with open arms as brothers and sisters in the faith, adding to the diversity of our community, we all too often belittled them as different, even foreign, as representing an unacceptable deviation from the norm. For all this I can only ask your forgiveness.[70]

It is from within this framework—acknowledgment of past wrongs and an expression of contrition for these wrongs—that Gregory launches into a series of recommendations for fostering cooperation between the Latin and Eastern Churches. These recommendations range from education and training on both the local and diocesan level to collaboration on pastoral initiatives.[71] This framework represents and urges a crucial shift in Latin attitudes towards the East, which makes the prospect of reconciliation possible. In his speech, Gregory offers the Eastern Churches greater confidence of Latin support for the embrace and development of their own tradition; for the Latin Church, he presents an

68. Wilton J. Gregory, "Cooperation and Autonomy. The Relationship Between the Eastern Catholic Churches and the Latin Majority in America," *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 40, nos. 1-4 (1999): 145-147.

69. Gregory, "Cooperation and Autonomy," 147.

70. Gregory, "Cooperation and Autonomy," 147.

71. Gregory, "Cooperation and Autonomy," 149-150, 155.

invitation to better live out the call of dialogue and unity as expressed by East and West at Vatican II.

To establish proper boundaries in Latin-Eastern Catholic relations, the Roman Curia promulgated a Code of Canons for the Eastern Churches in 1990. Canonical and pastoral guidelines published by the NCCB Committee on the Relationship between Eastern and Latin Catholic Churches and by the Canon Law Society of America provide aids for the application of the Eastern Canons and corresponding articles of Latin canon law to best meet the needs of all Catholic particular Churches. Examples from these guides contrast significantly with earlier versions, especially those in *Ea Semper*, the 1907 apostolic letter promulgated by Pope Pius X (1835-1914) to regulate the ecclesial lives of "Ruthenians" (all Greek Catholics) in the United States. Contrasting the older and newer guidance reveals instructive shifts in the ecclesiological principles underlying the relations between the Latin and Eastern Catholic Churches. The following examples will focus on settings where Latin and Eastern populations will most often encounter each other.

Catholic parishes are an important example of a context where Eastern and Latin Catholics navigate each other's traditions in the same space. Though all Catholics are bound by the disciplines of their particular Churches, it is not uncommon for Eastern Catholics to attend liturgies in Latin Catholic parishes where they lack access to parishes or clergy of their own. In 1907, the instruction for Eastern Catholics in this situation was to attend a Latin parish and conform to the Latin rite without canonically becoming Latins.[72] The NCCB's 1999 handbook, aiming to better foster the outward expression of

72. Pius X, *Ea Semper Fuit* (June 14, 1907): art. XXVII, www.vatican.va/content/pius-x/en/apost_letters/documents/hf_p-x_apl_19070614_ea-semper-fuit.html. Note that most sources in this

Eastern Catholic identity, gives the following guideline: "…members of Eastern Churches who do not have any contact with their own pastors ought to be helped as far as possible to observe their own tradition and customs."[73] The U.S. bishops cite *Orientale Lumen* 26 as the summons to the task of ministering to Eastern Catholics according to their Eastern traditions, even under Latin governance, ensuring their full participation in the life of the universal Church through the contribution of their particular Churches.[74] For this reason, the NCCB and Canon Law Society guidelines make provision for Latin clergy, with special permission, to administer certain sacraments, such as the sacraments of initiation, according to the discipline of the Eastern Church in question.[75] Even in cases where special permission is not necessary, such as in the Sacrament of Reconciliation, the guidelines require Latin pastors to take Eastern sensibilities into account when hearing the confession of an Eastern Catholic.[76] That Latin clergy are called to facilitate Eastern Catholics' participation in the liturgical and sacramental life of their particular Church, to the extent that it is feasible, demonstrates an appreciable effort to live an ecclesiology of communion rather than uniformity. This call, however, should

---

bibliography refer to this document by the shorter name *Ea Semper* rather than the longer name that the Vatican website provides. This thesis will follow the convention of these sources.

73. Committee on the Relationship between Eastern and Latin Catholic Churches, *Eastern Catholics in the United States of America* (United States Catholic Conference, 1999), 23.

74. Committee on the Relationship between Eastern and Latin Catholic Churches, *Eastern Catholics in the United States of America*, 23.

75. See, for example, Committee on the Relationship between Eastern and Latin Catholic Churches, *Eastern Catholics in the United States of America*, 26-27; Dimitri Salachas and Krzysztof Nitkiewicz. *Inter-Ecclesial Relations Between Eastern and Latin Catholics: A Canonical-Pastoral Handbook*, trans. George Dmitry Gallaro (Canon Law Society of America, 2009), 24-25. It should be remembered that, if an Eastern Catholic attends a Latin Mass, the Eastern Catholic will receive communion in the Latin form. However, the Eastern discipline remains a factor is in whether a child below the "age of reason" can receive. The Canon Law Society of America stipulates that "the children should receive it, even though the discipline of the Latin Church is different. Obviously, this should take place with due pastoral sensitivity in order to avoid unnecessary disturbance of the Latin faithful" (Salachas and Nitkiewicz, *Inter-Ecclesial Relations*, 25).

76. Committee on the Relationship between Eastern and Latin Catholic Churches, *Eastern Catholics in the United States of America*, 29.

not be confused with a practical requirement for Latin priests to become biritual, which itself requires a faculty granted by the Holy See.[77]

The issue of canonical transfers in a marriage context illuminates the shift in valuing the integrity of the Eastern Catholic Churches. In the case of the marriage of one Latin spouse and one Eastern spouse, *Ea Semper* did not allow the Latin spouse to follow the rite of the Eastern Catholic spouse, but the Eastern Catholic spouse had permission to follow the fasts and feasts of the Latin spouse. The Eastern spouse also had the option to transfer to the Latin Church during the marriage and to return to his or her own Eastern Church after the death of the Latin spouse.[78] These permissions follow the stated purpose of caring for the spiritual good of the Eastern rites, since *Ea Semper* expressly forbids inducing Eastern Catholics to become Latin.[79] However, in the context of the Latin Church being the dominant Catholic Church in the United States, the document gives clear priority to the Latin Church, sometimes pressuring Eastern Catholics to become Latin in all but name. The 1999 NCCB document expresses the current discipline in the following way: "An Eastern Catholic wife may transfer to the Church of her husband. A Latin Catholic husband or wife may transfer to the Church of their Eastern spouse at the time of the marriage or during the marriage."[80] The implication of this regulation is that the Eastern Catholic husband is not permitted to transfer to the Latin Catholic Church, perhaps except under extreme circumstances. These regulations already mark a shift in preference for tradition of the Eastern Catholic spouse in a Latin-majority country. Rather

77. Salachas and Nitkiewicz, *Inter-Ecclesial Relations*, 23
78. Pius X, *Ea Semper Fuit*, art. XXVIII-XXXI.
79. Pius X, *Ea Semper Fuit*, art. XXIV.
80. Committee on the Relationship between Eastern and Latin Catholic Churches, *Eastern Catholics in the United States of America*, 33.

than continuing the paradigm of Americanizing Catholics of a foreign rite, the newer regulations give deference to the minority and strengthen it against compromises on its own integrity.

An extension of the marriage question is that of the baptism of children, and the same ecclesiological shifts drive the changes in relevant canon law. In the case of a marriage between a Latin man and an Ruthenian woman, *Ea Semper* ruled that the children were always baptized in the Latin Church. In the case of a marriage between a Ruthenian man and a Latin woman, however, the man could choose for his children to be baptized in either the Ruthenian or the Latin Church.[81] However, even if the children were baptized in an Eastern Church, *Ea Semper* did not permit that the priest chrismate them; it ruled that such a Chrismation would be invalid.[82] Today, the children, by default, are baptized into the father's particular Church, though in other situations—including the mere agreement of both parents—the children can be enrolled in the mother's Church instead, be it Latin or Eastern and, if Eastern,[83] including the rite of Chrismation now that the Eastern Churches have resumed this practice. Reading this regulation against the question of canonical transfers in marriage reinforces the underlying desire to preserve and promote the Eastern Catholic Churches. This desire reflects a greater appreciation of the Eastern Catholic Churches as true sisters in the Catholic communion rather than as abnormalities in the life of an otherwise monolithic Catholic Church.

This concern for preserving the Eastern traditions continues in regulations regarding Eastern Catholic students in Latin Catholic seminaries and schools. The

---

81. Pius X, *Ea Semper Fuit*, XXXIV-XXXV.
82. Pius X, *Ea Semper Fuit*, XIV.
83. Committee on the Relationship between Eastern and Latin Catholic Churches, *Eastern Catholics in the United States of America*, 25; Salachas and Nitkiewicz, *Inter-Ecclesial Relations*, 11.

canonical-pastoral guidebook published by the Canon Law Society of America gives specific suggestions on how to ensure that Eastern Catholic seminarians, for example, undergo "formation according to their own rite, their own liturgical exercises and their own form of spiritual life…to avoid the loss of identity of Eastern students and the 'Latinization' of Eastern clerics."[84] Suggested steps include ensuring that the faculty include professors familiar with Eastern Catholicism, encouraging seminarians to attend divine liturgies in their own churches on Sundays and holy days, and providing a liturgical space for use by Eastern Catholic students on the seminary grounds.[85] The formation of future clergy requires special care that seminarians have full access to the theology, spirituality, and liturgical and sacramental practices of their respective churches, even in a Latin-majority environment.

The guidebooks of both the Canon Law Society and the NCCB say little to nothing regarding similar concerns in Roman Catholic schools. However, the one reference that the NCCB makes to Eastern Catholic students in its 1999 booklet is a requirement to respect these students' sacramental disciplines. These students are to receive these sacraments in their own Churches and according to the discipline of these Churches. Latin Catholic educators and clergy are not to attempt to override this discipline. Most notably: "As the Sacrament of Chrismation cannot be repeated, any attempt to do so is strictly prohibited."[86] This document opens with great esteem for the Eastern Catholic Churches, saying that their traditions "form part of the patrimony of the entire Church of Christ" and that "[t]he sharing of the riches of the faith and traditions of

84. Salachas and Nitkiewicz, *Inter-Ecclesial Relations*, 46-47.
85. Salachas and Nitkiewicz, *Inter-Ecclesial Relations*, 47.
86. Committee on the Relationship between Eastern and Latin Catholic Churches, *Eastern Catholics in the United States of America*, 28.

the East nurtures and strengthens the unity in diversity of the Church."[87] In light of this hard-earned vision of unity in diversity that the U.S. bishops embrace in this document, it would be reasonable to assume that the principles regarding seminaries also apply to Catholic schools.

The U.S. Roman Catholic school system, then, is a valuable gauge of how well Latin Catholics have embraced the Eastern Catholic Churches as equal sister Churches and given them the space to live and develop their authentic traditions. Eastern Catholic schools exist, but many Eastern Catholics either live too far away from these schools or do not have enough students to support their own school. Many, instead, attend Latin Catholic schools.[88] For this reason, the status of this work in Catholic schools serves as a sample of how well current practices conform to the directions taken in official guidance.

The first difficulty is a matter of access to Catholic education for Eastern Catholic students. Wilton Gregory drew attention to the issue of tuition rates at Catholic schools, which are tied to the local parish. Students from the school's parish enjoy a lower tuition rate than those from outside the parish.[89] While this system may make sense between Latin parishes, Gregory indicates that this tuition system creates undue latinizing pressure on Eastern Catholic families who desire a Catholic education for their children; promises of lower tuition can tempt Eastern Catholic families to register in Latin parishes "and in effect pass to the Latin Church."[90] For Gregory, then, it is imperative "to find ways to

---

87. Committee on the Relationship between Eastern and Latin Catholic Churches, *Eastern Catholics in the United States of America*, 5-6.

88. Fred J. Saato, *American Eastern Catholics*, vol. 2, *Pastoral Spirituality Series*, ed. Peter C. Phan (Paulist Press, 2006), 127.

