

Eastern
**Theological
Journal**

Eastern Theological Journal

11/1
2025

Eastern Theological Journal

HU ISSN 2416-2213

ETJ is a peer-reviewed academic journal,
published twice a year by the
St Athanasius Greek Catholic Theological Institute

It can be found in the list of publications
recognized as scientific journals by:

– the Italian National Agency for the
Evaluation of Universities and Research Institutes
(Agenzia Nazionale di Valutazione del
Sistema Universitario e della Ricerca),
in classification area 11
(History, Philosophy and Pedagogical Sciences),

– the Committee on History
(Történettudományi Bizottság II. FTO TTB [1901-] A),

– the Committee on Philosophy
(Filozófiai Tudományos Bizottság II. FTO FTB [1901-] A)
of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences
(Magyar Tudományos Akadémia)

Yearly subscription for institutions: 55 €

Rate for private individuals: 22 €

CIB Bank

SWIFT: CIBHHUHB

IBAN: HU83 1110 0702 1920 4893 3600 0001

EU VAT NUMBER: HU19204893

Cover and typesetting: Zoltán Szegvári

The views expressed are the responsibility of the contributors

Senior editors

Responsible Editor: Péter Galambvári,
Rector of
St Athanasius Greek Catholic
Theological Institute

Editor-in-chief: Miklós Gyurkovics,
St Athanasius Greek Catholic
Theological Institute

Assistant Editor: Zoltán Szegvári,
St Athanasius Greek Catholic
Theological Institute

Editorial Office

Eastern Theological Journal

Szent Atanáz Görögkatolikus
Hittudományi Főiskola
Bethlen G. u. 13-19
H-4400 Nyíregyháza, Hungary

Phone: +36 42 597-600

www.easternteologicaljournal.com

www.szentatanaz.hu

Manuscripts should be sent to:
gyurkovics.miklos@szentatanaz.hu

Editorial Board

H.E. Manuel Nin, OSB, Apostolic Exarch to Greece of the
Greek Byzantine Catholic Church,
Athens, Greece

Emmanuel Albano, Facoltà Teologica Pugliese,
Bari, Italy

István Baán, St Athanasius Greek Catholic Theological Institute,
Nyíregyháza, Hungary

Notker Baumann, University of Erfurt,
Erfurt, Germany

Giuseppe Caruso, OSA,
Pontificio Istituto Patristico Augustinianum,
Rome, Italy

Veronika Černušková, Sts Cyril and Methodius Faculty of Theology,
Olomouc, Czech Republic

András Dobos, St Athanasius Greek Catholic Theological Institute,
Nyíregyháza, Hungary

Daniel Galadza, Pontificio Istituto Orientale,
Rome, Italy

Lenka Karfíková, Charles University,
Prague, Czech Republic

Joseph O'Leary, Sophia University,
Tokyo, Japan

Vito Limone, Vita-Salute San Raffaele,
Milan, Italy

Giulio Maspero, Pontificia Università della Santa Croce,
Rome, Italy

Marcel Mojzeš, Greek Catholic Theological Faculty of University of Prešov,
Prešov, Slovakia

László Odrobina, St Athanasius Greek Catholic Theological Institute,
Nyíregyháza, Hungary
Stefano Parenti, Pontificio Ateneo San Anselmo,
Rome, Italy
Emanuela Prinzivalli, Pontificio Istituto Patristico Augustinianum,
Rome, Italy
István Seszták, St Athanasius Greek Catholic Theological Institute,
Nyíregyháza, Hungary
Tamás Véghseő, St Athanasius Greek Catholic Theological Institute,
Nyíregyháza, Hungary
Ilaria Vigorelli, Pontificia Università della Santa Croce,
Rome, Italy
Rafał Zarzeczny, SJ, Pontificio Istituto Orientale,
Rome, Italy

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| <i>Contributors of this volume</i> | II |
|--|----|

STUDIES

| | |
|--|-----|
| Emanuela PRINZIVALLI <i>La Prima lettera di Pietro nell'interpretazione patristica: spunti di riflessione</i> | 13 |
| Ilaria L. E. RAMELLI <i>Free Will, Ethical Intellectualism, Fate and Cosmology: From Bardaisan to Theodore Abū Qurrah</i> | 39 |
| Stefano PARENTI <i>Una preghiera siro-occidentale del Vangelo nell'euclologio Sinai gr. 959 (XI secolo)</i> | 85 |
| Riemer ROUKEMA <i>Sacrifices, Laws, and Demons in Origen's Debate with Celsus The Political Consequences of a Spiritual Struggle</i> | 121 |
| Emmanuel ALBANO <i>Manlio Simonetti e la crisi ariana. Qualche osservazione tra dato storiografico e metodo di indagine</i> | 145 |
| Daniel GALADZA <i>Liturgical Expressions of Ecclesiology and Communion The Commemoration of the Hierarchy in Byzantine Rite Eastern Catholic Churches</i> | 175 |

BOOK REVIEWS

| | |
|---|-----|
| Ágnes T. Mihálykó, <i>Review of Nathan P. Chase, Eucharistic Praying in Ritual Context: From the New Testament to the Classical Anaphoras</i> | 203 |
| Zoltán Szegvári, <i>Review of Baby Varghese, The Council of Chalcedon and the Syriac Orthodox Church. Efforts of Reconciliation 451-631</i> | 207 |

Contributors of this volume

Emanuela Prinzivalli

Pontificio Istituto Patristico Augustinianum, Rome, Italy

Ilaria L. E. Ramelli

University of Cambridge, United Kingdom

Stanford University, California, USA

Stefano Parenti

Pontificio Ateneo San Anselmo, Rome, Italy

Riemer Roukema

Protestantse Theologische Universiteit, Utrecht, Netherlands

Emmanuel Albano

Facoltà Teologica Pugliese, Bari, Italy

Daniel Galadza

Pontificio Istituto Orientale, Rome, Italy

Ágnes T. Mihálykó

Saint Athanasius Greek Catholic Theological Institute,
Nyíregyháza, Hungary

Zoltán Szegvári

Saint Athanasius Greek Catholic Theological Institute,
Nyíregyháza, Hungary

Liturgical Expressions of Ecclesiology and Communion

The Commemoration of the Hierarchy in Byzantine Rite Eastern Catholic Churches

Daniel GALADZA

Keywords: *liturgy, canon law, ecclesiology, Orthodox Church, Eastern Catholic Churches, Second Vatican Council, papal primacy, autocephaly, ecumenism, Ukraine*

Introduction; 1. Commemoration of the Hierarchy as an Expression of Ecclesiology; 2. The Commemoration of the Hierarchy in the Byzantine Rite; 2.1. The Authentic Tradition and the Greek Practice; 2.2. Commemoration of the Heads of Autocephalous Orthodox Churches; 2.3. Developments in East-Slavic Practice; 2.4. Excursus: Russian Orthodox Imitations of Papal Primacy; 3. Commemorating the Bishop of Rome in the Byzantine Rite; 3.1. Historical Background; 3.2. Twentieth-Century Practice in the UGCC Before and After Vatican II; 3.3. Ecclesiological Problems in Current Practice; 4. Concluding Remarks

Introduction

The way the Church lives, functions, and orders herself is expressed in her liturgy. In turn, the liturgical expression of ecclesiology provides a vision of communion which is of particular importance when examining the relationship between the Bishop of Rome and the Roman Catholic Church, on the one hand, and the Heads of the Eastern Churches in Communion with Rome, on the other hand.

