



THE JACOB RADER MARCUS CENTER OF THE AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES

Preserving American Jewish History

MS-603: Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum Collection, 1945-1992.

Series C: Interreligious Activities. 1952-1992

Box 50, Folder 10, Vatican Council II - Oriental churches, 1964.

SUMMARY

THE ORIENTAL CHURCHES

The ante-preparatory Commissions had drawn up three schemas on the Oriental Churches. One of these, entitled "The Unity of the Church", was discussed during the First Session, from November 27th until December 1, 1962. The Fathers then decided that this text should form the basis of a schema on Ecumenism and of part of the schema on the Church. Both of these schemas were discussed during the second Session of the Council in 1963.

The Co-ordinating Commission subsequently decided that the Conciliar Commission for the Oriental Churches, in addition to collaborating in the preparation of these two schemas, should also present a special schema, dealing exclusively with the Oriental Churches, presenting the texts previously prepared and reducing them to a series of propositions. This schema was distributed to the Council Fathers in May, 1963, and they in turn sent in their observations and recommendations. On January 15, 1964, the Co-ordinating Commission ordered the further reduction of the schema to a small number of fundamental points.

The schema, reduced in conformity with the above-mentioned directives, covers 6 pages and is divided into 6 parts, preceded by a brief Introduction:

1. Individual Churches.
2. The Spiritual Patrimony of the Oriental Churches.
3. The Oriental Patriarchs.
4. The Discipline of the Sacraments.
5. Divine Worship.
6. Relations with the Separated Brethren.

INTRODUCTION:

The Introduction recalls the respect enjoyed in the Universal Church by the institutions and practices of the Oriental Churches, which are the living witnesses of a most important part of the tradition of the Apostles and the early Fathers. The Council wishes to treat of certain questions touching them, with the intention of favoring their further development and their apostolic dynamism, leaving other problems to the attention of the Oriental Synods and the Holy See..

. THE INDIVIDUAL CHURCHES:

The diversity of the individual Churches, which all together compose the Mystical Body of Christ, is not contrary to the unity of the Church. Their traditions must be preserved, although with some adjustments to the circumstances of time and place.

The primacy of the Pope is exercised over all individual Churches. They are equal among themselves and have the same rights and duties, especially with regard to the Missions.

Parishes and a Hierarchy are to be established wherever the needs of the faithful make this necessary.

segue

Bishops who exercise their jurisdiction over one same territory must meet in Conference to establish a unified policy. The faithful of the Oriental Churches should retain their own rite.

2. THE SPIRITUAL PATRIMONY OF THE ORIENTAL CHURCHES:

The spiritual patrimony of the Oriental Churches is an advantage common to the entire Church. Consequently, the Council declares solemnly that they have the right and the duty to govern themselves according to their own proper discipline. Still more, they must return to their special traditions in case they have wandered from them. Those members of the Church in the West who, by reason of their office, are in relationship with the Orientals, must acquire the knowledge necessary for the discharge of their duties. Religious Institutes of the Latin rite working in the Orient should, as far as possible, set up houses or provinces of the Oriental rite.

3. THE ORIENTAL PATRIARCHS:

The institution of Patriarchs was recognized by the first Ecumenical Councils. They have jurisdiction over all the Bishops, the clergy, and the faithful of their territory or their rite. All the Patriarchs are equal, without prejudice to their seniority of honor. The Council confirms their rights and privileges. What is said of the Patriarchs is applicable likewise to Major Archbishops in charge of a particular Church or rite. The Pope or the Council can erect patriarchal Sees, if this be necessary.

4. THE DISCIPLINE OF THE SACRAMENTS:

The Oriental discipline of the Sacraments must be respected and restored. The schema treats of the Sacrament of Confirmation (administered by simple priests), of the participation in the liturgy on Sundays and feast-days (recommending also frequent Communion), of faculties for Confessions (extending to all the faithful of all rites, unless there be contrary orders from the Bishop), of the permanent diaconate (which is to be restored for the Orient in case it has fallen into disuse). As for mixed marriages between an Oriental Catholic and an Oriental non-Catholic, the Bishops are given the power to dispense from the canonical form (i.e. celebration before a Catholic priest) in cases where there is a grave reason, and provided that at least the Catholic party is disposed to give the usual assurances.

5. DIVINE WORSHIP:

Patriarchal or archiepiscopal Synods are empowered to institute, transfer or suppress holydays of obligation proper to their respective Churches, but not those common to all Orientals or to the Universal Church. Patriarchs and higher local authorities may agree on a common date for the celebration of Easter. Clerics and Religious follow their own proper discipline in what concerns the recitation of the Office.

6. RELATIONS WITH THE SEPARATED BROTHERS:

The Oriental Churches have a special mission for the unity of the Church. Orientals returning to Catholic unity shall be required only to make a profession of Faith. If they be priests, since their Orders are valid, they may exercise the ministry under the supervision

segue

THE ORIENTAL CHURCHES - 3.

of competent authority. "Communicatio in sacris", i.e. participation in non-Catholic religious services, is contrary to the Divine Law in so far as it is an offense against unity, implies acceptance of error and constitutes a danger of indifferentism. But circumstances may arise in which this danger is not verified and in which participation in non-Catholic religious services makes it possible to satisfy legitimate spiritual needs. Hence the Council decides that Oriental non-Catholics in good faith may receive in the Catholic Church the Sacraments of Penance, Holy Eucharist, and the Anointing of the Sick. Catholics in turn may request these same Sacraments from an Oriental non-Catholic priest if they are physically or morally unable to find a Catholic priest. Bishops are given the responsibility of taking proper steps in this regard and to supervise the practical application of these principles.



47-E-1964
COUNCIL AGENDA:
THE ORIENTAL CHURCHES

Rev. Dr. Ralph M. Wiltgen SVD
Divine Word News Service
C.P. 5080, Rome, Italy
Tel. 63-70-105.

ROME, Oct. 15 (DW) -- Discussion of the schema on the Oriental Churches was launched in the Vatican Council today with a preparatory seven-page report by Archbishop Gabriel Bukatko, 51, of Belgrade, Yugoslavia, who spoke in the name of the Conciliar Commission on Oriental Churches which had prepared the schema. Archbishop Bukatko said the treatment by the Vatican Council was meant "as a mark of deference to the Christian East and its Churches". The schema, he said, "does not intend to prejudice the ecumenical movement, but rather it desires to serve it by introducing a pastoral and ecumenical renewal in the Oriental Catholic communities".

