

STUDIES ON THE BYZANTINE LITURGY - I

THE DRAFT TRANSLATION:
A RESPONSE TO THE
PROPOSED RECASTING
OF THE BYZANTINE-RUTHENIAN
DIVINE LITURGY OF SAINT
JOHN CHRYSOSTOM

Serge Keleher

2006



Copyright © 2006 Serge Keleher

Stauropegion Press
PO Box 11096
Pittsburgh, PA 15237-9998

This small work is dedicated to

Metropolitan Joseph (Raya)
Archbishop of St. Jean d' Acre,
Haifa, Nazareth and All Galilee

Who fell asleep in the Lord on
10 June 2005
as this work was nearing completion.

“For though you have countless guides
in Christ, you do not have many fathers. For
I became your father in Christ Jesus
through the Gospel.”
I Corinthians 4:14-15

May Archbishop Joseph's Memory be Eternal!

EXORDIUM:

For a number of reasons, including the need to avoid any fresh differences with our separated brothers, the Eastern Catholic Church must avoid any idea of adapting its rites without prior agreement with the corresponding branches of the Orthodox Church.

We must not allow the adaptation of the liturgy to become an obsession. The liturgy, like the inspired writings, has a permanent value apart from the circumstances giving rise to it. Before altering a rite we should make sure that a change is strictly necessary. The liturgy has an impersonal character and also has universality in space and time. It is, as it were, timeless and thus enables us to see the divine aspect of eternity. These thoughts will enable us to understand what at first may seem shocking in some of the prayers of the liturgy – feasts that seem no longer appropriate, antiquated gestures, calls to vengeance which reflect a pre-Christian mentality, anguished cries in the darkness of the night, and so on. It is good to feel oneself thus linked with all the ages of mankind. We pray not only with our contemporaries but with men who have lived in all centuries.

We hope that this reminder of the principle of conservation in the liturgy coming from an Eastern patriarch will temper somewhat the ardour of reformers in both East and West.

His Holiness Maximos IV, Patriarch of Antioch,
Alexandria, Jerusalem and All the East.

The Eastern Churches and Catholic Unity,
Herder 1963, cited passage on page 226.

CONTENTS

Part I: the Context	1
1. Why These Comments?	3
2. The Controversy in its Historical Setting	13
3. A Process of Secrecy	47
4. Gender-Inclusive Language?	53
Part II: Observations on the 12 October 2004 Draft	67
5. The 12 October 2004 Draft Recasting/Translation	69
6. Some Notable Improvements	131
7. The Antiphons of the Enarxis	135
8. Some Rubrical Problems	139
9. Some Textual Inaccuracies	169
10. Some Questionable Translations	199
11. Offering the Anaphora Aloud	241
Part III: Conclusion	261
12. Some Unanswered Questions	263
13. What Now?	269
Appendix	A-1

PART I

THE CONTEXT

CHAPTER I

WHY COMMENTS FROM AN “OUTSIDER”?

In most areas of discussion, such a question would not arise; people review books, drafts and the like every day without requiring a particular “title” to justify the exercise. But since this writer is not a member of the Byzantine-Ruthenian Metropolitanate of Pittsburgh, does not live in the United States of America and English is not his language of choice, neither for the Divine Liturgy nor for much else, it would be naïve to assume that no one will ask what the draft of 12 October 2004 has to do with this writer.

Several friends have asked for a response to the draft of 12 October 2004. The draft of 12 October 2004 is certainly of interest. The Byzantine-Ruthenian Metropolitanate of Pittsburgh is an important Local Church in the Anglo-Byzantine world and English has become the most accessible language through which scholars, clergy and faithful of the several Eastern Orthodox and Greek-Catholic Churches are likely to communicate with each other. What the Pittsburgh Metropolitanate does in these matters will inevitably have some effect on the other Local Churches, if only by ricochet.

The Byzantine liturgical tradition is the common property of all the Churches which make use of that tradition – and is indeed part of the common heritage of all Christians.¹ Hence it

¹ Vatican II, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, § 5: “History, tradition and so many ecclesiastical institutions bear outstanding witness how much the Eastern Churches have merited for the universal Church. The Sacred Council, therefore, not only accords to this ecclesiastical and spiritual

is more than legitimate for Christians of other Local Churches to take an interest in what the Pittsburgh Metropolitanate is doing in liturgical matters; it would be strange if other Greek-Catholics and Eastern Orthodox did *not* take an interest and offer various thoughts on the subject. With specific reference to the Byzantine liturgical tradition and the Roman liturgical tradition, these passages from a recent book are particularly striking:

...the great forms of rite embrace many cultures. They...create communion among different cultures and languages. **They elude control by any individual, local community, or regional Church.** Unspontaneity is of their essence. In these rites I discover that something is approaching me here that I did not produce myself, which ultimately derives from divine revelation. That is why the Christian East calls the liturgy the “Divine Liturgy,” expressing thereby the liturgy’s independence from human control.²

Eventually, the idea of the given-ness of the liturgy, the fact that one cannot do with it what one will, faded from the public consciousness....However, it would lead to the breaking up of the foundations of Christian identity if the fundamental intuitions of the East, which are the fundamental intuitions of the early Church, were abandoned....Still less is any kind of general ‘freedom’ of manufacture, degenerating into spontaneous improvisation, compatible with the essence of faith and liturgy. The greatness of the liturgy depends

heritage the high regard which is its due and rightful praise, but also unhesitatingly looks on it as the heritage of the universal Church of Christ.”

² Joseph Ratzinger (now Pope Benedict XVI), *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, trans. John Saward (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2000), 165. Emphasis added.

– we shall have to repeat this frequently – on its spontaneity.³

The life of the liturgy does not come from what dawns upon the minds of individuals and planning groups... the liturgy becomes personal, true, and new, not through tomfoolery and banal experiments with the words, but through a courageous entry into the great reality that through the rite is always ahead of us and can never quite be overtaken.

...there can be development in the “Divine Liturgy,” a development, though, that takes place **without haste** or aggressive intervention, like the grain that grows ‘of itself’ in the earth (cf. Mk 4:28)...there can be variations within the ritual families.⁴

Two examples come to mind of such an organic development without haste or aggressive intervention, examples which many Greek-Catholics and Eastern Orthodox have beheld and enjoyed personally:

a) the restoration of the Divine Liturgy of Presanctified Gifts. Fifty or sixty years ago in North America, the use of this service in parishes was quite exceptional, both among Eastern Orthodox and among Greek-Catholics. Now it has become exceptional *not* to have the Divine Liturgy of Presanctified Gifts. This was not accomplished by any decree or act of coercion; rather it was done by patient celebration of the service in the seminaries, making the necessary texts available, and allowing the practice to spread in its own way, guided by the Holy Spirit. There were some problems on local levels;

³ Joseph Ratzinger (now Pope Benedict XVI), *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, trans. John Saward (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2000), 166.

⁴ Joseph Ratzinger (now Pope Benedict XVI), *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, trans. John Saward (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2000), 169. Emphasis added.

everything did not move simultaneously on an imposed timetable – but the results are wonderful.

b) The proclamation of the Resurrection Gospel at the doors of the temple on Holy Pascha. This custom may have arisen either in Jerusalem or in Constantinople; it was well established in the Greek Churches by the last quarter of the nineteenth century. From there, it has been spreading – almost unnoticeably, but effectively. It was in use at Saint Vladimir’s Seminary in 1963. Father Alexander Schmemmann did not present this to the seminarians as something mandatory; he simply proclaimed that Gospel himself. Many alumni of the seminary took up the practice, so that it has begun to spread to Slavic Churches which did not know of this previously. No one has imposed it – but no one has objected; reading this Gospel is quite effective.

The Holy See has expressed the intention of elaborating a *corpus* of norms, in collaboration with the Churches concerned, to adapt the 1996 *Instruction for applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*⁵ for the entire Byzantine liturgical family and yet for each specific Local Church. Clearly the Church expects the entire Byzantine liturgical family to take a fraternal interest in these matters.

At the same time, the various Local Churches of the Byzantine liturgical family have well-established local customs and variant readings of any number of liturgical texts. These differences do not necessarily detract from the essential unity of the Byzantine liturgical tradition; rather they provide a welcome dimension of richness and a heritage from which all benefit and which all may share in any number of ways.

⁵ Congregation for the Eastern Churches (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996), § 6b.

Pope John Paul II several times called for an “examination of conscience” on the part of the Church. In the words of Archbishop John Quinn:

An examination of conscience implies the willingness to face up to what is wrong, even sinful, to admit it, and to take steps to correct it....An examination of conscience means criticism.⁶

Archbishop Quinn goes on to remind his readers that

a striking example of contemporary criticism within the Church is the Cardinal Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, Joseph Ratzinger.⁷ In a book of personal reminiscences, Cardinal Ratzinger described the decision of Pope Paul VI to forbid the further use of the preconciliar rite of the Mass as the introduction of “a breach into the history of the liturgy whose consequences could be only tragic.”⁸ This criticism is significant, coming as it does from one of the most important members of the papal curia and directed against a recent Pope. It is surprising also that **it was made not in closed circles but in a published and widely read work.**⁹

Archbishop Quinn cites another example of such criticism from the spokesman of the Bishops of New Zealand during an *ad limina* visit on 21 November 1998, Bishop Peter James Cullinane. One of Bishop Cullinane’s points concerns the topic

⁶ John R. Quinn, *The Reform of the Papacy: The Costly Call to Christian Unity* (New York: Herder and Herder / Crossroad Publishing, 1999), 58-59.

⁷ Archbishop Quinn was writing in 1999. In 2005 Joseph Ratzinger became Pope Benedict XVI.