89. Gregory, "Cooperation and Autonomy," 151. Saato points out that this connection between a parish and its school is a feature of the U.S. Catholic school system and is not universal. In "some other countries" (he does not specify), Catholic schools are attached much more often to houses of religious life. See Saato, *American Eastern Catholics*, 127.

90. Gregory, "Cooperation and Autonomy," 152.

both welcome Eastern Catholic children into our Latin schools, and encourage them to remain members of their own Churches."[91] While information on Eastern Catholic students in U.S. Catholic schools is sparse, one can reasonably expect that progress in this area is far from uniform from parish to parish and diocese to diocese.

Once in Catholic schools, ongoing misunderstandings affect students' formation in their own tradition. The most palpable misunderstandings happen in sacramental practice. Gregory in 1999 lamented that "there are still incidents in Catholic schools where Eastern Catholics are included in [Latin Catholic] preparation programs and even required to repeat the reception of Confirmation and First Communion," a "sad fact" that he attributed to ignorance rather than malice.[92] While *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* called for the return of the Eastern Catholic churches to the practice of chrismating and communing infants at baptism, Adam DeVille confirms in 2017 that some Latin Catholic schools and bishops have ignored the fact that these Eastern Catholic students have already received the Sacrament of Confirmation, attempting to confirm them again.[93] Fred Saato writes that, some parents, who want their children to participate in the life of the church community, "encourage their [children's] participation as a social milestone or so that their children will not feel left out; others may simply not realize that these sacraments should not be repeated."[94] These decisions, though well-meaning, represent ongoing latinizing pressure on Eastern Catholics in the Catholic school system, and the problem

---

91. Gregory, "Cooperation and Autonomy," 152.
92. Gregory, "Cooperation and Autonomy," 151.
93. DeVille, "*Orientalium Ecclesiarum*," 343n27. In the main text of his chapter, DeVille focuses on the gradual transition of Eastern Catholic parishes back to the Eastern discipline of the sacraments of initiation. Under Latin influence, many parishes, especially Ukrainian ones, had taken on the practice of delaying First Communion and Confirmation. His endnote offers an example of the expected or even forced inclusion of Eastern Catholic students in Latin sacramental preparation, which, surely, does not help efforts toward restoring the practice proper to Eastern Catholic parish life.
94. Saato, *American Eastern Catholics*, 128.

requires remedies on the part of educators, parishes, and parents rather than placing the responsibility on only one of these groups.

Scholarly literature largely lacks discussion on this subject in the United States context. A parallel conversation, however, has begun in Australia in recent years. Early results of the Australian conversation serve as an instructive supplement to what the U.S. Church knows about its own situation, though the U.S. context will need confirmation of these findings in future surveys and studies. Regarding Australian Catholic schools, Olexander Kenez and Brian Kelty state that students—Latin and Eastern—who study in Catholic schools are formed in Latin Catholic spirituality. Their background paper corroborates DeVille's observations that both educators and bishops have often ignored Eastern Catholic students' sacramental practices. They report further hindrances in the students' ability to live out their own sacramental and liturgical discipline, as Latin Catholic teachers, convinced that the schools are meant to teach exclusively Latin Catholicism, enforce Latin symbols and outward expression.[95] Most poignantly, "Latin Catholic clergy frequently refuse communion to young children who are entitled to receive holy communion from the time of their reception of the mysteries of initiation which includes first Eucharistic communion."[96] Saato, speaking in the U.S. context, notes that not all Eastern Catholic Churches give young children the Eucharist, but those who do have met similar resistance from Latin clergy.[97] Such actions may represent attempts

95. Olexander Kenez and Bran Kelty, "Eastern Catholic Students in Catholics Schools: The Background Paper," *Compass* 43, no. 2 (2009): 17-18. Here, Kenez and Kelty refer to the banning of the wearing of the *chotki*, or Eastern Christian prayer beads, according to policies regarding jewelry instead of sacramentals. For more examples, see Andrew T. Kania, "Breathing Deeply, With One Lung: The Problem of Latin Church dominance within the Catholic Church" (*The Australasian Catholic Record* 81, no. 2, 2004), 198-199. Kania begins by recalling his own humiliating experience with a Latin Catholic teacher who corrected his sign of the cross in front of his class.

96. Kenez and Kelty, "Eastern Catholic Students," 17.

97. Saato, *American Eastern Catholics*, 128-129.

by Latin clergy to preserve the integrity of their own tradition or to avoid upsetting the Latin parishioners, but they also deny Eastern Catholic students the opportunity to participate in the pinnacle of the Christian life in accordance with their own Christian formation.

The experiences of Eastern Catholic students in Australia reflect both an assumption about Latin Catholicism as a default Catholicism and a lack of awareness of Eastern Catholic traditions. If Eastern Catholic students are entitled to formation in their own particular spiritual, liturgical, and theological traditions, then Latin Catholic teachers and clergy who work among Eastern Catholics, even in Latin Catholic parishes and schools, need to receive more education themselves on the history and tradition of Eastern Catholics. Kenez and Kelty recommend several modes of this education on the local and national level.[98] Once so formed, then Latin Catholics in these contexts will be better equipped to assist Eastern Catholics in the embrace of their own traditions, even in the Catholic school system.

Richard Rymarz, continuing Kenez and Kelty's work in Australia, suggests ways in which Catholic schools can integrate Eastern Catholicism into their curricula, fostering an appreciation for the Eastern Catholic Churches as more than simply communities with different externals and disciplines. He recommends incorporating Eastern Catholic perspectives into units on the sacraments and liturgy, among other topics, so that students can appreciate Eastern contributions to the tradition of the whole of Catholicism.[99] Furthermore, he calls for peer support in schools and collaborative engagement with

98. Kenez and Kelty, "Eastern Catholic Students," 18-19.

99. Richard Rymarz, "Eastern Catholic Students in Catholic Schools: Challenges and Responses," *Compass* 43, no. 2 (2009): 22.

Eastern Catholic parishes in order to strengthen fellowship and identity among students of the same particular Church.[100] Like the U.S. guidelines regarding seminaries, Rymarz's proposed measures reflect the same care to ensure full Eastern formation for Eastern Catholic students in a Latin-majority context which, unchecked, could deprive them of this formation. Rymarz, importantly, also seeks opportunities to educate Latin students not only on the liturgical and sacramental disciplines unique to the Eastern Catholic Churches, but also on the theological and historical particularities that animate these different expressions. Fostering at least a basic awareness of Eastern tradition, history, and theology would help Latin students engage with their Eastern brothers and sisters in more open dialogue, ultimately enabling them to better live their own role as a sister Church in the Catholic communion.

Conclusion

The liturgical-development processes of the Byzantine and Maronite Catholic Churches in the United States witness to a universal Catholic Church in which each Catholic tradition has pride of place and contributes to the catholicity of the Church. The Latin Catholic Church, at the same time, has made significant commitments to supporting the Eastern Churches as sister Churches of equal dignity. More work remains, however, in the repairing of the past harms that Latin mistreatment or ignorance inflicted on the American Eastern Catholic churches over the course of more than a century. The questions of inculturation, fidelity to tradition, and pastoral exigency that shape Eastern Catholic scholarly discourse on liturgical development offer many touchpoints for

100. Rymarz, "Eastern Catholic Students in Catholic Schools," 24.

discussions in the Latin liturgical debates. The Eastern Catholic Churches witness to the reality of the Latin Church as a sister Church itself. Like every Eastern Church, the Latin Church grew out of its own historical and cultural particularities that contribute to the patrimony of the Catholic Church but do not, in isolation, constitute the one perfect form of Catholic liturgical expression to which all particular Churches must aspire or adhere. The next chapter will explore the implications of these liturgical-ecclesiological insights from the East.

CHAPTER IV

THE LATIN CHURCH AS A SISTER CHURCH: LITURGICAL-ECCLESIAL IDENTITY OF THE WEST IN A COMMUNION OF CHURCHES

Metropolitan Andrei Sheptytsky (1865-1944), one of the most prominent figures of the nineteenth- and twentieth-century Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church, harbored hopes that would only begin to see their vindication in the lead-up to the Second Vatican Council. He encouraged the Ukrainian Catholic laity to embrace their liturgical tradition as a witness to both the Latins (Poles) and the Orthodox, and he began a program of Easternizing liturgical reforms.[1] Though scarcely ever citing him directly, Sheptytsky found a key dialogue partner in Russian Orthodox writer Vladimir Soloviev (1853-1900).[2] They shared a desire for the healing of the East-West schism in such a way that no Church—Catholic or Orthodox—loses its authentic apostolic traditions, above all its liturgy and autonomy. For his own Ukrainian Catholic Church, Sheptytsky "elucidate[d] how worship actualizes the Church, a concept finally enshrined in Catholic thought only decades after his death."[3] Regarding the Russian Orthodox Church, he warned that Latinization in liturgy and church structure could not be part of any viable strategy for unity, since, according to his observations, even the least religious of the Russian people knew and treasured their liturgy. In fact, Peter Galadza reports Sheptytsky as writing, "'[I]n the East, the Rite is an essential element of nationality, and, in the eyes of many, it

1. Peter Galadza, *The Theological and Liturgical Work of Metropolitan Andrei Sheptytsky (1865-1944)*, ed. Robert F. Taft, S.J., vol. 272 of *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* (Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 2004), 304, 334-336.

2. Galadza, *The Theological and Liturgical Work*, 103; Ivan Kaszczak, *Metropolitan Andrei Sheptytsky and the Establishment of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in the United States*, 2nd ed, (The Basilian Press, 2013), 7.

3. Galadza, *The Theological and Liturgical Work*, 207.

is religion as such.'"[4] From the perspective of Sheptytsky and Soloviev, full respect for the liturgical and theological traditions of their respective Churches would be the *sine qua non* of any union agreement.

Sheptytsky latches onto an insight that would be developed at Vatican II, namely, that "it is through liturgy, especially, that the faithful are enabled to express in their lives and manifest to others the mystery of Christ and the real nature of the true Church."[5] The story of U.S. Eastern Catholic liturgical development exemplifies the centrality of liturgy to the identity of the local church and the role of liturgy in the revelation of an ecclesiology of communion. The dialogue between liturgy and culture shapes both particular identity and universal communion. Such insights from the history of Eastern Catholic liturgy in the United States lend new insights to questions of liturgy, identity, and ecclesiology within Roman Catholic discussions, illuminating possibilities for the Latin Church's future liturgical development as a sister Church in the Catholic communion.

Themes from the U.S. Eastern Catholic Story: Identifying Kievan Rus' as a Model

Among Pope John Paul II's writings on the Christian East, two of his apostolic letters are particularly helpful for summarizing the main liturgical and ecclesiological insights of the U.S. Eastern Catholic story. John Paul wrote *Euntes in Mundum* in 1988 as a celebration of and a reflection on the one thousandth anniversary of the Baptism of Kievan Rus'. Seven years later, after the fall of the Berlin Wall and the dissolution of the

4. Galadza, *The Theological and Liturgical Work*, 303.

5. Second Vatican Council, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, in *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, ed. Austin Flannery, O.P. 4th ed. (Costello Publishing, 1979), 2.

Soviet Union and during the one hundredth anniversary of Pope Leo XIII's encyclical *Orientalium Dignitatis* (on the dignity of the Christian East), Pope John Paul II wrote *Orientale Lumen* to instruct Catholics (primarily Latin Catholics) on the insights and traditions of the Christian East in order to make Catholics more aware of the importance of the Eastern Churches for the realization of the full catholicity of the universal Church. He emphasizes the need for "conversion" of the Latin Church and for "mutual knowledge" between Catholic and Orthodox Christians, especially in the newly freed countries of Central and Eastern Europe. The pope identified a new threat to Christian unity in this region of the world, where "Christian brothers and sisters who together had suffered persecution" enjoyed greater opportunities for cooperation and dialogue but also "[were] regarding one another with suspicion and fear just when prospects and hopes of greater freedom [were] appearing."[6] Recalling the history of Latin-Eastern relations in Chapter 1 of this thesis, the reader will recognize the U.S. Eastern Catholic fears of being absorbed by either the Latin Church, the Russian Empire, or the worst impulses of Americanization. In this call to Catholics, the pope makes clear that mutual understanding, not absorption, is the path to peace.

