

# Many Mansions: East and West in the Roman Catholic Communion

Paul E. Bumbar

## Scope of the Chapter

This chapter looks at what is commonly called the *Roman Catholic Church*.<sup>1</sup> It gives an overview of the 19 Eastern Catholic Churches currently within the *Roman Catholic communion* of Churches,<sup>2</sup> along with their sometimes troubled place and role within this communion. Ecclesiology, church structure and functioning are the chapter's salient points. It is written for those interested in examining and addressing issues in the internal and external functioning of religious bodies.

It also is written for those with little or no knowledge of the Eastern Catholic Churches, which includes most Latin Catholics within the Roman Catholic Church; "Even after Vatican II and papal conclaves with . . . (Eastern) hierarchs in public view, most Roman Catholics still regard Eastern Catholic Churches as alien" (Manschreck, 1985, p. 93). They may also be wary of "Greeks bearing gifts." This lack of knowledge or hesitancy about Eastern Churches is generally even truer for individuals who do not belong to the Roman Catholic Church.<sup>3</sup> Hopefully, this chapter might lessen some of the confusion and parochialism related to Eastern Catholic Churches, by pointing out differences within the universal ("catholic") Church. In

---

P.E. Bumbar (✉)  
Dominican College, Blauvelt, NY, USA  
e-mail: durbar2@aol.com; glopeb@aol.com

<sup>1</sup>In this chapter, *Roman Catholic Church* always means the totality of *all* the Churches, anywhere, who are in full ecclesiastical communion with the *Church of Rome*. The Church of Rome, also called the *Roman Church* or *Latin-rite Church*, is the Church that is headed by the Bishop of Rome, who is also the Pope. The *Roman Catholic Church* currently includes 20 Churches; the Church of Rome plus 19 Eastern Catholic Churches.

<sup>2</sup>The *Roman Catholic communion of Churches* signifies the same reality as *Roman Catholic Church*; i.e., 20 Churches. The word *communion* is used to emphasize the plurality and interdependence of these Churches.

<sup>3</sup>The exceptions to this might be persons living in countries where a particular Church originated or is officially recognized; e.g., in Lebanon, whose constitution requires the president of the country to be a Maronite Catholic (cf. Roberson, 1999).

every age, conflicts and wars have been waged in the name of religion. It, therefore, seems worth the effort to remind religious educators that religious thought and practices can differ even within an apparently “monolithic” religious body like the Roman Catholic Church; that differences need not mean separation, but they cannot be ignored.

I will clarify certain issues so that a clearer, more multifaceted and complete image of the Roman Catholic Church can be developed by the reader. Just as a complete image can be reproduced from any part of a hologram, I trust the reader will come to see the total Church as present in a unique and irreplaceable way in each of the Churches in the Roman Catholic Church – in each of the 19 Eastern Churches as well as in the “Western Church,” the Church of Rome.<sup>4</sup> Mention will be made of some individual Eastern Churches to illustrate certain points, but most references will be brief, only by way of illustration, and will reflect the author’s Byzantine Rite and Ukrainian Church background. Readers wishing more in-depth information on any one or all Eastern Churches should consult works listed in the Reference section, especially the comprehensive books of Roberson (1999) and Saato (2006).

To critically examine and to constructively engage in dialogue, mutually understood words are essential. This chapter will explain those that might be unfamiliar (e.g., autocephalous, autonomous, eparchy, *sui iuris*) and others – like church, catholic, and orthodox – are familiar, but will be defined more specifically. With an accepted and commonly understood vocabulary, it should become easier and less confusing to address issues that divide the communities within and outside of the Roman Catholic Church. May this chapter aid in this endeavor.

## Introduction

As someone ordained a priest in the Ukrainian Catholic Church, I always have been familiar with “Eastern” Christianity. I did not realize, however, how narrow and unecumenical my perspective was until 1997, on my first visit to the homeland of all my grandparents.

One Sunday in Kyiv,<sup>5</sup> four of us were trying to find a Ukrainian Catholic church for worship. I asked a cab driver to take us to a Catholic church. He took us to a Latin-rite Catholic church. I finally remembered we were in a predominantly Orthodox country where “Catholic church” would mean “Latin-rite church” for most, so I asked a nun who was there, “Where is (a/the) *Ukrainian* Catholic church?” She was not sure, but explained where she thought Ukrainian

---

<sup>4</sup>Similarly, St. Cyprian of Carthage (d. 258) wrote: “The episcopate is a single whole, in which each bishop enjoys full possession. So is the Church a single whole. . . . There are . . . many *episcopi* . . . but only one episcopate.” (*On the Unity of the Church*, 5, in Ware, 1997, p. 14).

<sup>5</sup>Usually spelled Kiev, but *Kyiv* (pronounced “Kî -yiv”) is the more correct transliteration of the city – named after the Scandinavian Prince Kyi – and is now commonly used by native Ukrainians when writing in English.

Catholics had temporary use of a church.<sup>6</sup> We went there and saw a church with Byzantine mosaics, onion-shaped domes, and three-barred crosses – evidently not Latin-rite. I approached an old lady outside and asked, “Is this church Catholic?” “Yes,” she replied emphatically. With grateful thanks we entered the church. It was packed – worshippers standing in the nave and deacons before a ceiling-high icon screen, with the priests enclosed in the sanctuary while the choir was singing in Ukrainian and incense filled the interior, all aglow from candles in front of myriad icons. We were late for our Sunday Liturgy, but we had finally found our Ukrainian Catholic Church!

Or, so I thought. When I heard prayers for the Patriarch of Moscow, I realized we were in an Orthodox Church! The old lady had not misled us, but had said “catholic” with a small *c* – as in the “one, holy, catholic, and apostolic” of the Nicene Creed. We were not where we had wanted to go, but we felt comfortable and stayed to fully participate in the celebration of the Liturgy. It was one of the memorable events of our trip.

This story is worth remembering for a number of reasons, all related to this chapter:

- (1) It is easy to be parochial when talking about *church* (cf., me)
- (2) *Catholic* for most people means “Latin-rite Catholic” (cf., the cab driver);
- (3) Not all Catholics are fully aware of the Eastern Catholic Churches (cf., the nun);
- (4) Roman Catholics do not own the word “catholic” (cf., the Orthodox lady); and,
- (5) Eastern Catholic and Orthodox Churches are very similar (cf. our Sunday Divine Liturgy).

With this in mind, we will look at: (1) the meaning of *catholic*; (2) *church* and *churches*; and, (3) the Eastern Catholic Churches and their connection with the Orthodox Churches.