This brief paper presents an overview of the commemoration of the hierarchy, including the Bishop of Rome, in the Byzantine Rite Eastern Catholic Churches, focusing particularly on the practice of the largest such Church, the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church (UGCC),

tracing its development from a simple prayer for the hierarch and the communion of bishops to its elaborate form that subordinates one *sui iuris* Church to another. I conclude by offering a few comments on the ecclesiological problems manifested in the liturgy as it is celebrated today, and possible solutions for the current situation.

1. Commemoration of the Hierarchy as an Expression of Ecclesiology

Order and precedence among the leadership of the Church is not a new problem. Already during the earthly ministry of Christ, Jesus' disciples debated who was the greatest among them immediately after the institution of the Lord's Supper (cf. Luke 22:24) and they asked for privileged places at His right and left (cf. Matthew 20:23 and Mark 10:37). One was called first (John 1:40), one was chosen as the rock upon which Christ will build His Church (cf. Matthew 16:18), another was known as the "beloved disciple" (cf. John 20:2), and yet another considered himself the "least of the apostles" (cf. 1 Corinthians 15:9). Within a few centuries, the order of the successors of the apostles was the concern of ecumenical councils, established by canonical legislation, and expressed in the liturgy.

Liturgy, as the "summit toward which the activity of the Church is directed" and at the same time "the font from which all her power flows" (*Sacrosanctum Concilium*, par. 10), transmits dogmatic and doctrinal teachings and beliefs, and can express the ecclesiological status of a given Church. In this way, the liturgical celebration itself can be the most conspicuous expression of an ecclesiological vision of communion both through concelebration and through commemoration.

For the Orthodox Churches in communion with the Patriarchate of Constantinople, the order of their Diptychs is not only a sign of unity, pointing to the communion of Churches of the ancient patriarchates and throughout the world, but also a point of contention, depending

on who is commemorated first – or not commemorated at all. These Diptychs then guide the order of concelebration and manifest unity between all the various Orthodox Churches. The ways of commemorating the hierarchy during liturgical services can also be an immediate indication of a Church's jurisdictional and canonical status as autocephalous.¹

For the Eastern Churches in communion with Rome, communion is manifested in the liturgical assembly through concelebration and communion, particularly through and with the Pope, the Bishop of Rome. The order of the concelebrants, especially at papal liturgies, is dictated primarily by the canonical legislation of the Roman Catholic Church (i.e. *CIC*),² The Eastern Catholic Churches themselves manifest unity with the universal Church through the commemoration of the Pope of Rome in the Liturgy and through the

- 1 For autocephalous Orthodox Churches, apart from the consecration of *myron* or the use of certain liturgical objects and vestments during hierarchal liturgies, Objects that were once the prerogative of every bishop have become exclusive to heads of autocephalous Orthodox Churches following the liturgical practices of the Moscow Patriarchate. For example, the use of a crosier during certain liturgical rites or a processional cross is reserved for the Patriarch of Moscow or the Metropolitan of Kyiv. In the opposite direction, objects that were exclusive to heads of autocephalous Churches, particularly vestments such as the *omophorion*, pallium, *sakkos*, or *polystavrion*, became the prerogative of every bishop. See Job Getcha, *Territorialité des juridictions et expérience liturgique: quelques présupposés liturgiques et ecclésiologiques de l'autocéphalie*, in Marie-Hélène Blanchet – Frédéric Gabriel – Laurent Tatarenko (eds.), *Autocéphalies. L'exercice de l'indépendance dans les Églises slaves orientales: (IX^e-XXI^e siècle)*, Collection de l'École française de Rome, Rome 2021, 523-541; online: <https://books.openedition.org/efr/12378> (Open Access).
- 2 See, for example, the *motu proprio* of Pope Paul VI, "Ad purpuratorum Patrum Collegium" (11 February 1965), in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 57 (1965), 295-296, which guides the order of papal celebrations to this day, ignores Patriarchs and Major Archbishops who are not Cardinals, and places heads of Eastern Catholic *sui iuris* Churches after Cardinals.

request for ecclesial communion made by the newly elected Patriarchs (*CCEO* can. 76 par. 2) and Major Archbishops (*CCEO* can. 152 and can. 153 par. 1).³ Without such reception of ecclesial communion from the Pope, these “Fathers and Heads” of their own distinct and particular Churches, although legitimately elected, have limitations placed upon their primatial functions until they receive ecclesial communion and may not convoke synods or ordain bishops.

Apart from communion with the Roman Pontiff, however, there is no manifestation of a particular communion between the various Eastern Catholic Churches, except through the ministry of the Pope of Rome. Since there are no indications in the *CCEO* to guide such relations, presumably these depend upon the particular law of each individual Eastern Catholic Church. Nevertheless, traces of this collegiality and intercommunion can be found in the Byzantine Rite liturgy to this day, when each individual bishop is commemorated and prayed for, with the hope that his ministry of rightly announcing the Word of Truth be for God’s “holy Churches” – in the plural, referring to the various local Churches, rather than in the singular, referring to the universal Church.⁴

3 The requirement for the heads of Metropolitan *sui iuris* Churches to request the pallium from the Pope of Rome as a sign of full communion (cf. *CCEO* 156 par. 1) is an oddity for Eastern Christian traditions that seems to be a foreign imposition (i.e. a Latinization) upon the Byzantine Rite.

4 See, for example, the so-called “Sluzhebnik of Isidore of Kyiv”, *Vatican Slav.* 14 (ca. 14th-15th cent.), fol. 27v. For certain irregularities with this commemoration in the contemporary usage of some Byzantine Rite Eastern Catholic Diptychs, see Stefano Parenti, *La commemorazione del Papa di Roma nella “Divina Liturgia” bizantina*, in Idem (ed.), *A Oriente e Occidente di Costantinopoli. Temi e problemi liturgici di ieri e di oggi*, Monumenta Studia Instrumenta Liturgica 54, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Vatican City 2010, 237-269, here 259-261.

2. The Commemoration of the Hierarchy in the Byzantine Rite

In the Byzantine liturgical tradition, by commemorating a certain bishop, archbishop, metropolitan, or patriarch, the clergy express not only their prayer for their bishop's good work and well-being (cf. 1 Thessalonians 5:25, Hebrews 13:17, 1 Timothy 2:1-3), but they also indicate their own ecclesial status and canonical jurisdiction.⁵ In the same way, not commemorating a particular bishop can be an attempt to express a different jurisdictional status.