In these two apostolic letters, Pope John Paul II upholds the Baptism of Kievan Rus' and the subsequent development of the particular Eastern Churches as "an authoritative example of successful inculturation."[7] From these two letters, several threads from the Eastern Catholic story arise, and they will be helpful for giving new

6. John Paul II, *The Light of the East: Orientale Lumen* (United States Catholic Conference, 1995), 17, 19.

7. John Paul II, *Orientale Lumen*, 7.

considerations to U.S. Latin Catholic questions of liturgy and ecclesial identity. The first thread comes from the opening of *Euntes in Mundum*:

> Go into all the world, make disciples of all nations, *baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit* (cf. *Mt* 28:19; Mk 16:15).
>
> From the tombs of the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul in Rome, the Catholic Church desires to express to the One and Triune God her own profound gratitude because these words of the Saviour were fulfilled one thousand years ago on the banks of the Dnieper, at Kiev, capital of Rus', the inhabitants of which—in the footsteps of Princess Olga and of Prince Vladimir—were "grafted" on to Christ through the Sacrament of Baptism.[8]

Here, the pope expresses gratitude for the Baptism of Kievan Rus', indicating that this moment constitutes not only the cornerstone of Byzantine-Slavic Christian patrimony, but also is a treasure to the whole Church. Here, he implies this fact, but in *Orientale Lumen*, he makes it explicit.[9] Further, the remembrance of the Baptism of Kievan Rus' should urge Catholics and Orthodox Christians "stirred by a renewed awareness of their original communion," to "take up its challenge" to work toward the unity of the Churches.[10]

Chapter 3 discussed how, in *Euntes in Mundum*, the pope draws special attention to the process of inculturating the Gospel in the Slavic context, which he described not as the adjustment of Byzantine Christianity with external Slavic flair but as the planting of a seed from which grew an authentically Slavic form of Christianity that offers its own contributions to the universal Church.[11] The resulting mutual exchange between the Gospel and the culture, which the pope described, gave rise to a multitude of local,

---

8. John Paul II, *Go into All the World: Euntes in Mundum* (Office of Publishing and Promotion Services, United States Catholic Conference, 1988), 3. Emphasis original to the text.

9. John Paul II, *Orientale Lumen*, 3.

10. John Paul II, *Euntes in Mundum*, 9.

11. John Paul II, *Euntes in Mundum*, 5-6.

culturally- and historically-shaped expressions of the one Gospel. Chapter 3 explored these dynamics at play in Michael Plishka's local-theologies model of inculturation. Plishka anticipated that the outcome of inculturation in the local church would result in the creation of local theologies and liturgies that, though definitely related to their mother "Eastern" or "Latin" tradition, take forms that are not themselves strictly "Eastern" or "Latin."[12] Instead, the liturgical-ecclesial life of the local church will be attentive to the culture or cultures that surround it, inform them and be informed by them without being subsumed by them, and aid in the divinization of the human family through the "*theosis*" of culture.[13] Chapters 1 and 3 enumerated many of the ways in which the Latin and Eastern Churches' history of unity reflected itself in each Church's respective liturgies, negotiating their own liturgical-ecclesial identities through the demands of the union agreements, the transplanting of their traditions from Europe and the Middle East to the American continents, struggles with the Protestant majority of the United States, and the changing needs of each Church's particular flock. The conditions of the past and the present are already contributing to the formation of local theologies and liturgical expressions as the particular Churches encounter the cultures of the current United States.

The events of U.S. Eastern Catholic history reveal that the primary arena in which the Gospel is instantiated is the local church. Through the liturgy, the local assemblies in the parishes and dioceses or eparchies enact again the Body of Christ, and it is at this level of the Church that the laity and clergy are most responsive to each other and to the cultures of their localities. Therefore, it is at the level of the local church that

12. Michael Plishka, "From Easternization to Inculturation: Reinterpreting the Mission of the Eastern Catholic Churches," *Worship* 71, no 4 (1997): 327.

13. Plishka, "From 'Easternization' to 'Inculturation,'" 335.

the crucial work of the uptake of the Gospel and the making of disciples of all nations occurs.

The initiators and movers at many points throughout U.S. Eastern Catholic history were the laypeople themselves, from establishing parish life and voluntary societies to continually reexamining and redefining their relationship to their Catholic and Orthodox sister Churches. The Second Vatican Council affirms the right of the laity always to learn ever more about their traditions, to observe them ever more perfectly, and to develop them organically and according to their pastoral needs in light of their ecumenical vocation.[14] Eastern Catholics have lived these principles to the extent allowed by historical, cultural, and political circumstance, but, if the Church is to keep the word that it gave at Vatican II, then it needs to provide the laity with the tools and supports necessary to both fully receive their tradition and present it anew to future generations. It is imperative, then, that the laity and the clergy be in dialogue—both in official dialogue in a style like that of the Synod on Synodality and in unofficial dialogue in the context of pastoral encounter— both in order to pass on their traditions in light of the perennial Tradition of the Church Universal and to identify those areas for organic development, including appropriate borrowings from other traditions as would be beneficial to their local churches.

Pope John Paul II's words in *Euntes in Mundum* and *Orientale Lumen* articulate an ecclesiological vision that hopes for a full, mutually enriching, differentiated unity of the Christian churches of both East and West in one communion in Christ. The pope's reflections on the Baptism of Kievan Rus' bring to the fore those threads of the Eastern

14. Second Vatican Council, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum,* in *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents,* ed. Austin Flannery, O.P., 4th ed. (Costello Publishing 1979), 6, 24.

Catholic story poignantly expressed through the history of Eastern Catholic liturgical development in the United States. The threads include: a profound sense of inculturation, differentiation at the service of unity, the indispensability of the local church and the laity in the propagation of ecclesial life, and the liturgy as the quintessential realization of and source for the Church's identity in Christ. Taking the Kievan Rus' model as an instructive symbol of the insights of the Eastern Churches, this study will conclude with some questions that arise through the application of these insights to discussions of liturgy, identity, and unity in the contemporary U.S. Roman Catholic Church.

The Kievan Rus' Model Applied to Latin Questions on Liturgy and Ecclesial Identity

Liturgy and Identity: The Case of Traditiones Custodes *and the "Liturgy Wars"*

In 2021, Dennis M. Doyle and William H. Johnston exchanged critiques while discussing the importance and impact of Pope Francis's *motu proprio Traditiones Custodes*, which restricted the permissions for the celebration of the pre-conciliar liturgy that Pope Benedict XVI had broadened in *Summorum Pontificum* in 2007. Doyle wrote with alarm that the Traditional Latin Mass movement is so tightly bound with extremist politics and an expansionist agenda that continued widespread permission to celebrate the pre-conciliar liturgy would threaten the unity of the Church.[15] Johnston warned against conflating loyal Catholics who are attracted to the TLM with those who "from within [the TLM movement], reject the council and (with selectivity) this or that pope and stir up

15. Dennis M. Doyle, "The Traditional Latin Mass Movement and the Unity of the Church," *Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift* 72 (2021): 366.

others to do the same damage to the church."[16] The particular development of the TLM movement in the United States serves as an example of the conflict between different ecclesiologies as they relate to culture and tradition.

Both Doyle and Johnston are concerned for the challenge that the TLM movement poses for the unity of the Church. Though Doyle more explicitly highlights the need for unified acceptance of the liturgical reforms of Vatican II and Johnston places more emphasis on the need for pastoral sensitivity, the question of Catholic identity stands behind both arguments. Doyle explicitly addresses the identity question, asserting:

> The longing for the TLM is connected with a longing for the preconciliar Catholic Church… [at a time when] Catholics had many identity markers that helped to distinguish them from other people and even from other Christians…What many traditionalists tend to highlight about Vatican II and its aftermath is a weakening of Catholic identity and a lack of clarity about the rules. To them, the RM [Reformed Mass] is part of a package that fostered assimilation and desacralization. Where there had been a clear teaching about individual salvation through the one true Church, there now appeared to be a fuzzy picture of pop psychology / spirituality combined with hollow slogans about peace and social justice.[17]

For Doyle, the crux of the conflict occurs at the point of the current cultural context in the United States. The tumultuous changes in mid-twentieth century American Catholicism and American culture writ large have culminated in the creation of the increasingly polarized "culture war" camps. These camps more sharply determine one's identity, loyalties, and attitudes toward the other camps, more deeply entrenching themselves and closing themselves off from dialogue with one another during the papacy of Pope Francis than even in that of Benedict XVI.[18] In this context, Doyle notes four problems with the

16. William H. Johnston, "Reflections on the Traditional Latin Mass Movement: A Reply to Dennis M. Doyle," *Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift* 74 (2023): 221.
17. Doyle, "The Traditional Latin Mass Movement," 354.
18. Doyle, "The Traditional Latin Mass Movement," 356, 366.

TLM movement: 1) it promotes a worldview ripped away from the cultural context that sustained it, turning it into an "ideology" rather than a genuine expression of its "lifeworld"[19]; 2) it overemphasizes "the moment of transubstantiation and the power of the priest as to downplay severely" all other aspects of the Church's liturgical life, such as the participation of the laity, the diversity and unity of the Body of Christ, and the hope of Christian unity[20]; 3) it violates the spirit of John Paul II's and Benedict XVI's permissions by promoting the pre-conciliar liturgy as "a superior form of worship" and "promot[ing] a perpetual minority group"[21]; and 4) ultimately creates a "silent schism" that Benedict XVI was trying to avoid and that Francis identified as "already happening."[22]

Johnston's pastoral approach leads him to ask what people, especially young people, may find so attractive about the TLM and what spiritual difficulty may come about if that option were taken away or extremely limited. Johnston is quick to point out that one reason that people grow attached to the TLM is that they are searching for the antidote to a perceived lack in many parish celebrations of the RM. These celebrations, Johnston admits, are not always faithful to the reformed missal and risk overemphasizing the community aspect and the personality of the priest, losing sight of the liturgy's transcendence and principal purpose of worshipping God. Popes and theologians have shared this concern.[23] Johnston observes that young people have encountered the TLM,

19. Doyle, "The Traditional Latin Mass Movement," 356.
20. Doyle, "The Traditional Latin Mass Movement," 358-359.
21. Doyle, "The Traditional Latin Mass Movement," 359, 363.
22. Doyle, "The Traditional Latin Mass Movement," 365.
23. Johnston, "Reflections on the Traditional Latin Mass Movement," 218, 221.

found it beautiful, and experienced through it a deep experience of the Divine in a way that is "particularly suited to them."[24] He asks:

> How many TLM Catholics fit this description? I know of no statistical studies on that question. What will those Catholics find when the TLM is eliminated and they join their territorial parishes, seeking a form of Mass consonant with their liturgical spirituality informed by such conciliar teachings as *Sacrosanctum Concilium* 8, and *Lumen Gentium* 50? That, too, is an open question and a pastoral challenge for the church. The point here is that they – with their devotion to a form of Eucharist they have celebrated since 1984 with papal sanction, and with a liturgical spirituality in sync with conciliar teaching – should not be identified or lumped in with the TLM trouble-makers, but recognized and respected for who they are and what they seek.[25]

It is true that Popes John Paul II and Benedict XVI meant permission for the use of the pre-conciliar liturgy to be a temporary measure, and Pope Francis's promulgation of *Traditiones Custodes* was meant to promote the original goal of Paul VI "to transition all Catholics to accept and worship God through the RM."[26] However, Johnston believes that people attracted to this form of the liturgy have a gift of witness to offer the Church as they navigate the quest for holiness in the current socio-political-cultural context. In his final remarks, he says of them: "Few though they may be (?), let us not forget about them – and even be willing to learn what they may have to offer the church by their witness."[27]