Regarding mixed marriages between Catholics and non-Catholic Orientals, "the solution reached by the Conciliar Commission in plenary session on 30 September 1964 was that the canonical form for this kind of marriage should oblige only for liceity, not for validity," the archbishop said. Fourteen of the 21 Commission members who were present voted in favor of this proposal.

Archbishop Bukatko said "a matter of the greatest importance on both ecumenical and pastoral grounds" was the mitigation proposed by the schema for existing legislation on co-participation in sacred rites (Latin: *communicatio in sacris*) for Catholic and non-Catholic Orientals. Following the wish "of many Council Fathers" and considering it more in keeping "with the needs of the times", the Conciliar Commission mitigated the existing legislation which is "generally disliked and considered too rigid and severe by separated Orientals, and even a barrier and impediment to mutual understanding and union." The archbishop said it was the desire of the Commission thereby to provide for the spiritual needs of Catholics "and to make it easier for separated brethren to approach the means of salvation". He pointed out six important qualifications:

- 1) This refers only to separated Orientals, that is, those who still have valid sacraments.

- 2) A necessary condition is observance of that divine law which says such co-participation is always and everywhere forbidden as often as there is real danger to one's faith.

- 3) If Orientals who are separated in good faith from the Catholic Church spontaneously request of the Catholic Church the sacraments of Penance, Eucharist, and Anointing of the Sick, they may receive them.

- 4) Catholics are also allowed to ask these Sacraments of non-Catholic ministers belonging to a confession which has valid sacraments, as often as necessity or true spiritual utility suggest it, provided there is a physical or moral impossibility of reaching a Catholic priest.

- 5) Again supposing valid sacraments, a certain co-participation in sacred functions, things and places, is permitted between Catholics and separated Oriental brethren for a just cause.

- 6) It is left to the Local Ordinaries to keep vigilance over this matter and regulate it, and later they are to take mutual counsel in the matter and lay down opportune norms suited to local needs.

48-E-1964

MELCHITE PATRIARCH OF ANTIOCH
ASKS FOR DRASTIC CHANGES
IN CHAPTER ON PATRIARCHS

Rev. Dr. Ralph M. Wiltgen SVD
Divine Word News Service
C.P. 5080, Rome, Italy
Tel. 63.70.105

ROME, Oct. 15 (DW)- His Beatitude Maximos IV Saigh, 86, Melchite Patriarch of Antioch, Alexandria and Jerusalem, said today in the Council Hall that "the weakest chapter of the present schema is incontestably the one dedicated to the Patriarchs. "He spoke in French, and said that "the chapter, as it has been presented to us, is inadmissible".

"In the first place", he said, "it is false to present the patriarchate as an institution proper to the East". The first patriarch in the Catholic Church is the Pope, the Bishop of Rome, he said, "who is called the 'Patriarch of the West', in the 'Annuario Pontificio' (Papal Yearbook)". That the Pope is a Patriarch is confirmed "by the very name of this Patriarchal Basilica of St Peter in which we are now meeting." And a reminder can be found in "Patriarchium", a latinized Greek word which was used in the past for the Pope's residence at the Lateran.

Patriarch Maximos IV said further that patristic tradition and Ecumenical Councils have always considered the Pope as Patriarch of the West, "without ever believing that this could harm his primacy." He said that just as the Pope's primacy is not diminished by the fact of his being Bishop of Rome, "and in view of this title being equal to bishops", why should one feel the primacy would be diminished by the fact of his also being Patriarch of the West and, "in view of this title, on this plane, being the colleague of the Patriarchs of the East?". Patriarch Maximos said the concept of patriarchate is absolutely necessary for serene dialogue with Orthodoxy.

In the second place the Melchite Patriarch objected to the anonymous treatment of patriarchates in the schema text. Just as previous Ecumenical Councils had mentioned the patriarchates by name, he said, so this Second Vatican Council should do the same, and should cite among them the Holy Roman See and the Ecumenical See of Constantinople "whose titular represents the first dignitary of the Orthodox Church, considered and honored as such by His Holiness, Pope Paul VI."

Patriarch Maximos said in the third place that titulars of patriarchal sees in past ages have intimately shared the universal solicitude for the whole Church which was confided to Peter and his successors. "The Popes and Oriental Patriarchs at the time of union...", he said, "constituted in the Church a patriarchal college or -- as we would say today -- a summit of universal solicitude".

He said in the fourth place that the patriarchate was not "simply an honorary dignity", and objected to Oriental Patriarchs being showered with honors and being given precedence on one hand, and on the other hand being treated as inferiors "whose authority is conditioned by the infinite number of times that they must have recourse to the congregations of the Roman Curia before and after the most insignificant matters". He said that the Patriarch with his Sacred Synod "without prejudicing the prerogatives of the successor of Peter, normally ought to be the instance of last recourse for all the affairs of his Patriarchate." Such internal canonical autonomy, he said, could well serve "as a basis for union between the Catholic Church and the other Churches, both of the West and the East."

UFFICIO STAMPA

Session No. 3NEWS BULLETIN NO. 24GENERAL CONGREGATION NO. 103

The opening Mass of the 103rd General Congregation of the II Ecumenical Vatican Council was con-celebrated in the Byzantine-Melchite Rite by the Most Rev. George Hakim, Archbishop of Haifa, Nazareth and all Galilee, and by two Archimandarites, namely the Most Rev. Hilarion Cappucci, Superior General of the Order of St. Basil of Aleppo and the Most Rev. Athanase Hage, Superior General of the Choverite Order of St. Basil, along with two priests and two deacons. The liturgical singing was provided by the students of the Pontifical Greek College in Rome.

The Byzantine-Melchite Rite traces its origins to St. John Chrysostom. "Melchite" is the name given to the faithful of the apostolic patriarchal sees of the Orient, who, after the schism following upon the Council of Chalcedon, remained in communion with the universal Church. After the schism between the East and the West, a portion of the Melchite patriarchates of Antioch, Alexandria and Jerusalem returned to communion with the Roman Apostolic See in 1724. The Catholic Melchite Church, now governed by Patriarch Maximus IV Saigh and by 20 Bishops, numbers about 425,000 faithful. The orthodox of this same patriarchate are more than a million. The Byzantine Rite, whose mother language is Greek, is today celebrated in the vernacular according to localities. The Melchites use Arabic. Some of the prayers and blessings in this morning's Mass were sung in French while others were sung in English.

After the Mass, to the accompaniment of special liturgical chants proper to the Melchite Rite, the Gospel Book was enthroned by the Most Rev. Paul Achrar, Melchite Archbishop of Laodicea, Syria.

The work of the session was directed by His Eminence Cardinal Giacomo Lercaro, Archbishop of Bologna.

