



CHAPTER

29 The Reception of Vatican II by the Orthodox Church

Radu Bordeianu

<https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198813903.013.43> Pages 493–C29P28

Published: 26 January 2023

Abstract

In order to assess the reception of Vatican II by the Orthodox Church, one cannot search for major official statements. Rather, the process of reception involved the reactions of individual Orthodox theologians, some of whom were present at the council as observers or guests (such as Afanasiev and Nissiotis), and others who subsequently analysed various conciliar documents (such as Staniloae and Zizioulas). Most of their reactions focused on the relationship between papal primacy and synodality, pneumatology, Eucharistic ecclesiology, and communion. Another way in which the Orthodox received the insights of the council refers to the life of the Orthodox Church, including the lifting of the anathemas of 1054, the establishment of bilateral Orthodox–Catholic dialogues, liturgical reforms based on a common understanding of the communion between clergy and laity, and a renewed impetus for pan-Orthodox conciliarity, culminating with the convocation of the Council of Crete in 2016.

Keywords: Orthodox Church, Council of Crete, communion ecclesiology, synodality, Dumitru Staniloae, John Zizioulas, Nicholas Afanasiev, ecumenical observers, Vatican II, Second Vatican Council

Subject: History of Religion, Religious Studies, Philosophy of Religion, Religion

Series: Oxford Handbooks

1. Introduction

‘The voices which the Council had uncovered give it dimensions that transcend the Catholic Church’,¹ wrote Bishop Cassien (Bezobrazov), one of the Orthodox participants at the Second Vatican Council. His words still ring true today, given the main questions that Orthodox theology has addressed in the decades since the council and how Vatican II has influenced the life of the Orthodox Church.² Whether criticizing or applauding the council and its aftermath, Orthodoxy shaped its life and thought dialogically, taking into account the Catholic renewal set into motion at Vatican II.

In order to assess the reception of Vatican II by the Orthodox Church, one cannot search for major official statements by either individual national Orthodox churches or by a body representing the entire Orthodoxy. This is not how Orthodoxy operates. On the one hand, national Orthodox churches use their autocephaly (the authority of self-governance) only in administrative matters, and not to issue statements with doctrinal importance, which would impact the rest of Orthodoxy. On the other hand, a pan-Orthodox assessment was simply impossible in the decades following the council, when Orthodoxy was separated by the Iron Curtain.

The process of reception of Vatican II involved primarily the reactions of individual Orthodox theologians, some of whom were present as observers or guests of the pontifical Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity (SPCU), and others who reacted after the council. The reception of Vatican II’s theology was a matter

both of intellectual assessment and of theological influence. The first simply looks at the decisions of the council through an Orthodox lens; the second accepts the insights of the council into Orthodox theology and further develops them in a communion ecclesiology that emphasizes pneumatology, the local Church with all its ministries gathered in the Eucharist, synodality, and primacy. These reactions set the stage for several practical ways in which the Orthodox Church received Vatican II in its own life, including the lifting of the anathemas of 1054, the establishment of bilateral Orthodox–Catholic dialogues, liturgical reforms based on a common understanding of the communion between clergy and laity, and a renewed impetus for pan-Orthodox conciliarity.