The U.S. Eastern Catholic story would certainly be sympathetic to the desire to preserve one's own traditions, not only out of fear of their destruction but also out of a conviction of their own vocation of witness in and through their liturgical, spiritual, and theological traditions. Let the reader recall Joel Brady's accounts of Byzantine Catholics who immigrated to the United States for a time and then returned to Europe. These

24. Johnston, "Reflections on the Traditional Latin Mass Movement," 219.
25. Johnston, "Reflections on the Traditional Latin Mass Movement," 219.
26. Doyle, "The Traditional Latin Mass Movement," 365.
27. Johnston, "Reflections on the Traditional Latin Mass Movement," 221.

accounts (found in Chapter 1) revealed how crucial the liturgical and sacramental life of a church community was to these immigrants' identification of that church as *their* church that was a bastion of the faith as they had received it, regardless of whether that community was itself Catholic or Orthodox. On the Latin side, bishops like John Ireland, irritated most of all by married Eastern Catholic priests, did not often successfully recognize Eastern Catholics as Catholic at all—let alone as Catholics of equal standing as those of the Latin Church—again because of Eastern Catholics' liturgical and sacramental practices. While the bishops struggled to preserve unity in the face of the Protestant majority and anti-Catholic sentiment, the diversity in Eastern Catholicism appeared to be not a gift but a threat. The Vatican II documents presented in Chapter 2 articulate the ideas that the Eastern Catholic Churches are, in fact, equal in dignity to the Latin Church and should perfect the practice of their own tradition in union with the Church Universal (*Orientalium Ecclesiarum*) and that the liturgy, the source and summit of the Christian life, welcomes differentiated cultural expressions at the service of the catholicity of the faith given by Christ (*Sacrosanctum Concilium*). The history of the relationship between Latin and Eastern Catholics in the United States provides evidence that all Catholic groups knew at least implicitly that the liturgical life constitutes the life and identity of the Catholic Church. The challenge has been and continues to be the ability to recognize the authentic life of the Church as it is realized in forms outside of those shaped by one's own location in culture and history.

Returning, then, to Doyle's assessment of the TLM movement, it should not be surprising that people who find themselves drawn to the TLM are concerned with those identity markers of the liturgy and a certain reading of the "rules." These groups' search

for a clear Catholic identity echoes the same drive for unity in uniformity that strained tensions between Latin and Eastern Catholics during and around the time of the Americanist crisis (see Chapter 1). As Johnston noted in his pastoral analysis, it may be that Catholics who end up at the TLM have not found a sure sense of what it means to be Catholic in the Reformed Mass and its theological emphases. For the more radical, militant strains of this movement, an expansionistic mission for the TLM to become the dominant or even unique expression of Latin Catholicism is not distant from historical attitudes of the Latin Catholic Church towards the Eastern Churches: namely, the expectation that Eastern Catholics would conform to Latin Catholicism themselves and the sense of being in competition against the Orthodox and Protestant forms of Christianity. *Summorum Pontificum* presented an opportunity for both the pre-conciliar liturgy and the reformed liturgy to recognize in each other legitimate expressions of the one life in Christ and, thereby, to mutually enrich each other. *Traditiones Custodes*, in this context, is the indictment on the perennial failure to do so.

As Doyle stated, the U.S. socio-political landscape has increasingly fragmented and grown significantly polarized in recent decades. While Doyle is concerned with the way in which the TLM movement plays into these divisions, it is worth considering that, for some TLM attendees, the movement may be part of how they choose to respond to the heightened anxiety and uncertainty created by these deepening divisions. Though most people who eventually attend the TLM have adopted rather than inherited this tradition, they nevertheless find in the TLM the liturgical center of a grounding Catholic identity. In such a context, the drive to find such an identity is a real spiritual need and requires pastoral sensitivity. However, there is a danger in cherishing a nostalgia for a

seemingly more stable era with firmer boundaries around salvation, right liturgy, and clear rules: the temptation of unduly absolutizing particularities, taking what Mark Morozowich calls "the tradition of immediate experience" (see Chapter 3) for Tradition as such, and ripping the pre-conciliar practices from the context of their lifeworld. Robert Taft, twenty years prior to Doyle and Johnston's exchange, noted that both Eastern and Western liturgical discussions sometimes erroneously assumed that the Church can and should return to "some ideal evangelical past," whether the ideal century is "the classic patristic age of late antiquity" in the case of the Orthodox, "apostolic times" in the Protestant case,[28] or one or the other half of the twentieth century in the case of the Catholics. Both the TLM and the post-Vatican II reformed Mass have weathered decades of history and the questions that that history raises about authority, cultural changes, and defining elements of Catholic Tradition. That history cannot be erased, but nostalgic retrieval of the practices that accompanied that history, without caution or contextualization in a lifeworld, can distort what it means to receive, be faithful to, and develop the Tradition.

There remain questions on the future of the TLM, how to care for the people attached to it, and what controversies surrounding the TLM and liturgical reform indicate for the ecclesial identity (or identities) of a united Latin Catholic Church. Though one cannot copy-and-paste the pre-conciliar liturgy into the reform and post-reform world and expect it to maintain its same meaning and function, the Latin Church must grapple with the fact that the pre-conciliar liturgy has entered into the new cultural context in which the whole American Church finds itself. For better or for worse, local theologies are

28. Robert F. Taft, S.J., "'Eastern Presuppositions' and Western Liturgical Renewal," *Antiphon* 5, no. 1 (2000): 18.

forming in, around, and through the TLM. The question is whether these theologies do or one day will best express who these communities are within the context of the whole Body of Christ, contributing to the diversity in the unity rather than exacerbating the divisions. Doyle definitively states that a future in which the TLM fosters unity is likely impossible, considering the ongoing risk of "competitiveness" and "an implied critique of the contemporary offerings of the RM." Johnston, however, warns that too rash a movement to restrict the TLM risks provoking schism.[29] The history of the U.S. Catholic Church has accepted this risk before, with the tragic and devastating results described in Chapter 1 of this thesis. It is beyond the scope of this thesis to pass a definitive judgment on the TLM and its adherents; the decision of whether to phase out the pre-conciliar liturgy or to save the whole project for the sake of the figurative ten faithful people will be up to the future clergy and laity in an ongoing assessment of pastoral need in the service of true unity and catholicity.

New Latin Rites? The Case of an African American Rite or Black Catholic Ordinariate

The promulgation of *Sacrosanctum Concilium* and subsequent guiding documents strengthened efforts to revitalize or establish forms of Latin Catholic liturgy that reflect the local tradition. With a particular emphasis on the Church's esteem for all that is good in every culture, the NCCB Secretariats for the Liturgy and for Black Catholics published a document in 1990 called *Plenty Good Room: The Spirit and Truth of African American Catholic Worship*. This document expanded on the earlier NCCB study, completed and published in 1988, that offered options in the Order of the Mass of the Roman Rite "that

29. Doyle, "How to Deal with the Traditional Latin Mass Movement? Thoughts on William H. Johnston's Reply," *Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift* 74 (2023): 224, 225.

are available to those wishing to marry the richness of the Roman Rite with the genius of the African American culture."[30] The document discusses the options against the background of the development of African American spirituality and the history of the Catholic Church's failure to evangelize Black Catholics or to appreciate any culture outside of European "classical" culture from the colonial era to Vatican II.[31] Such moral and attitudinal failures included the view that white Catholics needed to "educate African Americans out of their 'uncivilized and barbaric' traditions and into European-American culture with which the Church seemed so fundamentally identified."[32] Though this outlook was motivated by race rather than canonical misunderstanding, this drive toward unity in uniformity of worship evokes the Americanist causes that marred Latin-Eastern relationships in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The search for ways of incorporating African American spirituality into the Roman liturgy, then, becomes an important step in repairing the relationship between American Black and white Catholics.

The subcommittee draws special attention to "the gift of 'Blackness'" for the whole Church, "a gift not just to improve the work of evangelization but to further the very Catholic nature that is the Church's."[33] The development of Black Catholic liturgy constitutes a central component of the efforts to embrace that gift. This document places the task in terms of inculturation, stating, "The Church's commitment to and call for liturgical adaptation in the African American community are clear and unequivocal."[34] It is important to note that, while the document explicitly recognizes the centuries-long

30. National Conference of Catholic Bishops, *Plenty Good Room: The Spirit and Truth of African American Catholic Worship* (United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 1990), vii.
31. NCCB, *Plenty Good Room*, 20, 34-39.
32. NCCB, *Plenty Good Room*, 68.
33. NCCB, *Plenty Good Room*, 31.
34. NCCB, *Plenty Good Room*, 33.

mutual influence and deep interconnection between the Church and Western European cultures,[35] it consistently prefers the term "liturgical adaptation" to name the process of particularizing the Roman liturgy in African American culture. Through this choice, the authors of *Plenty Good Room* were keeping to the task to both accommodate Black Catholic spirituality and to respect "the substantial unity of the Roman Rite."[36] However, the paradigm of inculturation as liturgical adaptation may overly restrict the realm of possibilities for fostering the growth of worship in which Black Catholic spirituality can be most fully honored and enable full, active, and conscious participation in liturgy. The example of the evangelization of Kievan Rus', however, demonstrates that adaptation of liturgy may only be the beginning of a more comprehensive task of translating the liturgical and theological heritage from one time and place to another. It may be possible that the pastoral needs of a local church require an inculturation so profound that the liturgical-ecclesial identity of that people can hardly be recognized as "Roman" at all. Scholarly discussions about an African American Catholic rite provide a test case for such questions.

In 1998, D. Reginald Whitt wrote an analysis of *Varietates Legitimae*, a document with instructions for inculturation of the Roman liturgy. Whitt explains that *Sacrosanctum Concilium* and *Varietates Legitimae* neither explicitly encourage the development of new liturgical traditions (what Whitt calls "ritual families") within the Latin Church nor forbid such developments. Whitt argues that, in fact, the inculturation

35. NCCB, *Plenty Good Room*, 41.
36. NCCB, *Plenty Good Room*, 123.

of the Latin rite that these documents encourage could itself give rise to new "ritual families" in the Latin Catholic Church.[37]

Whitt writes his article after the release of a 1992-1994 study commissioned by the National Black Catholic Congress, which concluded that "establishing an African American Catholic Rite" was impossible. He disagreed both with the study's conclusion and with the idea of "establishing" a new rite in the first place.[38] A "rite" refers not only to the order of worship but, rather, to the whole liturgical, spiritual, and theological tradition that a community has received, passed down, and shaped by a people's culture and history.[39] In this framework, the developmental process of a "rite" is exemplified by the *sui iuris* churches, which:

> …have developed distinct ways of celebrating the liturgy, special theological insights that they stress, spiritualities that speak to and from their different experiences, and laws and customary disciplines suited to the ways that they live out the Catholic Christian life. In other words, the peoples of the different churches *sui iuris* have brought their own cultures and the changes that they have experienced to bear on the traditions inherited from their patriarchates. They have inculturated those inherited traditions so that, for example, the Constantinopolitan tradition has been differentiated into thirteen recognized varieties! Those recognized patrimonial varieties, those inculturated and personalized liturgical, theological, spiritual and disciplinary religious heritages, are what the universal Church calls 'rites.'[40]

Whitt maintains that the existence of a distinct African American liturgical, theological, and spiritual tradition is not out of the question, but he cautions that it is nonsensical to speak of "establishing" a rite. Rather, "You inherit your rite, as part of who you are as a

---

37. D. Reginald Whitt, "*Varietates Legitimae* and an African-American Liturgical Tradition," in *Taking Down Our Harps: Black Catholics in the United States* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1998), 248, 254. For further explanation regarding Whitt's category of "ritual families," in contrast with "rite" and "ritual church," see pp. 250-251.