All these issues are viewed within the context of the current position of the Church of Rome, which affects the structure, governance, decision making, and functioning of virtually everything in the Roman Catholic communion; most specifically, the status and function of the Eastern Catholic Churches as well as relationships with other religious bodies. In addition to being an overview of the Eastern Catholic Churches, therefore, this chapter is also an “apologia,” a defense of these Churches and a critique of their status in the Roman Catholic communion. Worldwide, Eastern Catholics number not quite 17,000,000 – less than 2% of the entire Roman Catholic Church. As smaller ecclesial communities, they have had to assert their position in the face of an historically preponderant influence and authority; that is, the hegemony of the Roman (or “Latin Rite”) Church. In examining their

---

<sup>6</sup>After the fall of the Soviet Union and re-emergence of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church in 1989, property settlements were still being worked out between Catholics and Orthodox, to whom all church property had been given when the Soviets outlawed Catholicism in 1945.

situation and status, we are reminded of the important role religious educators have in addressing and correcting such hegemony in any religious body.

Let us begin with thoughts on *catholic*, *church* and *churches*.

## Meanings of “Catholic”

As the reader probably knows, the Greek word “katholikos” means “universal,” or “general.”

Quite simply, therefore, the “catholic” Church” means the “universal” Church – the Church as holding one and the same faith everywhere, no matter where it exists.

The first recorded use of the term “the catholic church” (ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία) is in a letter written by Ignatius of Antioch,<sup>7</sup> between 105 and 135. He warned the faithful against heresies, and to remain steadfast in the faith and to the earthly, “universal” church – which he compared to the heavenly (and, therefore, universal) kingdom (*Letter to the Smyrnaeans*, 8:2, in Drobner, 2007, p. 50). Other writers in the early Church subsequently adopted the term “catholic” and its use grew.

By the fourth century, as dispute and division arose in the Church, “catholic” became “Catholic,” that is, a way of identifying the communion of those Churches that followed the universally and generally accepted faith, *and were not heretical or schismatic*. At the same time, however, the Churches that had “separated” continued to use the term “catholic” in speaking of themselves. The initial communion of unified Churches had fragmented, and now witnessed the rise of “separated” church communities. Some of these remained in communion with one another, and some did not, but most continued to call themselves “catholic” in one sense or another.

The difference between “catholic” and “Catholic” that began so early on continues today. Not to oversimplify, how one uses “catholic” is often a question of capitalization. Remember the old lady in Kyiv? She said the church was “catholic” – just as she, an Orthodox Christian, would say every time she recited the Nicene Creed.<sup>8</sup> The adjective “catholic” is also used by Churches other than the Orthodox; e.g., Anglican and Lutheran. And to further complicate the matter, there are some “non-Rome-affiliated” Churches that use “Catholic” (capitalized) in their official names; e.g., the Old Catholic Church, the Anglican Catholic Church, the American Catholic Church, or the Independent Catholic Church of Ceylon. To differentiate themselves, these and other Churches that use “catholic” will often use “Roman Catholic” when speaking of Churches in communion with Rome.

Given the history and the ambiguity of “catholic,” we should not ambiguously or carelessly use the word, capitalized or not, especially in the age of ecumenism. Someone who says “Catholic Church” (to mean the communion of all the Christian

<sup>7</sup>St. Ignatius was St. Peter’s successor as bishop of Antioch (present day Antakya, in southeastern Turkey) and was writing to Christians in Smyrna (present day Izmir, in western Turkey).

<sup>8</sup>It is ironic that something similar occurs during the Ukrainian Catholic Divine Liturgy when the congregation is addressed by the presider as “all you orthodox Christians.”

Churches united with the bishop of Rome) would be better off saying “Roman Catholic Church” – so as not to offend or discount other Christian Churches that use the term “catholic.” Moreover, the Catholic (“universal”) Church is more than the particular Church that was founded in Rome in the first century. Persons, therefore, who say “Roman Catholic Church,” but really mean members of that particular Church founded in Rome, would do better by calling it “the Church of Rome,” “the Roman Church,” or even “the Latin-rite Church.”<sup>9</sup> In doing so, they do not discount the 19 other Catholic Churches who are part of the Roman Catholic Church communion. In discussions about church matters within the Roman Catholic Church, it is quite natural and correct to say “the Catholic Church,” or, as is usually done, simply “the Church”; however, when Catholics address persons from other religious groups, most especially those of a Church that uses “Catholic” in its official name (e.g., the Old Catholic Church) I think it is more proper to say “the *Roman Catholic Church*.” Finally, either with co-religionists or with “outsiders,” if I am speaking of one particular Church in the Roman Catholic communion, I should name the specific Church; e.g., the Ukrainian Catholic Church, the Maronite Catholic Church, the Latin-rite Church.

Having said this, I hasten to add that the Eastern Catholic Churches do not use the adjective “Roman” when naming themselves, preferring instead either “Greek” (e.g., the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church) or “Byzantine” (e.g., the Hungarian Byzantine Catholic Church), or simply the name of their particular Church (e.g., the Chaldean Catholic Church). All these Churches, however, are united, “in communion,” with the Church of Rome. They are in the “Roman Catholic communion of Churches,” and, therefore, to this extent, and this extent only, they can be called “Roman Catholic.”

A distinction must be made if one is to use this terminology, It must be accepted that “Roman Catholic” and “Roman Church” are not equivalent terms; not all Roman Catholics belong to the Church of Rome (i.e., the Roman Church); many other Roman Catholics belong to one of the 19 other Churches, but do not use “Roman” – mainly because that term is too often identified with the Roman Church (the ruling hegemony). Eastern Catholic Churches do not want to be identified with, or considered a subset of, the Church of Rome (the Roman Church). They are, and wish to be seen as, autonomous, independent Churches within the Roman Catholic communion.

I realize that in saying this, I swim against the tide of popular expression, the practice of many writers (e.g., McBrien, 1994) and, possibly, some Eastern Catholic Churches. I use the term “Roman Church” to mean the “Latin-rite” Church, as well as the other rites that stem from it; the Ambrosian, Mozarabic, Bragan, Carthusian,

---

<sup>9</sup>In this chapter, “Church of Rome,” “Roman Church,” and “Latin-rite Church” mean the same thing; that is, the Church founded in Rome that has its own particular practices – most notably, its Latin liturgy (hence the term, Latin Rite) which spread into Europe and throughout the world.