2. Orthodox Theology

As Vatican II was unfolding, the first Orthodox theologians to react to it were the ecumenical observers and scholars who could not serve as official observers for reasons of an ecclesiastical nature but were invited as guests of the SPCU; the distinction between observers and guests was nominal. These delegates did not speak in plenaries, but they influenced the council informally, attended public sessions and general congregations, had access to draft documents, and were informed of the results of various commissions at weekly meetings organized by the SPCU. As a result of the fruitful interactions of Orthodox and Catholic theologians at the Dominican Ecumenical Centre Istina in Paris and the monastery of Chevetogne, the SPCU was determined to bring Orthodox observers to the council.³ Constantinople was tasked to ask all Orthodox churches to send observers. The Ecumenical Patriarchate started out willing to do so and encouraged the other Orthodox churches to do the same. At Moscow's insistence, the first Rhodes conference (1961) decided that all Orthodox should act in unison, but Moscow opposed sending observers, so it seemed that no Orthodox Church would do so. However, after dealing directly with the Vatican and going against its own insistence on a unified Orthodox attitude, Moscow became the only Orthodox Church that sent observers to the first session. Its delegation consisted primarily of Vladimir Kotliarov and Vitaly Borovoi, whose reports were quite positive. Based on the positive experience of its observers at the first session, Moscow encouraged the other Orthodox churches to send observers.⁴ But Constantinople, still feeling too hurt by the actions of Moscow and the Vatican before the first session, refused to send representatives. The attitude shifted again when the new Pope Paul VI and Patriarch Athenagoras embraced each other during a common pilgrimage in Jerusalem in 1964; with this gesture, Rome recognized the pre-eminent place of Constantinople within the Orthodox world. This prompted the Ecumenical Patriarchate to send the following observers to the last two sessions: Panteleimon Rodopoulos, Ioannis Romanides, Maximos Aghiorgoussis, and André Scrima.⁵ Among other theologians who later attended Vatican II as observers, the following stand out: Paul Evdokimov and Nicholas Afanasiev from St Serge in Paris, and Alexander Schmemmann and Nicholas Arseniev from St Vladimir's Seminary in Yonkers, New York. The most influential among them was Afanasiev.

Afanasiev's essay on 'The Church which Presides in Love'⁶ was referenced in the preparatory drafts of *De Ecclesia*; its mention was removed from the final document only in an effort to limit all citations to biblical and patristic sources. His works influenced the discussions about the Church as communion, the contrast between universalist and eucharistic ecclesiologies, the role of the bishop in the Eucharistic assembly, and the nature of the Eucharistic community.⁷ Moreover, he attended the fourth session as SPCU's guest, and his work was recommended for further study to the participating bishops. Thus, it is not surprising that *Lumen Gentium* (LG) bears a striking resemblance to his Eucharistic ecclesiology that affirmed the fullness of the local Church gathered around its bishop in the Eucharistic assembly, with all its ministries: 'This Church of Christ is really present in all legitimately organized local groups of the faithful, which, insofar as they are united to their pastors, are also quite appropriately called Churches in the New Testament. For these are in fact, in their own localities, the new people called by God, in the power of the Holy Spirit' (LG 26).⁸ Unfortunately, Afanasiev died less than a year after the close of the council, so his own reception of Vatican II remains incomplete.

Another observer—the lay theologian and World Council of Churches (WCC) delegate Nikos Nissiotis—wrote some of the most detailed analyses of the council. Early on, he was among the sceptics who wondered why a pope who could speak infallibly would convene a council. He also wished that the council had not been called 'ecumenical', since in the current divided context, no church can hold an ecumenical council by itself. Moreover, he considered that all churches should be represented by bishops with full voting rights at least when discussing ecumenism—an unrealistic desire, in retrospect. He regarded the work of the council with

great admiration, especially for the bishops who conveyed the comments of the observers to the plenaries.⁹ However, he persistently criticized the conciliar documents for being weakly rooted in pneumatology.¹⁰ The conversation that Yves Congar had with him and Schmemmann is by now well known. The two observers said: 'If we were to prepare a treatise *De Ecclesia*, we would draft a chapter on the Holy Spirit, to which we would add a second chapter on Christian anthropology, and that would be all.'¹¹ The pneumatological turn of the council, while insufficient by contemporary Catholic and Orthodox standards, was certainly momentous.