2.1. The Authentic Tradition and the Greek Practice

In order to understand how the hierarchy was commemorated, let us turn to the liturgical books and to the text of the Divine Liturgy of St John Chrysostom, the primary Eucharistic liturgy celebrated in the Byzantine Rite today.⁶

- 5 For an explanation of the commemoration of names in the Diptychs, see *Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita, De Ecclesiastica Hierarchia*, 3.III.9, in Günter Heil – Adolf M. Ritter (eds.), *Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita, Corpus Dionysiacum. II. De coelesti hierarchia, De ecclesiastica hierarchia, De mystica theologia, Epistulae*, Berlin 1991, 88-89; Colm Luibheid (ed.), *Pseudo Dionysius, the Complete Works*, Classics of Western Spirituality, Paulist Press, New York 1987, 193-259, here 218-219.
- 6 For general liturgical studies on the Diptychs, see Robert F. Taft, *A History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, vol. IV: The Diptychs*, Orientalia Christiana Analecta 238, Pontificio Istituto Orientale, Rome 1991; Stefano Parenti, *Lanafora di Crisostomo. Testo e contesti*, Jerusalem Theologisches Forum 36, Aschendorff Verlag, Münster 2020, 417-434; Stefano Parenti, *The Liturgical τόποι of Ecclesiastical Communion. Diptychs, Commemorations, and Acclamations*, in Edward G. Farrugia – Željko Paša (eds.), *Autocephaly: Coming of Age in Communion. Historical, Canonical, Liturgical, and Theological Studies*, Orientalia Christiana Analecta 314, Pontificio Istituto Orientale, Rome 2023, vol. 2, 865-901.

Today, there are a maximum of six points during which the hierarchy could be commemorated, namely during:⁷

[1] the Prothesis Rite, when the dead and the living, including the hierarchy, are commemorated privately by the priest with the deacon while they prepare the Bread and Wine of the Eucharist before the beginning of the Divine Liturgy;

[2] the Great Ektene/Litany of Peace (ἡ μεγάλη ἐκτενῆ, ἡ μεγάλη συναπτή, τὰ εἰρηνικά/великаѧ ектеиѧ, мѣрнаѧ ектеиѧ), sung by the deacon at the beginning of the Divine Liturgy;

[3] the Great Praises (ἡ φήμη/великаѧ похвалѧ), which commemorates all the primates of Churches with which the presiding bishop is in communion, sung by the deacon during a Divine Liturgy celebrated by a primate of a Church;

[4] the Triple Ektene/Litany of Fervent Supplication, sung by the deacon after the Gospel reading;

[5] the Great Entrance (μεγάλη εἵσοδος/великий вхѡдѣ), said by the bishop, priest, and deacon, when the Gifts are transferred from the Prothesis to the Altar; and

[6] the Diptychs (τὰ δίπτυχα), first for the living and then for the dead, at the end of the Anaphora, which the bishop, priest, and deacon say.

These six points depend on the particularities of a given local liturgical tradition within the Byzantine Rite and each of the six points have their own history of development. The most ancient point

7 For a detailed presentation of these liturgical elements, see Daniel Galadza, *Autocephaly and the diptychs: The practice of commemorating bishops in liturgical texts*, in Marie-Hélène Blanchet – Frédéric Gabriel – Laurent Tatarenko (eds.), *Autocéphalies. L'exercice de l'indépendance dans les Églises slaves orientales: (IX^e-XXI^e siècle)*, Collection de l'École française de Rome, Rome 2021, 81-110; online: <https://books.openedition.org/efr/11702> (Open Access).

of the Divine Liturgy where the hierarchy was commemorated was during the intercessions of [6] the Diptychs, which is equivalent to the current point in the Roman Catholic Mass when the hierarchy is commemorated during the Eucharistic Prayer. The petitions of the [2] Great and [4] Triple Litanies once had a very sober form of commemoration and simply named their local bishop for whom they prayed: “For our Archbishop, *N.*, the revered priesthood, the diaconate in Christ, all the clergy and the people, let us pray to the Lord”.⁸ To this day, in the Greek practice it is completely normal for only the local bishop to be commemorated by the priest and deacon at a regular Divine Liturgy. According to this practice, the local nature of the Church and an authentic ecclesiological model of communion is expressed: the priest and deacon commemorate their bishop, the bishop commemorates his metropolitan, the metropolitan commemorates his patriarch, and the patriarch commemorates the other patriarchs and heads of Churches with whom he is in communion.

The model also expresses the roles of the hierarchy. The patriarch is the “father and head” of his Church (*CCEO* can. 55) and “enjoys power over all bishops including metropolitans” (*CCEO* can. 56). Under the patriarch are metropolitans, who are bishops (or archbishops) of their own see and preside over other bishops and eparchies (*CCEO* can. 133). In turn, bishops (or archbishops) are the pastors of an eparchy, a local “portion of the people of God which is entrusted for pastoral care to a bishop with the cooperation of the presbyterate so that, adhering to

8 Ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἀρχιεπισκόπου ἡμῶν (δεῖνος), τοῦ τιμίου πρεσβυτερίου, τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ διακονίας, παντὸς τοῦ κλήρου καὶ τοῦ λαοῦ, τοῦ Κυρίου δεηθῶμεν. A generic commemoration without any name is also found in some manuscripts, presumably used in times of persecution or other difficulty when contact with the current bishop was difficult to establish or maintain: “For Orthodox bishops, the revered priesthood, the diaconate in Christ, all the clergy and the people, let us pray to the Lord”. (Ὑπὲρ τῶν ὀρθοδόξων ἐπισκόπων, τοῦ τιμίου πρεσβυτερίου, τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ διακονίας, παντὸς τοῦ κλήρου καὶ τοῦ λαοῦ, τοῦ Κυρίου δεηθῶμεν.)

its pastor and gathered by him in the Holy Spirit through the Gospel and the Eucharist, it constitutes a particular Church in which the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church of Christ is truly present and operative” (CCEO can. 177). The priests and deacons who follow the authentic Greek practice commemorate only their local bishop who is the pastor of their local Church, praying: “Among the first, remember, Lord, our father and bishop, *N.*, granting to your holy Churches that in peace, safety, honour, health, for length of days he may rightly announce the word of Your truth”.⁹ Thus, the role of the local bishop is in communion with, and in service to, all the holy Churches of God, because in the commemoration of a single hierarchy, the prayer emphasizes synodal collaboration, since the service of the bishop or archbishop is to the “Churches” rather than to a single “Church”.

Although earlier canons discuss the role of the bishop and order in the diocese, canon 14 of the First-Second Council of Constantinople in 861 is the earliest to clearly obligate the clergy to commemorate their bishop within the Divine Liturgy and the first to prescribe penalties for failing to do so.¹⁰

The commemorations of the [1] Prothesis Rite were codified in the fourteenth century but, because of their private nature, they were constantly subject to expansion due to the personal devotion of the priest. The former sobriety of the [5] Great Entrance was replaced by the elaborate rites of today, including the commemoration of the hierarchy, documented in the fourteenth century.

9 Ἐν πρώτοις μνήσθητι Κύριε τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ ἐπισκόπου ἡμῶν δεῖνος δὲ χάρισαι ταῖς ἀγίαις σου ἐκκλησίαις ἐν εἰρήνῃ, σῶσον, ἔντιμον, ὑγιᾶ, μακροημερεύοντα, ὀρθοτομοῦντα τὸν λόγον τῆς σῆς ἀληθείας.

