

## **Violations of Vatican Directives Regarding Liturgy in the "Revised Divine Liturgy" promulgated by the Byzantine-Ruthenian Catholic Metropolitan Church of Pittsburgh 6 January 2007**

**May 2007**

### Background

In the 1930s the Ruthenian Catholic bishops in Europe and North America petitioned Rome to prepare a normative set of liturgical books. The Vatican prepared and published these books beginning with the Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom in 1941 through the Archieraticon in 1973 (the Great Trebnyk, which requires much special research, is (hopefully) still in preparation). Today these books are the official standard for all the Catholic Churches of the Ruthenian recension (Carpatho-Ruthenian, Ukrainian, Slovak, Romanian and Hungarian). They are also the standard used by the corresponding Eastern Orthodox Churches (most notably here in America the Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Church in America and the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in the USA).

In 1964/1965 an English language translation of the Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom was approved by Rome and promulgated. In 1976 an English language translation of the Divine Liturgy of St. Basil the Great was promulgated. These two books are not perfect but they are quite good. The rubrics are particularly accurate. These books have become the normative liturgicons in the Byzantine-Ruthenian Church. They are also in common use in some parishes of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church in America, the Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Church in America, the Ukrainian Orthodox Church and other places.

On January 6, 2007 the Council of Hierarchs promulgated the Revised Divine Liturgies of St. John Chrysostom and St. Basil the Great. It was hoped that these new editions would correct the relatively few errors of the 1964/1965 Chrysostom Liturgicon and the 1976 edition of the Basil Liturgicon. Instead these new editions are less faithful to the official liturgical books published by Rome. They introduce practices that are not found in other Byzantine liturgical books (Catholic or Orthodox). Some of these new practices are a blatant imitation of the practices in the *Novus Ordo* Liturgy of the Latin Church. Others are actually prohibited by the various Orthodox Churches. This revision to the Divine Liturgy harms the liturgical unity we currently share with other Byzantine / Greek Catholics and all Byzantine Orthodox and has the potential to harm the ongoing process to establish full unity with the Orthodox Churches. This newly promulgated Revised Divine Liturgy also embraces a type of English commonly called "inclusive language" which has been condemned by the Vatican in its instruction *Liturgiam Authenticam*. The Orthodox Church has also forbidden this type of "inclusive language" as it is alien to Orthodox anthropology.

We are not speaking here of an approved method of abbreviations. These newly promulgated Revised Divine Liturgies of Chrysostom and Basil do not contain the complete texts of these liturgies. The rubrics and texts do not correspond to the official editions published in Rome. They, and the promulgation directive, effectively prohibit the

full and accurate celebration of the officially approved Divine Liturgies of the Ruthenian Catholic Church in our parishes.

Below is a listing of excerpts from Vatican directives together with a brief summary of the problems with the Revised Divine Liturgy promulgated on 6 January, 2007.

---

## **Violations of the Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches, issued January 6, 1996 by the Congregation for the Eastern Churches**

*From the Liturgical Instruction at [www.vatican.va](http://www.vatican.va):*

### **18. Liturgical reform and renewal**

*The first requirement of every Eastern liturgical renewal, as is also the case for liturgical reform in the West, is that of rediscovering full fidelity to their own liturgical traditions, benefiting from their riches and eliminating that which has altered their authenticity. Such heedfulness is not subordinate to but precedes so-called updating.*

The Revised Divine Liturgies promulgated on 6 January 2007 are not heedful of rediscovering full fidelity to the Byzantine-Ruthenian liturgical tradition because 1) they are not faithful to the official liturgical books published by Rome, 2) they introduce and mandate a number of new liturgical practices that are not part of any Byzantine liturgical tradition and 3) they mandate these innovations in a purposeful "update" prior to "rediscovering full fidelity to [our] own liturgical tradition."

Examples of problems with the Revised Divine Liturgy are the removal of several litanies (especially those belonging to the "Office of the Three Antiphons", the Litanies of the Faithful before the Cherubic Hymn and the Litany before the Symbol of Faith) and the addition of rubrics ordering that certain prayers mandated to be prayed quietly by the priest in other Byzantine liturgions (both those used in the Catholic and Orthodox Churches of the Byzantine liturgical tradition) now be prayed aloud. These innovations diminish the authenticity of the liturgical celebration.

The Way Forward: The Ruthenian Catholic Church in America should finally promulgate all the liturgical books of the Ruthenian recension as published by Rome as normative. Over the course of the coming generations we can fulfill the requirement of renewal of our Liturgy (so it can properly form our Church) and then eventually work together with all of the Byzantine Churches (Catholic and Orthodox) to make changes (should they be desired).