Dominican, and Carmelite rites.<sup>10</sup> I use “Roman Catholic Church” to designate the communion of *all the 20 Catholic Churches* of the East and West. Qualifying “Catholic” with “Roman” affirms the unity of all these Churches with the Church of Rome, and implicitly acknowledges that other Churches have a right to, and do, call themselves *Catholic* or *catholic*.

## Church and Churches

In the Gospel of John (14.2) Jesus tells his disciples, “In my Father’s house, there are *many mansions*.”<sup>11</sup> This passage suggests that the Church of Christ, the “ekklēsia” or “gathering of the called-out ones” is meant to be a place where different peoples will be at home. At the first Pentecost, sundry people hear the Gospel in their own language (cf. Acts 2.5–11). Jesus says that those saved will be “. . .from east and west, and from north and south. . .at table in the kingdom of God” (Lk. 13:29), and St. Paul, that all are part of the new dispensation (Gal. 3, 28). In trying to explain and express the Gospel message to different peoples, the early Church adopted and adapted many different concepts, symbols, and languages while maintaining the “catholic” (universally the same) faith. Many mansions arose in the Father’s house.<sup>12</sup>

Continuing throughout its history, the Roman Catholic Church recognized value in the voices of the various Churches. Periodically, this came in the form of papal pronouncements; for example: in 1894, Leo XIII in *Orientalium Dignitas*, “On the Churches of the East”; in 1917, Benedict XV establishing the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church (Saato, 2006, pp. 37–38). John Paul II, in *Orientalis Lumen*, “Light of the East” (1995) said he looked forward to the Catholic Church breathing with “both lungs.”<sup>13</sup> Some popes have made clear the important status of the Eastern Churches in the Catholic Church.

Of equal importance to any papal pronouncements are the decrees of ecumenical councils – in this case, the Second Vatican Council.<sup>14</sup> Vatican II reaffirmed the validity and value of the Eastern Catholic Churches in three of its documents: (a) the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church (*Lumen Gentium*) says that “individual churches . . . in union with the Pope” constitute the universal or Catholic Church (no. 23); (b) the Decree on Catholic Eastern Churches (*Orientalium Ecclesiarum*) asserts the equality of these Churches within the Catholic Church; and, (c) the

---

<sup>10</sup>All these rites are not “churches” in the strict sense. They do not have, for example, their own Code of Canon Law or distinctive theology. They differ from the Roman Church only in some of their *ritual* practices; the Mass, or the Hours.

<sup>11</sup>Or “dwelling places” or “rooms” – depending on one’s translation of ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς μου *μοναί* *πολλά* *εἰσιν*.

<sup>12</sup>For an in-depth exploration of the early history and development of doctrine and Church teaching, cf. Drobner, 2007.

<sup>13</sup>One of the lungs, it should be noted, is really 19 other lungs; they are not all alike.

<sup>14</sup>The references to the documents of Vatican II are taken from Abbott (1966.)

Decree on Ecumenism (*Unitatis Redintegratio*) affirms the role of the Eastern Churches in ecumenical efforts with the Orthodox.

Thus, not only popes, but all the bishops of the Roman Catholic Church officially recognize and affirm the multiplicity of its Churches and their place within the universal Church. The matter was well put at the 1997 Synod for the Americas by Stephen Kocisko, the Byzantine Catholic Metropolitan of Pittsburgh: “The universal Church is, in fact, *a communion of Churches* (emphasis added) with their own theology, liturgy, spirituality and discipline which do not contradict but complement one another” (as cited in Saato, 2006, p. xiii).

This notion of a “communion of churches” is at the heart of the matter we are addressing. The individual Churches of the West and the East in the Roman Catholic Church all have their own integrity and value. Regardless of their size, they do not exist in a symbiotic but in a synergistic relationship; that is, they do not live off of one another, but they live – and grow – with one another. Each individual Church has a unique way of professing the Gospel message. If one traces the origins of any of these Churches, one sees that their distinctive elements (theology, liturgy, spirituality, and discipline)<sup>15</sup> grew out of the “variety of natural gifts and conditions of life” (Vatican II: *Decree on Ecumenism*, Art. 14, in Abbott, 1966) of its people and place. They are “autochthonous,” that is, formed of the earth where found. Each brings its “home grown” riches in theology, liturgy, spirituality, and discipline to the universal Church. In so doing, the entire Church communion is enriched. At the same time, these individual Churches can be strengthened by having their gifts welcomed, affirmed, and appreciated by the others. The association does not result in a homogenization of the Churches, a melting pot, but, rather, a mosaic wherein each distinctive piece adds to the beauty of the whole, and is enhanced – like a precious stone in a setting – by being part of the whole. With this in mind, let us now look at the different Churches in this Roman Catholic communion.

## The Eastern Catholic Churches: A Brief History

The history of the Churches in the Roman Catholic communion is lengthy, elaborate and, may it be said, often byzantine.<sup>16</sup> Despite centuries of unity in the “katholike ekklesia,” dissension in the Church (disputes, heresies, schisms) and

---

<sup>15</sup>According to the Decree on Eastern Catholic Churches, Art. 3; and the Decree on Ecumenism, Art. 15, 16, 17 (Abbott, 1966), these are the distinguishing characteristics by which a particular grouping is recognized as an “autonomous church.”

<sup>16</sup>The reader with an historical interest is referred to Chapter 1, “A Bit of History,” in Saato (2006), and to the work of Roberson (1999), which, although subtitled “A Brief Survey,” provides extensive histories of 19 Catholic and 39 Orthodox Eastern Churches. A concise and comprehensive history of the Ukrainian Church – how it was Catholic, became Orthodox, and is now both Catholic and Orthodox – is given in La Civita (2007). Such is the history of many Eastern Churches; the Great Schism of 1054 took most of them into the Orthodox communion, but, at various times, some Churches, at least parts of them, “re-entered” the Roman communion.

political events (wars, the rise and fall of emperors) brought divisions. The fragmentation of the universal Church, like the shifting of tectonic plates, was barely perceptible – until punctuated by episodic cataclysms. Beginning in the fifth century with the Assyrian Church of the East, some Churches left the communion because of differences over pronouncements of the early ecumenical councils. The Eastern and Western sides of the “katholike ekklesia,” however, managed to exist (sometimes contentiously) until 1054, when the Patriarch of Constantinople and the Papal legate mutually excommunicated one another and their respective followers. The breach was widened qualitatively and quantitatively during the fourth crusade when western troops sacked Constantinople in 1204. The subsequent resentment and outrage that the East felt toward the West cemented the fault lines, and has remained part of its collective memory.