At the beginning of the business session, the Secretary General announced that the Fathers would receive during the General Congregation copies of a new liturgical instruction in further implementation of the liturgical constitution solemnly promulgated at the end of Session 2 of the Council. This announcement was greeted with warm and widespread applause throughout the Council Hall.

The Relatio presenting the schema on "The Church in the World Today" was distributed to the Assembly in the course of the morning session. Also distributed to the Fathers was the amended text of Chapter 7 of the schema De Ecclesia, dealing with the eschatological character of the Christian vocation, along with the relative relatio. The Fathers were informed that they would be called upon next Monday, Oct. 19, to vote on this chapter. First on its individual articles and then on the chapter as a whole.

Archbishop Felici informed the Assembly that the Moderators had received many requests asking that the schemas which have been reduced to propositions should, after the brief discussion on the floor, be then returned to the competent Commission for revision before being put to a vote. The Moderators decided to submit this request to the Co-ordinating Commission. This Commission has now decided that, at the conclusion of

segue...

the floor debate on each of these schemas, the Fathers would be asked to vote on whether it should be put to a vote immediately. If the answer of the absolute majority, i.e., one more than half, is in the affirmative, the vote will be taken immediately. If the answer is negative, the text will be remanded to the competent commission for revision, and then be returned to the Council for a vote.

In answer to the desire of many Council Fathers to know what program the Council would follow in the first days of November, Archbishop Felici announced that there would be no General Congregations on Nov. 1 and 2 and that on Nov. 3 there would be a Solemn funeral Mass celebrated for all the Cardinals and Council Fathers deceased in the last year. The Regular General Congregations will resume on Nov. 4.

The following speakers continued the discussion of the schema of propositions dealing with the Oriental Churches:

1. Cardinal Jaime De Barros Camara, Archbishop of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil and for 11 years Ordinary of the faithful of the Oriental Rites in Brazil;
2. His Beatitude Alberto Gori, Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem;
3. His Beatitude Ignatius Peter Batanian, Armenian Patriarch of Cilicia;
4. Archbishop Josyf Slipyj, Major Archbishop of Lwow, Ukraine, in the name of the National Episcopal Conference of the Ukraine;
5. Archbishop Isaac Ghattas, Archbishop-Bishop of Thebes, Egypt;
6. Archbishop Charles de Provencheres, of Aix-en-Provence, France;
7. Archbishop Elias Zoghby, Patriarchal Vicar for Melchites in Egypt;
8. Bishop Michael Doumith, Maronite Bishop of Sarba, Lebanon;
9. Bishop Basilio Cristea, Bishop-Delegate for Roumanians in exile;
10. Bishop Joseph Stangl, of Würzburg, Germany;

The following paragraphs sum up the observations of the preceding speakers:

1. The Council should avoid giving the impression that it is concerned only with those of the Oriental faithful who actually live in the Orient. There are millions of them living in other countries and dispersed among Latin Catholics. In Brazil alone, there are faithful of eight Oriental rites. As for the choice of rite allowed those being converted to the Catholic Church, the present legislation should be retained, allowing freedom of choice but expressing a preference that they keep their original rite. This freedom is important because not infrequently such converts are anxious to adopt the rite of the priest who instructed them because of his influence in bringing about their conversion. The provisions on matrimony say nothing about the marriage of an Oriental Catholic and a Latin Catholic. All Latin Ordinaries having Oriental faithful in their dioceses should take care to have towards them the same sentiments of esteem and paternal love as for the faithful of their own rite. These scattered Oriental Catholics should never be simply tolerated as immigrants. It has been the express will of many recent Popes that they should receive the proper kind of treatment from the Bishops and clergy of the Latin Church. Should difficulties, major or minor, arise, then the interested parties should get together in a spirit of mutual understanding and settle these questions among themselves.

2. The provision of the text which insists on converted Orientals retaining their original rite but without prejudice to appeal to the Holy See is hardly calculated to provide the proper answer to difficulties which

segue....

may arise. In the first place, how can the supreme authority of the Church judge quickly and properly in a personal matter of such importance? Such a right of appeal is almost a suppression of freedom in practice. It would be ironical that a convert wishing to change rites should be obliged to appeal to the authority of Rome which he has always been taught to distrust and suspect. Hence, the Council should establish the principle that all converts retain their former rite, but should leave intact the freedom of the individual to change rites at the time of his conversion, if he so wishes.

3. The faculty granted in the text whereby Oriental Bishops could dispense from the canonical form of marriage imposed on them in 1949 does really not solve the problem. There were many invalid marriages after the 1949 change in legislation. Then faculties were granted to the patriarchs to dispense from the form and to grant sanctions in cases of invalidity. Still this was not enough. The dispensation from the form in a mixed marriage was equivalent to permission to marry only through the exchange of consent. But such a marriage is unthinkable for an Oriental. They cannot conceive of a marriage without the presence of some priest. Consequently, it is same to assume that countless dispensations from the form were actually followed by marriage before an Orthodox minister. Requiring the promises in mixed marriages, even in a somewhat diluted form, can really not give rise to any moral certainty, especially when they are made by a Catholic woman who traditionally is helpless against the will of her husband. For these reasons, the provision proposed in the appendix, whereby the validity of a marriage is safeguarded by the sole presence of a sacred minister, should be adopted. The present legislation renders the Church odious in the eyes of the Orthodox clergy and faithful. -- An individual being converted to the Catholic Church from a separated Oriental rite is like a son who has wandered away from his family home. When he returns to his native city, it is natural that he go, not to just any family, but to his own. Similarly, it is necessary to insist on retaining one's original rite when being converted to the Catholic Church. Individual freedom is safeguarded by the right of appeal to Rome.

4. The real question for the Oriental Church today is "to be or not to be." Many fine things are said in the schema on the Christian Orient. But the Oriental Churches must be viewed in the light of the Catholicity of the Church. We all know what vexations and persecutions have been the lot of many Oriental Churches in recent years. But it must not be forgotten that the Oriental Churches have suffered much and often from the imprudence of over-zealous Latinizers. Trying to force Oriental Catholics into the Latin Church not only works the ruin of the Oriental Churches, but also does great harm to the Latin Church itself. Such individuals, according to the expression of St. Augustine, are making great strides but they are off the road! Consequently, the Council should confirm and give new force to the prohibitions already issued against such tactics.