The positive experience of the observers began the process of a favourable reception of Vatican II in later Orthodox theology. Between 1964 and 1968, Dumitru Staniloae published ten articles that dealt directly with Vatican II.¹² Given his political isolation and five-year incarceration during communism, the level of his familiarity with conciliar debates is astounding. While he appreciated the affirmation that all bishops—including the pope—share in the same episcopal ordination, Staniloae considered that Vatican II strengthened papal infallibility and primacy compared to Vatican I; while Vatican I did not earnestly address the episcopal college, Vatican II explicitly subordinated the bishops to the pope on juridical grounds. While Staniloae appreciated *Lumen Gentium's* stipulation that the bishops are not merely vicars of the pope, but exercise a power that is proper to them, he criticized the pope's interventions over the episcopal majority, indicating that the bishops are conditioned by the pope, but not the other way around. The understanding that a bishop cannot exercise his ministry unless he is part of the College of Bishops is a positive step towards communion ecclesiology, as is the affirmation that the infallibility of the Church belongs to all the members—hierarchy and laity alike, the latter being endowed with a 'supernatural appreciation of the faith' (*LG* 12).¹³ When commenting on the fourth and fifth sessions, Staniloae appreciated the council's openness to the world. And yet, he detected some competition between the conservative and progressive factions, reflected in the documents on religious liberty, freedom of conscience and its relationship to truth, and the dual purpose of marriage, namely procreation and conjugal love. He was particularly disturbed that Paul VI did not allow an earnest discussion of priestly celibacy. Nevertheless, Staniloae esteemed the departure from the two-source theory of Revelation (Scripture and Tradition) and the recognition of the ecclesial status of Protestants reflected in the expression 'ecclesial communities'. Perhaps under pressure from communist censure, Staniloae highly praised the council's promotion of peace and its refusal to condemn communism.¹⁴

Already in the elements briefly sketched above, two important theological themes develop in Orthodox and Catholic theologies: *pneumatology* and *communion ecclesiology*. Naturally, these topics did not first emerge at the council but were anchored in the rediscovery of the patristic and biblical roots of theology in *la nouvelle théologie*, the early pneumatological ecclesiology of Johann Adam Möhler, the theology of the Church as *sobornost* of Alexei Khomiakov, and the ecumenical engagements of the Paris School involving Georges Florovsky and Vladimir Lossky, to give just a few examples. These authors and schools of thought represented the catalysts of significant theological development across denominational lines, coming into full prominence after the Second Vatican Council. Thus, the interchange between Orthodox and Catholic theologies continued, bringing the pneumatologies and ecclesiologies of the two churches closer together. For example, the parallels between the thought of Yves Congar and John Zizioulas are unmistakable. Their early ecclesiologies were markedly Christocentric, as were Vatican II's early schemata. But later on, the two theologians and the council took a pneumatological turn. The council—as Zizioulas contended—could not completely abandon its Christological structure, but it was only able to add the references to the Holy Spirit more as an afterthought than a constitutive structure; a future Vatican III should make pneumatology constitutive of both Christology and ecclesiology, which in turn would make communion into the condition of ecclesiological existence, of the very being of the Church.¹⁵ Zizioulas attempted—with varying degrees of success—to give an equally prominent role to the Son and the Spirit in the life of the Church, which 'breathes' the Spirit continuously, calling upon the Spirit to descend upon it as in the *epiclesis*,¹⁶ in contrast with the view of the Church as the Christologically constituted perfect society. This Eucharistic approach to ecclesiology remains prominent in Zizioulas's address to the 2005 International Synod of Bishops in Rome:

The ecclesiology of communion promoted by Vatican II and deepened further by eminent Roman Catholic theologians can make sense only if it derives from the Eucharistic life of the Church. The Eucharist belongs not simply to the *bene esse* (well-being) but to the *esse* (being) of the Church. The whole life, word and structure of the Church is Eucharistic in its very essence.¹⁷

These interchanges between Catholic and Orthodox theologies represent a solid foundation for addressing the most contested issue within communion ecclesiology, namely the reform of papal primacy, which Nissiotis regarded as a practical impossibility during the council, but with hope for the future.¹⁸ As Peter De