⁸ Joseph Ratzinger (now Pope Benedict XVI), *Milestones* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1998), 148.

⁹ John R. Quinn, *The Reform of the Papacy: The Costly Call to Christian Unity* (New York: Herder and Herder / Crossroad Publishing, 1999), 59.

of this present study directly. Bishop Quinn reports that Bishop Cullinane, addressing the Pope, mentioned

the declared intention of preserving the proper freedom of the Eastern Catholic Churches alongside the policy of evicting their priests from Latin dioceses or not permitting them to be ordained in Latin dioceses.¹⁰

Archbishop Quinn cited these and other instances of criticism “to illustrate that modern criticism of the Church does not come only from uninformed, disaffected, or malevolent sources.”¹¹ This present study is not written to express malevolence or disaffection; this study is intended to encourage the reprimatination of the authentic liturgical tradition, and to encourage further research and discussion toward that most desirable aim.

As Archbishop Quinn reminds us, the Second Vatican Council teaches that

while observing the moral order and the common benefit, people should be able to seek the truth freely, to express and publicize their views, to cultivate every art, and finally they should be informed of the truth of public affairs.¹²

The Council went on to apply the same thought to the Church:

It should be recognized that the faithful, clerical as well as lay, have a just freedom of inquiry, of thought and

¹⁰ John R. Quinn, *The Reform of the Papacy: The Costly Call to Christian Unity* (New York: Herder and Herder / Crossroad Publishing, 1999), 60-61.

¹¹ John R. Quinn, *The Reform of the Papacy: The Costly Call to Christian Unity* (New York: Herder and Herder / Crossroad Publishing, 1999), 61.

¹² Vatican II, *Gaudium et Spes*, § 59.

of humble and courageous expression in those matters in which they enjoy competence.¹³

Communio et Progresso, an important post-conciliar document known in English as the “Pastoral Instruction on the Means of Social Communication” and promulgated by the Pontifical Council for the Instruments of Social Communication on 29 January 1971, reveals in clear language that

Catholics should be fully aware of the real freedom to speak their minds which stems from a ‘feeling for the faith’ and from love....Those who exercise authority in the Church will take care to insure that there is responsible exchange of freely held and expressed opinion among the People of God.¹⁴

Archbishop Quinn reiterates a strong expression of Saint Augustine:

One must therefore tell the truth, especially when a difficulty makes it all the more urgent that the truth be told. Let those grasp it who can. Far be it that, in keeping silence out of consideration for those who might not be able to understand, not only truth be frustrated, but those be left in error who could have grasped the truth and thus escaped their error....How fearful we are that the truth may harm those who will not be able to understand! Why are we not afraid that

¹³ Vatican II, *Gaudium et Spes*, § 62.

¹⁴ *Communio et Progressio* §§ 115-117, 119, English translation (provided by the Pontifical Council for the Instruments of Social Communication) in *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post-Conciliar Documents*, ed. Austin Flannery, OP (Dublin, 1975), 293-349, cited passage on 332.

if we remain silent, those who could have understood will be deceived?¹⁵

If there is a need to offer criticism in the Church, as happens frequently in practice, one wants the criticism to be constructive and evangelical, guided by the Holy Spirit. As Saint Paul teaches:

the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, faithfulness, gentleness and self-control; against such there is no law.¹⁶ If we live by the Spirit, let us also walk by the Spirit. Let us have no self-conceit, no provoking of one another, no envy of one another.¹⁷

Archbishop Quinn continues:

Constructive criticism is motivated by the desire to improve the Church, to enable it to fulfil its mission more effectively. This kind of criticism is offered with consideration and respect, with faith and charity and the other qualities mentioned in Galatians... constructive criticism in the Church can also be forthright, bold, and courageous. Destructive criticism, on the other hand, is often divisive, intemperate, competitive, blind to a larger vision, and without reverence for authority.¹⁸

When reviewing such a draft, it is well to state clearly one's own preferences – it would be impossible to be qualified to review such a draft without having already formed certain

¹⁵ Saint Augustine of Hippo, *De Bono Perseverantiae*, 16, cited in Quinn, op. cit., 68-69.

¹⁶ Galatians 5:22-23.

¹⁷ Galatians 5:25-26.

¹⁸ John R. Quinn, *The Reform of the Papacy: The Costly Call to Christian Unity* (New York: Herder and Herder / Crossroad Publishing, 1999), 70.

opinions, both on general questions and on specific problems of liturgy and of translation.

The present writer is in fundamental agreement with the view that the Ruthenian liturgical tradition and practice was and remains in need of a serious repristination, and that this repristination must precede any attempt at a radical reform. This should not be taken as an endorsement of every jot and tittle of the *Recensio Rutena* editions; those books have been in print for sixty years or more; a re-evaluation after such a length of time is not inappropriate. Moreover, these sixty years have been a period of intense scholarship, of publications and of events in the secular world which have had serious influence on liturgical questions; some of these must also be taken into account. In 1932, Anton Baumstark (one of the “giants in the earth” of the whole liturgical movement) observed that “It seems to be of the nature of Liturgy to relate itself to the concrete situations of times and places.”¹⁹ Whether Baumstark was consciously referring to such events as the sudden publication explosion of liturgical books and related materials which has followed upon the collapse of Communism and the rapid invention of instantaneous communication and new methods of printing and publishing might be questioned, but it is beyond question that in consequence of these developments many important sources which were inaccessible to the members of the commission which produced the original *Recensio Rutena* service-books are now available to anyone who knows where to look and who has sufficient fluency in the relevant languages. Comparison of the *Recensio Rutena* service-books with these sources is essential – and that work is still in its infancy.

It would be possible to compose a list of minimum changes in both the original Church-Slavonic edition of the Liturgicon and the 1964/65 Ruthenian translation of that edition into

¹⁹ Anton Baumstark, *Comparative Liturgy*, rev. Bernard Botte (monk of Mont César), trans. F. L. Cross (Westminster, MD: Newman Press, 1958), 18.

English. But the sort of drastic recasting which the draft of 12 October 2004 represents goes much further; it is necessary to ask whether the necessary foundation for such a recasting has been laid.

So then, may these present comments may be received as a fraternal contribution, in the context of the larger discussion of how all of us try to serve our Local Churches in cultures and lands where her presence is relatively new.

Gratitude is due to many friends who gave valued assistance in this study, providing materials and offering many hours of proof-reading and helpful criticism. The views expressed and any errors of fact are exclusively the responsibility of the present writer, save in actual quotations.

THE CONTROVERSY AND ITS HISTORICAL SETTING

Liturgy is a matter of profound intimacy, affecting the deepest spiritual lives of those involved with divine worship. Differing understandings of Liturgy and different interpretations of liturgical data provoke serious disagreements which can become unpleasant quarrels. This happens even among the experts, the highly qualified liturgiologists. When bishops, clergy, monastics and lay people of a Local Church are at odds with one another on liturgical matters, this argument has not occurred in a vacuum. If one is to understand the disagreement and the points at issue, there is no avoiding the necessity to grasp the background, the history and the context of the disagreement. This remains true even after many people have forgotten some of the specific events of several decades ago, because emotions often endure longer than historical knowledge. This chapter seeks to explore the context and the background to the present discussion.

The awareness that a new English translation/redaction of the Divine Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom for use in the Byzantine-Ruthenian Metropolitanate of Pittsburgh is under serious consideration has been controversial for some time. The current controversy has its roots in an older and long-standing disagreement.

The Pittsburgh Byzantine-Ruthenian Church traces her origins to the Eparchy of Mukachiv,¹ which is located on the

¹ Mukachiv is a town in the Transcarpathian Region of western Ukraine. The diocese which bears the name of Mukachiv is based in the larger city of Užhorod, the regional capital, almost in walking distance to the Ukrainian-Slovak border. Transcarpathia is located geographically on

southern slopes of the Carpathian Mountains and includes the geographic mid-point of Europe.² The origins of this diocese are not certain, but popular belief asserts that the diocese was directly founded by the Cyrillomethodian mission in the ninth century.³ There are not sufficient documents or manuscripts available to establish the precise liturgical usage in the Eparchy of Mukachiv from the time of Saints Cyril and

the southern slopes of the Carpathian Mountains. The large majority of the population of this territory are Eastern Slavs; in religious affiliation they were almost entirely Greek-Catholic until a movement arose early in the twentieth century with the goal of returning to Eastern Orthodoxy (the Eparchy of Mukachiv had been Eastern Orthodox until 1646, when the "Union of Užhorod", similar to the Union of Brest in 1596, brought the Orthodox Christians of Transcarpathia into religious union with Roman Catholicism). For several reasons, the pro-Orthodox movement in Transcarpathia had some success in the first four decades of the twentieth century. After World War II the Soviet government, which took possession of Transcarpathia in the wake of the war, used blatant force and violence to aggregate the local Greek-Catholic Church (and the local Eastern Orthodox Church) to the Moscow Patriarchate. As the USSR disintegrated from 1988 through 1990, the Greek-Catholic Church in Transcarpathia was able to emerge from the catacombs, although not to the same extent as in Galicia (on the northern slopes of the Carpathians), so the Greek-Catholic Eparchy of Mukachiv is once again functioning more-or-less normally. Those seeking more information on the historical background will face a difficulty of nomenclature: as the Hungarians, the Slovaks, the Czechs and the Soviets have been in possession of Transcarpathia at various times, place names have changed repeatedly to suit the preferences of the occupying power at any given moment. Užhorod is also called Ungvar (in Hungarian) and Uzhgorod (Russian); Mukachiv is also called Munkacs (in Hungarian) and Mukačevo (in Slovak), and so it goes. The best popular work about this community is Paul Robert Magocsi, *Our People, Carpatho-Rusyns and Their Descendants in North America* (Toronto: Multicultural History Society of Ontario, 1984).