*From the Liturgical Instruction:*

### **21. The ecumenical value of the common liturgical heritage**

*Among the important missions entrusted especially to the Eastern Catholic Churches, <Orientalium Ecclesiarum> (n. 24) and the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches (can. 903), as well as the Ecumenical Directory (n. 39), underscore the need to promote union with the Eastern Churches that are not yet in full communion with the See of Peter,*

*indicating the conditions: religious fidelity to the ancient traditions of the Eastern Churches, better knowledge of one another, and collaboration and fraternal respect of persons and things. These are important principles for the orientation of the ecclesiastical life of every single Eastern Catholic community and are of eminent value in the celebrations of divine worship, because it is precisely thus that the Eastern Catholic and the Orthodox Churches have more integrally maintained the same heritage.*

*In every effort of liturgical renewal, therefore, the practice of the Orthodox brethren should be taken into account, knowing it, respecting it and distancing from it as little as possible so as not to increase the existing separation, but rather intensifying efforts in view of eventual adaptations, maturing and working together. Thus will be manifested the unity that already subsists in daily receiving the same spiritual nourishment from practicing the same common heritage.*

The Revised Divine Liturgies promulgated on 6 January 2007 do not work to restore the celebration of the Divine Liturgy in the Ruthenian Catholic Church in America to the official liturgical books we share with other Byzantine / Greek Catholics.

The Revised Divine Liturgies promulgated on 6 January 2007 do not work to restore the celebration of the Divine Liturgy in the Ruthenian Catholic Church in America with the Orthodox Churches of the Byzantine liturgical tradition.

While there are currently several English language editions of the Divine Liturgy used by the various Byzantine Catholic Churches in America (Ruthenian, Ukrainian, Romanian, and Melkite) the rubrics in these English language editions are essentially the same. If one allows for the slight differences in translation, priests from the different local Churches easily concelebrate the Divine Liturgy, each using the edition of the Divine Liturgy promulgated by his own eparchy. With this Revised Divine Liturgy promulgated on 6 January 2007 this becomes impossible since the Revised Liturgicons do not contain either the complete text or accurate rubrics as given in the official editions of the Divine Liturgy according to the Ruthenian recension as published at Rome.

This Revised Divine Liturgy also does not promote unity with the Eastern Churches that are not yet in full communion with the See of Peter. They, in fact, introduce at least one custom forbidden by many Orthodox Churches (that is the mandatory audible praying of the Anaphora and some of the other prayers belonging to the priest). The practice of our Orthodox brethren has not been taken into account. The existing editions of the Liturgicons in use were faithful to the Divine Liturgy as celebrated in the Orthodox Church. This newly promulgated revision distances us from both the historic and contemporary practice in Orthodoxy. While the official liturgical books of the Ruthenian recension were a model of liturgical unity with Orthodoxy this new revision introduces division. It actually increases the existing separation.

The Way Forward: Since the liturgical books of the Ruthenian recension are normative for both other Byzantine Catholics and several of the Orthodox Churches we should make no changes to them except together with all these Churches acting in unison. Local Churches could legitimately establish methods of abbreviations (along those lines of

abbreviations already common in all Churches) but the celebration of the full and official Liturgy should never be prohibited.

***From the Liturgical Instruction:***

***25. Competencies for the approval of the translations of liturgical books***

*The multiplication of eparchies or churches <sui iuris> of the same liturgical families that use the same language, sometimes within the same territory, normally requires that standard translations be used. The competent authorities should agree among themselves to obtain this uniformity.*

The Revised Divine Liturgies promulgated on 6 January 2007 do not assist with the directive to obtain uniformity in translation. There are currently at least six English language translations of the Divine Liturgy produced by the different Catholic Byzantine Churches and several produced by the different Orthodox Byzantine Churches. Among the Orthodox Churches of the Ruthenian recension, the Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Diocese of Johnstown uses the 1964/1965 edition produced by the Byzantine-Ruthenian Catholic Church as its preferred standard Liturgicon. This newly promulgated Revised Divine Liturgy harms the unity in liturgical texts that currently exists between the Byzantine-Ruthenian Catholic Church in America and its parallel Orthodox jurisdiction.

The promulgation for this Revised Divine Liturgy should be withdrawn and the bishops of the Catholic Byzantine Churches in the English speaking countries should create a joint liturgical commission to prepare common translations of the Ruthenian and other liturgical books. Metropolitan Nicholas of the Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Diocese of Johnstown and Archbishop Vsevolod of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in America are both on record as desiring a common translation. It is a shame that not only does this newly promulgated Revised Divine Liturgy stray from the official Ruthenian liturgical books it also makes future liturgical unity with other Byzantine Catholics and Orthodox much more difficult, if not impossible.