An attempt to foster reunion was made 70 years after the sack of Constantinople, at the Second Council of Lyons in 1274. The reunion officially lasted only 14 years – mostly because of civil and ecclesiastical politics, but also in part because of doctrinal differences; e.g., the *filioque* controversy.<sup>17</sup> The separation and drifting apart continued, and another attempt at reunion between East and West was made at the Council of Ferrara – Florence (1438–1439). It addressed mostly theological issues: the *filioque* (again), the teaching on purgatory, leavened versus unleavened bread in the Eucharist, and the nature and scope of the pope’s authority. Agreement was reached and a reunion between the two Churches was declared; however, this one was even briefer than the one at Lyons 165 years earlier – not even long enough for some of the Greek delegates to get back home. Some groups from the Armenian, Coptic, and Syrian Churches, however, did remain in communion with Rome (cf. Holmes & Bickers, 1983, p. 115 f.). Many at the time did not, but over subsequent centuries, individual Churches reestablished their communion with the Church of Rome, beginning with the Ruthenian (Ukrainian) Church 156 years after the council of Florence, continuing throughout the centuries and into more recent times with the Syro-Malankara Church in 1930.

Reunion with the Church of Rome to some extent has always hinged upon resolution of theological and liturgical differences. The *filioque* question raised at Florence was again revisited when the Ruthenian (Ukrainian) Church explored reunion with Rome. The Union of Brest, signed in 1595 after years of discussions, resulted in an agreement that the Ruthenian Church would not be compelled to use the *filioque* phrase in the recitation of the Creed, and would retain its liturgical practices, church calendar, and ecclesiastical privileges. Such theological and liturgical agreement, however, did not suffice. The original impetus for reunion had been to restore the spiritual and moral integrity of the Ruthenian Church, and union with Rome

---

<sup>17</sup>In 1014, after centuries of papal resistance to inserting “and the Son” after “I believe in the Holy Spirit who proceeds from the Father. . .” in the Nicea-Constantinopolitan Creed, it was used at a papal Mass and entered the Latin liturgy with “assumed . . . sanction of the papacy” (USCCB, 2003, Part II, p. 18). The Eastern Churches regarded this as contrary to the decrees of the ecumenical council and, therefore, inadmissible. It came up in 1054 during the disputes between Constantinople and Rome and contributed to the eventual schism.



was seen as the means to this end.<sup>18</sup> In the minds of some Ruthenian bishops and faithful, however, reunion was seen as subservience to Rome and a loss of their Eastern tradition and their autonomy. They, therefore, repudiated the Union and remained united with the (Orthodox) Patriarch of Constantinople. What ultimately sabotaged the Union of Brest had to do with ecclesiology, with church governance, not theology.

It must be briefly mentioned (but always remembered) that many of the disputes and subsequent division between Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism relate to how the Church is governed. After the schism in 1054, the Church of Rome understandably gravitated toward “keeping its own house in order.” Popes began asserting authority not only over local churches in the West, but also those in the East, claiming a universal jurisdiction that went beyond the “primacy of honor” which the East had always granted the Church of Rome because of its association with the Apostle Peter.<sup>19</sup> For the Eastern Churches, before and after schism, even though the bishop of a particular church (even that of Rome) may have a primacy of honor vis-à-vis other bishops, that bishop “still remains primarily bishop of a local Church” (Saato, 2006, p. 156).<sup>20</sup>

Papal actions and pronouncements that contradicted this principle of the jurisdiction local bishop furthered the separation between the East and West, and continue even today. Many Orthodox will say: “It is not history, but ecclesiology that ‘really’ divides us” (Morbey, 2001, p. 5) and view with misgiving the Eastern Catholic Churches in union with Rome. They say, in effect, that the Eastern Catholic Churches should either join the Roman Church (i.e., become “Latin”) or assert their genuine Eastern traditions and become “Orthodox,” as some have done. Others, however, have chosen to be in communion with the Church of Rome. Let us look more closely now at who those are.

## The Eastern Catholic Churches

Whatever the reasons for division, after the definitive break between East and West in 1054/1240 and over the course of centuries, most of the separated Eastern Churches, or parts of them, reestablished – sometimes more than once – their

---

<sup>18</sup>In 1577, Peter Skarga, a Polish Jesuit, published a famous and very influential work, *O jedności kościoła bożego pod jednym pasterzem*, “The Unity of God’s Church under One Pastor” (Warzeski, 1971).

<sup>19</sup>The fifteenth century “conciliar movement” indicates that, even in the West, many were wary of papal authority that claimed to supersede the authority of an ecumenical council. The conciliar movement stalled, however, and papal authority grew.

<sup>20</sup>In this regard, it is worth noting that when a Pope gives a solemn blessing (e.g., at Easter, or Christmas) it is “urbi et orbi”; that is, first to the city of Rome (“urbi”) of which he first is the Bishop, and *then* to the worldwide faithful (“orbi”).

communion with the Church of Rome.<sup>21</sup> These Eastern Churches that are in communion with the Church of Rome are listed each year in the *Annuario Pontificio* (the “Pontifical Yearbook” published by the Vatican).<sup>22</sup>

Currently, according to the 2008 *Annuario*, there are 19 Eastern Catholic Churches in union with the Church of Rome (Roberson, 2008). The *Annuario* as well as the Vatican II *Decree on Eastern Catholic Churches* and the *Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches* speak of them as *sui iuris* Churches; that is, Churches “of one’s own right/law,” or “of a particular nature.” This means that they have their own particular liturgy, theology, spirituality, and code of law that sets them apart. Another term applied to all of these Churches, and used interchangeably with *sui iuris*, is “autonomous,” meaning that they have their “own laws,” different from the Code of Canon Law governing the Western Church.<sup>23</sup> The Western Church (of Rome), the largest *sui iuris* Church, and the other 19 *sui iuris* Eastern Churches comprise the Roman Catholic communion of Churches.

A *sui iuris* Church has its own chief hierarchy, who will use the title of Patriarch, Major Archbishop, Metropolitan, or (Arch)Bishop, as history and ecclesial rulings allow. For example, the head of the Church of Rome is also called “Patriarch of the West,”<sup>24</sup> and there are six other patriarchs in the Roman Catholic communion: the Armenian, Chaldean, Coptic, Maronite, Melkite, and Syrian Churches. The head of the Romanian Greek Catholic Church has a title just below a patriarch – that of Major Archbishop – as do the heads of the Syro-Malabar, Syro-Malankara, and Ukrainian Greek Catholic Churches. “Metropolitan” is the title for the heads of the Ethiopian/Eritrean and the Ruthenian Byzantine Catholic Churches. Other Churches use Archbishop or Bishop to designate their hierarchy. As previously mentioned, the actual title of the head of a particular Church depends on any one or more of number of factors; antiquity, history, political importance, number of faithful, size. Regardless of the title of its head hierarchy, each *sui iuris* Church has the right to govern itself.