² The geographic mid-point of Europe is in the small village of Jasynja, in the eastern area of Transcarpathia (formerly Maramaros county, now the Rachiv region. A small monument marks the exact spot in question. Bishop Daniel (Ivancho) was born in this village on 30 March 1908.

³ The Cyrillomethodian mission founded seven dioceses – but only six are known by name. Mukachiv could conceivably be the "missing" seventh diocese. Moravia, an important base of the Cyrillomethodian mission, is in Slovakia, not far from Transcarpathia.

Methodius until the Union of Užhorod in 1646.⁴ However, by that time liturgical books in Church-Slavonic were being printed in Kyiv, in L'viv and elsewhere and some of these printed books have appeared in collections in and around Transcarpathia,⁵ so we may have reasonable confidence that the service-books in use were those of the tradition associated with Saint Peter (Mohyla), Metropolitan of Kyiv-Halych from 1632-1646.⁶

The relationship of the Eparchy of Mukachiv with the Greek-Catholic Church on the northern slopes of the Carpathians was and is problematic, but here we are mainly concerned with liturgical matters. The Eparchy of Mukachiv was not represented at the infamous Synod of Zamost' in 1720, nor at the Synod of L'viv in 1891, so the decrees of Zamost' had no legal force in the Eparchy of Mukachiv. Neither did the decrees of the 1891 Synod of L'viv.⁷ To some extent the usages

⁴ Even the basic documentation of the Union of Užhorod in 1646 is not altogether certain.

⁵ At the time of writing, *Transcarpathia* is the name of a region of Ukraine on the southern slopes of the Carpathian Mountains; this is the only territory of present-day Ukraine which had been part of the Hungarian Kingdom until the end of World War I. The term *Transcarpathia* is a relative newcomer to the geographic vocabulary. During the inter-war period a somewhat larger territory was under Czechoslovak administration and was then termed *Subcarpathian Rus'*. Some of that territory is now in the present-day Slovak state; Greek-Catholics in eastern Slovakia are organized for ecclesiastical purposes in the Eparchy of Prešov, created in 1818 by detaching several deaneries from the Eparchy of Mukachiv. Much more recently, the Eparchy of Prešov has itself been divided; the southern parts are now served by the Apostolic Exarchate of Košice.

⁶ In the Millennium Collection of the Rare Book Room of Robarts Library at the University of Toronto there is a "Mohyla" Church-Slavonic Liturgicon with marginalia showing that it was still in use in the Eparchy of Mukachiv until World War I. Cf. *The Millennium Collection of Old Ukrainian Books at the University of Toronto Library: a Catalogue*, Edward Kasinec and Bohdan Struminskyj, Chair of Ukrainian Studies (University of Toronto, 1984), 5-7 "The Liturgiarium" (L'viv, 1691).

⁷ The purported decrees concerning liturgy of that 1891 Synod had no canonical force anywhere, although they became customary in varying

of Zamost' and the 1891 Synod of L'viv reached the Eparchy of Mukachiv by way of custom, but there was always an awareness that the Eparchy of Mukachiv had a distinct liturgical identity of her own.

As all historians of liturgy are aware, the invention of the printing press did much to advance the idea of *uniformity* in liturgy. Some liturgical books were printed in Transcarpathia, especially popular prayer-books but also some books for the use of the clergy in conducting divine services. However the 1905 Liturgicon,⁸ published in L'viv, quickly found a welcome in Transcarpathia, and in those daughter Churches of the Eparchy of Mukachiv which continued to use Church-Slavonic.⁹

degrees in different places. Cf. *Письма-Послання Митрополита Андрея Шенгитського, ЧСВВ. з часів німецької окупації*, Bibliotheca Logos, Volumen XXX (Yorkton, Sask., Canada, 1969), 157.

⁸ This 1905 Liturgicon is a *missale plenum*, modeled on the *Missale Romanum*, and could justly be called the *Missale Ruthenum*. The bibliographic pedigree of this missal originates with a Greek *missale plenum* published by Cardinal Nerli in 1683 at the Monastery of Grottaferrata for the monks' use when serving the Byzantine Liturgy. Metropolitan Cyprian (Zhokhovsky) of Kyiv-Halych and All Rus' found this Greek "missal" attractive, and edited a similar "missal" in Church-Slavonic, which he published at 1692 in Vilnius, Lithuania. This Zhokhovsky "missal" became the model for similar Ruthenian "missals" published at least in 1697 (Suprasl), 1733 (Univ) 1734 (Pochaiv), 1735 (Pochaiv), 1740 (Univ), 1744 (Pochaiv – this edition was the first to give the rubrics for the "read Mass", to be found in the 1905 missal on page 320 of the Mundare, Canada reprint during World War II), 1747 (Univ), 1755 (Pochaiv), 1755 (L'viv), 1763 (Suprasl), 1780 (L'viv), 1788 (Pochaiv), 1791 (Pochaiv), 1840 (Peremyshl) and L'viv 1866. In the twentieth century, the 1905 Church-Slavonic Liturgicon or *Missale Ruthenum* was reprinted at least twice: once in Mundare, Alberta, Canada during World War II (by that time the 1941 edition had already been printed in Rome, but communications between Rome and Canada during the period were virtually impossible and the need for service-books was acute) and in Rome, although not by the Holy See (a private printer did this as an investment), probably in 1968. The book is now out of print but second-hand copies are easily found.

⁹ Thus the Eparchy of Prešov, founded in 1818 in what is now eastern Slovakia, welcomed the 1905 Liturgicon, and – importantly for our

The use of the 1905 Liturgicon did not necessarily mean that the clergy¹⁰ followed the prescriptions of this book to the letter – there were many variations. In the USA one could find significant differences of liturgical usage from one parish to the next and from one priest to another. The liturgical situation was chaotic. This can even be demonstrated from popular prayer-books, which give liturgical texts showing significant variations from one book to the next. The Greek-Catholic hierarchy found this liturgical chaos unpalatable.

By the second half of the nineteenth century a dispute was already in full swing¹¹ between those who wanted a liturgical practice as close as possible to the liturgical practice of Eastern Orthodoxy,¹² and those who wanted a liturgical practice as different as possible from that of Eastern Orthodoxy.¹³ The

purposes – the parishes in the USA with clergy and faithful from Transcarpathia and eastern Slovakia continued to use the 1905 Liturgicon until the shift from Church-Slavonic to English. There are probably parishes of the Byzantine-Ruthenian Pittsburgh Metropolitanate where the 1905 L'viv Liturgicon is in use even today.

¹⁰ Lay people would seldom have had occasion to use the 1905 Liturgicon, which is an altar book, although some lectors and cantors would use it for the Epistle and/or the occasional chants.

¹¹ An early salvo in this controversy was the publication of Father Eugene Fentsik's book *Литургика или Объяснение Богослужения Святой, Восточной, Православно Католической Церкви* (Budapest, 1878). The book has the *Imprimatur* of Bishop Nicholas (Toth) of Prešov – the *Imprimatur* was later withdrawn. In February 1990 one could purchase mint-condition copies of the book at the Orthodox bookstore in Prešov.

¹² Metropolitan Andrew (Sheptytsky) of Kyiv-Halych eventually became the crucial leader of those who wanted a liturgical practice as close as possible to that of Eastern Orthodoxy. He was a figure of immense personal authority; his loyalty to the Catholic Church was beyond question and he enjoyed the confidence of successive Popes.

¹³ Those who wanted a liturgical practice as different as possible from that of Eastern Orthodoxy eventually had Bishop Gregory (Khomyshyn) of Stanislaviv (now Ivan-Frankivsk) as their most outstanding leader. On 23 March 1931 Bishop Gregory published a notorious pastoral letter "On Byzantinism" – Bishop Gregory had no use for anything Byzantine, openly regretted that Ukraine had received the faith from Constantinople instead of from Rome and to crown all asserted that Communism is the twentieth-century lineal descendant of Byzantium.

polemics of the discussion, especially during the inter-war period,¹⁴ often included accusations against the personal integrity of this or that advocate of one view or the other. The religious orders became involved: the Studites from the beginning were supportive of Byzantine liturgical authenticity. The Basilians opposed the movement for liturgical reparation. The Redemptorists were in a difficult position: their bishop, Hieromartyr Nicholas (Charnetsky),¹⁵ was accustomed to serve according to the Orthodox Niconian tradition and so were his priests and deacons. At the same time the Redemptorists were also involved in preaching missions and trying to serve the faithful, often with various devotional forms adopted wholesale from the Roman liturgical and paraliturgical tradition. So the Redemptorist approach to the problem was not always consistent.

Still worse: in the minds of some people the liturgical dispute became linked with secular politics. That problem at least seems to have been largely absent in the Pittsburgh jurisdiction, although there have been occasional reverberations from the battles in Eastern Europe.

To make a long story a little shorter, while Metropolitan Andrew was not able by himself to overcome the objections of his opponents on the liturgical front, he succeeded in convincing the bishops to refer the entire question to the Holy See, asking the Holy See to provide a set of official or “typical”

The pastoral letter was translated into Italian and circulated among the cognoscenti in Rome; in after years a copy was kept in the library of the Pontifical Oriental Institute and photocopies of that copy are still to be found here and there (*Lettera Pastorale di Mons. Gregorio Chomyszyn, Vescovo di Stanislaviv, al Clero della Diocesi di Stanislaviv, sul Bizantinismo*, Traduzione dei Sacerdoti A. N. e C. D. A., Stanislaviv 1931, A spese dell'Ordinariato Vescovile). The original Ukrainian text was published in Bishop Gregory's diocesan newspaper. The Italian translation was privately printed in Rome.