It should be noted that, while the Ruthenian Catholic Church in America is promulgating a Revised Divine Liturgy that is not accurate when compared to the typical Roman edition, the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church – including the eparchies in America – restated their support for the official Ruthenian liturgical books at their Synod of Bishops which was held in September 2006. In the Resolutions from that Synod we find support and reinforcement for the common standard for the Ruthenian Churches:

*4. [We resolve] to inform the clergy and faithful of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church (UGCC) that the following documents concerning Divine Services, which were presented to the Eastern Churches by the Roman Apostolic See, are obligatory for the whole Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church:*

*1) The typikon on Vespers, Matins, and the Divine Liturgy published in Rome in 1953;*

*2) The document of the Second Vatican Council on liturgical matters “Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy (Sacrosanctum Concilium)”;*

3) *Instructions for applying the liturgical prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches, published by the Congregation for the Oriental Churches on January 6, 1996.*

In the future we will have both Byzantine-Ruthenian and Byzantine-Ukrainian parishes in the same city and sometimes across the street from one another (and sometimes even served by the same priest) using liturgical books that no longer match. This does not serve the Liturgical Instruction's directive to obtain uniformity.

The Way Forward: Since it makes absolutely no sense for each ethnic Byzantine jurisdiction (both Catholic and Orthodox) to each have a different translation of the service books the Byzantine Churches (Catholic and Orthodox) should work together to prepare a single translation that can be normative. Several Orthodox bishops in the United States have indicated a willingness to work together (and, indeed, the Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Diocese of Johnstown considers the Pittsburgh 1964 translation of the Chrysostom Liturgy and the 1976 Basil Liturgy to be normative for them).

Ideally, it would be good for the Congregation of the Eastern Churches to work with the Ecumenical Patriarchate and other Orthodox Patriarchates to form a joint translation committee to prepare quality English language editions of all liturgical texts. Such a joint committee would foster unity between the Catholic and Orthodox Churches.

As a very minimum, the Congregation of the Eastern Churches should insist that any new translations prepared by a single Church be considered as temporary, and not normative, until all Catholic Churches using the Byzantine Liturgy in English agree to a common translation.

***From the Liturgical Instruction:***

***29. Liturgical books and ecumenism***

*On the other hand, quite a number of editions of liturgical books published in Rome are sometimes appreciated and used by Orthodox brethren. Nonetheless, any unnecessary differentiation between the liturgical books of the Eastern Catholic Churches and those of the Orthodox should be avoided. Rather, common editions, in the measure in which it is possible, are encouraged. Pope John Paul II affirms, in the occasion of his address to the Catholics of the Armenian Church, "It is particularly dear to me to wish that the common study of the liturgy and its necessary adaptations be a privileged field of collaboration between Armenian Catholics and Orthodox." [29]*

*Such a wish is repeated anew in the general terms of the Ecumenical Directory n. 187 which exhorts the use of liturgical texts in common with other Churches or ecclesial Communities, because "when Christians pray together, with one voice, their common testimony reaches the heavens and is understood also on earth."*

Because the Revised Divine Liturgies promulgated on 6 January 2007 are not an accurate English translation of the official Ruthenian edition Liturgicon published at Rome and makes purposeful changes to both texts and rubrics they violate the directive since they

create unnecessary differentiation between the Byzantine-Ruthenian Catholic Church and both the other Byzantine Catholic Churches of the Ruthenian recension and the parallel Orthodox Churches which share this recension. As noted above the 1964/1965 edition of the Chrysostom Liturgy and the 1976 edition of the Basil Liturgy are in both in common use by the Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Diocese of Johnstown (where they are the preferred editions) and in some parishes of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in America. These newly promulgated revisions to the Divine Liturgy destroy the liturgical unity which we now share with both other Byzantine Catholic Churches and the Orthodox Churches. It seems that since some Orthodox Churches already use the Ruthenian Catholic (1964/1965) edition of the Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom and the 1976 edition of the Divine Liturgy of St. Basil and even consider these books to be their standard that these Churches should be part of any process to modify the Divine Liturgy, once it is fully restored in accordance with Section 18 of the Liturgical Instruction. But the Orthodox Churches are not considering the changes mandated by this newly promulgated Divine Liturgy and are, in fact, actively engaging in renewal to a usage that is very close to the official liturgical books of the Ruthenian recension.

The Way Forward: Individual Catholic Byzantine Churches should be required to seek input from the parallel Orthodox Church before translations are promulgated. As noted above, some of the Orthodox Churches are eager to work together to produce a common translation.