38. Whitt, "*Varietates Legitimae*," 247-249.

39. Whitt, "*Varietates Legitimae*," 249. Here, Whitt cites the 1990 Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches.

40. Whitt, "*Varietates Legitimae*," 250.

Catholic Christian people, and all the Holy See does or does not do in its regard is *recognize* that, indeed, that is what you have because of who you are."[41] If, then, the Latin Catholic Church discerns that it is desirable and fitting to have an African American Latin Catholic ritual family or even an African American Catholic Church *sui iuris*, it is possible that the Holy See (and, most likely, the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops) can study the liturgical, theological, and spiritual situation of Black Americans and recognize the legitimacy of a distinct Black Catholic tradition.

In 2019, Kenneth L. Crowe Hamilton wrote about the effects of *Liturgicam Authenticam*, a 2001 document which affirmed that translations of the post-Vatican II Roman Mass need to adhere more closely and more literally to the Latin source text.[42] The tighter adherence to Latin styles and symbols of expression, according to Hamilton, restrict the particularities of African American worship by both eliminating the use of the vernacular of Black Americans and by reinforcing a dualistic notion of spirit and nature that is foreign to Black spirituality. For Hamilton, such a move represents not only regression with respect to the desires of Vatican II but also constitutes an imperialism that resists "the thinking of the missionary principles and the incorporations of non-Eurocentric notions of inculturation and acculturation" achieved in the 1960s.[43] The 2001 document on liturgical translation, then, frustrates the development of authentic Black Catholic ritual and contributes to a wider pattern of elevating "[t]hat which is more European, more marked by control and so-called intellectualism that is to be desired in

41. Whitt, "*Varietates Legitimae*," 252.

42. Kenneth L. Crowe Hamilton, "Regrouping in the Clearing: Resisting *Liturgiam Authenticam* and Reconsidering an African American Rite," *Journal of the Black Catholic Theological Symposium* 12, no. 1 (2019): 129, ecommons.udayton.edu/jbcts/vol12/iss1/10.

43. Hamilton, "Regrouping in the Clearing," 140.

liturgy" over the liturgical forms of "the darker races and perverse geographies…opposite forms that involve dance, drum rhythms, and often ecstatic proclamations."[44] He then invokes *Sacrosanctum Concilium*'s calls for profound inculturation of the liturgy to urge his fellow Black Catholics to continue to strive for a thoroughly Black Catholic expression of not only the Mass but of the Catholic Tradition as a whole.

Rather than simply adapting the Roman rite and the Roman liturgical-theological tradition to Black American vernacular, symbol, and music, Hamilton identifies the need for a liturgical-ecclesial structure that fully incorporates Black spirituality and styles of worship, a structure built from within the community instead of being presented (or even imposed) by Rome. He lists elements that entered the Roman liturgy for Black Catholics in the 1960s but need to enjoy wider and fuller use: "black gospel music, African dance, more rhythmic and spirited liturgical celebrations and a new ecumenism as seen, for instance, in the introduction of preaching styles from the larger black church, including call-and-response."[45] His frame here is remarkable for the Latin Church but ought not to be a surprise from the perspective of the Eastern Catholic Churches. The development of an authentic, living, and effective African American rite, whether inside or outside the boundaries of the Latin Church, cannot be reduced to the adaptation of the Roman rite to Black cultural sensibilities. Hamilton presents a vision of Black Catholics as recipients and stewards of the same tradition as that of the Black Methodists, Episcopalians, Pentecostals, etc., in and through which "the larger black church" has negotiated its Christian faith with its lived experience as Black Americans over the course of centuries. Over twenty years before Hamilton's article, Whitt's language hinted at a similar

44. Hamilton, "Regrouping in the Clearing," 143.
45. Hamilton, "Regrouping in the Clearing," 132.

understanding of the ecclesial identity of the Black Catholic Church while asserting the possibility of its existence as a distinct ritual family: "A distinct Western ritual family might also be recognized in the case of African-American Christians, *some of whom are Catholics*…"[46] In the same way that the Melkite Greek Catholic Church identifies itself as being both Catholic (in union with Rome) and Orthodox (Christians of the Melkite-Byzantine tradition),[47] so too do Whitt and Hamilton see Black Catholics as embodying a twofold identity: Black *and* Catholic. In this context, Eastern Catholic ecclesiological impulses expand the Latin Catholic imagination to include a possible space for the flourishing of a distinct Black Catholic liturgical and theological heritage and perhaps even reveals further pathways for dialogue and unity with the African American non-Catholic Churches.

Though there still does not exist any missal for an African American liturgy, a 2020 book edited by Sr. Rita Mboshu Kongo about the Zairean Rite reignited discussions about the official recognition of an African American liturgy. In the midst of Pope Francis's general tone of appreciation and overall call for further inculturation, his language paints an image of fitting the Roman Rite into Congolese culture.[48] This image leaves the impression that the Roman Rite and Congolese culture are fundamentally at odds with each other, excluding from the imagined scope of inculturation, as the seed of the Roman Rite grows in Congolese soil, the appearance of an altogether new rite.

---

46. Whitt, "*Varietates Legitimae*," 255.

47. Lawrence G. Gosselin, ed., *Prayers for Publicans*, revised ed. (Holy Transfiguration Church, 1984), i.

48. Carol Glatz, "Zairean Rite Offers Example for Developing an Amazonian Rite, Pope Says," Crux, December 1, 2020. cruxnow.com/Vatican/2020/12/Zairean-rite-offers-example-for-developing-an-amazonian-rite-pope-says.; cf. Paul Samasumo, "Pope Francis: The Zairean Rite is a 'Promising Model' for the Amazon," Vatican News, December 1, 2020, www.vaticannews.va/en/pope/news/2020-12/pope-francis-zairean-rite-preface-book-amazon.html.

The creation of the Zairean Mass represents a significant step in the fulfillment of the Second Vatican Council's calls for the inculturation and dialogue with the cultures of the world, both of which the Eastern Catholic Churches exemplify. Considering that the evangelization of many of the peoples of Africa took place through the Latin Church, it should be expected that the resulting liturgies bear some resemblance to the Latin Rite. However, Nathan Chase raises a concern that the Zairean Rite is an example of "a reticence on the part of Roman authorities to allow for modest, let alone far-reaching, forms of liturgical inculturation,"[49] perhaps precisely out of the concern for the fundamental unity of the Roman Rite. He refers to observations by Neil Xavier O'Donoghue, who pointed out that the inculturation process that formed the Zairean Mass did not extend to any other sacramental rites.[50] (Note that Whitt would not, then, call the Zairean Rite a "rite" in the same sense as the Byzantine Rite.) Chase echoes Hamilton's diagnosis of the problem of an African American rite: "It seems that a Eurocentrism at best, or a sort of liturgical imperialism at worst, has long guided the process of liturgical inculturation in Rome, even after Vatican II."[51] This Eurocentrism operates much like the U.S. strains of Latinization, which understands Latin forms to be the default or even superior modes of theology and liturgy and fails to recognize the common faith of another *sui iuris* Church in that Church's particular modes of expression. In order to prepare the ground for the development of other inculturated liturgies and, therefore, reveal the full catholicity of the Church, future theological and

49. Nathan Chase, "Pope Francis: The Zaire Rite, a Model for the Amazon," PrayTellBlog, December 1, 2020, praytellblog.com/index.php/2020/12/01/pope-francis-the-zaire-rite-a-model-for-the-amazon/.

50. Chase, "Pope Francis: The Zaire Rite."

51. Chase, "Pope Francis: The Zaire Rite."

pastoral work will need to seek other ecclesiological models that resist the tendency toward taking any one of the particular Churches as a default.

Regardless of the partial progress of the inculturation of the Zairean Rite, Nate Tinner-Williams finds in this form of the Mass a hope for further conversation about a possible African American rite. Already, the Gospel Mass tradition sprang up from the Black Catholic inculturation in the 1980s and 1990s, a movement, which, according to Tinner-Williams, took cues from the Africanization movement that resulted in the Zairean Rite. There have been no official attempts in this conversation since the mid-1990s with *Varietates Legitimae*, "despite the fact that at least some Black parishes indeed integrate innovations from the Zaire Use itself."[52] Such sharing between Christian groups with similar roots characterized the evangelization of Kievan Rus', which thoroughly translated the Byzantine tradition into the Slavic world while still retaining a recognizable familiarity with the Greek tradition which formed the missionaries Cyril and Methodius. If Black Catholic parishes are given greater space to engage in such exchanges while translating those shared elements into the U.S. milieu, there may arise a joint Roman-African liturgy that reflects and realizes the spirituality and theological gifts of the U.S. Black Catholic Church.

The Hope of Kievan Rus': Ecumenism and Christian Unity

The End of Uniatism and the Hope for a United Church

On June 23, 1993, in Balamand, Lebanon, the Joint International Commission for Theological Dialogue Between the Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church published

52. Nate Tinner-Williams, "New Book from the Vatican Renews Hope for an African-American Rite," Black Catholic Messenger, December 1, 2020, blackcatholicmessenger.org/pope-francis-new-rites.

a joint statement on the issue of "uniatism." A 1992 statement from the U.S. Orthodox/Roman Catholic Consultation makes an important distinction that the 1993 document assumes. The 1992 document understands one form of "uniatism" as the union of an Eastern Church with Rome as part of its self-understanding as Church. This meaning is distinct from "uniatism" as a method that requires the breaking of communion with the Orthodox Church to join the Catholic Church at the expense of the Orthodox communion.[53] The Balamand Statement rejects the second meaning as a method of union while affirming the first as a right of the Eastern Catholics. The Eastern Catholic Churches—which arose more often from this method of union than from any other—continue to have the right to exist, the right to exercise their pastoral capacity in regards to their faithful, and the rights and obligations of their union with Rome.[54] The commission recognized that uniatism as a method arose from "the outdated ecclesiology of return to the Catholic Church,"[55] in which "the Catholic Church…presented herself as the only one to whom salvation was entrusted" and missionaries' efforts focused on "the effort to convert other Christians, individually or in groups, so as 'to bring them back' to [their] own church."[56] All of the pastoral recommendations of the Balamand Statement flow from an ecclesiology of communion:

> On each side it is recognized that what Christ has entrusted to his Church—profession of apostolic faith, participation in the sacraments, above all the one

53. U.S. Orthodox/Roman Catholic Consultation, "Joint Statement on Tensions in Eastern Europe Related to 'Uniatism,'" United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, May 28, 1992, 5 www.usccb.org/resources/joint-statement-on-tension-in-eastern-europe-related-to-uniatism.pdf.

54. Joint International Commission for Theological Dialogue Between the Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church, "Uniatism, Method of Union of the Past, and the Present Search for Full Communion," in *The Quest for Unity: Orthodox and Catholics in Dialogue*, ed. Borelli, John, and John H. Erickson (St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1996), 2-3, 15. Scholars commonly refer to this statement as the "Balamand Statement," and so this author will do the same hereinafter.

55. Joint International Commission, "Uniatism," 30.

56. Joint International Commission, "Uniatism," 10.

> priesthood celebrating the one sacrifice of Christ, the apostolic succession of bishops—cannot be considered the exclusive property of one of our churches.[57]

In its pastoral recommendations, the Balamand Statement reinforces this ecclesiology of communion by stating: "Pastoral activity in the Catholic Church, Latin as well as Oriental, no longer aims at having the faithful of one church pass over to the other."[58] It also recommends that all clergy be formed with positive knowledge of the other church and that "everyone should be informed of the apostolic succession of the other church and the authenticity of its sacramental life."[59] The commission hoped that it had overcome "all proselytism and all desire for expansion by Catholics at the expense of the Orthodox Church," removing the obstacle to dialogue posed by the Orthodox concerns about uniatism and absorption by Rome.[60] Neither side needs to fear the loss of its own identity for the sake of union.