¹⁴ 1918-1939.

¹⁵ Apostolic Visitor and later Apostolic Exarch of Volyn, Pidlassia and Polessia.

liturgical books for all the Greek-Catholics of the “Ruthenian”¹⁶ tradition to use. The Bishops of Mukachiv-Užhorod, Prešov, Križevtsi, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia and Winnipeg all belonged to Metropolitan Andrew’s episcopal assemblies and associated themselves with the petition to Rome, asking the Holy See to produce this “typical” set of liturgical books for them.¹⁷

The Great Depression and World War II both made the liturgical matter more difficult. The USA had a particular problem not of its own making: Rome’s decision to forbid the ordination of married men to major orders in the three Exarchates in North America had an especially hurtful effect on the Pittsburgh Exarchate. When Bishop Basil (Takach) insisted on enforcing Rome’s imposition of celibacy,¹⁸ he faced an opposition movement which eventually led to the creation of a Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Diocese in the USA,¹⁹ within the jurisdiction of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople. The imposition of celibacy and the division of the Exarchate between those who remained in union with Rome and those who formed the Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Diocese were accomplished with bitterness and trauma for all

¹⁶ Defining the term *Ruthenian* is a thorny challenge; its meaning has changed several times. But in this particular instance the bishops were referring to those eparchies and exarchates using Church-Slavonic as a liturgical language and using the 1905 Liturgicon (in varying degrees). There were also much smaller communities of Greek-Catholics serving in Church-Slavonic but using either the Niconian service books or the pre-Niconian service books; they were not included in this request to Rome.

¹⁷ Cyril Korolevsky, *Metropolitan Andrew* (L’viv: Stauropegion, 1993), 433-436 gives a brief account of the process of producing these books. Cf. also Archimandrite Victor J. Pospishil, “Sheptyts’kyi and Liturgical Reform” in *Morality and Reality, The Life and Times of Andrei Sheptyts’kyi*, ed. Paul Robert Magocsi (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, University of Alberta, 1989), 201-225.

¹⁸ Following the 1929 *Cum Data Fuerit* decree of the Holy See.

¹⁹ The diocesan cathedral, seminary and bishop’s residence are now located at Johnstown, Pennsylvania. Metropolitan Nicholas of Amisos is the ruling bishop at the time of writing.

concerned; huge amounts of money were lost on seemingly endless litigation to determine the ownership of Church properties. Even at the time of writing, seven decades later, the scars of this painful tragedy are not fully healed.

On the specific matter of Liturgy, the Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Diocese prided itself on maintaining the liturgical practice of the Greek-Catholic Church in the USA as that liturgical practice had been brought from Transcarpathia and had remained in America until the outbreak of the celibacy crisis. Changes came, but gradually and patiently, since the people were strongly attached to the familiar services.²⁰ Meanwhile the Pittsburgh Exarchate was introducing various innovations, all of which were in a Latin direction.

World War II brought much stress to all the various Churches in most countries, including the USA. During the war the Vatican was able to send²¹ sample copies of the new liturgical books²² to each of the bishops as these books were published, but it was far more difficult to provide copies in sufficient numbers for the clergy. In 1942 Metropolitan Andrew published a good two-color reprint of the new edition of the Divine Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom. Intended for the clergy, Metropolitan Andrew printed 5,000 copies, which

²⁰ The Carpatho-Russian faithful, both Greek-Catholic and Eastern Orthodox, are passionately fond of singing in Church, and often know the liturgy remarkably well. One-volume compendia (in Church-Slavonic) of the Vespers and Orthros services for Sundays and feast days, the Paschal cycle and so on were quite popular. The particular tradition of liturgical chant (often called “Prostopinije”) believed to have originated in Transcarpathia was and is perhaps the single most important and distinctive liturgical characteristic of this community.

²¹ One assumes that the Vatican had to use diplomatic channels for this purpose.

²² Father Cyril Korolevsky reports that the new books were printed in Rome, partly at Grottaferrata and partly at the Vatican Press because of war conditions – and used “beautifully tinted Slovakian paper” (“The Liturgical Publications of the Sacred Eastern Congregation,” *Eastern Churches Quarterly* 6, no. 7 (July-September 1946): 388-399, cited passage on 395.

was a remarkable achievement in the midst of World War II.²³ In 1944 the Eparchy of Mukachiv managed to publish a black-and-white²⁴ reprint of the 1941 Roman edition of the *recensio rutena* Divine Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom; this reprint was almost certainly done on the initiative of Hieromartyr Theodore (Romzha),²⁵ who was appointed Bishop on 8 August 1944 and made the reprint available to his clergy.²⁶ Thus one might have expected that the Pittsburgh Exarchate, which was a daughter Church of the Eparchy of Mukachiv, would have received the new Roman edition gladly. Events did not so transpire.²⁷

²³ At the time the Archeparchy of L'viv had just over a thousand diocesan priests, and the two suffragan dioceses had just over 1,100 diocesan priests. However, Metropolitan Andrew was certainly looking towards the uncertain future; no one could know when it would be possible to print such a book again.

²⁴ To distinguish the rubrics from the text, this black-and-white reprint adds an asterisk before each rubric.

²⁵ Pope John Paul II beatified the Hieromartyr Theodore in June 2001.

²⁶ Bishop John brought his book to Rome when he came for the 1990 synod with the Pope and graciously allowed an interested priest to make a photocopy. Hieromartyr Theodore had ordained Bishop John to the priesthood on 6 July 1947 and gave the new priest a copy of the 1944 reprint as a memento of the ordination. The reprint was produced in the printing house of the Order of Saint Basil the Great, in Užhorod, by the authority of the administration of the Eparchy of Mukachiv – meaning, one assumes, Blessed Theodore. We do not know how many copies were printed – but it appears that Blessed Theodore was also anticipating a troubled future, since his reprint includes a short form of Absolution, a short form of the Anointing of the Sick, a final Absolution for the dying, and a very short form with which to convey the papal absolution to the dying.

²⁷ We do not yet know whether Bishop Basil and the leading priests of the Pittsburgh Exarchate were even aware of the 1944 reprint of the *recensio rutena* Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom in Užhorod; ordinary communications were nonexistent, so it would have been a question of someone succeeding in bringing a copy from Transcarpathia to the USA in the midst of the closing months of World War II. From the end of World War II until around 1955, there were no postal communications between the USSR and the USA.

It would have been impractical for the Pittsburgh Exarchate to do much about the new editions during World War II; money was tight and there were wartime restrictions on civilian travel and on printing. Bishop Basil (Takach) was seriously ill and incapacitated; as soon as the war ended he urgently requested a Bishop-Coadjutor. The Holy See²⁸ appointed Father Daniel Ivancho as the Bishop-Coadjutor to Bishop Basil and in effect the Administrator of the Pittsburgh Exarchate. The liturgical restoration mandated by the Holy See was certainly on Bishop Daniel's agenda, but more urgent problems required Bishop Daniel's immediate attention. There was a pressing need for a seminary as soon as possible, since Pittsburgh could no longer send students to eastern Europe.²⁹ There was a need for a diocesan newspaper.³⁰ It had been impossible to conduct annual clergy retreats during World War II. The onslaught of Communism in Eastern Europe meant that there were many well-justified pleas for assistance from the Church in the USA, so that Bishop Daniel had to organize repeated collections in an attempt to meet this need. Demographic changes in the US meant that Bishop Daniel had to begin to collect names and addresses of Greek-Catholic

²⁸ With the active encouragement of Empress Zita, the exiled Apostolic Queen of Hungary. The Empress came to Pittsburgh for the new bishop's ordination to the episcopate and – following a protocol to which American Catholics were completely unaccustomed – “presided” at the Divine Liturgy of the new Bishop's consecration (on 5 November 1946), enthroned in the sanctuary of the church, within the altar rails, wearing most impressive Imperial regalia. Many of those present must have been quite bewildered.

²⁹ The successful construction and establishment of Saints Cyril and Methodius Seminary in Pittsburgh was one of the greatest achievements of Bishop Daniel's years in office. It was necessary to raise one million US dollars – an immense sum at the time. The property was purchased in 1950; the seminary opened for the beginning of the academic year in 1951, with 40 students. In 1952 Bishop Daniel blessed the seminary chapel.

³⁰ Bishop Daniel devoted much effort to preparing for the appearance of the newspaper, but publication did not commence until 1956, two years after Bishop Daniel's departure.

faithful in Florida and California.³¹ In virtually every parish, returning war veterans were urging programs – including anglicization – to insure the future of the Church.³² There was a need for new construction of churches and schools. It was necessary to revive church organizations and activities which had been dormant during the war years. With all this and more, Bishop Daniel did not lack for occupation. But he did not forget the liturgical matter.

Obtaining copies of the new *recensio rutena* service-books from Rome would not be difficult; Rome itself reprinted some of the books to meet the demand.³³ Introducing the restored Liturgy was bound to be a delicate problem; the bishop and his clergy would need patience and pastoral prudence. While he was still Coadjutor and Administrator, Bishop Daniel may not have felt entirely free to act, since on principle the administrator of a diocese does not innovate. Bishop Basil (Takach) died on 13 May 1948, and three months later Bishop Daniel was formally constituted Exarch.

In 1952 Bishop Daniel held liturgical conferences with his clergy (who by this time knew that the “Ruthenian Recension” books had been published – if only because the Philadelphia Exarchate had introduced them) and during these meetings the Bishop began to give decisions on questions as they arose.