Mey shows, Vatican II's treatment of the papacy elicited varied Orthodox responses. On the one hand, Nissiotis was surprised by how openly the bishops discussed collegiality and how they did not regard conciliarity as automatically counteracting papal primacy. Similarly, Zizioulas engages with Ioannis Karmiris's recognition of a primacy of honour for the bishop of Rome; however, Zizioulas remarks, this kind of primacy of honour remains ambiguous and no longer exists in Orthodoxy (an allusion to Constantinople's claim of a real primacy within Orthodoxy, not recognized by Moscow), and both conciliarity and primacy are of divine right. On the other hand, Schmemmann regarded the ecclesiologies of Vatican II as presenting only one of the many historical ecclesiological models. Karmiris and Basil Krivocheine, while regarding Vatican II as a positive first step in regard to the relationship between the pope and the College of Bishops, were unhappy that Vatican II did not depart enough from Vatican I.¹⁹ Despite these mixed reactions, Joseph Famerée shows that Orthodox and Catholics have progressed significantly since Vatican II: the two churches spoke in unison at Ravenna in 2007 on equality among the bishops and their intricate connection with the local Eucharistic assembly. According to Famerée, the statements of the Catholic bishops at Vatican II or of the Orthodox experts mentioned above are not as important as the Ravenna declaration that speaks with one voice, as part of the common reception made possible by the openness that Vatican II initiated.²⁰

Clearly, recent Orthodox ecclesiology has focused on Trinitarian, Eucharistic, and communion ecclesiologies as a result of the questions raised by theologians writing on Vatican II (Lossky, Florovsky, Staniloae, Zizioulas), or even present as observers (Afanasiev, Nissiotis, and Schmemmann). The themes discussed at Vatican II became central for Orthodox theology, too. Having highlighted some of the Orthodox theological developments related to Vatican II, it is now important to turn to the influence that the council had upon the life of the Orthodox Church.

3. The Life of the Orthodox Church

As we saw above, the relationship between Rome and Constantinople varied greatly between 1961 and 1965, reaching unimaginable levels towards the end of the council. Although Athenagoras was unable to visit Vatican II as he intended, he initiated the lifting of the mutual excommunications of 1054. A moment of grace occurred at the concluding vigil of the council, on 7 December 1965. After the reading of the decision to 'lift the sentences of excommunication, remove them from the midst of the Church, and consign them to oblivion',²¹ Pope Paul VI and Metropolitan Meliton of Heliopolis (representing Patriarch Athenagoras) embraced each other, to the enthusiastic applause of the assembly.

This dialogue of love set the tone for the Orthodox–Catholic theological dialogues to follow. Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew does not hesitate to affirm that, as a result of Vatican II, Catholic and Orthodox churches have experienced in common a significant spiritual renewal; a 'return to the sources' through the study of the Bible, the Fathers, and the Liturgy; the liberation from the rigid limits of scholasticism in favour of the openness of ecumenical encounters; the mutual annulment of the anathemas of 1054; the frequent exchange of annual visits and salutations; the return of relics, and the establishment of theological dialogues.²² The oldest and most prolific among regional dialogues is the North American Orthodox–Catholic Theological Consultation, whose first meeting took place on 9 September 1965. Among the numerous documents that this consultation has produced, the statements on *Baptism and Sacramental Economy* (1999) and *The Filioque: A Church Dividing Issue?* (2003) are noteworthy. The former is the only official statement that affirms explicitly that Orthodox and Catholic churches recognize each other's baptisms—a recognition that many take for granted, even though in ultra-Orthodox circles, rebaptisms still occur. The latter statement's (mostly tacit) reception put to rest the thorny issue of the Filioque (i.e., the addition, in the usage of the Western Church, to the creed of Nicaea Constantinople of the phrase 'the Holy Spirit, who proceeds from the Father [and the Son]'), which is no longer the subject of ecumenical dialogues. Without an official recognition, it would be an exaggeration to state that this issue has been completely resolved, but the silence on this subject speaks loudly: the Filioque 'need no longer divide us'.