10 *Hieromonk Agapios – Monk Nikodemos, Πηδάλιον*, Antonios Georgiou – Apostolos Pheretopoulos (eds.), 4th edition, Ἐκ τοῦ τυπογραφείου Βλαστοῦ Χ. Βαρβαρρήγου, Athens 1886, 291.

The [3] Great Praises are part of most hierarchal liturgies of the Byzantine Rite presided by a bishop, but in the UGCC today they are completely omitted.¹¹

2.2. Commemoration of the Heads of Autocephalous Orthodox Churches

In the Orthodox Churches, the importance of communion between the various local autocephalous Churches is expressed through the commemoration of their patriarchs, particularly during the [3] Great Praises. Canon 28 of the Council of Chalcedon already explains the order of the bishops of the pentarchy – Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, whose order is also recognized in Eastern Catholic canon law (cf. *CCEO* can. 59 par. 2) – and over the course of history more autocephalous Orthodox Churches were added to the list:

11 Although there are currently no [3] Great Praises in Byzantine Rite Eastern Catholic practice among the Slavs, vestiges of this commemoration are visible in *Службеникъ свѣтителскій*, Унів. Друк. Успен. монастиря 1740, 28-29. See also L. Huculak, *The Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom*, 226.

Diptychs of the Eastern Orthodox Churches

| Order of Constantinople ¹² | Order of Moscow ¹³ |
|---|---|
| <i>Orthodox Patriarchs</i> | |
| Most-holy and Ecumenical Patriarch (of Constantinople) | Ecumenical Patriarch and Archbishop of Constantinople [omitted since 15 October 2018] |
| of Alexandria | Pope and Patriarch of Alexandria [omitted since 8 November 2019] |
| of Antioch | Patriarch of Antioch |
| of Jerusalem | Patriarch of Jerusalem |
| of Moscow | Patriarch of Moscow and all Rus' ¹⁴ |
| of Belgrade | Catholicos Patriarch of all Georgia |
| of Bucharest | Patriarch of Serbia |

¹² See *Ἱεροδιακόνικον*, Holy Monastery of Simonos Petras, Agion Oros 2020, 128-129; *Δίπτυχα της Εκκλησίας της Ελλάδος*, 2025; *Ἀποστολική Διακονία τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ελλάδος*, Athens 2024, 30.

¹³ Maksim Sinjuk – Andrei Mazur (eds.), *Последование диаконского служения, Храм святых бессребреников и чудотворцев Космы и Дамиана на Маросейке*, vol. 2, Moscow 2011, 41-44. This order is followed by the Moscow Patriarchate, which follows a different chronology for the establishment of the various autocephalous Orthodox Churches and now omits any heads of autocephalous Churches that have recognized the autocephaly of the Orthodox Church of Ukraine headed by Metropolitan Epiphany Dumenko.

¹⁴ In the 1917 edition of the [3] Great Praises published for the enthronement of Patriarch Tikhon Bellavin of Moscow, his title was “of Moscow and all Russia” (и всея россии), but Russia was later changed to “Rus” (и всея руси) in order to claim jurisdiction over territory beyond the borders of the modern-day Russian Federation.

| | |
|---|---|
| of Sofia | Patriarch of Romania |
| of Georgia | Patriarch of Bulgaria |
| <i>Archbishops and Primates of Autocephalous Orthodox Churches</i> | |
| of Cyprus | Archbishop of Cyprus [omitted since 20 November 2020] |
| of Athens | Archbishop of Athens [omitted since 3 November 2019] |
| of Warsaw | Archbishop of Albania |
| of Tirana | Metropolitan of Warsaw |
| of Prešov | Metropolitan of the Czech Lands and Slovakia |
| of Kyiv [added since 5 January 2019] | Metropolitan of America and Canada |
| <i>All other metropolitans, archbishops, bishops, and synods, and civil authorities</i> | |

Praying and reciting such a list of hierarchs during the Divine Liturgy has also become a “status symbol” and an expression of prestige among the Orthodox Churches. This is the case to such an extent that in Ukraine it has been recited by the primates of various Churches, in particular Patriarch Filaret Denysenko of the Kyivan Patriarchate and Metropolitan Onuphry Berezovsky of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, that are not recognized as autocephalous (or even canonical) by many of the other patriarchs and metropolitans whom they commemorate.

2.3. Developments in East-Slavic Practice

It was in present-day Belarus, Lithuania, Poland, Russia, and Ukraine where commemoration of the hierarchy became an important issue. In the seventeenth century a so-called “pyramidal structure” of commemorations developed, namely that each priest and deacon commemorated the whole hierarchy of their Church, from the

Patriarch or Pope at the top, all the way down to their local bishop, as opposed to the original authentic practice of the Greek Church described above, where the priest commemorated his own bishop, the bishop commemorated his patriarch, and the patriarch commemorated the other patriarchs and heads of other local Churches.

The explanation for this change begins in the period after the Council of Florence. Although Diptychs do not appear to have been an important issue at the council, there was some discussion among Greek clergy in Italy and Crete after the council about whom they should commemorate.¹⁵ Despite prescriptions in a few liturgical manuscripts from the fifteenth century to commemorate the Pope in the Diptychs,¹⁶ nevertheless, the *editio princeps* of the *Hieratikon* containing the Divine Liturgy in Greek by Demetrios Doukas, published in Rome in 1526 with the special privilege of Pope Clement VII, does not indicate the commemoration of the Pope of Rome, and only indicates the commemoration of one bishop, in keeping with the traditional practice.¹⁷

¹⁵ Pope Eugene IV was indifferent, but Patriarch Metrophanes II of Constantinople (1440-1443) ordered Orthodox clergy in regions under Latin domination, such as Methoni (Modon), Koroni, and Crete, to commemorate the Pope. Such commemorations outside these regions are unknown, except for Constantinople, where the patriarch would have commemorated the Pope in Hagia Sophia. See Georgius Hofmann (ed.), *Orientalium documenta minora*, in Idem (ed.), *Concilium Florentinum, Documenta et scriptores*, Series A, III, fasc. 3, Pontificum Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, Rome 1953, 45-47 (no. 36).

¹⁶ This is likely in response to the letter of Pope Nicholas V to Constantine XI Palaeologos from 1451, requesting that all the Greek clergy commemorate the Pope. The Apostolic Constitution *Reddituri de commissio* of Pope Calixtus III from 3 September 1457 repeats this request directly to the Greek clergy. See Athanasius Welykyj (ed.), *Documenta Pontificum Romanorum historiam Ucrainae Illustrantia (1075-1953)*, vol. I: 1075-1700, *Analecta Ordinis Sancti Basilii Magni*, Series II, Sectio III, Rome 1953, 137.

¹⁷ S. Parenti, *La commemorazione del Papa di Roma nella "Divina Liturgia" bizantina*, 238-239.