³¹ All these needs appear in Bishop Daniel’s first pastoral letter, issued on 5 February 1947.

³² Most religious denominations in the USA were affected by the return of veterans; such men were expected to assume leadership in their parishes and their own experiences in the armed services gave them important expectations for their home churches. A significant number of veterans also entered the clergy; this was among the reasons for the striking increase in the numbers of seminarians and theological students in the United States.

³³ The Holy See reprinted the *recensio rutena* Liturgicon in 1952.

Bishop Daniel also held similar conferences with his clergy on 23 March and 7 October 1953.³⁴

In 1944 the Holy See had published a booklet of rubrics for the Divine Liturgy, Vespers and Orthros usually referred to as the *Ordo Celebrationis* from the first two words of the Latin title.³⁵ In his circular letter to all the “Ruthenian” episcopate on 10 September 1941³⁶ Cardinal Tisserant noted that from the middle of the seventeenth century onward the rubrics had been particularly modified and altered, so that restoring a typical book for the Divine Liturgy would also require a book of rubrics or *Ordo Celebrationis*, which was then (in 1941) in preparation.³⁷ The *Ordo Celebrationis* of 1944 was published in Latin, and ten years later had still not been translated into English.³⁸ Bishop Daniel knew that at least some of his clergy could not read Latin fluently, and neither could the seminarians, so on 1 December 1953 Bishop Daniel appointed a committee of Father Eugene Hornyak, Father Eugene Chromoga and Father Paul Tigyer to translate the *Ordo Celebrationis* into English.³⁹

Realizing that introducing the changes in liturgical practice which the new Church-Slavonic edition and the *Ordo Celebrationis* called for would have to be done gradually, on 31

³⁴ *The Order for the Celebration of Vespers, Matins and the Divine Liturgy According to the Ruthenian Recension* (Pittsburgh, 1954), xxvii.

³⁵ *Ordo Celebrationis Vesperarum Matutini et Divinae Liturgiae iuxta Recensionem Ruthenorum*, Sacra Congregatio pro Ecclesia Orientali (Romae, 1944). A second edition (unchanged from the first one) was printed in 1953.

³⁶ Protocol Number 1219/28.

³⁷ This entire letter was published (in the original Italian) in *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 8 (Rome, 1942), 136-139.

³⁸ The *Ordo Celebrationis* was translated into Ukrainian soon after the Latin text was published. The present writer is not aware of any translations into any other languages.

³⁹ *The Order for the Celebration of Vespers, Matins and the Divine Liturgy According to the Ruthenian Recension* (Pittsburgh, 1954), title page.

October 1953 Bishop Daniel wrote to Eugène Cardinal Tisserant, then in charge of the Oriental Congregation,⁴⁰ requesting temporary dispensations from 23 particular requirements of the new books – had each of these dispensations been granted, the effect would have been to have had virtually no changes at all.⁴¹ However, Bishop Daniel was familiar with the custom of the Holy See in such cases and would not have expected to receive all the dispensations he requested in his letter. Accordingly, the Oriental Congregation responded in a letter of 27 November 1953,⁴² granting – on a temporary basis – ten of the requested dispensations, courteously refusing the others and reminding Bishop Daniel that in the Liturgy offered in the seminary and in houses of paramonastic formation the dispensations should not be used, but the service should take place in strict conformity to the new books.

The translation of the *Ordo Celebrationis* which the three priests prepared at Bishop Daniel's instruction included the circular letter of Cardinal Tisserant of 10 September 1941, Bishop Daniel's letter to Cardinal Tisserant of 31 October 1953 and the Congregation's letter in response of 27 November 1953.⁴³ Each paragraph in the *Ordo Celebrationis* affected by the dispensations was given a footnote clarifying what the practice would be in the Pittsburgh Exarchate in the light of

⁴⁰ The Pope himself was the nominal Prefect of this Congregation, so the Cardinal who actually administered the Congregation was called the Secretary. This continued until the pontificate of Paul VI.

⁴¹ The complete text of this letter from Bishop Daniel to Cardinal Tisserant appears in *Ordo Celebrationis, English Translation with Annotations and Illustrations*, Serge Keleher and Jack Figel (Fairfax, VA: Eastern Christian Publications, 1996), 116-119.

⁴² The complete text of this letter from the Oriental Congregation to Bishop Daniel appears in *Ordo Celebrationis, English Translation with Annotations and Illustrations*, Serge Keleher and Jack Figel (Fairfax, VA: Eastern Christian Publications, 1996), 120-122.

⁴³ *The Order for the Celebration of Vespers, Matins and the Divine Liturgy According to the Ruthenian Recension* (Pittsburgh, 1954), x – xxiii.

these letters and in the light of the Bishop's decisions in the clergy conferences on liturgy. On 16 February 1954 Bishop Daniel gave some further clarifications.⁴⁴

On 22 February 1954 Bishop Daniel approved this English translation.⁴⁵ It was reproduced by mimeograph, appearing on 25 March 1954,⁴⁶ with a dedication to the students of Saints Cyril and Methodius Seminary in Pittsburgh. Copies were provided to the clergy and seminarians and to religious houses. In the seminary chapel and elsewhere the restored Divine Liturgy gradually began to come into use to some extent. There is no reason to think that if Bishop Daniel had remained Exarch the process thus begun would not have continued, unhurriedly but effectively.⁴⁷

However, Bishop Daniel's position was difficult for other reasons not directly related to liturgical matters. For several years he had been living in a marital relationship,⁴⁸ despite the

⁴⁴ *The Order for the Celebration of Vespers, Matins and the Divine Liturgy According to the Ruthenian Recension* (Pittsburgh, 1954), xxvii.

⁴⁵ *The Order for the Celebration of Vespers, Matins and the Divine Liturgy According to the Ruthenian Recension* (Pittsburgh, 1954), title page. This was the first translation of the *Ordo Celebrationis* into English; two other translations into English have since been published.

⁴⁶ The booklet carries the date of March 25, 1955, but this can only be a *lapsus calami*; by March 1955 there was no possibility of doing such a thing. Nor would it have taken 13 months to type the stencils for a book of about 165 pages.

⁴⁷ In 1954 the "Byzantine-Slavonic Rite Catholic Exarchate of Pittsburgh, PA" published a *Liturgical Catechism on the Sacrifice of the Divine Liturgy*. No author is named. The *Nihil Obstat* was given by Father Eugene Hornyak, in his capacity as *Censor Deputatus*; the *Imprimatur* was given by Bishop Daniel on 2 February 1954. One is inclined to think that this book was intended as part of an educational program leading to the introduction of the Roman edition of the liturgical books.

⁴⁸ In 1961 Protopresbyter John Yurčišin, who for several decades was Chancellor of the Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Diocese and was notably well informed, told the present writer in conversation that Father Daniel Ivancho, before becoming a bishop, had approached Bishop Orestes of the Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Diocese, asking to be received as a married priest – but since the marriage had taken place after Father

prohibition of married clergy in his Exarchate.⁴⁹ He had kept his own marital relationship a close secret. He was giving good leadership as Bishop and was assisted by a group of clergy who valued that leadership. After more than fifty years, it is impossible to determine who did and who did not know or suspect that the bishop was secretly married. But there were some implacable opponents of the liturgical restoration and there were others who for their own reasons wished to be rid of Bishop Daniel.⁵⁰ An opportunity presented itself in 1954,⁵¹

Daniel's ordination, Bishop Orestes was unable to accept him. Protospresbyter John is now deceased.

⁴⁹ Bishop Daniel was ordained to the priesthood in 1934, five years after Bishop Basil (Takach) refused to ordain any more married priests.

⁵⁰ It has been stated that in 1954 there was a serious attempt to incorporate the Pittsburgh Exarchate into the structure of the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church in the USA (cf. Magocsi, *Our People*, op. cit, p. 38). Bishop Daniel was a strenuous opponent of the idea.

⁵¹ In late October 1954 the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church organized a well-attended "National Eucharistic Marian Congress of the Oriental Rites" in Philadelphia. For whatever reason Bishop Daniel did not participate and only two of his priests are known to have participated – Father Alexander Papp and Father Basil Pekar (Father Basil Pekar served on the organizing committee). This large gathering brought together the Apostolic Delegate to the USA, the Armenian Catholic Patriarch Peter XV (Cardinal Agagianian, who would have had no trouble reaching the ear of Pope Pius XII and speaking frankly with the Oriental Congregation), Samuel Cardinal Stritch, Thomas Cardinal Tien, a large number of Archbishops and Bishops and some highly influential clergy; as many as 30,000 faithful participated. It has been stated that a small group of priests of the Pittsburgh Exarchate took advantage of this occasion to forward the information on Bishop Daniel's marital status to the Holy See. The Philadelphia event took place over the weekend of 22-24 October 1954; the decree of Pius XII appointing Msgr. Elko Apostolic Administrator of the Pittsburgh Exarchate was announced in a papal audience to the Acting Secretary of State, Archbishop Dell'Acqua, on 25 November 1954 (text in *Historical Mirror, Sources of the Rusin and Hungarian Greek Rite Catholics in the United States of America, 1884 – 1963*, John Slivka, editor, *apud auctorem* (New York, 1978), 315). One cannot be sure that the Philadelphia event and Bishop Daniel's sudden departure from Pittsburgh are connected with each other, but the dates are consistent with that view. The most complete account of the Philadelphia celebration is *Ten-Year Anniversary Book of the National Eucharistic Marian Congress of the Oriental Rites, The Ark*, Volume XI, October 1964, Stamford, Connecticut.

and his opponents, searching for anything to give them leverage against Bishop Daniel, discovered the clandestine marriage and brought it to the attention of the Holy See.