Other regional dialogues followed, culminating in the establishment of the Joint International Commission for Theological Dialogue between the Roman Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church in 1979. In its initial stage, the international dialogue focused on sacramental theology, especially the Eucharist and Holy Orders. In its second stage, it responded to the new context created after the fall of communism but entered a period of crisis in the late 1990s, when the Orthodox protested at the re-emergence of Byzantine Catholic churches

in Eastern Europe. After a six-year hiatus, the international dialogue resumed in 2006, in this third stage focusing on issues of primacy and synodality.

Beyond the theological significance of these statements, one cannot underestimate the importance of pan-Orthodox participation in international dialogues. While the Orthodox churches that enjoyed political freedom had participated in the ecumenical movement since 1948 with the establishment of the WCC, the churches under communism were forbidden to enter into dialogue with the West. They opposed ecumenism until 1961, when the Vatican invited observers from all Orthodox churches. To offer a unified response to this invitation, all autocephalous Orthodox churches participated in three Rhodes conferences of 1961, 1963, and 1964, which gradually opened up the possibility for the churches under oppressive communist regimes to be involved in ecumenism—most immediately in the dialogue with the Catholic Church, but also in ecumenism in general, through the WCC and bilateral dialogues. The importance of Vatican II for Orthodox ecumenism cannot be overstated: Orthodox churches from the Eastern Bloc owe their ecumenical participation to Rome's invitation to send observers to Vatican II.

Besides official dialogues, Nicholas Denysenko documents 'the cross-pollinating exchanges between the Orthodox and Catholic Churches'.²³ These were informal exchanges between Orthodox and Catholic theologians such as Afanasiev, Schmemmann, and Congar, who influenced each other as they studied the liturgy together. Their agreement on the communitarian nature of lay and ordained priesthoods rooted in a common baptism is what gave rise to *Sacrosanctum Concilium* (SC)'s affirmation that 'all the faithful should be led to that full, conscious, and active participation in liturgical celebrations which is demanded by the very nature of the liturgy, and to which the Christian people, "a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a redeemed people" (1 Pet 2:9, 4–5) have a right and obligation by reason of their baptism' (SC 14). Vatican II's stature, in turn, influenced several liturgical reforms in the Orthodox Church. Thus, on the one hand, Orthodox theologians used the historical-critical methods of the West to study the liturgy and initiated profound liturgical reforms, even though they also cautioned against chaotic changes, as they perceived the reforms that *Sacrosanctum Concilium* set in motion in Catholicism. It became common to change from liturgical prayers said silently to being read out loud; from laborious church architecture and Byzantine-style iconography to more simple, modern architecture and modest iconography; from prominent roles assigned to the priest and the cantor to active participation of all the faithful who often practise frequent communion. On the other hand, looking favourably to the role of the Spirit in the Orthodox liturgy, Catholicism revived the split *epiclesis*, added three new Eucharistic prayers, and emphasized the role of the Spirit in the sacrament of confirmation. Catholics experienced a renewed role of the laity in the liturgy, including assistance with the distribution of communion, frequent reception of communion, and prayer in vernacular languages.²⁴

Unexpectedly, the Second Vatican Council also became a catalyst for pan-Orthodox synodality. For obvious political reasons, pan-Orthodox synodality was impossible for much of the second millennium. But the early twentieth century saw the first efforts to convene a pan-Orthodox council. Interrupted by two world wars and the emergence of militant atheist communist regimes, these efforts were reignited by the Vatican's invitation to send ecumenical observers. As stated above, the 1961, 1963, and 1964 Rhodes conferences attempted to offer a common response to this invitation and to begin in earnest the preparations for a pan-Orthodox council. These latter efforts led to the Holy and Great Council of Crete (2016), which ended up being attended by only ten of the fourteen autocephalous churches. The Moscow Patriarchate and three other churches under its sphere of influence announced their withdrawal from Crete just days before its opening. Although not the pan-Orthodox council that was intended, Crete remains the most notable instance of Orthodox conciliarity in recent times.