The following listing (Table 1) gives a picture of the 19 Eastern Catholic *sui iuris* Churches – their official names, number of faithful, relative size, and their ecclesiastical jurisdictions. Note that they are not as far-flung as the Church of Rome

---

<sup>21</sup>Until fairly recently, these re-united Churches were called “Uniate Churches,” but since “uniate” has also a pejorative meaning, it is no longer used in ecumenical circles. It should be noted that the Maronite Catholic Church and the Italo-Albanian Byzantine Catholic Churches were always in communion with Rome; i.e., they never had to “re-unite.”

<sup>22</sup>The *Annuario* is the “official” list of the Eastern Churches in communion with the Apostolic See, and is the one used in this chapter. Other sources may have different numbers, listings, or names.

<sup>23</sup>“Autocephalous” – meaning, “its own head” – is a designation used only by the Orthodox for a Church that is self-governing and independent of any other authority; e.g., the Council of Ephesus (431) declared the Church of Cyprus autocephalous, independent of Constantinople.

<sup>24</sup>This is the title the Orthodox Churches prefer, and use, when speaking of the Bishop of Rome, the “Pope.” It is also worth noting that the Coptic Orthodox Church of Alexandria assigns the title “Pope of Alexandria and Patriarch of All Africa” to its head hierarchy.

**Table 1** Autonomous (*sui iuris*) Catholic Churches (cf. *Annuario Pontificio* as cited in Roberson, 2008)

"The Church" <sup>a</sup>	# Members (Rounded off)	% of Eastern Catholics	Number of Jurisdictions <sup>b</sup>	Locations of the Jurisdictions
1. Albanian Byzantine Catholic	3,600	<1	01	Southern Albania
2. <b>ARMENIAN CATHOLIC</b>	539,800	03	17	Armenia Lebanon, Iraq, Iran, Egypt, Syria, Turkey, Amman/Jerusalem, Ukraine, France, Greece, Latin America/Mexico, Buenos Aires, Romania, USA/Canada
3. Bulgarian Byzantine Catholic	10,000	<1	01	Bulgaria
4. <b>CHALDEAN CATHOLIC</b>	452,500	3	21	Iraq, Iran, Jordan, Lebanon, Egypt, Turkey, USA, Australia
5. <b>COPTIC CATHOLIC</b>	163,900	01	07	Egypt
6. <b>Ethiopian/Eritrean Catholic</b>	208,100	01	06	Ethiopia, Eritrea
7. Greek Byzantine Catholic	2,300	<1	02	Greece, Turkey
8. Hungarian Byzantine Catholic	290,000	02	02	Hungary
9. Italo-Albanian Byzantine Cath.	61,600	<1	03	Italy, Sicily
10. <b>MARONITE CATHOLIC</b>	3,090,500	18	26	Lebanon, Cyprus, Jordan, Israel, Palestine, Egypt, Syria, Argentina, Brazil, USA, Australia, Canada, Mexico
11. <b>MELKITE GREEK CATHOLIC</b>	1,597,300	09	25	Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, Israel, Jerusalem, Brazil, USA, Canada, Mexico, Iraq, Egypt/Sudan, Kuwait, Australia, Venezuela, Argentina
12. <b>Romanian Greek Catholic</b>	776,500	05	06	Romania, USA
13. <b>Ruthenian Byzantine Catholic</b>	646,600	04	06	USA, Ukraine, Czech Republic
14. Slovak Greek Catholic	246,000	01	03	Slovakia, Canada
15. <b>SYRIAN CATHOLIC</b>	161,800	01	14	Lebanon, Iraq, Jordan, Egypt, Sudan, Syria, Turkey, USA, Venezuela
16. <b>Syro-Malabar Catholic</b>	3,947,400	23	27	India, USA
17. <b>Syro-Malankara Catholic</b>	413,500	02	06	India
18. <b>Ukrainian Greek Catholic</b>	4,284,000	25	29	Ukraine, Poland, USA, Canada, Great Britain, Germany/Scandinavia, France, Brazil, Argentina, Australia
19. "Yugoslavian" Greek Catholic	59,200	<1	03	Croatia, Serbia/Montenegro, Macedonia
Totals	16,954,600	98% (+5 <1%)	205	

<sup>a</sup>Six of 19 *sui iuris* Eastern Churches are **PATRIARCHAL**, four are **Major Archiepiscopal**, and two are **Metropolitan**.

<sup>b</sup>The jurisdictions: are either an **Archeparchy** or **Eparchy** (like a "diocese" and can be Patriarchal, Major, Metropolitan, or regular); some, an **Exarchate** (like a "vicariate" and either Patriarchal, Archiepiscopal, or Apostolic); four, a **Patriarchal Dependency**; three, an **Ordinary**; one, a **Territorial Abbey**; and one, an **Apostolic Administration**.

in terms of their jurisdictions. They are more tied to their countries of origin and destinations for their emigrants.

The major differences between patriarchal, major archiepiscopal, and metropolitan Churches rest largely on the autonomy a particular Church has in selecting its head: (a) in a patriarchal Church, the bishops (eparchs) elect their patriarch and let the Church of Rome know who was elected; (b) in a major archiepiscopal Church the name of the one elected is submitted for Rome's approval; and, (c) in a metropolitan Church, Rome selects one name from a list of three nominated by the Church.

Eastern Catholic Churches also use slightly different terms to define ecclesiastical jurisdictions. What in the West is a *diocese* is in the East an *eparchy* (or *archeparchy*, depending on size and status). An Eastern Catholic *exarchy* corresponds roughly to a *vicariate* or *ordinariate* in the West.

In defining *Churches*, there is one more distinguishing characteristic; that of *rite*. In the past, Churches were often referred to as "rites"; the Latin-rite<sup>25</sup> and the Eastern rites (Armenian, Coptic, Ukrainian, etc.). This use of *rite* focused largely on the liturgy and rituals of a church – visible elements that distinguished one Church from another. The term *rite* is still used, but it is now used to define groupings of the particular Churches.