Further north and east, the liturgical books from the Kyivan Metropolia provide certain novelties. The 1639 *Leitourgiarion* or *Sluzhebnik* of Metropolitan Peter Mohyla also maintained the original practice of priests and deacons commemorating only the local hierarch, but give explanatory rubrics for how the clergy should commemorate the hierarch if he is a metropolitan or a bishop, or if the church where they are celebrating is directly subject to a patriarch (i.e. if it has stavropegial status). Thus, a certain level of flexibility, along with explanatory notes, was introduced into the liturgical books to respond to the particular situation of the specific church where the book was being used.¹⁸

The situation in Muscovy after the sixteenth-century creation of the Moscow Patriarchate was somewhat different. Despite the supposed reliance upon Greek liturgical books in an attempt to return to what the Russian Church believed to be authentic liturgical practices, the books resulting from the liturgical reform initiated by Patriarch Nikon consistently include the name of the Patriarch of Moscow before the commemoration of the local bishop, even in presbyteral liturgies. The practice of commemorating the patriarch is already attested in the Muscovite printed *Sluzhebnik* of 1602, although no further titles of the patriarch are given.¹⁹ This is a departure from contemporaneous manuscripts, which, despite the creation of the Moscow Patriarchate in 1589, still mention only an archbishop, showing how printed books made it possible to transmit uniform practice and introduce innovations to liturgical practice – something which was more

¹⁸ *Лейтоургиаріон сієстѣ Служѣбникѣ*, Kyiv 1639, 228; Peter Galadza, “Seventeenth-Century Liturgicons of the Kievan Metropolia and Several Lessons for Today”, in *St. Vladimir’s Theological Quarterly* 56/1 (2012), 73–91.

¹⁹ *Служѣбникѣ божественныхъ литургій*, Moscow 1602, 92v–93r.

difficult with manuscripts.²⁰ By the time of the printing of the 1655 Moscow *Sluzhebnik*, edited by Patriarch Nikon Minin of Moscow, the Diptychs include the name of the Patriarch of Moscow, as well as the local metropolitan and the priest offering the Gifts in the Divine Liturgy, establishing the “pyramidal” form of commemorations: “His Holiness, N., archbishop of Moscow, patriarch of all great and little Russia, and our metropolitan, whose jurisdiction it is, and the most pious priest, N., offering these holy Gifts. And for the salvation of our pious ruler, the tsar and great prince N., and his pious empress and great princess N., and the pious tsarevich and great prince N., and the pious princesses, N.N., and the whole palace and their armies”.²¹

During the Synodal period and after the abolishment of the Moscow Patriarchate by Tsar Peter I in 1721, it was, naturally, impossible to commemorate a patriarch, and so the newly organized Holy Synod was commemorated in the place of the patriarch.²²

The change in commemoration observed in the Nikonian period in Slavonic liturgical books can be confirmed in the contemporary canonical legislation of the Russian Orthodox Church today. According to the Statutes of the Moscow Patriarchate, the name of the Patriarch of Moscow is to be commemorated at all liturgical services

20 For more on the creation of the Moscow Patriarchate, see Borys Gudziak, *Crisis and Reform: The Kyivan Metropolitanate, the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and the Genesis of the Union of Brest*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA 2001, 168-187.

21 The acclamation “Lord, save the pious” and *Polychronion* before the *Trisagion* were for the tsar and the patriarch. See *Служебникъ*, Moscow 1655, 329-330 (ткѡ-тл); Paul Meyendorff, *Russia, Ritual, and Reform: The Liturgical Reforms of Nikon in the 17th Century*, St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, Crestwood, NY 1991, 155 and 191-194.

22 See, for example, *Божественная Литургія иже во стихѣхъ отца нашего Іоанна Златоустаго*, Kyiv 1905, 71v-72r; *Служебникъ, тисненіе седмое*, St Petersburg 1912, 9.

in every church of the Russian Orthodox Church.²³ The insistence upon this practice suggests universal and immediate jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Moscow throughout the Russian Orthodox Church.

2.4. Excursus: Russian Orthodox Imitations of Papal Primacy

The intuition that this is an imitation of papal primacy, universal jurisdiction, and Latin influence, requiring the commemoration of the highest ecclesiastical authority in every church, seems correct. Despite the absence of any canonical stipulation in contemporary Roman Catholic canon law, the practice of commemorating the Pope is simply assumed and failure to do so falls under general penalties for clergy not following liturgical prescriptions.²⁴ From the promulgation of the Roman Missal of Pope Pius V in 1570 until the Second Vatican Council, the commemoration of the Pope of Rome within the Roman Canon was in the prayer of the anaphora *Te igitur...una cum famulo*, where *papa nostro* originally meant the local bishop, until it was specified that

23 The required formula is: “For our Great Lord and Father N., the Most Holy Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia”. See *Глава IV. Патриарх Московский и всея Руси*, in *Устав Русской Православной Церкви*, 2 December 2017; online: <http://www.patriarchia.ru/db/text/133121.html>.

24 Both the *CIC* and the liturgical books of the Roman Catholic Church have no explicit requirements that the Pope *must* be commemorated, nor do they include explicit penalties for failing to do so. This issue is not mentioned in the *CIC* and the problem is one exclusively dealt with in the CCEO. See Carl Fürst, *Penal Sanctions*, in George Nedungatt (ed.), *A Guide to the Eastern Code: A Commentary on the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, Kanonika 10, Pontificio Istituto Orientale, Rome 2002, 797.

this referred to the Pope of Rome and the name of the local bishop was added afterwards, with the phrase *et antistite nostro*.²⁵

3. *Commemorating the Bishop of Rome in the Byzantine Rite*

3.1. *Historical Background*

The oldest Greek Catholic, or “Uniate”,²⁶ liturgical books from present day Ukraine, Poland, Lithuania, and Belarus followed the authentic order of commemorations until the end of the seventeenth century, since the 1596 Union of Brest between the Kyivan Metropolia and Rome did not establish any requirements for Uniate clergy to commemorate the Pope. Despite growing concerns in Rome that Uniate priests were not commemorating the Pope in every liturgical service, the traditional practice of commemorating the local bishop appears to have been retained until the Synod of Zamość in 1720, which first required the Pope of Rome to be commemorated in every

25 See *Institutio generalis missalis romani*, in *Missale Romanum*, editio typica tertia, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Vatican City 2002, 48-49. For the part of the Roman Canon where the hierarchy is commemorated, namely *Te igitur...*, see Leo Eizenhöfer, “*Te igitur* und *Communicantes* im römischen Messkanon”, in *Sacris Erudiri* 8 (1956), 14-75. For the earlier history of this question, see Josef Jungmann, *Missarum sollemnia. The mass of the Roman rite: Its origins and development*, vol 2, trans. Francis Brunner, Christian Classics, Westminster, MD 1986, 152-159.

26 Although the term “Uniate” is considered derogatory, “nonetheless, it is frequently the only serviceable term for Eastern Catholic realities prior to the late 18th cent”. See Peter Galadza, *Uniate*, in Andrew Louth (ed.), *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 4th edition, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2022, 1986.

liturgical service and by all clergy – not just by the metropolitan.²⁷ Despite this order, the Pope was commemorated at [1] the Prothesis, the [5] Great Entrance, and [6] the Diptychs, but not during most of the Litanies.