***From the Liturgical Instruction:***

***54. The Anaphoras in the Divine Liturgy***

*Considering that the Anaphora is a true masterpiece of mystagogical theology, it is appropriate to study the ways in which, at least in some circumstances, it could be pronounced aloud, so as to be heard by the faithful. The pastors should see to it that the people are formed according to that theology which is present in so pre-eminent a way in the Anaphora.*

The Revised Divine Liturgies promulgated on 6 January 2007 contain new rubrics that direct that many of the “secret” prayers of the priest be proclaimed aloud - including the Anaphora - in blatant imitation of the way these prayers and especially the Eucharistic Canon is prayed in the Mass of the Latin Rite.

This creates a problem with liturgical unity with other Byzantine Catholics of the Ruthenian recension since the official Church Slavonic edition of the Divine Liturgy of St. Basil clearly directs the recitation of the Anaphora in mystica (quietly).

This also creates a problem with liturgical unity with the Orthodox since most local Orthodox Churches prohibit the praying of these prayers aloud (and a priest who does so can be suspended).

It seems logical and correct that the authors of the *Liturgical Instruction* only called for “study” and did not mandate the Eastern Catholic Churches to adopt the custom of the Latins. The call for “study” allows for this custom to be considered by all of the Eastern

Churches which would then provide the soil for such a change in custom to grow organically rather than to be forced upon the Church.

It should also be considered that the results of the experimentation in the *Novus Ordo* Mass of the Latin Church (which the mandate imitates) have not borne fruit and the custom itself (the purposeful praying aloud of the Anaphora as a catechizing tool) has been questioned by many liturgical scholars, including Cardinal Ratzinger (now Pope Benedict XVI), especially in his book "The Spirit of the Liturgy". In a speech entitled "*We Experienced That There God Dwells With Men*" given by Cardinal Ratzinger in 1999 he specifically discussed the Byzantine Liturgy: "*What persuaded the envoys of the Russian Prince that the faith celebrated in the Orthodox liturgy was true was not a type of missionary argumentation whose elements appeared more enlightening to listeners than those of other religions. Rather, what struck them was the mystery as such, the mystery which, precisely by going beyond all discussion, caused the power of the truth to shine forth to the reason. Put in a different way, the Byzantine liturgy was not a way of teaching doctrine and was not intended to be. It was not a display of the Christian faith in a way acceptable or attractive to onlookers. What impressed onlookers about the liturgy was precisely its utter lack of an ulterior purpose, the fact that it was celebrated for God and not for spectators, that its sole intent was to be before God and for God "euarestos euprosdektos" (Romans 12:1; 15:16): pleasing and acceptable to God, as the sacrifice of Abel had been pleasing to God. Precisely this "disinterest" of standing before God and of looking toward Him was what caused a divine light to descend on what was happening and caused that divine light to be perceptible even to onlookers. We have, in this way, already reached a first important conclusion regarding the liturgy. To speak, as has been common since the 1950s, of a "missionary liturgy" is at the very least an ambiguous and problematic way of speaking. In many circles of liturgists, this has led, in a truly excessive way, to making the instructive element in the liturgy, the effort to make it understandable even for outsiders, the primary criterion of the liturgical form. The idea that the choice of liturgical forms must be made from the "pastoral" point of view suggests the presence of this same anthropocentric error. Thus the liturgy is celebrated entirely for men and women, it serves to transmit information--in so far as this is possible in view of the weariness which has entered the liturgy due to the rationalisms and banalities involved in this approach. In this view, the liturgy is an instrument for the construction of a community, a method of "socialization" among Christians. Where this is so, perhaps God is still spoken of, but God in reality has no role; it is a matter only of meeting people and their needs halfway and of making them contented. But precisely this approach ensures that no faith is fostered, for the faith has to do with God, and only where His nearness is made present, only where human aims are set aside in favor of the reverential respect due to Him, only there is born that credibility which prepares the way for faith.*" (Eutopia Magazine, Catholic University of America, Vol. 3 No. 4: May/June 1999)

The Way Forward: The Ruthenian Catholic Church should not prohibit the celebration of the Divine Liturgy according to the official books of the Ruthenian recension published by Rome. The soil could be prepared for possible organic growth in which these secret prayers might be allowed to be prayed out loud. The result of possible organic development should not be either assumed or forced. And certainly the liturgical books

should not be amended with new rubrics until a parallel development has also occurred across the Orthodox Churches.