According to the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*: "The liturgical traditions or rites presently in use in the Church are the Latin . . . and the Byzantine, Alexandrian or Coptic, Syriac, Armenian, Maronite and Chaldean rites" (John Paul II, 1992, n. 1203); that is, one in the West, and six in the East. These groupings into "traditions" or "rites" are based on ". . .the liturgical, theological, spiritual and disciplinary patrimony, culture and circumstances of history of a distinct people, by which its own manner of living the faith is manifested in each autonomous (*sui iuris*) Church" (Canon 28 of *Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*; also, Vatican II, *Decree on Eastern Catholic Churches*, art. 3). The most salient factors for the groupings of the *rites* and the particular Churches today are: (a) liturgy, (b) theology, (c) spirituality, and (d) canonical discipline. It is worth noting that this same Canon 28 goes on to group the Eastern rites treated in the Code into but five traditions, rather than the six enumerated in the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, which lists the Maronite Rite separately. The Eastern Code, places the Maronites in the Antiochene ("Syrian" in the *Catechism*) Rite. This results in five "Eastern rites": Alexandrian, Antiochene (or Syrian), Armenian Chaldean, and Constantinopolitan ("Byzantine" in the *Catechism*). The 19 Eastern Catholic Churches listed in the 2008 *Annuario Pontificio* can be grouped into these five rites, as follows (Table 2):

These 19 *sui iuris* Eastern Churches, grouped into the five "rites," have, by and large, existed from the very beginnings of the Christian Church. In fact, as the reader may have noticed, some of them antedate the Church of Rome. Seniority,

---

<sup>25</sup>Pope Pius V (1566–1572) "imposed the liturgical rite of Rome on the Latin (Western) Church, in response to the confusion that preceded the Protestant Reformation" (Zagano, 2006), but there still are six other liturgical rites under the patriarchate of the Bishop of Rome; i.e., Ambrosian (in Milan), Mozarabic (in Toledo), Bragan (in Portugal), and in the Dominican, Carthusian and Carmelite Religious Orders.

**Table 2** The Eastern rites and the *Sui Iuris* Eastern Catholic Churches

Tradition/rite	The 19 Autonomous Eastern Churches	
1. Alexandrian	Coptic, Ethiopian/Eritrean	(n = 2)
2. Antiochene	Maronite, Syrian, Syro-Malankara	(n = 3)
3. Armenian	Armenian	(n = 1)
4. Chaldean	Chaldean, Syro-Malabar	(n = 2)
5. Constantinopolitan	Albanian, Bulgarian, Greek, Hungarian, Italo-Albanian, Melkite, Romanian, Ruthenian, Slovak, Ukrainian, “Yugoslavian”	(n = 11)

however, does not always mean authority or influence, and all the Eastern Catholic Churches have to contend with the hegemony of largest Church in the Roman Catholic communion, namely, the Roman Church.

### The Status of the Eastern Churches and the Hegemony of Rome

In any society, some sort of ruling hegemony always exists. The largest, most powerful subsume the smaller, less powerful, who then may become identified with them. Witness how citizens of the USA are named “Americans” even though millions of other people live in the Americas (North, Central and South), or how inhabitants of the other 14 Republics in the former Soviet Union were frequently called “Russians” by outsiders. In like manner, the Church of Rome has overshadowed and sometimes overwhelmed the smaller Eastern Catholic Churches; a Church in union with Rome became “Roman,” a subset of the “Latin Rite,” at least in popular parlance, if not also, as occasionally happened, in actual practice. Even today, the Church of Rome all too often functions as a “massive canopy . . . (stifling) small shrubs in the undergrowth of a tropical rainforest” (Kania, 2008, p. 9). Let us first look briefly at the past.

Historically, the equating of the Latin-rite Church with the entire Roman Catholic Church has been to a large extent the doings – by design or default – of the Church of Rome, and some of the Popes in particular. The power of the Popes grew greatly after 800 AD when Leo III crowned Charlemagne as Emperor. It was efficient and effective for the emperors to be legitimated by the Church, to have one religion “to unify diverse subjects – people of various ethnicities and social classes, speaking languages that varied from German and its dialects to the Slavic language” especially in a time when “allegiance to religion bested all other loyalties such as allegiance to emperors, barons, and even ethnicity, language and social class (Pereira, 2008, pp. 2, 3). Conversely, it was also efficient and effective for the popes to have the protection of the emperors to secure their temporal holdings and, in times when popes were sometimes poisoned, to secure their personal safety. One hand washed the other. Both sides of the alliance profited, the relationship solidified, and once the power of the Patriarchate of Constantinople ended (with the city’s capture by the Moslems in 1453), the authority of the “Patriarch of the West,” the Pope,

became the ruling hegemony in the Roman Catholic communion. “*Roma locuta, causa fnite*” (“Rome has spoken, the case is closed”) became the final argument in ecclesiastical disputes after the Great Schism (1054) when the Christian world was divided into the Orthodox East and the Catholic West.<sup>26</sup> Saato (2006, pp. 14–37) gives an overview of how the hegemony of the popes grew in the second millennium, to the extent that the Bishop of Rome, the “Patriarch of the West,” eventually claimed *universal jurisdiction* over *all* Churches in the West as well as in the ancient Patriarchal Churches of the East – most of which by this time identified themselves as Orthodox.

This “imperialism” of the Church of Rome had deleterious results for Eastern Catholic Churches. In India, in 1599, there was the forced Latinization of many of “The Thomas Christians,” once a part of the Assyrian Church and to this day tracing their origins back to the Apostle Thomas. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the Roman Church tried to latinize the Ethiopian Church (cf., Saato, 2006, p. 26 f.; and Roberson, 1999, p. 20 f.). Such actions are epitomized by the words of Pope Benedict XIV in 1752: “Since the Latin Rite is the rite of the holy Roman Church and this Church is mother and teacher of the other Churches, the Latin Rite should be preferred to all other rites” (as cited in Saato, 2006, p. 34).<sup>27</sup>

Efforts to latinize the theology, liturgy, practices, and discipline of other Eastern Churches continued. In 1891, at the provincial synod of Lviv,<sup>28</sup> Rome exerted strong pressure on the Ukrainian (then called “Ruthenian”) Catholic Church to do away with the practice of a married clergy. The synod, however, formally resolved to continue the Church’s historical practice of clerical matrimony. The resolution was read in the Lviv Cathedral and sent to Rome for final acceptance, but when the final version of the synod resolutions was published in Rome, it was not the one the synod had adopted and submitted. It was a version written by the Apostolic Delegate to Ukraine which stated: “. . .the Synod, recognizing this freedom (to marry before ordination) and leaving it undisturbed, nonetheless, in consideration of the benefit and need of our church, urges the seminary authorities to support and confirm in their intention . . . those seminarians well disposed to accept clerical celibacy” (as cited in Himka, 1999, p. 118). In other words, the Ukrainian Church was told to “put your treasure where your heart should be.” The pressure to discontinue clerical matrimony continued, and in the 1920s clerical celibacy was made mandatory in two of the three Ukrainian eparchies; only the archbishop in Lviv withstood the pressuring.