3.2. Twentieth-Century Practice in the UGCC Before and After Vatican II

This practice continued until the 1930s in most Greek Catholic books, as evidenced by the 1929 *Leitourgikon* published in Lviv.²⁸ It was only with the publication of the Roman *recensio ruthena* in the 1940s that all the clergy of the Greek Catholic Churches were obliged

²⁷ See Lawrence Huculak, *The Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom in the Kievan Metropolitan Province During the Period of Union with Rome (1596-1839)*, *Analecta Ordinis Sancti Basilii Magni*, Series II, Sectio I, Rome 1990, 184-187 (Great Ektene) and 319-326 (Diptychs). The Pope was not commemorated in the Great Ektene in early Ruthenian liturgical books. See L. Huculak, *The Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom*, 213 and 402.

²⁸ See *Λειτουργικόν σιντήριον Службеникъ*, Lviv 1929, 6, 29, 43; Peter Galadza, *The Theology and Liturgical Work of Andrei Sheptytsky (1865-1944)*, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 272, Pontificio Istituto Orientale, Rome 2004, 319 and 329-330. It should be noted that in the liturgical editions of the Basilian Fathers, the commemoration of the Pope also appeared in the Great Ektene, although it was not separated from the other church authorities. See *Службеникъ*, Zhovkva 1917, 15; Ihor Vasylyshyn, *Нові видання богослужбових книг першої половини XX століття у Греко-Католицькій церкві як плід літургійної реформи. Еволюція видань від початку століття (1905 р.) і аж до 1940-х рр. XX століття*, in Janusz Mieczkowski – Przemysław Nowakowski (eds.), *Reformy liturgii a powrót doźródeł*, *Ad fontes liturgicos* 4, Uniwersytet Papieski Jana Pawła II w Krakowie, Wydawnictwo Naukowe, Kraków 2014, 285-299, here 294. For the liturgical practice among Ruthenians outside of Galicia, see András Dobos, *Prassi e teologia circa l'eucaristia nella storica eparchia di Mukačevo. Dall'unione di Užhorod (1646) fino alla metà del XX secolo*, *Studies in Eastern Christian Liturgies* 3, Aschendorff Verlag, Münster 2022, especially 450, 490-491, and 523-527.

to commemorate the Pope of Rome at five points of the Divine Liturgy, as well as at every Litany in all other liturgical services.²⁹ On top of that, in some Ektenes the Pope of Rome was commemorated separately, before the rest of the hierarchy, and the erroneous title of “most holy ecumenical hierarch” continued to be ascribed to the Pope by Father Cyril Korolevsky, the “heart and soul” of the Vatican commission for revision of Church Slavonic liturgical books in the twentieth century, misinterpreting and misapplying a title used for the Patriarch of Constantinople that has never been corrected.³⁰ These modifications, codified in the Church Slavonic *editio typica* of the *recensio ruthena* promulgated by the Holy See in the 1940s, are still considered the official liturgical books for all Byzantine Rite Eastern Catholic Churches of Eastern Europe, except for those in Bulgaria, Russia, and Serbia who use the so-called *recensio vulgata*.

These Roman editions of Byzantine Rite liturgical books were later accompanied by canonical legislation that required all the clergy to commemorate the Pope of Rome “according to the prescriptions of the liturgical books”. For example, the *CCEO* states that the public commemoration of the Pope of Rome is seen as an “expression of loyalty, obedience, and respect to the successor of Peter”.³¹ The requirement to

29 *Літургіконъ сієсть Служебникъ*, Rome 1942, 181, 195-196 (Great Litany, where the Pope of Rome is commemorated before, and separately from, the rest of the hierarchy), 216-217, 232, 255-256.

30 Serge Keleher, “Ukrainian Catholics: Four Translations of the Divine Liturgy. Some Early Translations”, in *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 39/2-4 (1998), 267-402, here 273-275; S. Parenti, *La commemorazione del Papa di Roma nella “Divina Liturgia” bizantina*, 252-257. For more on Korolevsky, see P. Galadza, *The Theology and Liturgical Work of Andrei Sheptytsky (1865-1944)*, 277-279; Cyrille Korolevskij, *Kniga bytija moego (Le livre de ma vie). Mémoires autobiographiques*, 5 vols., Collectanea Archivi Vaticani 45, Archives secrètes vaticanes, Vatican City 2007.

31 See John Faris, *Patriarchal Churches*, in G. Nedungatt (ed.), *A Guide to the Eastern Code*, 169-170.

commemorate the Pope is explicitly reiterated for Churches ruled by a Patriarch (*CCEO* can. 91), Major Archbishop (*CCEO* can. 152), and Metropolitan (*CCEO* can. 161). Intentionally failing to commemorate the hierarchy according to the prescriptions of the liturgical books bears the grave penalty of potential excommunication (*CCEO* can. 1438), since intentional failure to commemorate the necessary hierarchy is not only an omission of prayer for one's spiritual authority, but also negation of communion with, and subordination to, that authority, which can cause "scandal of the Christian faithful" (*CCEO* can. 209 par. 1 and par. 2.).³² This penalty in the *CCEO* is noteworthy, because no equivalent canon exists in the *CIC*, suggesting it was either unimaginable to celebrate the Mass without commemorating the Pope of Rome, or the liturgical commemoration of the Pope was not considered as important an expression of union and communion as were some kinds of other juridical manifestations of obedience and concord.

3.3. Ecclesiological Problems in Current Practice

Despite the various magisterial documents from the Second Vatican Council (i.e. *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*), the promulgation of a new code of canon law for the Eastern Churches (i.e. *CCEO*) in 1990, and various instructions and declarations since then,³³ little has been done to manifest the authentic ecclesiology of Eastern Catholic Churches as more than just different, non-Roman liturgical rites in the liturgical celebration of the Byzantine Rite itself. While it is a known fact that the notoriously conservative character of liturgy preserves ancient customs

³² See also Marco Brogi, *Eparchies and Bishops*, in G. Nedungatt (ed.), *A Guide to the Eastern Code*, 235.

³³ Most notably Congregazione per le Chiese Orientali, *Istruzione per l'applicazione delle prescrizioni liturgiche del Codice dei Canoni delle Chiese Orientali*, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Vatican City 1996.

and traditions long after they are acknowledged as being obsolete even for the liturgical celebration itself;³⁴ it is, nevertheless, striking that liturgical reforms in the Catholic Church have focused on eliminating “useless repetitions” so that the Liturgy should be “within the people’s powers of comprehension” (*Sacrosanctum Concilium*, par. 34) but have failed to consider reforms needed for the liturgy to reflect its proper and authentic ecclesiology.

If we accept that the UGCC is a *sui iuris* Church of the Byzantine Rite, with its own “father and head” (CCEO can. 55), called to “return to [her] ancestral traditions” (*Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, par. 6), including the liturgical traditions and authentic practices held in high esteem by the Catholic Church (*Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, par. 1), and that “every change that has been improperly introduced in more or less recent times should be re-examined” because “it would not seem helpful to introduce a differentiation of usage with respect to the Orthodox Churches”,³⁵ then the following reveal problems of conflict between current liturgical practice and authentic ecclesiology:

i. Title of the Pope: Much has been written on the titles of the Pope of Rome.³⁶ For the Byzantine Rite, the correct liturgical title for the Pope, as accepted by the Holy See in the Greek liturgical books

³⁴ See, in general, R. F. Taft, *Beyond East and West: Problems in Liturgical Understanding*, Pontifical Oriental Institute, Rome 2001.