Vatican II not only reignited pan-Orthodox synodality but was also the model for Crete regarding the invitation of ecumenical observers. The Vatican delegated Cardinal Kurt Koch and Bishop Brian Farrell, president and secretary respectively of the pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity. Their role, however, was limited to being passive spectators at the opening and closing sessions. While this invitation is an encouraging sign of ecumenical openness, Vatican II remains the standard for consultation with other churches and the prominent role of observers in the conciliar process.

Another practice that Vatican II consecrated in modern times—but is in fact the tradition of the ancient councils—was the involvement of *periti* or theological experts, even though they did not have a vote. The influences of then-deacon Athanasius of Alexandria on the First Ecumenical Council, or of Congar and Karl Rahner on Vatican II, are amply documented. Orthodox theologians attempted to bring their

contributions to Crete as well. For example, the Orthodox Theological Society in America produced a set of responses to the drafts of Crete, which were read by some participating bishops. Moreover, churches were encouraged to include theological experts in their delegations, as some did. Sadly, the four absent churches held Crete captive by not allowing it to deviate in a meaningful way from the previously agreed conciliar drafts, which had the overall approval of the missing churches. Even so, the absent churches have not recognized Crete. This was a lost opportunity for Orthodox theologians to influence a council as Catholic theologians influenced Vatican II—a model difficult to emulate.

Looking at the theologies of Crete and Vatican II, two elements stand out. When Vatican II was first announced as an ecumenical council, the Orthodox reaction was swift: in our divided context, none of our churches can convene an ecumenical council, since we do not recognize each other fully as Church.²⁵ Recent Catholic theology distinguishes between the seven ecumenical councils of the largely undivided Church and the general councils that the Catholic Church held afterwards.²⁶ Similarly, Crete did not regard itself as an ecumenical council. But a minority faction of participating bishops challenged the ecclesiological principle behind this affirmation; their understanding that Orthodoxy alone can be called ‘Church’ was based on a narrow understanding of the limits of the Church. Under their influence, Crete only timidly refers to non-Orthodox as churches, and it makes the distinction between ‘churches’ and ‘confessions’.²⁷ Up until Crete, Orthodoxy had never made this distinction, with one exception: in a pre-conciliar draft entitled ‘The Relationship of the Orthodox Church to Other Christian Churches and Communities’ (1976). Neither did Catholic theology do so before Vatican II, when it introduced the distinction between ‘churches’ and ‘ecclesial communities’ (*Unitatis Redintegratio* 22); in the case of the latter, the emphasis fell on ‘ecclesial’—of the Church—as opposed to the negative connotation that this expression received subsequently, as a non-recognition of Protestants and Anglicans as Church. It is thus surprising that this distinction was introduced at Crete by the participants who oppose ecumenism; they were probably unaware that their distinction was an innovation from Vatican II and later misappropriated to diminish the ecclesial character of others. Ironically, they applied this term even to the Catholic Church. Vatican II remains a model of coexistence of competing factions and a standard of conciliar theological profundity.

p. 503 Having begun with the words of one Orthodox participant at the Second Vatican Council, it is appropriate to conclude with the words of another observer. Nissiotis considered that Vatican II had an ecumenical character in the sense of challenging other churches to critical self-examination, renewal leading to a new evangelism, and repentance for our lack of common action in the world.²⁸ The reception of Vatican II by the Orthodox Church in its theology and life makes Nissiotis’s ecumenical task achievable. Catholic and Orthodox churches will hopefully continue to unite in a new evangelism and common action in the world.