The Church of Rome continued its hegemony during the emigration of Eastern Catholics from Sub-carpattia and Galicia (Ukraine) to the United States. These

---

<sup>26</sup>“East” and “West” reflect divisions of the old Roman Empire, the Danube River being approximate dividing line.

<sup>27</sup>This seems a dramatic change of heart, or at least a gross inconsistency, because 10 years earlier, in 1742, this same Pope Benedict XIV had published the bull *Etsi Pastoralis* “to buttress the position of the (Byzantine rite) Italo-Albanians in relation to the Latins” (Roberson, 1999, p. 145).

<sup>28</sup>The Ukrainian name for the city called “Lwów” (by the Poles), Lvov (by the Russians) or “Lemberg” (by the Germans).

faithful needed churches and priests of their own, so Pius X, in the papal bull *Ea Semper* in 1907, appointed a monk from Galicia named Soter Ortynsky as the “Greek Catholic” bishop for the United States.<sup>29</sup> This was one step forward, but two steps back, because this Greek Catholic bishop had authority only “as an auxiliary to every Latin ordinary” and with the stipulation that “No married priests were to be sent to the U.S., nor were any married men to be ordained” (Kaszczak, 2007, p. 7).<sup>30</sup> *Ea Semper* institutionalized the deeply felt sentiments of US Latin-rite bishops, who had been resisting the presence of non-Latin-rite bishops in their jurisdictions, and used clerical celibacy to justify their position. Meeting in 1893, they said that:

the presence of married priests of the Greek rite in our midst is a constant menace to the chastity of our unmarried clergy, a source of scandal to the laity and, therefore, the sooner this point of discipline is abolished before *the evils* (emphasis added) obtain large proportions, the better for religion. . . . The possible loss of a few souls of the Greek rite, the archbishops thought, ‘bears no proportion to the blessings resulting from uniformity of discipline’” (Hennese, 1981, as cited in Kaszczak, 2007, p. 4).

On two subsequent occasions, in 1894 and in 1896, the Latin-rite bishops also proposed that they have the faculty of creating national parishes for all Ruthenian Catholics and placing them under their jurisdictions (Paska, 1975), in effect, “to simply become Latin Catholics” (Kaszczak, 2007, p. 8). The latinization of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was continuing.

Greek Catholic faithful resisted this. At their National Church Congress in 1913, they asserted their rights as Greek Catholics, including the right for their bishop to ordain married men, and Bishop Ortynsky “signed the proposals of this congress” (Kaszczak, 2007, p. 12). It did not, however, stem the tide of Latin-rite resistance to a married clergy, and Pius XI reaffirmed Pius X’s prohibition of a married clergy in the United States. In 1929, he issued the decree *Cum data fuerit*, Article 12 of which states, “. . . priests of the Greek-Ruthenian rite who wish to go to the United States of North America and stay there, must be celibates” (as cited in Warzeski, 1971, p. 277).

For the most part, the “Greek-Ruthenian” (Ukrainian) Church acceded to this, but not everyone. To preserve their tradition of a married clergy, some eventually broke away and, in 1938, formed the Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Diocese of the USA (Johnstown, PA) under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. The “loss of a few souls,” foreseen by the Latin-rite ordinaries in 1893, was for them the price worth paying to enforce clerical celibacy in the United States. The over-900-year-old tradition of a married clergy in one particular Church became collateral damage to a felt need for uniformity and conformity in the “Father’s house.”

---

<sup>29</sup>The Austrian government, since 1772, called those living in what had been the eastern half of the old Roman Empire “Greek Catholics” because they had been Christianized by Greek missionaries (Kaszczak, 2007, p. 3).

<sup>30</sup>Full, ordinary jurisdiction was granted in 1913, but the prohibition against ordaining married men remained.

Unfortunately, the tendency toward uniformity continues, and even in catechetical materials. The *General Catechetical Directory*, published by the Vatican in 1971, says the Apostles' Creed is "a synthesis of and key to reading all of the Church's doctrine, which is hierarchically ordered around it. . ." (*GCD*, 1971, n. 115). The hegemony is evident. Eastern Catholic Churches do not use the Apostles Creed.

Yet again, when the first version of the *Catechism of the Universal Church*<sup>31</sup> was distributed in 1990,<sup>32</sup> the Eastern Catholic bishops in the United States responded saying the Catechism "works from the perspective of the Roman view throughout . . . seeing the Roman tradition as the principle of universality, normative for all the Churches" (unpublished document, in Saato, 2006, p. 151). The response seems to have little effect on the final document because, 2 years later, the final version of the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* stated, "The Church professes this mystery [of the faith] in the *Apostles' Creed* (emphasis added). . ." (John Paul II, 1992, n. 2558), thereby again discounting the fact that Eastern Catholic Churches use the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed, not the Apostles' Creed. Moreover, even though the *National Directory for Catechesis* (U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops [USCCB], 2005) more than once makes mention of creeds (pp. 60, 97, 191), it also says that the Apostles' Creed is "among those formulations that should be learned by heart" (p. 103) – but no mention is made of the other creeds, in apparent contradiction of what it had earlier affirmed; "The *Catechism of the Catholic Church* is a catechism for the universal Church" (USCCB, 2005, p. 73).

Eastern Catholics have difficulty accepting the universality of the *Catechism* when it omits two-thirds of the references to Eastern Church practice that were in the original version. To correct this omission, the U.S. Eastern Rite bishops felt they had to issue their own three-volume catechism<sup>33</sup> which reflects Byzantine theology, liturgy and practice (Saato, 2006).

The hegemony is not limited to catechetical materials. In 1990, a separate *Code of Canons for the Eastern Churches* was promulgated, which was a very important event because to be recognized as a church in the Roman Catholic communion, a group must have its own "discipline," that is, code of church law. The 1990 *Code* would seem to have dispelled the notion of Roman hegemony over the Eastern Churches; however, it was not so. The first attempts at developing this Eastern code were so offensive to Eastern bishops that Pope John XXIII suspended the work. Unfortunately, the subsequent attempt adhered to the working principle that the Eastern code and existing Western code should be procedurally similar. This resulted in the Eastern code following the Western code so closely that ". . .while the code was described as being drawn on Eastern sources, its canons are similar to and in some cases identical with canons in the Western code. . ." and leaves "to

<sup>31</sup>This was the original title of what is now called the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (John Paul II, 1992).