³⁵ Congregazione per le Chiese Orientali, *Istruzione per l'applicazione delle prescrizioni liturgiche del Codice dei Canonici delle Chiese Orientali*, par. 74: “If the Eastern Catholic Churches have a special duty of fostering unity among all Eastern Churches, among other ways, through religious fidelity to the ancient traditions, it would not seem helpful to introduce a differentiation of usage with respect to the Orthodox Churches, all participating in the same common origin. Every change that has been improperly introduced in more or less recent times should be re-examined based on these principles.”

³⁶ See Oren Margolis – Graham Barret, *Pope, Titulature of*, in A. Louth (ed.) *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 1543.

published in Grottaferrata, is approximately “our Holy Father N., Pope of Rome” (ὁ παναγιωτάτος Πατὴρ ἡμῶν ὁ δεῖνος Πάπα Ῥώμης).³⁷

All other additions and augmentations lead to confusion and can be considered superfluous.³⁸

ii. Frequency of the Commemoration of the Pope: As noted, the authentic commemoration of the hierarchy in the Byzantine Rite does not provide for the Pope of Rome to be commemorated at every petition for the hierarchy, unless he himself is present or the liturgical celebration takes place in Rome. Thus, the current practice of the Melkite Greek Catholic Church³⁹ and the practice of the UGCC until 1929 better reflects the local character of a *sui iuris* Church.

iii. Titles of Eastern Hierarchs: When dealing with the Byzantine Rite, it is generally safe to assume that if a term or title does not exist in Greek but does in Latin or Italian, its origins should be questioned. Thus, it must be stated explicitly that the title “Major Archbishop”

37 See *Ἱερατικόν*, Rome 1950, 137, published by the Holy See (Ἐγκρίσει καὶ ἀδείᾳ τῆς Ἀγιωτάτης καὶ Ἀποστολικῆς Ἐδρας τῆς παλαιᾶς Ῥώμης); S. Keleher, “Ukrainian Catholics: Four Translations of the Divine Liturgy”, 273.

38 For example, the papal title “servant of the servants of God” (*servus servorum Dei*) was adopted by Pope Gregory the Great (d. 604) to counter the use of the title “Ecumenical” by Patriarch John the Faster of Constantinople (d. 595). Nevertheless, and contrary to Pope Gregory’s views, the Pope of Rome has adopted the title “supreme pontiff of the Universal Church” (*summus pontifex Ecclesiae universalis*) since the fifteenth century. See Roald Dijkstra – Dorine van Espelo, “Anchoring Pontifical Authority: A Reconsideration of the Papal Employment of the Title *Pontifex Maximus*”, in *Journal of Religious History* 41/3 (2017), 312-325.

39 See Néophyte Edelby (ed.), *Liturgicon. Missel byzantin à l’usage des fidèles*, Éditions du Renouveau, Beirut 1960, 409, 417, 431, 438-439, 450. In the Melkite Greek Catholic Church, every priest commemorates the Pope of Rome at every Divine Liturgy, but does so only once, at the [6] Diptychs.

does not exist in the Byzantine Rite or in any Greek liturgical books because it is a modern invention of the Vatican and was codified in Latin (*archiepiscopus maior*).⁴⁰ By extension, it seems contradictory to insist that Eastern Catholics return to their ancestral traditions, follow the example of the Orthodox, and not claim the title of patriarch, but then limit the powers of metropolitans,⁴¹ invent instead the new title of “Major Archbishop” which has previously never existed and subordinates metropolitans to archbishops,⁴² and then claim that the Holy See is unable to create patriarchates in the East because it

40 For Cyprus as the see of a “major archbishop”, see Edward Farrugia, *The Church of Cyprus: Autocephaly Irrespective of Size and the Civil-Ecclesial Position*, in E. Farrugia – Ž. Paša, *Autocephaly: Coming of Age in Communion*, vol. 1, 263-288. In the first millennium, Cyprus had one archbishop, with his see in Constantina, and fourteen suffragan bishops, none of whom were metropolitans. See Giorgio Fedalto, *Hierarchia Ecclesiastica Orientalis*, Edizioni Messagero, Padua 1988, vol. 2, 875-888. The notion that archbishops can govern metropolitans is a modern deviation in the Orthodox Church. Since the declaration of the autocephaly of the Church of Greece in 1833 and until 1922 Athens was the only Metropolitan See of Greece and also bore the title Archbishop. See G. Fedalto, *Hierarchia Ecclesiastica Orientalis*, vol. 1, 489-493; Paraskevas Matalas, *The Church of Greece: The Battle Over Autocephaly, 1833-1852*, in E. Farrugia – Ž. Paša, *Autocephaly: Coming of Age in Communion*, vol. 1, 427-458. This arrangement of an archbishop having jurisdiction over other metropolitans was erroneously imitated by the Vatican and at no time were any archbishops called “major” in the Byzantine Rite. For the history and Roman invention of the title “Major Archbishop” (*archiepiscopus maior*), see J. Faris, *Major Archiepiscopal Churches*, in G. Nedungatt (ed.), *A Guide to the Eastern Code*, 201-202.

41 The metropolitan structure declined for various reasons and the role of the metropolitan became increasingly assumed by patriarchs. See J. Faris, *Metropolitan Churches*, in G. Nedungatt (ed.), *A Guide to the Eastern Code*, 213.

42 Canon 28 of the Council of Chalcedon is a known example of metropolitans subordinated to an archbishop, albeit one that also bears the title of patriarch eventually. For a discussion of this canon, see John Erickson, *Chalcedon Canon 28: Its Continuing Significance for Discussion of Primacy in the Church*, in E. Farrugia – Ž. Paša, *Autocephaly: Coming of Age in Communion*, vol. 2, 1137-1157.

cannot act unilaterally or innovate in the Christian East. More clarity is required from the Holy See.

iv. Communion Between *sui iuris* Churches: Presently, there is little contact between the various *sui iuris* Eastern Catholic Churches and visible signs of the unity of the universal Church are limited to the ministry of the Pope of Rome and to papal liturgical celebrations. Unfortunately, even at such papal liturgical celebrations an ecclesiological understanding of Eastern Catholics existing as distinct Churches in communion with Rome is clearly lacking.⁴³ Since the Roman Pontiff has “the right, according to the needs of the Church, to determine the manner, either personal or collegial, of exercising this function” (cf. *CCEO* can. 45 par. 2), some kind of resolution to this problem could be proposed by the Holy See, especially in light of two synods of the Catholic Church dealing with the issue of synodality.⁴⁴ In anticipation of such a decision, the patriarchal and major archepiscopal Eastern Catholic Churches of the Byzantine Rite have the opportunity to manifest their unity with other Eastern Catholic Churches through a revival of the [3] Great Praises in the Divine Liturgy and mutual commemoration of one another. The proposed order would be as follows:

43 The most visible example of this is the placement of cardinals, who by virtue of their sacred orders are usually never higher than archbishops and often have the role of a curial functionary, before heads of Churches *sui iuris*, who are recognized as “father and head” of a particular local Church. See fn. 2 above.