---

**Violations of the Principles given in *Liturgiam Authenticam* ([www.vatican.va](http://www.vatican.va)):**

***From Liturgiam Authenticam:***

4. *The Second Vatican Ecumenical Council in its deliberations and decrees assigned a singular importance to the liturgical rites, the ecclesiastical traditions, and the discipline of Christian life proper to those particular Churches, especially of the East, which are distinguished by their venerable antiquity, manifesting in various ways the tradition received through the Fathers from the Apostles. (Cf. Second Vatican Council, Decr. On Eastern Catholic Churches, Orientalium Ecclesiarum, n. 1.)*

*The Council asked that the traditions of each of these particular Churches be preserved whole and intact. For this reason, even while calling for the revision of the various Rites in accordance with sound tradition, the Council set forth the principle that only those changes were to be introduced which would foster their specific organic development. (Cf. Second Vatican Council, Const. Sacrosanctum Concilium, n. 4; Decr. Orientalium Ecclesiarum, nn. 2, 6.)*

The official liturgical books of the Ruthenian recension published in Rome beginning with the Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom in 1941 through the Archieraticon in 1973 preserve the liturgical tradition of the Ruthenian recension whole and intact. The promulgation of the Revised Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom and the Revised Divine Liturgy of St. Basil the Great by the Ruthenian Catholic Church in America on 6 January 22, 2007 violates the principles given in *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* and *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, as reviewed in *Liturgiam Authenticam*. The introduction of a new set of liturgical rubrics modeled after the Latin Church does not assist to manifest the ecclesiastical tradition we have received from the Fathers (especially the Eastern Fathers) which they in turn have received from the Apostles.

***From Liturgiam Authenticam:***

7. *For these reasons, it now seems necessary to set forth anew, and in light of the maturing of experience, the principles of translation to be followed in future translations whether they be entirely new undertakings or emendations of texts already in use and to specify more clearly certain norms that have already been published, taking into account a number of questions and circumstances that have arisen in our own day. In order to take full advantage of the experience gained since the Council, it seems useful to express these norms from time to time in terms of tendencies that have been evident in past translations, but which are to be avoided in future ones. In fact, it seems necessary to consider anew the true notion of liturgical translation in order that the translations of the Sacred Liturgy into the vernacular languages may stand secure as the authentic voice of the Church of God. (Cf. Pope Paul VI, Address to translators of liturgical texts into vernacular languages, 10 November 1965: AAS 57 (1965) 968.)*



*This Instruction therefore envisions and seeks to prepare for a new era of liturgical renewal, which is consonant with the qualities and the traditions of the particular Churches, but which safeguards also the faith and the unity of the whole Church of God.*

This new revision of the Divine Liturgies of St. John Chrysostom and St. Basil the Great effectively divides the Ruthenian Church in America from the other Churches (Catholic and Orthodox) which together share the Ruthenian Recension. It is effectively the first major step to creating a new liturgical recension. This Revision of these Divine Liturgies harms the security in liturgy shared by the Churches of the Ruthenian recension (Catholic and Orthodox). It also harms the unity of the whole Church of God because it makes the Ruthenian Catholic Church in America noticeably different than the other Catholic Churches of the Ruthenian recension. It also harms the official liturgical unity we currently share with the Orthodox Churches, especially the liturgical unity we share with the Orthodox Churches of the Ruthenian recension.

***From Liturgiam Authenticam:***

*20. The Latin liturgical texts of the Roman Rite, while drawing on centuries of ecclesial experience in transmitting the faith of the Church received from the Fathers, are themselves the fruit of the liturgical renewal, just recently brought forth. In order that such a rich patrimony may be preserved and passed on through the centuries, it is to be kept in mind from the beginning that the translation of the liturgical texts of the Roman Liturgy is not so much a work of creative innovation as it is of rendering the original texts faithfully and accurately into the vernacular language. While it is permissible to arrange the wording, the syntax and the style in such a way as to prepare a flowing vernacular text suitable to the rhythm of popular prayer, the original text, insofar as possible, must be translated integrally and in the most exact manner, without omissions or additions in terms of their content, and without paraphrases or glosses. Any adaptation to the characteristics or the nature of the various vernacular languages is to be sober and discreet. (Cf. the Consilium "for the implementation of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy", Letter to the Presidents of the Conferences of Bishops, 21 June 1967: Notitiae 3 (1967) 296; Card. Secr. of State, Letter to the Pro-Prefect of the Congr. for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, 1 February 1997.)*

The principle is valid for the Eastern Churches. That is, that the official liturgical texts of the Ruthenian recension prepared and promulgated by Rome do “*transmit the faith of the Church received from the Fathers*” and “*are themselves the fruit of the liturgical renewal.*” These recently promulgated Divine Liturgies of St. John Chrysostom and St. Basil the Great fail to translate the official editions “*integrally and in the most exact manner, without omissions or additions in terms of their content, and without paraphrases or glosses.*” Instead, these new revisions of these Divine Liturgies make purposeful abbreviations and rubrical changes away from the official liturgical books.