<sup>32</sup>With only one copy for each bishop, and *sub secreto* (Reese, 1991).

<sup>33</sup>*Light for life* (Pittsburgh: God with Us Publications): *The Mystery Believed* (1994); *The Mystery Celebrated* (1996); *The Mystery Lived* (2001).



the particular law of the various Eastern Churches such things as . . . honorary titles, and the liturgical calendar” (Saato, 2006, p. 37). In other words, it disregarded the history and integrity of Eastern canon law. Saato goes on to conclude: “. . .current (Roman) curial practice is loathe to admit any real autonomy to those Churches that its documents call autonomous. . .” (p. 37). This is unfortunate, but for Eastern Churches, their experience.

## Conclusion

This experience with the *Catechism* and with the *Code* – indeed, the general history of the Eastern Catholic Churches – indicates that, despite presumably good intentions, centuries-old attitudes and habits are hard to eliminate and avoid. It is, however, the function of education to promote changed behavior, thinking or attitudes. Changing attitudes within a church (or temple, or mosque) and between religious groups is part of the role of religious education. Those who are engaged in religious education within the Roman Catholic Church should not contribute to the hegemony of the Latin-rite. By knowing about and talking about the Eastern Catholic Churches, religious educators can do much to mitigate the hegemony of the West, give their audience a truer, more complete picture of Roman Catholic Church, and demonstrate that there is room for all in the “Father’s house.”

I hope any apparent defensiveness on my part has not offended or distracted the reader, and I point out this situation because not only does a hegemonic atmosphere affect relationships within the Roman Catholic Church communion, it also makes other Churches extremely wary of ecumenical advances from that communion. Since it diminishes prospects for authentic dialogue, a hegemonic atmosphere should be resisted and countered by all, especially religious educators. Learning about others is the necessary first step to understanding and respecting them.

While it is encouraging to have heard Pope John Paul II say that the Church should “breathe with two lungs,” the dominant Roman Church, as a whole, has to allow the Eastern Churches more room to breathe and move about in the Father’s house. Failure to do so belies the promise of the Pope’s statement; it erodes the status and hampers the flourishing of Eastern Churches. Moreover, it hampers and undermines ecumenical dialogue, because the Orthodox can then rightly fear the same fate will befall them. Respecting and fostering the traditions of the Eastern Catholic Churches will facilitate church growth and reunion because it will show that the “holy and apostolic” church of Christ can be simultaneously “one and universal,” truly catholic. The Eastern Churches themselves have a significant role in fostering this, by more vigorously asserting their historic rights, and by consistently engaging with the Orthodox. Specifying how this might and is being done exceeds the scope of this chapter.

Religious educators in the Roman Catholic communion, for their part, have to: (1) “lead people beyond” (“e-ducare”), by raising awareness – and critiquing the hegemony – of the Roman Church in the universal church; and (2) understand, value and make known the unique liturgical, theological, spiritual, and disciplinary

differences of the Eastern Catholic Churches, so that these Churches – as well as the Orthodox – may be accepted for who they are and assume their rightful place in the Father’s house. Having read this chapter, the reader, hopefully, is more aware of the Eastern Catholic Churches in the Roman Catholic communion of Churches and their close ties to the Orthodox Churches, and is more equipped to do this.

## References

- Abbott, W. M. (Ed.). (1966). *The documents of Vatican II*. New York: Herder and Herder.
- Drobner, H. (2007). *The fathers of the Church: A comprehensive introduction* (S. Schatzmann, Trans.). Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.
- General Catechetical Directory (GCD)*. (1971). Vatican City: Sacred Congregation for the Clergy.
- Himka, J.-P. (1999). *Religion and nationality in Western Ukraine: The Greek Catholic Church and the Ruthenian national movement in Galicia, 1867–1900*. Montreal, QC: McGill University Press.
- Holmes, J. D., & Bickers, B. (1983). *A short history of the Catholic Church*. New York: Paulist Press.
- John, P. II. (1992). *Catechism of the Catholic Church*. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- John, P. II. (1995). *Oriental Lumen*. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- Kania, A. T. (2008, September 6). Let other lights shine. *The Tablet*, p. 8–9.
- Kaszczak, I. (2007). *Kyr Soter: The first Greek Catholic Bishop in the United States of America*. Philadelphia, PA: The Ukrainian Catholic Archeparchy of Philadelphia.
- La Civita, M. (2007). *The Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church. One* (pp. 12–19). Washington, DC: Catholic Near East Welfare Association.
- Manschreck, C. (1985). *A history of Christianity in the world* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- McBrien, R. (1994). *Catholicism*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Morbey, A. (2001). *The Pope’s ‘apology’*. Retrieved, January 2, 2009, from Website of The Diocese of New England Orthodox Church in America: <http://www.dneoca.org/articles/apology0701.html>
- Paska, W. (1975). *Sources of particular law for the Ukrainian Catholic Church in the United States*. Washington, DC: Catholic University.
- Pereira, A. (2008). *The rally around religion*. Retrieved, January 2, 2009, from Web site of The National Catholic Reporter: <http://ncronline3.org/drupal/?q=search/node/Pereira>.
- Reese, T. J. (1991, Winter). Biographical essay on the Catechism for the universal Church. *The Living Light*, 27, 151–157.
- Roberson, R. (1999). *The Eastern Christian Churches: A brief survey* (6th ed.). Rome, Italy: Edizioni “Orientalia Christiana.”
- Roberson, R. (2008). *Eastern Catholic Churches statistics 2008*. Retrieved September 1, 2008 on CNEWA Web site: <http://www.cnewa.org/generalpg-verus.aspx?pageID=125>
- Saato, F. J. (2006). *American Eastern Catholics*. New York/Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB). (2003). *North American Orthodox-Catholic theological consultation*. Retrieved January 2, 2009, from <http://www.usccb.org/comm/archives/2006/06-213.shtml>
- United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB). (2005). *National directory for Catechesis*. Washington, DC: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops.
- Ware, T. (1997). *The Orthodox Church: New edition*. London: Penguin Books.
- Warzeski, W. (1971). *Byzantine rite Rusins in Carpatho-Ruthenia and America*. Pittsburgh, PA: Byzantine Seminary Press.
- Zagano, P. (2006, January). *What all Catholics should know about Eastern Catholic Churches*. Update on Web site of American Catholic: <http://www.americancatholic.org/>