44 See Maria Ivaniv Lonchyna, “The Synodality of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church After Vatican II: A Need of the Faithful and Challenge for the Roman Curia”, in *Religions* 16 (2025), 673; online: <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel16060673> (Open Access).

Proposed Diptychs of the Eastern Churches in Communion with Rome

| Head of <i>sui iuris</i> Church | Rite |
|---|--------------------------|
| <i>Patriarchs</i> | |
| Pope of Rome | Roman |
| Patriarch of Alexandria of the Coptic Catholic Church | Alexandrian |
| Patriarch of Antioch of the Syrian Catholic Church | Antiochene (West-Syriac) |
| Patriarch of Antioch of the Melkite Greek Catholic Church | Constantinopolitan |
| Patriarch of Antioch of the Maronite Church | Antiochene (Maronite) |
| Patriarch of Baghdad of the Chaldean Catholic Church | Chaldean (East-Syriac) |
| Patriarch of Cilicia of the Armenian Catholic Church | Armenian |
| <i>Major Archbishops</i> | |
| Major Archbishop of Kyiv-Halyč of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church | Constantinopolitan |
| Major Archbishop of Ernakulam-Angamaly of the Syro-Malabar Church | Chaldean (East-Syriac) |
| Major Archbishop of Făgăraș and Alba Iulia of the Romanian Greek Catholic Church | Constantinopolitan |
| Major Archbishop of Trivandrum of the Syro-Malankara Church | Antiochene (West-Syriac) |
| <i>All other metropolitans, archbishops, bishops, and synods, and civil authorities</i> | |

v. Distinctions in the Ministry of the Pope: From the perspective of the Eastern Churches in communion with Rome, the Pope of Rome is both the head of the universal Church and, as Bishop of Rome and Patriarch of the West, also the head of the Roman Catholic *sui iuris*

Church. As such, certain elements of contemporary UGCC liturgical practice codified by Rome in the *Archieratikon*, the bishop's liturgical book equivalent to the Roman *Pontificale*, require re-examination.⁴⁵ The most notable aberration is the oath sworn by the candidate for presbyteral ordination – unknown elsewhere in the Byzantine Rite but adopted from Medieval German feudal contexts via the Latin Rite and included right in the middle of the ordination rite in the Roman edition of the *recensio ruthena*.⁴⁶ In the oath the candidate lists the seven Sacraments in the order of the Latin Church (i.e. sacred orders before marriage), swears allegiance to the Pope of Rome, and declares that he believes all that the Holy Roman Catholic Church declares to be believed.⁴⁷ The continued recitation of this oath contradicts the definition of a rite as a distinct theological, liturgical, canonical, and spiritual tradition (cf. *CCEO* can. 28) and the notion of a Church *sui iuris* as being led by its own father and head (cf. *CCEO* can. 55).

45 For a recent study of this question, see Stefano Parenti, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum 6 and the Recovery of 'Ancestral Traditions': Historical Problems and Ways Forward*, in Andrew Summerson – Cyril Kennedy (eds.), *Eastern Catholic Theology in Action: Essays in Liturgy, Ecclesiology, and Ecumenism*, Eastern Catholic Studies and Texts 1, Catholic University of America Press, Washington DC 2024, 46-65.

46 Rupert Bursell, “The Clerical Oath of Allegiance”, in *Ecclesiastical Law Journal* 17 (2015), 295-305. Oaths do exist in the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite, but they are not added to the liturgical rite itself. See Alexey Dmitrievskiy, Ставленникъ: Руководство для священно-церковно-служителей и избранныхъ въ епископа, при ихъ хиротоніяхъ, посвященіяхъ и награжденіяхъ знаками духовныхъ отлчій, съ подробнымъ объясненіемъ всѣхъ обрядовъ и молитвословій, Тип. Императорскаго Университета св. Владиміра, Kyiv 1904, 83-85.

47 *Архіератиконъ или Служѣбникъ Святительскій*, Rome 1973, 245-246.

4. *Concluding Remarks*

It is my hope that these reflections might help to better understand how liturgy in the Christian East expresses an ecclesiological vision of communion and to provide a point of reference from within the liturgical tradition for further discussion aimed at a renewal of an authentic ecclesiology of the Eastern Catholic Churches.

The liturgical commemoration of the hierarchy is not merely an attempt to grasp for some kind of earthly primacy or assert a hierarchy's authority; rather, it is a prayer for bishops to rightly impart the Word of God's Truth in service to the Church. In particular, the commemoration of the Bishop of Rome presents challenges for the UGCC in two ways: first, to live out its vocation in light of the Catholic magisterium after the Second Vatican Council; and second, to fulfil the ecumenical mission of each Eastern Catholic Church (cf. *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, par. 24), particularly in its own context of Kyivan Christianity.

As has been noted recently, the "ecumenical credibility" of the Catholic Church is crucial for any hopes of Christian unity and the latest document on the primacy of the Bishop of Rome published on 13 June 2024 has noted that the Orthodox "do not recognize the present relationship of the Eastern Catholic Churches with Rome as a model for future communion".⁴⁸ In the Ukrainian context, liturgical practice has been both "one of the greatest stumbling blocks – as well as one of the greatest building blocks – in efforts to 'rebuild the walls' of the

⁴⁸ Dicastery for Promoting Christian Unity, *The Bishop of Rome: Primacy and Synodality in the Ecumenical Dialogues and in the Responses to the Encyclical Ut unum sint. A Study Document*, Collana *Ut unum sint* 7, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Vatican City 2024, 87 (par. 130).

‘second Jerusalem’”,⁴⁹ referring to Kyiv, as the city was known from the seventeenth century onward. Faithfulness in the UGCC to the common Byzantine liturgical tradition is a positive point of unity and there should be no fear to implement very simple corrections to the commemoration of the hierarchy, in full conformity with the Second Vatican Council and the magisterium flowing from it.⁵⁰

Abstract

The way the Church lives, functions, and orders itself is expressed in her liturgy. In turn, the liturgical expression of ecclesiology provides a vision of communion which is of particular importance when examining the relationship between the Bishop of Rome and the Roman Catholic Church, on the one hand, and the Heads of the Eastern Churches in Communion with Rome, on the other hand. This brief paper presents an overview of the commemoration of the hierarchy, including the bishop of Rome, in the Byzantine Rite Eastern Catholic Churches, focusing particularly on the practice of the largest such Church, the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church, tracing its development from a simple prayer for the hierarchy and the communion of bishops to its elaborate form that subordinates one *sui iuris* Church to another. The paper concludes with comments on the ecclesiological problems manifested in the liturgy as it is celebrated today, and possible solutions for the current state of affairs.

49 Peter Galadza, “Liturgical Latinization and Kievan Ecumenism: Losing the Koinē of Koinonia”, in *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 35/1-4 (1994), 173-194, here 174.

50 For observations on, and reactions to, such changes, see Michel Jalakh, *Ecclesiological Identity of the Eastern Catholic Churches: Orientalium Ecclesiarum 30 and Beyond*, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 297, Pontificio Istituto Orientale, Rome 2014, 328.