***From Liturgiam Authenticam:***

*24. Furthermore, it is not permissible that the translations be produced from other translations already made into other languages; rather, the new translations must be made directly from the original texts, namely the Latin, as regards the texts of ecclesiastical composition, or the Hebrew, Aramaic, or Greek, as the case may be, as*

*regards the texts of Sacred Scripture. (Cf. S. Congr. of Rites, Instr. Inter Oecumenici, n. 40 a: AAS 56 (1964) 885.)*

The principle is valid for the Eastern Churches. For Ruthenian Catholics the original text for purposes of translation is the Church Slavonic text issued by Rome. These new Revised Divine Liturgies of Chrysostom and Basil were not translated from the original Church Slavonic text but from the Greek text. The Greek editions of these Divine Liturgies are surely excellent but it is the Slavonic editions of these books, published by Rome, which are to Ruthenians what the *Nova Vulgata Editio* is to the Latin Church. Approval of these books should be withdrawn until they can be corrected to match the official editions of the Ruthenian recension.

***From Liturgiam Authenticam:***

*25. So that the content of the original texts may be evident and comprehensible even to the faithful who lack any special intellectual formation, the translations should be characterized by a kind of language which is easily understandable, yet which at the same time preserves these texts' dignity, beauty, and doctrinal precision. (Cf. Pope Paul VI, Address to translators of liturgical texts into vernacular languages, 10 November 1965: AAS 57 (1965) 968; Congr. for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, Instr. Varietates legitimæ, n. 53: AAS 87 (1995) 308.)*

The newly Revised Divine Liturgies do not preserve doctrinal precision. The use of what is known as “inclusive language” (“gender neutral language”) creates theological confusion in places where the older text provided theological accuracy. There are numerous examples, but one may suffice here. In the dismissal of the Divine Liturgy the wordings used in the 1964/1965 edition (now in common use) were precise and clear: “*For [Christ] is gracious and loves mankind.*” The Revised Divine Liturgies render this as “*For Christ is good and loves us all.*” The term “mankind” clearly refers to all men from Adam to the last soul conceived before the Second Coming. The term “us all” is potentially exclusive and could easily mean only those people gathered at that point in time. It does not make sense to replace a translation that was inclusive and doctrinally clear with one that is potentially exclusive and doctrinally confusing.

***From Liturgiam Authenticam:***

*30. In many languages there exist nouns and pronouns denoting both genders, masculine and feminine, together in a single term. The insistence that such a usage should be changed is not necessarily to be regarded as the effect or the manifestation of an authentic development of the language as such. Even if it may be necessary by means of catechesis to ensure that such words continue to be understood in the "inclusive" sense just described, it may not be possible to employ different words in the translations themselves without detriment to the precise intended meaning of the text, the correlation of its various words or expressions, or its aesthetic qualities. When the original text, for example, employs a single term in expressing the interplay between the individual and the universality and unity of the human family or community (such as the Hebrew word 'adam, the Greek anthropos, or the Latin homo), this property of the language of the original text should be maintained in the translation. Just as has occurred at other times in history, the Church herself must freely decide upon the system of language that will*

*serve her doctrinal mission most effectively, and should not be subject to externally imposed linguistic norms that are detrimental to that mission.*

The translations used in the Revised Divine Liturgies of Chrysostom and Basil violate this directive. In the Symbol of Faith (the Creed) they replace the very clear “*Who for us men and for our salvation*” with the potentially exclusive “*who for us and our salvation*”. The term “anthropos” is omitted from the Creed, thus changing the Creed.

In 2002 Jorge A. Cardinal Medina Estévez, Prefect, Congregation of Divine Worship, spoke to this issue for the Latin Church in ***Observations on the English-language Translation of the Roman Missal:***

*III. Examples of problems related to questions of "inclusive language" and of the use of masculine and feminine terms*

*A. In an effort to avoid completely the use of the term "man" as a translation of the Latin homo, the translation often fails to convey the true content of that Latin term, and limits itself to a focus on the congregation actually present or to those presently living. The simultaneous reference to the unity and the collectivity of the human race is lost. The term "humankind", coined for purposes of "inclusive language", remains somewhat faddish and ill-adapted to the liturgical context, and, in addition, it is usually too abstract to convey the notion of the Latin homo. The latter, just as the English "man", which some appear to have made the object of a taboo, are able to express in a collective but also concrete and personal manner the notion of a partner with God in a Covenant who gratefully receives from him the gifts of forgiveness and Redemption. At least in many instances, an abstract or binomial expression cannot achieve the same effect.*