Rome would not tolerate a bishop living in a marital relationship, particularly in the United States. Conversely, Rome was anxious to avoid a public scandal. An arrangement was made: on 2 December 1954 Bishop Daniel “retired” from his position but remained listed in the *Catholic Directory* as the Exarch-Emeritus, with his nominal address at the Chancery in Pittsburgh. In reality he moved to Florida, supplemented his retirement pay by engaging in a small commercial business enterprise, refrained from all involvement in Church affairs and did not comment on any Church matters.⁵² Bishop Daniel died on 2 August 1972, maintaining his silence to the end.

Rome acted with extraordinary haste. On the same day as Bishop Daniel’s “retirement” and departure from Pittsburgh, the Vicar General, Msgr. Nicholas T. Elko, was made Administrator of the Exarchate. In February 1955 he was appointed Titular Bishop of Apollonias; in March 1955 Cardinal Tisserant ordained Msgr. Elko to the episcopate in Rome. His appointment as Exarch was announced in September 1955.

Msgr. Elko – Bishop Elko as he soon became – was obdurately opposed to the “Ruthenian Recension” as the Holy See had presented it and would not accept the liturgical books published by the Holy See. He was implacably determined that so long as he could prevent it, this form of Liturgy would

⁵² In those years, the closest Bishop Daniel came to making any such comment occurred in 1969 when Father Emil Mihalik, whom Bishop Daniel had known, was appointed the first Bishop of the Ruthenian Eparchy of Parma, Ohio. Shortly before his consecration the new bishop-elect was surprised to receive a small but heavily insured parcel from Florida. The parcel contained Bishop Daniel’s pectoral cross and a brief note reading “Emil – be good to your priests; take it from one who knows!” [Information courtesy of Father Eugene Chromoga.]

not be introduced into the Pittsburgh Exarchate. After Bishop Daniel's departure, Msgr. Elko transferred Father Eugene Chromoga from Pittsburgh itself to California, where he was given the name of one family and instructed to organize a parish, with no assistance from the Exarchate.⁵³ Father Eugene Hornyak⁵⁴ entered the novitiate of the Ukrainian Order of Saint Basil the Great,⁵⁵ receiving the monastic name of Augustine when he took the schema. In 1961 he became bishop for the Ukrainian Greek-Catholics in England, Scotland and Wales and, to his credit, obtained the present Ukrainian Greek-Catholic cathedral church and clergy house in London. Unhappily for all concerned, Bishop Augustine became involved in the early nineteen-seventies in a bitter controversy over the issue of the Ukrainian Patriarchate and eventually resigned his position in 1987, living in retirement until his death in 2003.

Father Paul Tigyer, the third member of the commission which had produced the first English translation of the *Ordo Celebrationis* on the instructions of Bishop Daniel, seems to have managed to remain on reasonably peaceful terms with Bishop Nicholas and does not seem to have been involved in any further controversy.⁵⁶

⁵³ Despite this inauspicious beginning Father Eugene Chromoga succeeded brilliantly in California; he established not only one parish, but a deanery which in 1982 became the Eparchy of Van Nuys. Father Eugene never gave up on the *recensio rutena* or on the *Ordo Celebrationis*. Mitrophoric Archpriest Eugene Chromoga is now dead.

⁵⁴ Originally from Ruski Kerestur in what was then Yugoslavia.

⁵⁵ Father Basil Pekar, of the Pittsburgh Eparchy, was from Transcarpathia and had been associated with Bishop Daniel's effort to begin introducing the "Ruthenian Recension"; he also entered the Ukrainian Basilian novitiate in company with Father Hornyak; Father Pekar received the monastic name of Athanasius. Father Athanasius has continued to be active in church affairs involving both Transcarpathia and the Byzantine-Ruthenian Church in the USA.

⁵⁶ Unlike most of the protagonists in the affair, Father Paul Tigyer is still alive at the time of writing.

Daniel Donovan of the Bronx, New York, was a seminarian at the time at Saints Cyril and Methodius Seminary in Pittsburgh. The young seminarian's support for the *recensio rutena* and the work of Father Eugene Chromoga was more than Bishop Elko was prepared to tolerate; Daniel Donovan was immediately expelled from the Seminary. Disgusted, Mr. Donovan joined the Eastern Orthodox Church, married and was ordained priest during the summer of 1955.

There remained the mimeographed comb-bound copies of the English translation of the *Ordo Celebrationis*. Since these books contained the copies of the correspondence between the Oriental Congregation and Bishop Daniel, they demonstrated that the *Ordo Celebrationis* and the entire "Ruthenian Recension" as published by Rome applied to the Pittsburgh Exarchate. Nothing daunted, Bishop Elko had the mimeographed books recalled and the pages with this correspondence were removed before the books were returned to their owners. Fortunately a few copies escaped this bowdlerizing. An "unabridged" copy of the book remained in another seminary in the USA; this copy was photo-reproduced in the nineteen-eighties and became useful in producing the 1996 version.

Bishop Elko was determined to continue and develop the work of promoting the use of English for the divine services, including the Divine Liturgy itself.⁵⁷ For this purpose translations of the Divine Liturgy in more or less the form actually in use in the Pittsburgh Exarchate were published, sometimes with music⁵⁸ to be used in congregational signing.

⁵⁷ Thus Bishop Elko brought Bishop Fulton J. Sheen, then a famous television personality, to the annual pilgrimage at Mount Saint Macrina, Uniontown, Pennsylvania over the Labor Day weekend in 1955. At Bishop Elko's invitation, Bishop Sheen was the main celebrant – in English – of the Pontifical Divine Liturgy. A report of this service appeared in the *Junior Catholic Messenger*, then published weekly.

⁵⁸ Largely based upon the traditional "Prostopinije" of the Eparchy of Mukachiv.

Bishop Elko also organized at least one choir to sing the Divine Liturgy in English using harmonized music. The anglicization campaign gathered strength. Incredible though it may seem in retrospect, at the time this was quite unpopular with many of the Roman Catholic hierarchs in the USA; there were serious efforts made in Rome to stop the liturgical use of English for Byzantine services. Fortunately, Patriarch Maximos IV of Antioch, Alexandria, Jerusalem and All the East defended the liturgical use of vernacular languages and the Blessed Pope John XXIII accepted the Patriarch's arguments.⁵⁹

It has been stated that in the late nineteen-fifties there were fresh attempts to introduce the *Ordo Celebrationis* and the Ruthenian Recension into the Pittsburgh Exarchate. If such efforts were made, they failed completely. Bishop Elko simply would not hear of such a project. Instead, what Bishop Elko called "Americanization" proceeded at ever-increasing speed.⁶⁰

Since the Exarchate covered the entire USA and was growing at the time, Bishop Elko wanted an Auxiliary Bishop. He obtained one in the person of Stephen Kocisko, originally from Minneapolis, who was ordained bishop in October 1956. In 1963 Bishop Kocisko became the first bishop of the newly-created Eparchy of Passaic; simultaneously Bishop Elko became the first bishop of the newly-created Eparchy of Pittsburgh; these two new Eparchies replaced the earlier

⁵⁹ Cf. Archbishop Nicholas Edelby [later Metropolitan of Damascus, then secretary to the Patriarch], "The Byzantine Liturgy in the Vernacular," in *The Eastern Churches and Catholic Unity*, ed. Maximos IV, Patriarch of Antioch, Alexandria, Jerusalem and All the East (Edinburgh and London: Nelson, 1963), 195-218.

⁶⁰ This program included strong pressure to adopt the Gregorian Calendar, the widespread removal of icon-screens, ever more drastic abbreviations of the Divine Liturgy, the building of churches with no regard for the architectural needs of the Byzantine Liturgy, the replacement of traditional services with Latin devotions, and so on.

Apostolic Exarchate. Bishop Kocisko shared Bishop Elko's aversion to the "Ruthenian Recension" and the *Ordo Celebrationis*.

Meanwhile, the Second Vatican Council was meeting, from 1962 through 1965. The obvious contradictions between the Council's decisions regarding the Eastern Churches and the direction Bishop Elko and Bishop Kocisko were giving their eparchies did not inhibit the two bishops – they both conducted something of a campaign against the entire conciliar project for a number of years. However, Bishop Elko had a specific ambition. Every morning during the Council sessions there was a celebration of the Eucharist for all the Council Fathers, gathered in Saint Peter's in Rome – on most mornings this meant a celebration of one or another Eastern Liturgy. Bishop Elko wanted to serve such a Divine Liturgy *in English* for the Council.

Such a proposal was realistic, particularly since the Council was mandating an extended use of the vernacular in the Roman Mass. It seemed sensible for the Fathers to experience such a service according to one of the Eastern traditions. Bishop Elko was informed that in order to fulfill his ambition he would have to present an English translation of the Divine Liturgy *according to the recensio rutena edition of 1941*, have this translation approved by the Holy See, and then publish the same translation for use in the Eparchies of Pittsburgh and Passaic. Bishop Elko did precisely that; he created a commission to prepare the translation, obtained the approval of the Oriental Congregation for this translation and published the translation at the Byzantine Seminary Press in Pittsburgh. But there was an occult reservation to this seeming acquiescence: Bishop Elko and Bishop Kocisko made it crystal clear to the clergy of their respective eparchies that while the *texts* of this translation were to be used, more or less, the clergy were not permitted to follow the *rubrics* and order of

service of this new edition.⁶¹ As Cardinal Tisserant had specified in his circular letter of 10 September 1942, § 3, the difficulty and the need for liturgical restoration lay primarily in the rubrics.