5. The schema as it stands, needs revision because, first of all, the Oriental Churches are not just appendages to the Catholic Church but an integral part of it. Hence, they should not be left by the wayside, but should be included in the schema De Ecclesia. The text omits the treatment of the gravest problem for the Oriental Churches, namely, the threat of pastoral anarchy caused by plurality of jurisdictions in one same diocese. Besides, a more satisfactory treatment of patriarchates and patriarchates is needed. The schema has fine words, but these must be translated into action. It is strange that nothing is said in the text on the territorial jurisdiction of patriarchs. It would mean so much

segue...

if the Oriental faithful were to learn that their patriarchs would have a place in the senate of the Church and the right to participate in the election of the First Patriarch of the Catholic Church. All these matters would be better treated in the schemas, De Ecclesia and The Pastoral Duties of Bishops. For transfers to the Catholic Church, it should be insisted that previous rite be retained, with recourse in very special cases to the Holy See.

6. With the Latin Church, the Oriental Churches manifest the catholicity of the Church by their patrimony of liturgy, spirituality, theology and ecclesiastical institutions. We Latins need the example of these churches in our efforts to renew the Catholic Church. Its mission today is universal and so we must welcome the efforts of the Oriental Churches towards a greater share in this mission. They have a special vocation today to promote unity. Some degree of participation in Orthodox services is demanded by the welfare of souls.

7. Two points need to be born in mind when treating of the Oriental Churches. The patriarchal system, as canonized by the early ecumenical councils, was in force even in the West, for many centuries. It was gradually supplanted, but Latin patriarchs were set up in various Oriental patriarchal sees. These patriarchs were generally regarded as intruders and as shadows of the Roman Pontiff. Their presence was a constant source of friction. There must be some new thinking on the validity of the patriarchal system for the Church of the West today. Secondly, up until Vatican I, the primacy of the Roman Pontiff, which was the chief source of division between East and West, was regarded in the Orient only as a canonical structure. The Pope was always considered as the first Bishop of the Catholic Church. The decision to proclaim the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff as a dogma of faith, was taken in a Council in which representatives from the Orient were conspicuously absent. When the Orientals broke with Rome, they attributed no special theological value to the primacy. Neither did they regard themselves as separating from the Universal Church of Christ but only from the Latin Church whose head is the Pope. The text should be revised so as to eliminate a false vision of the Church. -- The prevalent legislation on participation in non-Catholic religious services is based on a false interpretation of Trent by individuals not acquainted with the Orient. The new provisions of the schema meet a concrete spiritual need of Oriental Catholics. -- We should be grateful that we are free to say these things within the precincts of this Ecumenical Council. If we had no Cardinals remarkable for their good will, no Commissions or sub-commissions, and if the Council were being presided over by Cardinal Humbert, then many Council Fathers would go away ex-communicated for things said on the Council floor. (N.B. Cardinal Humbert was the Papal Legate to Constantinople in 1054 and exacerbated an already delicate situation by attributing to the patriarch and his followers all the heresies then existing in the Church.)

8. The hopes of the Oriental Church almost fade away into thin air in the presence of this text. These propositions fail to correct long-standing prejudices, as when they insinuate that the Oriental Churches are just "individual churches." Secondly, the propositions are filled with useless repetitions because many of their points have received better treatment elsewhere. Thirdly, on many points -- having their own hierarchy outside the Orient, retaining their own rite, mixed marriages, participation in Orthodox services -- the text does not provide the ideal answers to the problems. It is complete silent on the one crucial problem of the Oriental Churches today, i.e., more than one jurisdiction within the territorial limits of one same diocese. This system was intended to solve problems, but turned out to be against the best interests of the Church. Unless the Council solves this problem now, it will be accused of having shelved it forever.

segue...

9. Oriental Catholics number about 11 million. Six-million of these, more than half, belong to the Byzantine rite in the Ukraine and in Roumania. Contrary to what is thought in some quarters, the presence of Oriental Catholics among their separated brethren is a contribution to Christian unity. The Council should regard it as a duty to bring to the attention of the UN the sad lot of some 6-million faithful of the Byzantine rite who are unjustly deprived of religious freedom, not only because they are Catholics but also because they are Orientals.

10. It is no mark of disrespect to the Oriental Churches to treat of them in a special schema distinct from the schema on the Church. But it is regrettable that this treatment has been contracted into a mere series of propositions. We now find nothing left of the previous text except a skeleton instead of a well-built body. The subject matter should be restored to its previous form and provided with more detailed explanations. The text should not be a mere compilation of canons, but should be expressed in such a way as to be a genuine expression of esteem and brotherly love for our Oriental brethren. The text has very little to say about the faithful of the separated churches. As regards participation in Orthodox services, the welfare of souls demands that the Church, prudently and under the direction of the Ordinaries, should distribute sacramental graces with a more generous hand to all those who are baptized, who show good will and are in spiritual danger. Unfortunately, the tone of the text is marked by a fear of exceptions, dangers, abuses, even sins, and also an unduly canonical spirit. The tone, on the contrary, should be one which echos the magnanimity and the kindness of the love of Jesus Christ. The freedom granted here should not be restricted to some Sacraments only, but should be extended to all with the sole exception perhaps, of Holy Orders. Revision on the text will take time, but future generations will not ask whether we worked for three or for four sessions but will judge us on the decrees which speak for the Council.

Present in the General Congregation this morning were 2,092 Fathers.

The General Congregation adjourned at 12:20.

* * * *

N.B. The Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity announces an addition to the list of Delegated Observers to the Vatican Council:

Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Alexandria

Very Rev. Archimandrite Cyril Koukoulakis of the patriarchal clergy
Dr. Theodore Mosconas, Archivist and Librarian of the Patriarchate

F I N E

N. 52.

Le schéma "De Ecclesiis Orientalibus".

Conférence de Presse de S.E. Mgr. Joseph KHOURY
Archevêque Maronite de TYR et de Terre Sainte.

Ce schéma procède sans aucun doute de très bonnes intentions qui sont ainsi exposées par les deux rapporteurs de la Commission Conciliaire du même nom:

- témoigner de la présence des rites catholiques orientaux à Vatican II;
- pourvoir à leur vie ecclésiastique et religieuse, au moins en partie;
- témoigner aux autres orientaux non-catholiques estime, respect et charité....

D'autre part, il contient bon nombre d'excellentes dispositions que nous signalerons avec joie, encore que, insuffisamment élaborées et précisées, certaines d'entre elles risquent soit de demeurer inefficaces, soit même d'ouvrir la voie à des contestations, comme nous en donnerons des exemples.

Si donc nous nous permettons de présenter de l'ensemble un exposé plutôt critique, qu'il soit bien entendu que n'y sont visées ni les intentions, ni les personnes, et encore moins que tout y soit considéré comme négatif. Cette critique veut être bien au contraire à la mesure de nos espérances, éclairante et constructive, reflétant des idées qui se sont largement manifestées en commission, dans l'Aula et tout autour afin d'aider, si possible, à une plus profonde compréhension des problèmes et d'obtenir une élaboration conciliaire plus parfaite, susceptible de mieux répondre aux buts de ce concile sur le double plan de la pastorale et de l'oecuménisme.