*B. In the Creed, which has unfortunately also maintained the first-person plural "We believe" instead of the first-person singular of the Latin and of the Roman liturgical tradition, the above-mentioned tendency to omit the term "men" has effects that are theologically grave. This text - "For us and for our salvation" - no longer clearly refers to the salvation of all, but apparently only that of those who are present. The "us" thereby becomes potentially exclusive rather than inclusive.*

The Greek “anthropos” is the exact equivalent of the Latin “homo”. How is it possible that in the year of our Lord 2007 an English translation of any of the Divine Liturgies of any of the Particular Catholic Churches – Eastern or Western – omits the word “anthropos” (“homo”) when the head of the Congregation for Divine Worship has stated that “*to omit the term "men" has effects that are theologically grave*”? The earlier 1964/1965 edition was correct in using the phrase “for us men and for our salvation”. This error must be corrected.

There are a number of examples of the type of inclusive language prohibited by the Congregation for Divine Worship, not just in the texts of the Revised Divine Liturgies that have been promulgated but also in the changeable texts (the “troparia” and other hymns) for the entire liturgical year that have been rewritten to embrace this type of “inclusive language”.

It should also be noted that the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese in America has now prohibited all translations of the Symbol of Faith except for the official translation which correctly translates the term “anthropos” as “men”. The various Orthodox Churches in the English speaking world are slowly but surely making it clear that the so-called “inclusive language” is alien to Orthodox anthropology.

***From Liturgiam Authenticam:***

*32. The translation should not restrict the full sense of the original text within narrower limits. To be avoided on this account are expressions characteristic of commercial publicity, political or ideological programs, passing fashions, and those which are subject to regional variations or ambiguities in meaning. Academic style manuals or similar works, since they sometimes give way to such tendencies, are not to be considered standards for liturgical translation. On the other hand, works that are commonly considered "classics" in a given vernacular language may prove useful in providing a suitable standard for its vocabulary and usage.*

Inclusive language is clearly a passing fashion in modern English. It is the product of those who are well meaning but incorrect in their desire to erase all innate differences between men and women. Translations of the Divine Liturgy which embrace such political agendas should be rejected. We in the Byzantine Church must learn from the lessons of our brethren in the Latin Church. If we avoid the use of inclusive language we avoid the problems that the Latin Church is now working diligently to correct.

***From Liturgiam Authenticam:***

*36. In order that the faithful may be able to commit to memory at least the more important texts of the Sacred Scriptures and be formed by them even in their private prayer, it is of the greatest importance that the translation of the Sacred Scriptures intended for liturgical use be characterized by a certain uniformity and stability, such that in every territory there should exist only one approved translation, which will be employed in all parts of the various liturgical books. This stability is especially to be desired in the translation of the Sacred Books of more frequent use, such as the Psalter, which is the fundamental prayer book of the Christian people. (Cf. Pope Paul VI, Apost. Const. *Laudis canticum*, 1 November 1970. n. 8: AAS 63 (1971) 532-533; *Officium Divinum, Liturgia Horarum iuxta Ritum romanum, editio typica altera* 1985: *Institutio Generalis de Liturgia Horarum*, n. 100; Pope John Paul II, Apost. Letter *Vicesimus quintus annus*, n. 81 (1989) 904-905.)*

The newly Revised Divine Liturgies of Chrysostom and Basil make unnecessary changes to texts that are already accurately translated and have been committed to memory by the faithful for the past 40 years. If it is truly the desire of the Church that the Byzantine Churches which use English as the primary language of the Divine Liturgy are to soon come to a common English translation of the original Church Slavonic texts from the editions promulgated by Rome, then any changes to the texts memorized by the faithful premature to the introduction of a common text should be minimal, so as to preclude the changing of liturgical texts prayed and often memorized by the people twice in a single generation. These revisions to the Divine Liturgies harm the stability the Ruthenian Church has had for the past 40 years and will make it more difficult to someday introduce

texts that will be uniform translations of the same Slavonic original texts common to all the Byzantine Churches. (Cf. *Liturgical Instruction Section 25.*)

***From Liturgiam Authenticam:***

***B. The Creed or Profession of Faith***

*65. By means of the Creed (Symbolum) or profession of faith, the whole gathered people of God respond to the word of God proclaimed in the Sacred Scriptures and expounded in the homily, recalling and confessing the great mysteries of the faith by means of a formula approved for liturgical use. (Missale Romanum, editio typica tertia: Institutio Generalis, n. 78.)*

*The Creed is to be translated according to the precise wording that the tradition of the Latin Church has bestowed upon it, including the use of the first person singular, by which is clearly made manifest that "the confession of faith is handed down in the Creed, as it were, as coming from the person of the whole Church, united by means of the Faith." (St. Thomas Aquinas, Summa Theologiae, IIaIIae, I, 9. St. Thomas Aquinas, Summa Theologiae, IIaIIae, I, 9.)*

The principle is true for the Eastern Churches. The newly promulgated text of the Creed omits the word “anthropos”. See the comments on the theological problems this change to the Creed creates by Jorge A. Cardinal Medina Estévez above. The Creed should be translated exactly.