The book was approved on 10 December 1964 and published in 1965.⁶² Bishop Elko was able to serve the Divine Liturgy at the Second Vatican Council as he had wished.⁶³

After Vatican II the two US Ruthenian Bishops returned to Pittsburgh and Passaic, respectively, to find that the turmoil breaking out in the Roman Catholic Church was also affecting their own Church. They felt that their Church had already had more than enough turmoil, but they proved unequal to the task of keeping things peaceful.

The number of seminarians in Pittsburgh dropped alarmingly, to the point that the seminary itself was in danger. Bishop Kocisko began to act in opposition to Bishop Elko, although certainly not in anything to do with the Liturgy. As the seminary came under threat, in 1966 Bishop Kocisko abruptly withdrew the Passaic seminarians from the seminary in Pittsburgh. That same year Father John Martin, who had been Chancellor of the Pittsburgh Eparchy, suddenly

⁶¹ This prohibition was probably never put in writing, and was certainly not published. But it was efficacious. In 1967 Father John Balog was delated to Bishop Kocisko for serving as the book prescribed; the bishop sternly rebuked Father Balog. When he indicated to the Bishop that the Bishop's own name was on the book as having given the approval, Bishop Kocisko roundly disabused him of the idea that this nominal approval meant anything. Father Balog was badly shocked that such duplicity could exist in the Church and told several of his friends that this had happened.

⁶² Father David Petras, SEOD, describes the translation process in "A Survey of the Liturgical Translations of the Byzantine Catholic Metropolia," *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 39, nos. 2-4 (1998): 241-266, in particular 245-249.

⁶³ An audio recording of Bishop Elko's Divine Liturgy during Vatican II was made; the responses were sung by the choir of the Pontifical Russian College, directed by Father L. Pichler, an accomplished musician.

quarreled with Bishop Elko, resigned his position, and went to Stanford University to pursue doctoral studies in philosophy. Almost immediately the Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Diocese invited him to consider becoming a candidate for the episcopate.⁶⁴ Father John Martin accepted this invitation, which not only provided the Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Diocese with an excellent Bishop but also caused a sensation in the Byzantine-Ruthenian Catholic Church.⁶⁵ At about the same time, some thirty priests of the Pittsburgh Eparchy sent a collective letter to Rome, asking the Holy See to remove Bishop Elko.⁶⁶

At the time of Bishop Daniel's sudden resignation, Bishop Elko was appointed on the assumption that he would be able to keep the Church under control. By 1966, it was apparent that this task was beyond him. The manner of his removal caused still more amazement; Bishop Elko visited Rome in the normal way and was suddenly informed, as he was about to fly home to Pittsburgh, that he would not be permitted to

⁶⁴ Since almost all the clergy of the Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Diocese were and are married men, finding a candidate for the episcopate can be a problem. In 1966 the health of Metropolitan Orestes was precarious, and the diocesan administration was anxious to have a young bishop of Carpatho-Russian ethnic background, so their invitation to Father John Martin was understandable. By coincidence, Father Peter Molchany, who in 1966 was Vicar General of the Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Diocese, had actually baptized the infant John Martin – at the time of the Baptism Father Molchany was himself a young priest serving at Saint John's Greek-Catholic Cathedral in Pittsburgh, where the Martin family were parishioners. This was to prove fortuitous when Father John Martin suddenly became Bishop-Elect for the Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Diocese in 1966.

⁶⁵ Bishop John Martin made it a rule to refuse any and all invitations to express public comments on events in the Byzantine-Ruthenian Catholic Church; he did not even discuss such matters in private except with trusted friends. On one unforgettable occasion, Bishop John icily dismissed a Jesuit who approached him during a Church dinner in New York with the hope of obtaining some information about Bishop Elko.

⁶⁶ According to rumors circulating at the time, one complaint was that Bishop Elko did not permit the teaching of "phenomenological existentialism," whatever that may be.

leave Rome.⁶⁷ At least in name Bishop Elko remained Eparch of Pittsburgh, but an Apostolic Administrator *sede plena* was appointed in the person of Msgr. Edward Rosack. This strange situation⁶⁸ lasted for almost a year. Finally Bishop Elko was “promoted”⁶⁹ to be titular Archbishop of Dara and given the meaningless sinecure of “Prelate for the Conferral of Sacred Orders in Rome According to the Byzantine Rite.”⁷⁰ With these empty but grandiloquent titles it was possible to accomplish Bishop Elko’s removal from Pittsburgh with a minimal shred of dignity.⁷¹ This was done late in 1967;⁷² Bishop Kocisko was

⁶⁷ In 1928 an analogous case occurred in the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church in Canada. Blessed Nicetas (Budka) had been Apostolic Exarch in Winnipeg since 1912 and was also visiting Rome in the normal way, when he was suddenly informed that he had “resigned” (he had done no such thing) and would not be allowed to return to Canada – he was not even permitted to go to Winnipeg privately and retrieve his personal belongings. Even though he was a Canadian citizen the Oriental Congregation required him to go to L’viv (then in Poland) and remain there. In his case, the reason seems to have been that he persisted in ordaining married priests. Blessed Nicetas died a martyr in Karaganda in October 1949 at the hands of the Soviets; his refusal to enforce celibacy earned him the martyr’s crown. Pope John Paul II beatified him in 2001.

⁶⁸ Which made the national news in the USA several times, including a good-sized article in *Time* magazine, illustrated with a photograph of Bishop Elko carrying a ciborium.

⁶⁹ In accordance, perhaps, with the ancient Latin method *promoveatur ut admoveatur*.

⁷⁰ This post, originally created in 1595 by Pope Clement VIII, had been vacant for several years when Bishop Elko was appointed to it; he was succeeded in this nominal appointment by Bishop Andrew (Katkov) of Nauplia, the Russian Greek-Catholic bishop in residence at the Russicum. Bishop Andrew, of blessed memory, has since died. Nowadays there is no need for a special bishop to do such ordinations. The Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church maintains a representative in Rome who is a bishop; the Italo-Greek bishops are readily available and other bishops from Eastern Europe and the Middle East can easily be invited to Rome. Moreover, it is now usual for candidates to be ordained in their home dioceses.

⁷¹ Bishop Elko was at least allowed to return briefly to Pittsburgh and collect his belongings. His friends among the clergy wanted to offer him a farewell dinner in Pittsburgh; Msgr. Rosack, after consulting with the Apostolic Delegate, would not permit it. A large group of lay friends of Bishop Elko held such a farewell dinner in his honor – and refused to

transferred from Passaic to Pittsburgh. Nothing changed in the matter of Liturgy. But more was in the offing. Passaic was vacant, with Bishop Kocisko still the Administrator after his own transfer to Pittsburgh. In July 1968, Msgr. Michael Dudick was appointed bishop-elect of Passaic; he was ordained to the episcopate in October 1968.⁷³

The Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Exarchate in the United States had become a Metropolitanate in 1958. The Pittsburgh Exarchate had the same ambition, but things had moved at a snail's pace. In February 1969 the Holy See created the Byzantine-Ruthenian Metropolitanate in the USA, with Bishop Stephen of Pittsburgh as the first Metropolitan Archbishop, and established the Eparchy of Parma, naming Father Emil Mihalik as the first Bishop of this new Eparchy; he was ordained to the episcopate in Parma, Ohio, on 12 June 1969.

For his own ordination to the episcopate, Father Emil Mihalik summoned Father Eugene Chromoga back from his California exile and kept him as a close adviser, particularly on liturgical questions. The new Bishop of Parma soon awarded Father Eugene the rank of Mitrophoric Archpriest and other distinctions, making Father Eugene Rector of the Cathedral Church in Parma.⁷⁴

allow even Bishop Elko's friends among the clergy to attend. [Information courtesy of Mitrophoric Archpriest Peter E. Molchany.]

⁷² In 1971 Archbishop Elko returned to the USA as auxiliary to the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Cincinnati. Archbishop Elko died on 18 May 1991. In the later years of his life, he was a popular lecturer for various conservative Catholic groups. He privately published an autobiographical novel, attributing the "Ruthenian Recension" to Communist pressure on the Holy See.

⁷³ Bishop Augustine (Hornyak) was one of the co-consecrators of Bishop Michael (Dudick).

⁷⁴ The night before Bishop Emil's consecration, a quasi-liturgical event of some significance took place in a Cleveland hotel during a cocktail party! The cocktail party was a reception for the out-of-town clergy. As one does on such occasions, a young priest of another jurisdiction was "circulating" and greeting various friends. The reception was held in a

On 8 April 1970, less than a year after his ordination to the episcopate, Bishop Emil of Parma issued a formal letter officially promulgating the *Ordo Celebrationis*, mandating the use of the 1965 English translation of the 1941 Roman edition of the Divine Liturgy according to the Ruthenian Recension, and giving some specific directions concerning the Divine Liturgy. This letter makes no reference to the correspondence between the Oriental Congregation and Bishop Daniel, but one or two of the dispensations which Bishop Daniel had received are imposed by Bishop Emil's letter.⁷⁵ The ice had finally been broken, at least for a while.

This promulgation was only a part of a period in the early life of the Ruthenian Eparchy of Parma which came to be known ironically as the "Parma Spring."⁷⁶ Archbishop Kocisko and probably Bishop Dudick were "concerned" about this whole pattern and when the three bishops met at a pilgrimage that summer it was made clear to Bishop Emil that one

guest suite in the hotel and as the young priest went from one room to the next he happened to enter a bedroom full of clergy, who all looked furious, and the Apostolic Delegate to the USA (Archbishop Luigi Raimondi), looking triumphant and declaiming something in Latin. The young priest withdrew hastily, realizing that whatever was happening did not require his presence. As it turned out, the Apostolic Delegate had attempted to compel the reading of the Papal mandate - *in Latin* - for the consecration of the new bishop to take place during the ceremony. The ordinand refused point-blank, whereupon the Apostolic Delegate threatened to withdraw the mandate and prevent the consecration. So they "compromised" and had the Apostolic Delegate read out the mandate in Latin in the hotel bedroom during the cocktail party, with as many of the diocesan clergy present as could be quickly mustered. On the evening after the consecration at a clergy party at the cathedral rectory there was a good deal of fascinating reminiscence, especially from Father Eugene Chromoga.