Le schéma en question comporte un préambule et six paragraphes:

- 1) Des églises particulières
- 2) Du Patrimoine à sauvegarder
- 3) Des Patriarches orientaux
- 4) De la discipline sacramentaire
- 5) Du culte divin
- 6) Des relations entre frères désunis.

Pour la commodité de l'exposé nous pouvons les ramener à trois divisions:

- I. Considérations générales (Préambule et §. 1 et 2)
- II. Des Patriarches (§. 3)
- III. Dispositions particulières (§. 4 à 6).

I. Considérations générales.

Trois points nous retiendront surtout:

- A) L'opposition églises particulières-église universelle, qui semblerait canoniser ici l'idée inconsciente que l'église catholique s'identifie avec l'église latine, les autres n'étant que des annexes, pour ne pas dire des accessoires ad ornamentum.
- B) L'expression "proeter ea quae ad universam ecclesiam spectant" pose le problème de la valeur des dispositions de ce schéma pour l'église latine et celle des autres textes conciliaires pour les églises orientales: s'appliquent-ils à elles en totalité (liturgie, régime des diocèses...) ou au contraire pas du tout?
- C) La législation nouvelle sur l'obligation faite au non-catholique de passer au rite catholique correspondant, sauf recours au Souverain Pontife lui-même, où le concile paraîtrait codifier l'intolérance rituelle après avoir solennellement proclamé la liberté religieuse.

II. De Patriarchis orientalibus.

Trois notations principales:

- A) On semble vouloir confiner cette vénérable institution en Orient, alors qu'elle est (et pourrait encore plus devenir) de patrimoine de l'église universelle. (Le Pontife Romain ne revendique-t-il pas encore le titre de Patriarche d'Occident?) En conséquence, on ne retient des anciens conciles, et encore pas en toute fidélité, ce qui définit les relations des patriarches orientaux entre eux, mais pas du tout avec le Siège Romain et conséquemment avec le reste de l'église, comme proclamé solennellement à Chalcédoine et reconnu à Florence.
- B) On se tait sur le problème fondamental de savoir si ces patriarchats succèdent de plein droit aux Patriarcats Apostoliques et, en cas contraire, sur ce qui devrait être fait pour les réintégrer dans leur antique dignité, et qui semblerait poser la question cruciale de l'unique "Sedens" sur l'unique "Sedes".
- C) On omet enfin toute mention de l'épiscopat et de la nature traditionnellement synodale du pouvoir patriarcal; dont on déclare vouloir sauvegarder "iura et privilegia", sans en définir le rôle essentiel et les obligations.

III. Dispositions particulières.

Toutes relèvent de la législation purement canonique et ont été renvoyées, pour les latins à la commission post-conciliaire.

De plus:

- A) Certaines se contentent de constater ce qui est, sans préciser ni clarifier: ainsi de l'obligation de la messe dominicale ou de l'office quotidien.
- B) D'autres légifèrent trop vite sans tenir compte des différenciations légitimes: ainsi de l'administration de la confirmation ou de la restauration du diaconat.
- C) D'autres enfin répètent, sans cohérence suffisante, des choses réglées par ailleurs: tels les mariages mixtes et la communicatio in sacris.

Conclusions

1°) Tel quel, le schéma ne mérite pas son titre ni n'est digne de ceux à qui il est consacré. S'il doit être maintenu comme il est, il s'intitulerait bien mieux:
De aliquibus quaestionibus ad orientales peculiariter spectantibus.
En effet pour la première fois qu'un concile oecuménique se penche sur les églises orientales catholiques, trois siècles en moyenne après leur reconstitution, l'église maronite mise à part; pour ces églises qu'on veut considérer, en droit sinon en fait, comme les représentants de la moitié orientale de la chrétienté; pour leur première véritable rencontre et confrontation avec leurs soeurs d'Occident, on aurait attendu qu'un décret les concernant particulièrement comportât au moins trois éléments:

- une clarification de la notion et de la valeur ecclésiale, non moins que des rapports réciproques de mots tels que liturgie, rite, juridiction ...
- une présentation de leur situation actuelle et de leurs problèmes spécifiques, dans la lumière du chemin parcouru, aussi bien en terre d'Orient que dans la Diaspora.
- une nette orientation vers l'avenir et une définition précise de leur rôle dans le mouvement oecuménique : non pas obstacle, ni membres pour ainsi dire honteux de la catholicité ou de l'orientalité, mais précurseurs, témoins et promoteurs de cette double Cause.

II°) Rien de tout cela ou presque dans ce schéma, mais des considérations toutes tournées vers le passé, des dispositions fragmentaires toutes sous le signe de la non-latinisation, position négative et appauvrissante qui s'explique de moins en moins dans les voies nouvelles qui s'ouvrent à l'Eglise et où elle devrait aller de soi; textes de surcroît qui ne devaient faire l'objet d'aucune discussion, auxquels on a accordé en dernière heure une "brevis disceptatio", et qui ne seront pas votés à bon escient, vu que l'immense majorité des Pères conciliaires, "salva reverentia", ne savent trop à quoi s'en tenir en la matière et se verront portés à voter de confiance.

III°) Pour nous, le complément sur les églises catholiques orientales s'inscrirait tout naturellement, dans le sens indiqué par nos remarques, entre le De Ecclesia et le De Oecuménismo, sans aucunement chercher à les répéter. Ceci pour la partie doctrinale. Et quant à la partie canonique, elle serait simplement renvoyée, sous forme de recommandations ayant autorité, à la Commission de réforme du droit canonique, laquelle, nous ne le répéterons jamais assez, devrait se faire sur la base non de deux droits monolithiques, mais d'une codification unique où les lois communes à l'Eglise Universelle seraient complétées par la législation propre à chaque église particulière, à commencer par là où les églises dites latines qui vont désormais s'épanouir chacune selon son génie propre, sans détriment bien au contraire de l'unité de la Catholica et de la propagation de la Foi. Comme prémices de ce travail une commission conciliaire serait chargée de différencier les textes de Vatican II dans cette perspective.