Suggested Reading

Bordeianu, Radu. ‘Orthodox Observers at the Second Vatican Council and Intra-Orthodox Dynamics’. *Theological Studies* 79, no. 1 (2018): 86–106.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Clapsis, Emmanuel. ‘The Roman Catholic Church and Orthodoxy: Twenty-Five Years after Vatican II’. *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 35, no. 3 (1990): 221–36.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Nissiotis, Nikos. ‘Report on the Second Vatican Council’. *The Ecumenical Review* 18, no. 2 (1966): 190–206.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Selaru, Sorin. ‘Les 50 ans d’*Unitatis Redintegratio*: Une occasion d’évaluation (auto)critique orthodoxe’. *Irénikon* 87, nos. 3–4 (2014): 400–16.

Staniloae, Dumitru. *Theology and the Church*. Translated by Robert Barringer. Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1980.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Zizioulas, John D. *Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church*, Contemporary Greek Theologians 4. Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1985.

- 1 Cited in Giuseppe Alberigo and Joseph A. Komonchak, eds., *History of Vatican II*, 5 vols. (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1995–2006), 2:522–23.
- 2 Throughout its documents, Vatican II used ‘Churches’ in reference to Orthodoxy, and not the singular. While appreciating the Council’s unambiguous recognition of the Orthodox as Churches, the Orthodox observers saw this use of the plural as a Catholic presupposition that a Church cannot have unity without the papacy. Unless I refer to the sum of autocephalous churches, I use the singular ‘Church’ in reference to the Orthodox world.
- 3 Emmanuel Lanne, ‘La Perception en Occident de la participation du Patriarcat de Moscou à Vatican II’, in *Vatican II in Moscow (1959–1965): Acts of the Colloquium on the History of Vatican II; Moscow, March 30–April 2, 1995*, edited by Alberto Melloni (Leuven: Library of the Faculty of Theology K. U. Leuven, 1997), 122–23.
- 4 Mauro Velati, *Separati ma fratelli: Gli osservatori non-cattolici al Vaticano II (1962–1965)* (Bologna: Il Mulino, 2014), 234–35.
- 5 The Romanian monk André Scrima so impressed Cardinal Suenens with his view of the relationship between Scripture and the Liturgy that the cardinal suggested that the pope consult Scrima directly before concluding the discussions on *Dei Verbum*. Moreover, Scrima’s essay on the role of role of Virgin Mary was widely circulated at the council and, when *Orientalium Ecclesiarum (OE)* was ready to restore *communicatio in sacris* with the East, Scrima asked Congar to convince the Pope to freeze the approval process, since the Orthodox do not allow it even in extremis. As a result, *OE* 29 allows Eucharistic sharing with the East only after consultation with ‘the ordinaries of the separated churches’.
- 6 In *The Primacy of Peter: Essays in Ecclesiology and the Early Church*, ed. John Meyendorff (Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1992), 91–143; originally published as ‘L’Église qui préside dans l’amour’, in *La Primauté de Pierre dans l’Église orthodoxe*, ed. N. Afanassieff et al. (Neuchâtel: Ed. Delchaux et Niestlé, 1960), 57–110.
- 7 *AS* I/4, p. 87, n. 2; II/1, p. 252, n. 57; III/1, p. 254. See Anastacia Wooden, ‘The Limits of the Church: Ecclesiological Project of Nicolas Afanasiev’, PhD diss., Catholic University of America, 2019, 125–26.
- 8 While applauding such passages, John Meyendorff pointed out that others contradict this eucharistic ecclesiology, as for example when particular churches are characterized as ‘constituted after the model of the universal Church’ and ‘portions of the universal Church’ (*LG* 23). Moreover, Meyendorff was critical of intercommunion as a consequence of Afanasiev’s Eucharistic ecclesiology, as well as of *Unitatis Redintegratio*’s third chapter, which allows for intercommunion, although for different reasons. John Meyendorff, ‘Vatican II: A Preliminary Reaction’, *St Vladimir’s Theological Quarterly* 9, no. 1 (1965): 29–31.