Because ecclesiological questions, in the context of Catholic-Orthodox dialogue, are aimed toward the eventual attainment of full reunion between the Christian Churches, scholars occasionally raise the question about the future status of the Eastern Catholic Churches. Michel Jalakh accepts the possibility of the Eastern Churches eventually ceasing to exist as separate entities outside of their sister Orthodox Churches.[61] Both Jalakh and David Petras warn that dealing with the question of the future of the Eastern Catholic Churches jumps into the realm of speculation and cannot be decided today.[62]

---

57. Joint International Commission, "Uniatism," 15.
58. Joint International Commission, "Uniatism," 22.
59. Joint International Commission, "Uniatism," 30.
60. Joint International Commission, "Uniatism," 35.
61. Michel Jalakh, O.A.M., *Ecclesiological Identity of the Eastern Catholic Churches: Orientalium Ecclesiarum 30 and Beyond*, ed. Edward G. Farrugia, S.J., vol. 297 of *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* (Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 2014), 322.
62. Jalakh, *Ecclesiological Identity*, 322; David Petras, "The Ecumenical Status of the Eastern Catholic Churches," *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 37, no. 3-4 (1992): 364.

Speculation on the status of the Eastern Catholic Churches in a reunited Church is beyond the scope of this thesis, but it is worth observing that the question itself arises as one of ecclesial identity. Michel Jalakh states that, at Vatican II, the role of the Eastern Catholic Churches shifted from one of representing the "dissidents" until they returned to the true Church to one of forming the bridge between East and West. However, he notes that only the Catholic side has accepted this bridge and that the rejection of uniatism as a model made the Eastern Catholic Churches into "the anti-model of unity in the Church."[63] If the Eastern Catholic Churches exist only as a bridge between Catholics and Orthodox or as the path for current Orthodox wishing to enter communion with the Catholic Church, then it would seem that, when the God-willed unity is realized, the Eastern Catholic Churches would have no further reason to exist. However, if both the Catholic and Orthodox Churches reject a concept of unity that requires the erasure of one of the constituent churches, then it seems at least unnecessary that the Eastern Catholic Churches be absorbed or erased for the sake of unity.

The story of Eastern Catholic liturgy in the United States reveals that the identity of the Churches is shaped just as much by history and culture as by dogma and rubrics. By virtue of who they are as a result of their pilgrimage through these histories and cultures, all Churches of the West and of the East have their gift to offer for the building up of the Body of Christ. These gifts and the Churches that offer them, therefore, cannot be interchangeable. Jalakh offers a possible mode of moving away from a "functional" view of the existence of the Eastern Catholic Churches. He suggests that the fact of their being in union with Rome now, along with the history that shaped their union, forms their

63. Jalakh, *Ecclesiological Identity*, 311-312.

identity, not over against either the Latins or the Orthodox but as witnesses to the full catholicity of the Church. The Eastern Catholic Churches are the "thorn in the flesh" that bear in themselves the tension of separation and yet also the eschatological hope of unity.[64] Having lived as both Catholic and Eastern, they resist the Roman tendency toward unity in uniformity, and "they know that not all that was acquired in communion is to be refused, and not all that was adopted from the Latin theology is untouchable."[65] Jalakh implies a place for the Eastern Catholic Churches even after full reunion by virtue of their history and their ongoing development in changing circumstances. In a reunited Christianity, the communities that were formed in and through their relationship with Rome while they were still separated from the Orthodox Churches will retain a character necessarily distinct from both. Any terms of union that respect the particularity of all its members cannot simply erase this historically- and culturally-shaped identity of the current Eastern Catholic Churches without compromising this principle of unity in diversity.

The question of the future of the Eastern Catholic Churches, though certainly not an imminent one demanding an immediate answer, has implications for how the Catholic communion approaches both ecumenical dialogue and the development of Eastern Catholic liturgical-ecclesial identity now. Chapter 2 examined the text of *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, which elucidated the Second Vatican Council's understanding of the Eastern Catholic Churches as possessing dignity fully equal to that of the Latin Church, having the rights of the governance of their patriarchates and their synods in union with the Roman Pontiff, having the right to know and organically develop their particular

64. Jalakh, *Ecclesiological Identity*, 334, 337.
65. Jalakh, *Ecclesiological Identity*, 345.

theologies and liturgies, and having a special ecumenical vocation to the Orthodox. Chapter 3 opened with the words of Melkite Catholic Archbishop Joseph Tawil, which affirmed an Eastern Catholic vocation of witness not only to their sister Orthodox Churches but also to the Latins and to the United States. Whether the Latin Catholic Church continues to have a functional view of the Eastern Catholic Churches affects Eastern Catholics' ability to live their liturgical-ecclesial identities in the United States, obstructing the realization of a communion ecclesiology characterized by unity in diversity.

The Russian Catholic Church and the Need for Latin Cooperation

The Russian Greek Catholic Church, one of the smallest of the *sui iuris* Eastern Catholic Churches, formed in 1905 under Tsar Nicholas II's policy of religious tolerance. Rome established two apostolic exarchates for the Russian Greek Catholic Church, the first in 1917 for Russia and the second in 1928 for China. Due to the consequence of the Bolshevik Revolution and the Soviet Regime in Russia and of the Communist Revolution in China, both exarchates have been vacant since the 1950s.[66] Since then, the Russian Catholic Church has had no bishop of its own and, for that reason, has been especially dependent on the local Latin ordinary for continued leadership. The Russian Greek Catholic Church, during a congress in San Felice del Benaco, Italy, in June 2017, reiterated a decades-long request for a bishop. The lack of official response has left Russian Catholics feeling abandoned in the quest for greater ecumenical relations with

66. Ronald Roberson, C.S.P., *The Eastern Christian Churches: A Brief Survey*, 6th ed. (Edizioni Orientalia Christiana, 1999), 109, 185-186. An exarchate is a pre-eparchial or pre-diocesan jurisdiction, and an exarch is the bishop of such a jurisdiction.

the Russian Orthodox Church.[67] Any sort of functional or instrumental view of the Eastern Catholic Churches in their role as "bridges" to the Orthodox, then, not only restricts the Latin Church's ability to receive the Eastern Catholic Churches as full-fledged members of the Catholic communion but also, in this particular case, undermines the greater measure of autonomy and the full flourishing that the Second Vatican Council intended for the Russian Greek Catholic Church and all Eastern Catholic Churches.

Peter Galadza usually would not advocate for further division of the Russian Church because of his own operative ecclesiology—in which the "'the Orthodox and Catholic Churches are together the one, holy, catholic and apostolic church – though in a state of schism."[68] Further, practicality indicates that restoring the Russian Catholic Church does not seem to be the most effective way to spread the Gospel in Russia.[69] In 2016, he finds himself advocating for the resuscitation of the Russian Greek Catholic Exarchate. In its current state, Russian Catholicism continues to lack its own hierarchy, in part due to the Vatican's desires to maintain open lines of ecumenical dialogue with the Russian Orthodox Church. However, Galadza's criticism of this strategy lies in the political reality of the ties between the Russian Orthodox Church and the Russian government, such that this strategy toward the Patriarchate of Moscow requires political

67. Adam A. J. DeVille, "In Search of a Father." The Catholic World Report, June 18, 2017, www.catholicworldreport.com/2017/06/18/in-search-of-a-father/; Francis X. Rocca, "Feeling Abandoned, Russian Catholics Appeal to the Pope," The Wall Street Journal, June 7, 2017, www.wsj.com/articles/feeling-abandoned-russian-catholics-appeal-to-the-pope-1496827805.

68. Peter Galadza, "An Apologia for the Revival of the Russian Greco-Catholic Exarchate," *Logos* 58, nos. 1-4 (2017): 308. Though Galadza admits that his ecclesiology "may hardly be acceptable to magisterial Catholic ecclesiology (not to mention almost all iterations of Orthodox ecclesiology)," he shows that some acceptance of his concept is implied by the current advice that pastors usually give to Russian Orthodox Christians who seek union with Rome without leaving their Russian tradition. Rather than join a Catholic Church—whether Latin or Eastern—Russian Christians in this situation "[are] oftentimes counseled by Catholic authorities to continue worshipping in the Orthodox Church and only once a year receive communion in a Catholic Church" (308).

69. Galadza, "An Apologia," 307.

capitulations that "do not make Russia a healthier society." Galadza summarizes the problem in this way: "the Vatican's desire to mollify the Kremlin by eradicating any traces of the Exarchate certainly contradicts Vatican II's desire to validate Eastern Catholicism – not to mention religious freedom."[70] When the head of the Russian Orthodox Church and the government with which it is so closely associated jeopardize the unity of the Russian Church and Christian unity in general, radical and prophetic witness, or "folly for the sake of Christ" in the form of strengthening the Russian Catholic Church is necessary.[71]

While Galadza's primary concerns are the life of the Gospel in Russia and the Ukrainian-nationalistic temptation to reject a revived Russian Catholic Church,[72] he offers a connection with the U.S. Eastern Catholic milieu. Galadza comments:

> Let us now move on to the question of Russian Greco-Catholic communities outside Russia. Why promote the latter? Why not simply allow Orthodox communities alone to represent Russian Christianity? Again, at the risk of sounding judgmental, it would seem that in far too many instances some of these communities provide a skewed witness to the genius and potential of the Russian tradition. This is not to suggest that Catholics will teach Orthodox how to live their Russian Christianity. That would be absurd: we have too many examples of failed Russian Catholic undertakings to be overly confident about this. However, for decades the Russian Catholic parishes of New York, Los Angeles, Melbourne, and San Francisco – to name just a few – have provided invaluable service in the cause of opening Western minds and hearts to the glories of Christian Rus' [the theological and liturgical insights of the Byzantine-Slavic tradition]. Moreover, with the number of Russian emigrés [sic] to Western countries increasing every year, it seems appropriate to invite Western Catholics with a sincere love for the Russian people and their tradition to involve themselves at such parishes in ministering to these newcomers.[73]

70. Galadza, "An Apologia," 321.
71. Galadza, "An Apologia," 309-310.
72. Galadza, "An Apologia," 311.
73. Galadza, "An Apologia," 320.

Whether or not Galadza intends such a meaning, his initial resistance to the reinstatement of a Russian Catholic hierarchy seems to be inclined toward the functional view that Jalakh counters. He states that a Russian Catholic Church is not the most effective mode of evangelizing Russia and that it is not necessary for representing Russian Christianity. His appreciation of the good that the Russian Catholic diaspora has done for showing the West the "glories of Christian Rus'" still tends in an instrumental direction, but his statement aligns with the ecumenical and inter-ecclesial vocation articulated by Vatican II and Archbishop Tawil: the vocation of witness to both the Orthodox Church and the Roman Catholic Church by virtue of being who it is. Despite its small size and limited institutional resources, the Russian Catholic Church, like other Eastern Catholic Churches, contributes to the catholicity of the Gospel, the hope of the unity of the churches, and the sharing of the richness of the Eastern traditions for the whole Church.

Galadza, in the end, promotes the revival of Russian Catholicism, and he takes as his inspiration Metropolitan Anderi Sheptytsky's love for the Russian tradition in spite of the oppressive, corrupt power of the Russian Empire. Sheptytsky, while advocating for Ukrainian interests and maintaining the importance of union with Rome, harbored a "Christian Russophilia," illustrated by his desire for "a flourishing Russian Catholic Exarchate."[74] As a precursor to current efforts to promote the Eastern Churches and ecumenical dialogue, Sheptytsky, for Galadza, is a model for both respecting the true pains and damage of the present political situation while also working toward a unity that respects particular traditions. Michael Plishka's model of inculturation hints at one further possibility for discussions on liturgy and ecclesiology in light of the U.S. Eastern

74. Galadza, "An Apologia," 317.

Catholic story. The presence of the Russian Catholic Church in the United States presents an opportunity—if properly supported—for the development of a local theology that is not identical to either the Russian tradition or to a general "Eastern" one, but rather is a unique interpretation of the Russian Christian tradition, shaped by its history in the U.S. context and by its interaction with and dependence on the U.S. Latin Catholic hierarchy.