Nº. 50

LES EGLISES AU PROCHE-ORIENT

(J. Aucagne, Revue Travaux et Jours)

(Les chiffres sont ceux de l'Annuario Pontificio, complétés par quelques estimations ^{plus} récentes. La marge d'erreur reste cependant considérable d'autant que les bouleversements politiques et sociaux entraînent des changements rapides)

1. Patriarcat d'Antioche

Antioche est maintenant une petite ville turque de province qui compte sur 60'000 habitants environ 2'000 chrétiens byzantins-orthodoxes, avec un prêtre, le seul résidant à Antioche, quelques centaines de catholiques.

Voir ci-dessous les deux catholicat qui furent de la mouvance d'Antioche: Sis des Arméniens et Baylone des Chaldéens.

En 451, la plupart des fidèles de culture syriaque se séparent de la communauté byzantine en adoptant la terminologie dite monophysite condamnée par le Concile de Chalcédoine. Après l'invasion arabe, (639) les syriaques restés fidèles à la doctrine de Byzance se donnent leur propre patriarche (maronites). Dans la suite, un patriarche byzantin sera nommé par Byzance ou élu.

D'où trois patriarches d'Antioche: Un syrien dit monophysite, un maronite resté toujours de fait en communion avec Rome, un byzantin, qui suivra non sans répugnance Byzance lors de la rupture de 1054, et adoptera le rite byzantin, en langue grecque, puis syriaque, puis arabe.

Une partie des "Syriens" (en LTT2) puis des Byzantins (1724) entrent en communion avec Rome, avec leurs patriarches propres: autotal (5 patriarches d'Antioche: trois catholiques: Maronite, Syrien, Grec-catholique; un Grec-orthodoxe; un Syrien orthodoxe.

Nombre de fidèles sur le territoire du Patriarcat:

540'000 maronites (plus " ou 400'000 émigrés); 100'000 syriens; 250'000 grecs-catholiques (plus 150'000 émigrés); 350'000 grecs-orthodoxes (plus 200'000 émigrés); 100'000 syriens orthodoxes.

Catholicat arménien: Très tôt l'Eglise arménienne obtient son autonomie interne sous le primat d'un "catholicos" (délégué général). Elle se sépare de Byzance (et donc de Rome) après Chalcédoine. Un second "catholicos" s'établit à Etchmiadzine en 1444, Celui de Cilicie gardant la partie occidentale de l'Arménie. En 1740, une partie des Arméniens entre en communion avec Rome.

Les Arméniens-orthodoxes sont environ 300'000 répandus dans tout le Moyen Orient, Perse, Syrie, Liban surtout, (certains dépendent d'Etchmiadzine). Les catholiques sont environ 45'000 (Syrie et Liban).

Catholicat chaldéen. C'est à l'origine une délégation générale pour la Perse. Ils se séparent de Byzance après Ephèse (44") car ils

ils tiennent à deux personnalités dans le Christ. Nombreuses missions en Inde et en Chine, dont il reste l'importante communauté de Kérala (2'500'000 catholiques et 850'000 "orthodoxes").

Le patriarche de l'Eglise de l'Est (nestorien) est réfugié aux Etats Unis. Environ 200'000 catholiques, dits chaldéens (union depuis 1552) et 100'000 orthodoxes dits Nestoriens.

Répartition géographique: Syrie: Grecs-orthodoxes : 200'000 ; Grecs-catholiques 65'000 (en 5 diocèses). Arméniens orthodoxes : 120'000 ; arméniens catholiques 20'000 (en deux diocèses). Maronites 15'000 (2 vicariats patriarcaux). Chaldéens : 6'000 ; Nestoriens: 10'000.

Liban: Maronites : 515'000 (8 diocèses) ; Grecs-orthodoxes: 210'000 Grecs catholiques : 125'000 (7 diocèses) Syriens orthodoxes : quelques milliers. Syriens catholiques : 20'000 ; Arméniens orthodoxes : 100'000. Arméniens catholiques : 19'000. Chaldéens : 3000. Nestoriens : 2000 (?) Latins 14'000 (nombreux étrangers).

Iraq: Chaldéens : 170'000 ; Nestoriens : 50'000 (?) ; Syriens: catholiques : 30'000 (?) ; Syriens-orthodoxes : 15'000 (?) ; Arméniens-orthodoxes 15'000; Arméniens catholiques : 3'000. Latins : 4'000.

Perse: Nestoriens : 20'000 ; Chaldéens 12'000 (?) ; Arméniens orthodoxes : 50'000 (dépendant d'Etchmiadzine) ; Arméniens catholiques : 2'500. Latins : 7'000 (?).

2. Patriarcat de Jérusalem

Il fut créé pour honorer la ville sainte. Longtemps de rite antiochien (syriaque) il adopta le rite byzantin vers le XIII-XVème siècle. A leur arrivée les croisés installèrent un patriarche latin (1099) rétabli en 1847. Depuis le titulaire a toujours été un italien, comme le titulaire byzantin est toujours hellène. De plus, le patriarche grec-catholique d'Antioche joint toujours à son titre celui de Jérusalem.

Géographie: Territoire de Jordanie et d'Israël. Grecs-orthodoxes : 70 à 100'000 (tous de langue arabe) ; Grecs-catholiques 42'000 ; Latins : 48'000.

3. Patriarcat d'Alexandrie: Il venait tout de suite après Rome avant que Constantinople ne prenne cette place. Le patriarche a porté le titre de Papa peut-être avant l'Evêque de Rome (sans que cela n'engage de primauté).

Dioscore refusa d'accepter le Concile de Chalcédoine pour se séparer de Constantinople, la ville rivale, en 451. Mais un patriarche byzantin (toujours de langue grecque) continua à régir les fidèles "grecs-orthodoxes". Ceux qui suivirent Dioscore ont gardé le vieux nom d'Egyptiens sous sa forme de "copte".

Géographie: L'Egypte, avec de plus une Eglise importante en Ethiopie (8'000'000 de fidèles) devenue entièrement indépendante après la deuxième guerre mondiale).

Fidèles: Coptes orthodoxes : 6 millions, avec de nombreux diocèses. Coptes catholiques : 100'000 (4 diocèses); Grecs-ortho-

doxes: 35'000 Grecs-catholiques; 10'000 (dépendant du patriarche d'Antioche, qui porte aussi le titre d'Alexandrie).

Des communautés de tous les autres rites, en communion ou non avec Rome, dont le nombre de Fidèles ne dépasse guère 5'000 pour chacune, toutes avec leur hiérarchie propre. Elles diminuent constamment par l'émigration, seuls les coptes restant stables.

4. Brève synthèse:

Il y a au Proche-Orient des Eglises nationales, en général séparées de Rome, mais qui comptent toutes au moins une minorité en communion avec le Pape. L'Eglise maronite est même toute entière dans ce cas: la communion avec Rome fait partie de son essence historique.