- 9 Nissiotis considered that the Catholic bishops present went through ‘a veritable school of ecumenism’. Nikos Nissiotis, ‘Comité Central du Conseil œcuménique, Genève, 8–17 février 1966: Rapports sur le 2e Concile du Vatican’, *Istina* 11, nos. 2–3 (1966): 255–56.
- 10 See e.g. Nikos Nissiotis, ‘The Main Ecclesiological Problem of the Second Vatican Council and the Position of the Non-Roman Churches Facing It’, *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 2, no. 1 (1965): 49–50.
- 11 Yves Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, vol. 2, *He Is Lord and Giver of Life*, trans. David Smith (New York: Seabury, 1983), 66.
- 12 The only article available in English appears in Dumitru Staniloae, *Theology and the Church*, trans. Robert Barringer (Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1980), 45–72. This is a representative sample where the Orthodox author begins with observations concerning Vatican II and then creatively develops Orthodox theology in dialogue with the council.
- 13 Dumitru Staniloae, ‘Doctrina Catolica a infailibilitatii la I-ii si al II-lea Conciliu de la Vatican [The Catholic Doctrine of Infallibility at the First and Second Vatican Councils]’, *Orthodoxia* 17, no. 4 (1965): 459–92.
- 14 Dumitru Staniloae, ‘Dezbaterile si hotaririle sesiunii a patra a Conciliului al II-lea de la Vatican [The Debates and Decisions of the Fourth Session of the Second Vatican Council]’, *Orthodoxia* 18, no. 1 (1966): 8–34.
- 15 In this same context, Zizioulas writes a positive evaluation of Vatican II, which ‘has given hope and promise to many people that something can be done. ... [T]he introduction of the notion of communion into ecclesiology ... combined with the rediscovery of the importance of the *laos* of God and the local Church, can help even the Orthodox themselves to be faithful to their identity.’ John D. Zizioulas, *Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church*, Contemporary Greek Theologians 4 (Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1985), 123, 39–42.
- 16 *Ibid.*, 185.
- 17 ‘Synodus Episcoporum Bulletin: XI Ordinary General Assembly of the Synod of Bishops 2-23 October 2005’. This quote is a return to Zizioulas’s earlier contention that the Eucharist makes a Church—a statement originating with Henri de Lubac, and then Vatican II. See Paul McPartlan, *The Eucharist Makes the Church: Henri de Lubac and John Zizioulas in Dialogue* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993).
- 18 Nikos Nissiotis, ‘Mouvement œcuménique et Vatican II, un point de vue orthodoxe’, *Istina* 11, nos. 2–3 (1965–66): 316–17.
- 19 Peter De Mey, ‘Conciliarité et autorité au niveau universel dans l’Église: de *Lumen Gentium* au *Document de Ravenne*’, *Irénikon* 83, no. 2 (2015): 202–6.
- 20 Joseph Famerée, ‘L’Église locale selon *Lumen Gentium*: Réactions orthodoxes à l’époque du concile’, *Irénikon* 88, no. 2 (2015): 164–80.
- 21 Alberigo and Komonchak, *History of Vatican II*, 5:472–78.
- 22 Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew I, ‘Greeting by his All-Holiness Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew on the Occasion of the 50th anniversary of the Opening of the Second Vatican Council; Rome, St. Peter’s Square, October 22, 2012’, *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 57, nos. 1–4 (2012): 380.
- 23 Nicholas E. Denysenko, *Liturgical Reform after Vatican II: The Impact on Eastern Orthodoxy* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2015), 9.
- 24 *Ibid.*, 357–65.

- 25 Nikos Nissiotis, 'Is the Vatican Council Really Ecumenical?', *The Ecumenical Review* 16, no. 4 (1964): 367.
- 26 Richard R. Gaillardetz, *Teaching with Authority: A Theology of the Magisterium in the Church* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1997), 198–99.
- 27 Holy Great Council of Crete, 'Relations of the Orthodox Church with the Rest of the Christian World' (2016): no. 6, <https://www.holycouncil.org/-/rest-of-christian-world>⁵¹.
- 28 Nissiotis, 'The Main Ecclesiological Problem', 62.