Galadza urges the Latin Catholics to welcome and support the faithful of their sister Church. The revival of a Russian Catholic hierarchy is a project that only the highest authorities of the universal Church can undertake. Beyond "involv[ing] themselves at such [Russian Catholic] parishes in ministering" to new immigrants from Russia,[75] Galadza does not specify the support that Latin Catholic laypeople should offer. However, his call for support calls attention to the idea that Latin cooperation as a sister Church will enable the whole Church to come closer to the full realization of the communion ecclesiology to which the Eastern Catholic Churches point. This study of the U.S. Eastern Catholic story offers resources to imagine what such a program may entail.

Chapter 1 showed that, often, during the history of Catholic immigration to the United States, parish communities needed their own buildings, supplies, and priests, and the lay people took the initiative to build churches and request priests and supplies. Eastern Catholics commonly shared spaces with Latin Catholics, with the permission of the local Latin Ordinaries, until they were able to gain a footing of their own. Chapter 1 also uncovered how much tension resulted from the sheer lack of knowledge about Eastern Catholics by Latin Catholics, and Chapter 3 addressed the slow growth of this knowledge in the Catholic education system, the training of clergy, and pastoral

75. Galadza, "An Apologia," 320.

guidelines regarding other spaces shared by Latin and Eastern Catholics. These areas of Catholic formation would be the primary arenas for explicit instruction on Eastern Catholic liturgy, history, theology, and spirituality, whether in their own course units or interwoven throughout the existing curriculum, depending on the needs of the students. This measure would incorporate Eastern forms of Catholicism into the sphere of awareness of Latin Catholic students, resisting absolutisms that could arise from only making students aware of Latin Catholic concepts and traditions or from conflating all Eastern practices with Orthodoxy only. Wilton Gregory made similar suggestions in his 1999 address, specifically calling for such cooperation on the local level in schools, seminaries, and catechesis, and on the national level in the Conference of Catholic Bishops.[76] In *Orientale Lumen* (1995), Pope John Paul II, in naming opportunities for rapprochement with the Christian East, declares that the Christian West will "make it their duty above all to share, where possible, service projects with their brothers and sisters in the Eastern Churches, or to assist in bringing to a successful conclusion all that the latter are doing to help their people."[77] The pluralistic society of the United States presents many opportunities for such joint pastoral and service work by Latin and Eastern Catholics, particularly in larger cities where many different Christian communities are represented. Continued dialogue between Latin and Eastern Catholics will be necessary to uncover more areas of pastoral, financial, and logistical need in order to promote the flourishing of even the smallest of the Eastern Catholic communities in the United States.

76. Wilton J. Gregory, "Cooperation and Autonomy. The Relationship Between the Eastern Catholic Churches and the Latin Majority in America," *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 40, nos. 1-4 (1999): 149-156.

77. John Paul II, *Orientale Lumen*, 23.

Conclusion

Eastern Catholic liturgical-ecclesial experiences provide a framework for liturgical development, ecclesial identity, and Christian unity that the U.S. Latin Catholic story, taken alone, would leave unexamined. The Eastern Catholic Churches received at the Second Vatican Council their call to return to and organically develop their church's liturgical and theological traditions and to attend especially to ecumenical relationships with the Orthodox Churches. As the Latin Catholic Church in the United States and worldwide finds ways to cooperate more and more fully with the Eastern Catholic Churches in the fulfillment of their vocation, the Latin Church's own liturgical theology and ecclesiological vision must expand to embrace that of the Eastern Churches in the eschatological hope of the unity and catholicity of the Body of Christ. U.S. Latin Catholic discussions about liturgy and ecumenical dialogue become more than matters of adherence to rubrics and agreements on joint formulae. Questions of liturgy and dialogue are revealed to be questions of who Catholics—and Christians in general—are as Church in community with God and with each other. Eastern Catholics, with their diverse histories, cultural contexts, and theological traditions, witness to the developments that lead to the unity in diversity that makes disciples of all nations until Christ shall be all in all.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Blanco, Pablo. "Las Iglesias orientales católicas y ortodoxas en las enseñanzas del Vaticano II: Eastern Catholic and Orthodox Churches in the Teachings of Vatican II." *Scripta Theologica* 46, no. 2 (2014): 357-376. EBSCOHost.

Brady, Joel. "Becoming What We Always Were: 'Conversion' of U.S. Greek Catholics to Russian Orthodoxy, 1890-1914." *U.S. Catholic Historian* 32, no. 1 (Winter 2014): 23-48.

Byzantine Liturgical Conference. *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom*. Byzantine Seminary Press, 1965.

Carey, Patrick W. *Catholics in America: A History*. Updated edition. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2004.

Carroll, John. "John Carroll's Letter on Lay Trusteeism in New York City (1786)." In *American Catholic History: A Documentary Reader*. 2nd ed. Edited by Mark Massa, S.J., and Catherine Osborne. New York University Press, 2017.

Chase, Nathan. "Pope Francis: The Zaire Rite, a Model for the Amazon." PrayTellBlog, December 1, 2020. praytellblog.com/index.php/2020/12/01/pope-francis-the-zaire-rite-a-model-for-the-amazon/.

Christ – Our Pascha: Catechism of the Ukrainian Catholic Church. Synod of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church, 2016.

Committee on the Relationship between Eastern and Latin Catholic Churches. *Eastern Catholics in the United States of America*. United States Catholic Conference, 1999.

De Provencheres, Charles. "The Heritage and Role of Eastern Catholic Churches." In *Third Session Council Speeches of Vatican II*, edited by Leahy, William K., and Anthony T. Massimini, 131-133. Paulist Press, 1966.

De Tocqueville, Alexis. "Alexis de Tocqueville on American Catholics in the New Republic (1835)." In *American Catholic History: A Documentary Reader*. 2nd ed. Edited by Mark Massa, S.J., and Catherine Osborne. New York University Press, 2017.

DeVille, Adam A. J. "In Search of a Father." The Catholic World Report, June 18, 2017. www.catholicworldreport.com/2017/06/18/in-search-of-a-father/.

———. "*Orientalium Ecclesiarum*." In *The Reception of Vatican II*, edited by Matthew L. Lamb and Matthew Levering, 324-346. New York: Oxford University Press, 2017. EBSCOHost.

Diamond Jubilee of Saints Peter and Paul Ukrainian Catholic Church in Cleveland, Ohio: June 1-2, 1985. Sts. Peter and Paul Ukrainian Catholic Church, 1985.

The Divine Liturgies of Our Holy Fathers John Chrysostom and Basil the Great: Responses and Hymns set to the Carpathian Plainchant. The Byzantine Catholic Metropolitan Church *Sui Juris* of Pittsburgh, USA, 2006.

The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom. Byzantine Seminary Press, 1965.

Daoust, Julie. "Patriarch Sviatoslav Speaks at Sheptytsky Institute Banquet at University of Toronto." Homin Ukraini (Ukrainian Echo). Ukrainian Echo, June 6, 2014, www.homin.ca/news.php/news/13653/group/23.

Dolan, Jay P. *The American Catholic Experience: A History from Colonial Times to the Present*. University of Notre Dame Press, 1992.

Doyle, Dennis. "The Concept of Inculturation in Roman Catholicism." *U.S. Catholic Historian* 30, no. 1 (2012): 1-13. EBSCOHost.

———. "How to Deal with the Traditional Latin Mass Movement? Thoughts on William H. Johnston's Reply." *Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift* 74 (2023): 223-226.

———. "The Traditional Latin Mass Movement and the Unity of the Church." *Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift* 72 (2021): 350-366. EBSCOHost.

Farrugia, Edward G. "The Patriarchate at Vatican II." *Naukovy zapiski UKU: Bohoslov'ya*, no. 8 (2021): 227-242. doi: 10.47632/2075-4817-2021-227-242.

Galadza, Peter. "Ancestral Traditions': Particularities, Problems, and Challenges of Their Revival in Greco-Catholic 'Diasporas.'" *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 60, nos. 1-4 (2019): 223-231.

———. "An Apologia for the Revival of the Russian Greco-Catholic Exarchate." *Logos* 58, nos. 1-4 (2017): 307-325. EBSCOHost.

———. "'Full, Conscious and Active Participation': *Sacrosanctum Concilium*'s Influence on an Eastern Catholic Worship Aid." *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 57, nos. 1-4 (2016): 251-262. EBSCOHost.

———. *The Theological and Liturgical Work of Metropolitan Andrei Sheptytsky (1865-1944)*. Edited by Robert F. Taft, S.J. Vol. 272 of *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*. Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 2004.

Gibbons, James. "Cardinal Gibbons Defends the Knights of Labor (1887)." In *American Catholic History: A Documentary Reader*. 2nd ed. Edited by Mark Massa, S.J., and Catherine Osborne. New York University Press, 2017.

Glatz, Carol. "Zairean Rite Offers Example for Developing an Amazonian Rite, Pope Says." Crux, December 1, 2020. cruxnow.com/Vatican/2020/12/Zairean-rite-offers-example-for-developing-an-amazonian-rite-pope-says.

Gosselin, Lawrence G., ed. *Prayers for Publicans*. Revised edition. Holy Transfiguration Church, 1984.

Gregory, Wilton J. "Cooperation and Autonomy. The Relationship Between the Eastern Catholic Churches and the Latin Majority in America." *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 40, nos. 1-4 (1999): 143-161.

Hamilton, Kenneth L. Crowe. "Regrouping in the Clearing: Resisting *Liturgiam Authenticam* and Reconsidering an African American Rite." *Journal of the Black Catholic Theological Symposium* 12, no. 1 (2019): 127-162. ecommons.udayton.edu/jbcts/vol12/iss1/10.

"Head of UGCC Would Like to Meet with Patriarch Kirill to Relieve Tension." RISU. Religious Information Service of Ukraine, risu.ua/en/head-of-ugcc-would-like-to-meet-with-patriarch-kirill-to-relieve-tension_n46251.

Hermaniuk, Maxim. *The Second Vatican Council Diaries of Met. Maxim Hermaniuk, C.SS.R. (1960-1965)*. Translated by Jaroslav Z. Skira and annotated by Karim Schelkens. Vol. 15 of *Eastern Christian Studies*. Uitgeverij Peeters, 2012.

"HUSAR Card. Lubomyr, M.S.U." Press Office of the Holy See. Holy See, accessed February 17, 2024. press.vatican.va/content/salastampa/en/documentation/cardinali_biografie/cardinali_bio_husar_l.html.

Ieraci, Laura. "Vatican Lifts Ban on Married Priests for Eastern Catholics in Diaspora." National Catholic Reporter, November 17, 2014. www.ncronline.org/news/vatican/vatican-lifts-ban-married-priests-eastern-catholics-diaspora.

Jalakh, Michel, O.A.M. *Ecclesiological Identity of the Eastern Catholic Churches: Orientalium Ecclesiarum 30 and Beyond*. Edited by Edward G. Farrugia, S.J. Vol. 297 of *Orientalia Christiana Analecta.* Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 2014.

John Paul II. *Go into All the World: Euntes in Mundum*. Office of Publishing and Promotion Services, United States Catholic Conference, 1988.

———. *The Light of the East: Orientale Lumen*. United States Catholic Conference, 1995.

———. *Ut Unum Sint*. May 25, 1995. www.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_25051995_ut-unum-sint.html.

Johnston, William H. "Reflections on the Traditional Latin Mass Movement: A Reply to Dennis M. Doyle." *Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift* 74 (2023): 217-222.

Joint International Commission for Theological Dialogue Between the Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church. "Uniatism, Method of Union of the Past, and the Present Search for Full Communion." In *The Quest for Unity: Orthodox and Catholics in Dialogue*, 175-183. Edited by Borelli, John, and John H. Erickson. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1996.