Ces Eglises sont en général pour la pluralité, la territorialité, et l'égalité de toutes les Eglises.

L'Egypte est presque entièrement copte, l'Iraq presque entièrement chaldéen, le Liban surtout maronite.

Mais l'Eglise syrienne est très dispersée, L'Eglise arménienne de Sis, à la différence de celle d'Etchmiadzine, n'a guère que des regroupements peu nombreux dans la région d'Alep (Syrie du nord).

Il y a une Eglise grecque-orthodoxe dans chacun des trois patriarchats, et c'est d'elle que sont issus les patriarchats grecs-catholiques. Elle est dominante en Syrie et à Jérusalem.

Les "grecs" voient dualité Orient-Occident là où les autres voient pluralité. Dispersés, ils ne tiennent pas à la territorialité véritablement autochtone dans le patriarchat de Jérusalem, où à part le patriarche, deux évêques et la grande majorité des prêtres et des fidèles sont des Arabes. Comme Eglise internationale, ils s'opposent surtout aux Grecs, d'ailleurs seule présente ou presque sur leur territoire. Au contraire les Eglises nationales acceptent sans grande difficulté le caractère international de Jérusalem, sous un mode ou sous un autre.

En fait les "Grecs" sont presque les seuls en Jordanie-Palestine, et ils sont majoritaires en Syrie, qui est d'ailleurs un territoire uniquement confessionnel. Tous sont arabes. Mais dans tous ces pays, sauf au Liban, l'Islam reste la religion largement dominante, celle de 80 à 95% de la population. Le réseau inextricable des divisions chrétiennes est à la fois une source de complication, - dans le catholicisme et pour l'oecuménisme - de conservation, et repliement sur soi-même.

Mais aucun observateur objectif ne peut voir de solution, ni au problème à l'intérieur de l'Eglise catholique, ni au problème oecuménique. Il faut pourtant insister sur le fait peu connu de la grande crise du Vème siècle sur les deux natures ou les deux personnalités du Christ, qui servit de base à un mouvement nationaliste qui se sépara de l'empire Byzantin plutôt que de l'Eglise catholique comme telle. Par réaction, c'est au Concile de Chalcédoine (451) que le Patriarchat de Constantinople prit le titre de "Patriarchat oecuménique", contre lequel protestèrent non seulement les patriarchats nationaux d'Alexandrie et d'Antioche, mais encore celui de Rome. Pour les premiers, il s'en suivit une séparation immédiate et qui dure encore; avec Rome, les périodes de ruptures se multiplièrent jusqu'à la grande séparation de 1054.

n. 43 Conference of Mgr. Isaac GHATTAS
 Archbishop of Thebes
 (R.A.I.)

"The Schema on the Eastern Churches"

First of all I must state that I am going to speak essentially of the situation of the Church in my country, Egypt, and the situation of my Church, the Church of this country, which is the Cophtic Church.

You all know Egypt, the R.A.U., yet it would be useful to recall some figures: Egypt has about 27 million inhabitants, almost all grouped in the valley of the Nile and the Delta, with a density of more than 700 inhabitants per square km. of cultivable land; it is a country which has always had great unity since remote antiquity.

Of these 27 million inhabitants, the Cophtic Church has 6 million believers, almost all orthodox. The Cophts in communion with the Church of Rome number only about 100,000. There are other Catholic communities; the most important are of Byzantine rite, Maronite rite and Latin rite. Some of them number at present less than 10,000 members, and are constantly diminishing as a result of emigration. As for the orthodox of the Byzantine rite, who form a different Church, they are for the most part of hellenic origin and nationality. Their number, which was some tens of thousands, has considerably diminished, also as a result of emigration, and could be estimated at a maximum of 40,000.

The Cophts on the contrary emigrate very little; their Church is that of the ancient Tradition of Alexandria, that of Saint Mark of the great doctors of the Athanasian Church and Cyril, of the founders of monachism, Saint Paul, Saint Antony, Saint Pacome.

It is profoundly Egyptian, i.e. impregnated, since apostolic times, with the traditions of this country which has remained the centre of a great revival of the Arab world. We have seen that among the faithful, the Catholics are only a very small minority, less than 2%. It is also important to note the existence of communities of Copt-Protestants, who have some few thousand members. This explains that our main preoccupation in studying these propositions on the Eastern Churches has been ecumenism.

What does the Schema mean for us, from this point of view?

First of all good things, which I am happy to emphasize, for they are the proof of the very sincere good will of the commission, in spite of the negative aspects, of which I shall also have to speak. This positive aspect can be noticed above all in everything concerning the discipline of the sacraments, except in that concerning marriage, to which point I shall return. The schema offers great facilities for the "communicatio in sacris", participation in the same sacraments for the Catholics as for the Orthodox. This is a very important point, for it is the recognition in the facts of the validity of the sacramental order among our orthodox brothers. This shows that the division between us Cophts is neither of the faith, nor of the sacramental, but only of a juridical order. This separation was made in 451, at the

Council of Chalcedon, because of a dispute on words: Dioscore, Pope of Alexandria, in order to use the traditional term since that time, remained faithful to the vocabulary in use in his Church, that of Saint Cyril, doctor of the universal Church. He did not at all desire to have connections with Constantinople and Constantinople felt the same towards him. His vocabulary permits an accusation of monophysism and excluding him from the Catholic communion.

It is this separation which is taken today as based on a bad pretext. One recognizes here a dispute of individuals, and the individuals having changed, it no longer has a *raison d'être*.

Yet it is necessary that the cophtic Church rediscovers its place in the catholic communion. But it is also on this point that the rest of the schema seems to us to be very weak: In fact it must be clearly shown that the Eastern Churches have their place in the universal Church as integral members of catholicity. But to make a special schema for these Churches does not seem to us to be a good method. In spite of all the good will displayed, by placing these Churches en masse an appearance is given of tolerating them. We are placed apart, as being special churches.

But in the schema on the Church, it is justly shown that the universal Church is formed of special churches. It is here that our position lies, although the text has not dared to use the word patriarchate to designate us. But it suffices to put it. It appears that this schema on the Church has not been taken into account in general to frame that which concerns us. The text has been confined to the Eastern Churches, it has not been coordinated enough, perhaps because it was thought that in any case the East constituted a case apart. But we are not apart, and like an appendix to the Catholic Church; as Pope John XXIII said to all the Churches: "This house is your house, that of your Fathers". We are not an adventitious wing, joined on; we are at the origins of the Church.