***From Liturgiam Authenticam:***

*74. A certain stability ought to be maintained whenever possible in successive editions prepared in modern languages. The parts that are to be committed to memory by the people, especially if they are sung, are to be changed only for a just and considerable reason. Nevertheless, if more significant changes are necessary for the purpose of bringing the text into conformity with the norms contained in this Instruction, it will be preferable to make such changes at one time, rather than prolonging them over the course of several editions. In such case, a suitable period of catechesis should accompany the publication of the new text.*

If indeed the various Byzantine Catholic Churches are going to work together to fulfill the Liturgical Instruction’s desire for a common text of the Byzantine Liturgy we share with other Churches (Catholic and Orthodox) then the promulgation of these Revised Divine Liturgies of Chrysostom and Basil makes no sense since the other Byzantine Catholic Churches are not making such rubrican and textual revisions to the Divine Liturgy but are instead working faithfully to restore a praxis that approaches that given in the official liturgical books of the Ruthenian recension published by Rome.

The editions of the Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom (1964/1965) and the Divine Liturgy of St. Basil the Great (1976) were not perfect but were in very close conformity with the normative Church Slavonic editions. The newly promulgated Revised Divine Liturgies of Chrysostom and Basil are not in conformity with the norms for the Ruthenian Church. Any future attempts to return to employ the normative versions of the Divine

Liturgy will only serve problematic. These Revised Divine Liturgies only serve to harm stability.

The Way Forward: The Congregation for the Eastern Churches should prepare and promulgate an equivalent of *Liturgiam Authenticam* for the Eastern Catholic Churches, preferably one prepared in conjunction or consultation with the Orthodox Churches. While *Liturgiam Authenticam* is a document addressed to the Latin Church the principles of authenticity and accuracy in translation are valid for all Catholic Churches. No new translations of Eastern liturgical texts should be approved until such a directive is in place. This will allow the Eastern Catholic Churches to learn from the problems the Latin Church encountered in translation (especially into English). The current Ruthenian translations mimics the problems the Latin Church is now seeking to fix.

---

***From the Code of Canons of Oriental Churches:***

*Canon 40 §1. Hierarchs who preside over Churches sui iuris and all other hierarchs are to see most carefully to the faithful protection and accurate observance of their own rite, and not admit changes in it except by reason of its organic progress, keeping in mind, however, mutual goodwill and the unity of Christians.*

The Revised Divine Liturgies promulgated on 6 January 2007 do not “*see most carefully to the faithful protection and accurate observance*” of the Ruthenian Rite. This Revision introduces changes that are not organic and harm the unity of Christians. The rubrical and textual changes are not organic (one cannot legislate organic change in advance). This Revision does not serve the mutual goodwill and unity of Christians because these changes make the Ruthenian Catholic Church liturgically different than other Byzantine Catholic Churches, effectively removing the Ruthenian Catholic Church in America from the Ruthenian Recension. They also make us different then other Orthodox Churches.

---

***Inaestimabile Donum approved by Pope John Paul II on 17 April 1980:***

*"The faithful have a right to a true Liturgy, which means the Liturgy desired and laid down by the Church, which has in fact indicated where adaptations may be made as called for by pastoral requirements in different places or by different groups of people. Undue experimentation, changes and creativity bewilder the faithful."*

Because the Revised Divine Liturgies promulgated on 6 January 2007 are both incomplete and introduce many changes the faithful are denied their right to the Liturgy laid down by the Church at Rome when it promulgated the official Church Slavonic edition of the Byzantine Divine Liturgies for the Ruthenian Recension (beginning in 1942). No other Byzantine Catholic or Byzantine Orthodox Church has engaged in this type of experimentation with the Divine Liturgy. Indeed, the other Byzantine Catholic and Orthodox Churches that share in the Ruthenian Recension are working diligently to renew the celebration of the Divine Liturgy in accordance with the shared standard that exists in the official Slavonic books published by Rome.

What is needed is an accurate, complete and common translation of all the Slavonic Liturgical books of the Ruthenian Recension. Individual parishes should not be prohibited from celebrating the Divine Liturgy and other Divine Services according to the official liturgical books of the Ruthenian recension.

Prepared by:

John Vernoski, May 2007