"Joint Statement on Tensions in Eastern Europe Related to 'Uniatism.'" United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, May 28, 1992. www.usccb.org/resources/joint-statement-on-tension-in-eastern-europe-related-to-uniatism.pdf.

Kania, Andrew T. "Breathing Deeply, With One Lung: The Problem of Latin Church dominance within the Catholic Church." *The Australasian Catholic Record* 81, no. 2 (2004): 198-211.

Kaszczak, Ivan. *Bishop Soter Stephen Ortynsky and the Genesis of the Eastern Catholic Churches in America*. Published by the author, 2016.

———. *Metropolitan Andrei Sheptytsky and the Establishment of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in the United States*. 2nd ed. The Basilian Press, 2013.

Kelly, Timothy. *The Transformation of American Catholicism: The Pittsburgh Laity and the Second Vatican Council, 1950-1972*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009.

Kenez, Olexander, and Bran Kelty. "Eastern Catholic Students in Catholics Schools: The Background Paper." *Compass* 43, no. 2 (2009): 16-19. EBSCOHost.

Khalil, Louis. *The Maronite Mass and Devotions*. Daughters of St. Paul, 1957.

Khater, Akram. "'Like a Wolf Who Fell upon Sheep'; Arab Diaspora and Religion in America, 1880-1930." *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies* 21, no. 1 (2021): 1-26. doi.org/10.3138/diaspora.21.1.2020-06-15.

Kopanic, Michael. “Slovaks in New Jersey: An Overview.” *Naše Rodina* 24, no. 2 (June 2012): 1-11. www.academia.edu/37609105/Slovaks_in_New_Jersey_An_Overview.

Kwaiter, Elias, B.S.O. *A Pioneer Melkite Parish on the Shores of the Great Lakes in Cleveland*. Translated by Kenneth J. Mortimer. St. Elias Melkite Catholic Church, 1996.

Labaki, Georges T. “The Maronite Church in the United States, 1854-2010.” *U.S. Catholic Historian* 32, no. 1 (Winter 2014): 71-83. EBSCOHost.

Leo XIII. *Rerum Novarum*. May 15, 1891. www.vatican.va/content/leo-xiii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_l-xiii_enc_15051891_rerum-novarum.pdf.

———. “*Testem Benevolentiae* Condemns ‘Americanism’ (1899).” In *American Catholic History: A Documentary Reader*. 2nd ed. Edited by Mark Massa, S.J., and Catherine Osborne. New York University Press, 2017.

Liturgical Catechism on the Sacrifice of the Divine Liturgy. Byzantine-Slavonic Rite Catholic Exarchate of Pittsburgh, PA, 1954.

Loya, Joseph A. “‘Cum Data Fuerit’ Fallout: The Celibacy Crisis in the Byzantine Catholic Church, 1930-1940.” *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia* 106, nos. 3-4 (Fall-Winter 1995): 149-174. jstor.com/stable/44211217.

McDannell, Colleen. *The Spirit of Vatican II: A History of Catholic Reform in America*. Basic Books, 2011.

“Memoirs of Patriarch Lubomyr Husar Presented in Kyiv,” Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church. Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church, December 8, 2023. ugcc.ua/en/data/memoirs-of-patriarch-lubomyr-husar-presented-in-kyiv-797/.

Morozowich, Mark M. “Eastern Catholic Infant Communion: Has Catholic Dogmatic Teaching Prohibited It?” *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Catholic Studies* 49, nos. 1-2 (2008): 83-85.

———. “The Liturgy and the Ukrainian Catholic Church in the United States: Change through the Decades.” *U.S. Catholic Historian* 32, no. 1 (Winter 2014): 49-69. EBSCOHost.

———. “Tradition or Innovation – An Analysis of Recent Liturgical Developments in the Ukrainian Catholic Church in the United States.” *Worship* 86, no. 1 (January 2012): 16-39. EBSCOHost.

Moufarrej, Guilnard. “Ancient Sounds in the New World: Syro-Maronite Chant in Lebanese Maronite Communities in the United States.” *Yearbook for Traditional Music* 51 (2019): 103-138. doi.org/10.1017/ytm.2019.8.

National Conference of Catholic Bishops. *Plenty Good Room: The Spirit and Truth of African American Catholic Worship*. United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 1990.

O'Mahony, Anthony. "'...again to breathe fully from two lungs': Eastern Catholic Encounters with History and Ecclesiology." *The Downside Review* 134, no. 4 (2016): 107-118. EBSCOHost.

Pekar, Athanasius B., O.S.B.M. *The History of the Church in Carpathian Rus’*. Translated by Marta Skorupsky. Vol. 322 of *East European Monographs*. The Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center, Inc., 1992.

Petras, David. “The Ecumenical Status of the Eastern Catholic Churches.” *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 37, no. 3-4 (1992): 349-381. EBSCOHost.

———. “The Liturgical Life of the Byzantine-Ruthenian Church: Its Past and Future.” *Diakonia* 25, no. 1 (1992): 61-96.

———. “Presbyteral Celibacy: Church Discipline or Divine Revelation?” *Studi sull’Oriente Cristiano* 17, no. 1 (2013): 297-312.

Pius X. *Ea Semper Fuit*. June 14, 1907. www.vatican.va/content/pius-x/en/apost_letters/documents/hf_p-x_apl_19070614_ea-semper-fuit.html.

Plishka, Michael. “From Easternization to Inculturation: Reinterpreting the Mission of the Eastern Catholic Churches.” *Worship* 71, no 4 (1997): 317-335. EBSCOHost.

Pospishil, Victor J. *Ex Occidente Lex: From the West – The Law: The Eastern Catholic Churches under the Tutelage of the Holy See of Rome*. St. Mary’s Religious Action Fund, 1979.

Renoff, Richard. “The Elko Episcopate: An Era of Conversions.” *Diakonia* 26, no. 2 (1993): 99-118.

Roberson, Ronald G., C.S.P., comp. “Eastern Catholic Churches in the United States 2018.” United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2018, www.usccb.org/issues-and-action/cultural-diversity/asian-pacific-islander/demographics/upload/Eastern-Catholic-Churches-in-the-U-S-2018-Pie-Chart.pdf.

———. *The Eastern Christian Churches: A Brief Survey*. 6th ed. Edizioni Orientalia Christiana, 1999.

Rocca, Francis X. “Feeling Abandoned, Russian Catholics Appeal to the Pope.” *The Wall Street Journal*, June 7, 2017. www.wsj.com/articles/feeling-abandoned-russian-catholics-appeal-to-the-pope-1496827805.

Russin, Keith S. “Father Alexis G. Toth and the Wilkes-Barre Litigations.” *St. Vladimir’s Quarterly* 16, no. 3 (1972): 128-149. EBSCO Host.

Rymarz, Richard. “Eastern Catholic Students in Catholic Schools: Challenges and Responses.” *Compass* 43, no. 2 (2009): 20-24. EBSCOHost.

Saato, Fred J. *American Eastern Catholics*. Vol. 2, *Pastoral Spirituality Series*, edited by Peter C. Phan. Paulist Press, 2006.

Salachas, Dimitri and Krzysztof Nitkiewicz. *Inter-Ecclesial Relations Between Eastern and Latin Catholics: A Canonical-Pastoral Handbook*. Translated by George Dmitry Gallaro. Canon Law Society of America, 2009.

Salim, Anthony. “Re-imagining Adult Faith Formation in the Syriac-Maronite Catholic Church.” *The Quarterly Journal of St. Philaret’s Institute*, no. 41 (Winter 2022): 133-151. doi-org.libproxy.udayton.edu/10.25803/26587599_2022_41_133.

Samasumo, Paul. “Pope Francis: The Zairean Rite is a ‘Promising Model’ for the Amazon.” Vatican News, December 1, 2020. www.vaticannews.va/en/pope/news/2020-12/pope-francis-zairean-rite-preface-book-amazon.html.

Second Vatican Council. *Lumen Gentium*. In *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, edited by Austin Flannery, O.P., 4th ed., 350-426. Costello Publishing 1979.

———. *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*. In *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, edited by Austin Flannery, O.P., 4th ed., 441-451. Costello Publishing 1979.

———. *Sacrosanctum Concilium*. In *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, edited by Austin Flannery, O.P., 4th ed., 1-40. Costello Publishing 1979.

———. *Unitatis Redintegratio*. In *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, edited by Austin Flannery, O.P., 4th ed., 452-470. Costello Publishing 1979.

Senyk, Sophia. “The Ukrainian Church and Latinization.” *Orientalia christiania periodica* 56, no. 1 (1990): 165-187.

Simon, Constantine, S.J. "The first years of Ruthenian church life in America." *Orientalia christiana periodica* 60, no. 1 (1994): 187-232.

St. George Maronite Catholic Church. *The Maronite Mass Service Book*. Translated by John Trad. n.p., n.d.

St. John the Baptist Byzantine Catholic Church (Lansford, PA). *St. John the Baptist: Recall and Rejoice*. Custombook, Inc., 1972.

Stolarik, M. Mark. "Slovak Immigrants Come to Terms with Religious Diversity in North America." *Catholic Historical Review* 96, no. 1 (2010): 56-84. EBSCOHost.

Taft, Robert F., S.J. "Eastern Catholic Theology – Is There Any Such Thing? Reflections of a Practitioner." *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 39, no. 1 (1998): 13-58. EBSCOHost.

———. "'Eastern Presuppositions' and Western Liturgical Renewal." *Antiphon* 5, no. 1 (2000): 10-22.

Tataryn, Myroslaw. "The Eastern Catholic Churches and the Paradox of Vatican II." *International Journal for the Study of the Christian Church* 13, no. 2 (2013): 83-95. doi.org/10.1080/1474225X.2013.781333.

Tawil, Joseph. "The Courage to Be Ourselves." Melkite Catholic Eparchy of Newton. Vianney Vocations, 2023. melkite.org/excerpt/the-courage-to-be-ourselves.

———. "A Voice from the East." In *Council Speeches of Vatican II*, edited by Küng, Hans, Yves Congar, O.P., and Daniel O'Hanlon, S.J., 193-196. Paulist Press, 1964.

Tentler, Leslie Woodcock. *American Catholics: A History*. Yale University Press, 2020.

Tinner-Williams, Nate. "New Book from the Vatican Renews Hope for an African-American Rite." Black Catholic Messenger, December 1, 2020. blackcatholicmessenger.org/pope-francis-new-rites.

Todd, Christopher. *Reclaiming Our Inheritance After Vatican II: Leadership Lessons from Eastern Catholic History and Liturgy.* Eastern Christian Publications, 2023.

"Top Ukraine Prelate Says Vat Doc on Same-Sex Blessings Applies Only to Latin Church." Crux. Crux Catholic Media, Inc., December 23, 2023. cruxnow.com/church-in-europe/2023/12/top-ukraine-prelate-says-vat-doc-on-same-sex-blessings-applies-only-to-latin-church U.S. Orthodox/Roman Catholic Consultation.

Whitt, D. Reginald. "*Varietates Legitimae* and an African-American Liturgical Tradition." In *Taking Down Our Harps: Black Catholics in the United States*, 247-280. Orbis Books, 1998.

Yaz'kova, Veronika. "Katolicheskaya tserkov' i kul'tura: novye puti starogo dialoga." *Nauchno-analiticheskiy vestnik IE RAN*, no. 3 (2018): 179-185, dx.doi.org/10.15211/vestnikieran32018179184.

Zoghby, Elias. "Eastern and Western Tradition in the One Church." In *Council Speeches of Vatican II*, edited by Küng, Hans, Yves Congar, O.P., and Daniel O'Hanlon, S.J., 49-54. Paulist Press, 1964.

———. "Separation Between East and West." In *Third Session Council Speeches of Vatican II*, edited by Leahy, William K., and Anthony T. Massimini, 134-136. Paulist Press, 1966.