Not only does one appear to have proved the need of adding a wing to an edifice which was constructed without us, but furthermore, only the catholic eastern Churches are put there. But it is the eastern Churches entirely which have their place to themselves in the catholic edifice, since apostolic times. By right the Eastern Churches are integral parts of the universal Church, in spite of the separation in fact. This is well illustrated in the schema on ecumenism. It is this which concerns us, not a schema apart which separates us from our orthodox brothers. With the orthodox Church we have in common the same prayer books because we find in them the same faith, including the doctrine of the two natures and including the primacy of Peter celebrated in lyric terms on the 5 Abib of our calendar, which is the old Egyptian calendar. It is why we wish to be able to celebrate again together not only Easter, but also the great festivals. We have in effect the same origins, the same customs, the same Fathers in faith. A schema apart on the Eastern Churches does not seem to take all this into account: instead of making bridges of us, it isolates us from our nearest brothers.

As we are regarded as being apart, one assumes without wishing to a paternal tone, and not a fraternal one: it is said for example that the Eastern Churches are all equal, because they are in like manner entrusted to the pastoral government of the Pontifical Sovereign. We are good Catholics and we believe in the doctrine of the Primacy. But it is not this which makes us equal; all the Churches, including the Latin Churches, are equal as integral parts of the one Church of Christ: the Pope recognizes, sanctions this equality; he does not create it.

As the Eastern Churches are advised to study their traditions well; they are told to take care of their Churches in order to fulfil their apostolic mission; they are conceded powers. Such are certain terms of the schema, which are not too frequent, yet which suffice to provoke annoyance:

On this subject, it is notably conceded to the Eastern bishops the right to exempt their subjects from the canonic form in the case of mixed marriages. This was certainly done with good intentions. But one speaks unceasingly of the respect of discipline peculiar to the Eastern Churches, since the Council confirms and commends it, why not adopt on this point this ancient discipline: for us, any mixed marriage blessed by an Eastern priest is valid, whether the priest is orthodox or catholic. It is this tradition, unfortunately interrupted by a simple administrative decree in 1949, in spite of our protestations, which we should like to see restored.

Moreover, the schema is very insufficient as concerns the patriarchates and the patriarchs.

We do not wish to speak here of the person of our venerated patriarchs; at the second session, Pope Paul VI realizing the injury done through them returned to them the traditional honours recognized since the first Council session. But what is more important than the honours, however legitimate they might be, is their *raison d'être*, i.e. the sense of the patriarchal institution in the Church.

For this one must speak of the apostolic origin of the patriarchates: they are the evidence of the apostolicity of the Church.

One must speak of their legitimate autonomy; it is the source of diversity, i.e. that it demonstrates the catholicity of the Church.

One must speak also of their role as bond of unity between the bishops of the same region; in their patriarchates, the patriarchs are the sign of the unity of the Church. As they testify also to this unity in the universal Church, it is normal that they form a part of the Senate of the Church which is still under discussion, that they have their place in the electoral college of the Pontifical Sovereign who is also the first of the patriarchs:

Yet none of these points appears in the schema which deals with certain juridical powers and above all places them only within an Eastern context, and not in their true place, in the universal Church. The patriarchates are regarded anonymously, as though their apostolic seats were not known, as though the patriarchates did not have territory.

It must be said on this point that the schema is extremely timid, doubtless because it did not want to take up a position in a very complicated problem, that of the multiplicity of jurisdictions on the same territory.

This problem being indeed very delicate, I repeat that I am speaking essentially with regard to Egypt; furthermore in this matter, one can at the moment do no more than make some assumptions. Should they still be made, or what has happened? In the schema on the Pastoral Care of the Bishops, the East was deliberately excluded from two essential principles:

1) It is necessary that a diocese be neither too large nor too small. It has been said that this principle was vague; it is however sufficient to incite prudent and progressive reforms. Too many dioceses in the East have less than 10,000 believers; most of the time it is a question of territory where there is already one, and often three or four other catholic bishops. I shall not enter into all the details, but I believe that it should be studied how to best apply this principle in the East and not condemn it to immobility.

2) It is recognized that in order to coordinate pastoral action, national episcopal conferences are necessary. But in the East, this is only recommended in a vague manner. The schema on the bishops refers to that on the Churches and the schema on the Eastern Churches remains just as vague. This would be ludicrous if it did not have to be expressed as the paralysis of the Church in the countries in full process of evolution, who are in need of unity and efficacy. Certainly one cannot suppress a certain multiplicity of jurisdiction. But this only makes a coordinated action more necessary. It is also necessary for the patriarchs to become again the principle of a regional unity, at least in the territories where this is possible without causing great trouble. The assumption must be made: the canonists and time will slowly bring this about.

Regional episcopal conferences must also be planned, given the interdependence in which the Arabian countries are living and their hopes of unity. There again one cannot remain in immobilism.

One question arises in conclusion: how to make these restorations and evolutions possible?

I believe that there is only one satisfying solution; it is that of suppressing the schema. In effect the schema on "the Church" has already recognized the legitimate diversity and the regrouping of dioceses into national or patriarchal ensembles. It would take very little to make everything in order on this subject and it is already satisfactory.

The schema on ecumenism, in Chapter III, deals very well with all the importance of the oriental traditions and advises a certain "communicatio in sacris". It is pointless to return to it here.

The schema on the pastoral care of the bishops needs only a few additions in order for the patriarchates and the necessary reforms in the East to be also well specified. It is in this way that the East appears as an integral part of the universal Church.

As for the more juridical clauses of the schema, they could be sent to the Commission for the revision of the Code. Otherwise the true autonomy of the patriarchs is recognized,

they must decide from now the concrete measures to be taken in agreement with the Pope if it is a matter of points important for the whole Church.

As for mixed marriages, their place is in the text concerning marriage; it is oriented in any case towards the solution which we consider normal, as well as many others.

Another solution exists, halting, in our opinion, which consists in profoundly amending the schema in order to eliminate from it everything which seems to make the Eastern Churches strangers and minors. But this leaves the true question unanswered: Are the Eastern Churches, or are they not, regarded as an integral part of the catholic Church? If the answer is yes, their traditions should impregnate all the theology, all the schemas of the Council and not just one special schema. That which we ask ^{of} the bishops of the Council and also of public opinion, is to understand our real problems. Everywhere we have encountered very great sympathy; but our problems are complex. We wish to be able to return home and say to our faithful, to our orthodox brothers: the Eastern tradition now has its true place in the catholic Church; your patriarchs are surrounded by ^{the} respect of all; they will be your representatives to the Pope, they truly have their role in the Church, and not only purely formal honours.

For this we count on the sympathy of all, on the Holy Spirit also which guides the Council through difficulties. But we know that it is working through men and that it why we thought it necessary to act and to speak.