⁷⁵ Most of Bishop Emil's own instructions regarding abbreviations and so forth are facultative, not prescriptive – he writes that this or that element need not be included, but does not prohibit that element. The full text of the letter can be found in the 1996 edition of the *Ordo Celebrationis* in English translation, 123 – 130.

⁷⁶ The implied reference is to the "Prague Spring" of 1968, halted by the Warsaw Pact (i.e. Soviet) invasion of Czechoslovakia.

eparchy was not to be “out of step” with the other two. The strictures were so severe that Bishop Emil seemed to lose much of his interest in his eparchy, but the priests were determined that the movement now at last begun was not to be stopped. The practical result was an increase in chaos.

Archbishop Kocisko remained opposed to the “Ruthenian Recension” and the whole project of liturgical reparation. Bishop Michael of Passaic gradually came to accept the necessity of this, at least to a degree. When asked about an English text of the *Ordo Celebrationis*⁷⁷ he would recommend the English translation produced in 1953 by the committee that Bishop Daniel had appointed. Since the 1953 translation was a bibliographic rarity, a recommendation to use it was not entirely helpful. In any event, Bishop Michael never issued a formal promulgation.

In 1975, on the occasion of the 2nd annual Eastern Churches Day, held in Hillside, Illinois, the Association of Eastern Rite Priests of the Greater Chicagoland Area sponsored and printed a pocket-sized “people’s booklet” of the Divine Liturgy.⁷⁸ This rather nicely-done booklet is probably as close as the Pittsburgh Metropolitanate has yet come to a people’s edition of the Divine Liturgy in conformity with the official Church-Slavonic books published in Rome. The Divine Liturgy itself is in skeleton format, since the aim of the booklet is to provide the people with the texts that they are to sing. The three Antiphons for Sundays, ferial days and feast days of Our Lord are given in full. The “Propers” of the Divine Liturgy (that is, the occasional chants to be sung by the faithful) are all given in full, including the verses for the Prokeimena and Alleluia. Psalm verses, apart from those in

⁷⁷ Since by that time very few American priests could read Latin with sufficient comprehension to cope with such a text.

⁷⁸ *The Divine Liturgy of the Byzantine Church*, compiled and edited by Rev. Thomas R. Chelena, East Chicago, Indiana, with the assistance of Rev. David Petras, Taylor, Michigan, 1975. With thanks to Father Thomas Chelena.

the 1964/65 translation of the Divine Liturgy, are given according to the Septuagint.⁷⁹ This edition turned out to be popular and remained in common use, at least in the Eparchy of Parma, for several years.

In 1977⁸⁰ the Holy See published another in the series of “Ruthenian Recension” liturgical books: the *Archieraticon*, the book containing various services as they are done by a bishop. Persistent rumors had it that the Ruthenians were publishing an English translation of the *Archieraticon*, but almost thirty years have gone by and there is no sign of such a translation being published.

The liturgical crisis continued. In one sense, the Ruthenian Metropolitanate was marching in something resembling liturgical lockstep: the English translation of 1965 was still absolutely required. But this applied to the text, not to the rubrics and certainly not to the abbreviations, which often varied. Some clergy paid no attention to the *Ordo Celebrationis*, some clergy tried to observe it (in part or even in full), and there was no indication of either a fresh printing of the 1954 mimeographed version or a new translation.⁸¹ When the

⁷⁹ It would be worthwhile to check the Psalm verses in this 1975 edition against the Septuagint Psalter published by Holy Transfiguration Monastery in 1974; it is not unlikely that Father Thomas Chelena and Father David Petras used that Psalter for the psalm verses while adapting them to the functional variety of English used in the other texts in the 1975 Liturgy booklet.

⁸⁰ The book was actually available in the summer of 1977; it is formally dated 1973.

⁸¹ There is also an English translation done by Father Matthew Berko and published by Redeemer’s Voice Press in 1958 with the *Imprimatur* of Metropolitan Constantine (Bohachevsky) of Philadelphia. This is a convenient translation for those who understand Church-Slavonic and can cope with Ukrainian phonetics, because all the texts of actual portions of prayers are printed in Church-Slavonic with Ukrainian phonetics. For that reason, this was not a particularly convenient publication for the US Ruthenian clergy. Father Matthew Berko was a school friend of Father Eugene Chromoga, so Father Berko would have had access to the 1954 translation in preparing his 1958 version. The

Oriental Congregation published (in January 1996) the *Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescription of the Code of Canon of the Eastern Churches*⁸² it became necessary to prepare and publish a new translation of the *Ordo Celebrationis* with the liturgical texts in English; Eastern Christian Publications produced this in July 1996 and the demand was so great that it was necessary to do a second printing in January 1997. This 1996 edition included the correspondence between the Oriental Congregation and Bishop Daniel (Ivancho) which had originally been included in the 1954 translation and then removed by order of Bishop Elko; the dispensations have lapsed but the letters are still of considerable interest. This 1996 translation has no intrinsic juridical value; the Latin text always remains normative. Still, the translators did their best to produce a clear translation.

There are relatively few parishes anywhere in the Pittsburgh Metropolitanate where the Ruthenian Recension Divine Liturgy as it appears in the 1941 Church Slavonic edition published in Rome and the 1965 English translation published in Pittsburgh, and as regulated by the *Ordo Celebrationis*, is the usual form of service. Father Lambert Beauquin, one of the great liturgiologists of the first half of the twentieth century, articulated a sound principle of liturgical reform: no one can successfully reform a Liturgy which he does not know and has not experienced over considerable time. So the first and indispensable step in any thought of modifying the Divine Liturgy as restored in 1941 and regulated by the *Ordo Celebrationis* is to begin celebrating according to those books – in English, obviously, since that is the language used in the Pittsburgh Metropolitanate and no one is attempting to re-impose Church Slavonic in the United States.

English of Father Berko's translation is better than that of the 1954 translation.

⁸² The original text is in Italian but there is also an official English version.

The fashion for liturgical “renewal” which has been in the air since Vatican II is having its effects in the Pittsburgh Metropolitanate. One manifestation of this is the draft which has prompted this present study. A substantial length of time for the 1941 Divine Liturgy prescribed for the “Ruthenian Recension” to be used in the parishes should have been allowed, and for the faithful to become accustomed to the 1941 Divine Liturgy and familiar with it, and only then to see if there is any pastoral need to modify it. As things are, some seriously undesirable revisions may well be imposed by episcopal authority so as to produce yet another caricature of the Byzantine Liturgy.⁸³ The majority of the faithful of the parishes of the Pittsburgh Metropolitanate have probably *never* had an opportunity to attend the Divine Liturgy served in accordance with the official service books.

The history recounted above should make it clear why such an abuse of episcopal authority is unlikely to succeed.⁸⁴ Clergy and people alike have had their fill of edicts mandating invented liturgies instead of authentic ones. As Father Archimandrite Robert Taft has cogently remarked:

Ironically, however, the Eastern Catholic liturgical renewal so strenuously fostered by the Holy See since Pope Leo XIII has been opposed every step of the way by those who should have welcomed it on bended knee as a great grace of God: I mean, of course, by the Eastern Catholic hierarchy, with a few notable

⁸³ One Sunday recently a woman who for 13 years had been a parishioner at a Byzantine-Ruthenian parish in the USA attended Divine Liturgy for the first time at the Greek-Catholic parish in Dublin, Ireland. Although the Divine Liturgy in Dublin is not in English, she brought with her a people’s prayer-book with the text of the Liturgy from the 1965 Pittsburgh-Passaic English translation and she had no trouble following the Divine Liturgy. Had she instead brought the 12 October 2004 draft, the woman would have been unable to follow the service.

⁸⁴ Other events, particularly in the USA, have also decreased the likelihood of clergy and laity offering blind obedience to the hierarchy.

exceptions like Andrey Sheptytsky (1865-1944), Archbishop of Lviv, Metropolitan of Halych, and primate of the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church.

Various reasons are given for this opposition, but as usual in such matters, the real roots go much deeper. The real issue is not ritual practice at all. Many of the rubrical niceties that divide the clergy – the size and shape of a veil or diskos, the cut of a vestment, the amplitude of one's sleeves, where to put the antimimension – are of little or no significance in themselves. But these divergent ritual uses have become symbols of religious identity, much as was true of the Ritualist Movement in late 19th-century Anglicanism. At issue were not mere differences of rubric, but symbolic affirmations of the conviction that Anglicanism was not “Protestant” but “Catholic.”

At bottom, then, what we face is two different interpretations of a community's past, two different historical visions. This is possible because history, of course, is not just a shared past, but one's view of that past seen through the lens of present concerns. This vision is not a passive view of the past as an objective reality, but a pattern formed through a process of selection determined by one's present outlook.

Some Eastern Catholic clergy see their history as a progress from schism and spiritual stagnation to a life of discipline, renewal, and restored religious practice in the Catholic communion. For this group, the adoption of certain Latin – they would say “Catholic” – devotions and liturgical uses is a sign of this new identity. Such attitudes reflect an interior erosion of the Eastern Christian consciousness, a “latinization of the heart” resulting from a formation insensitive to the true nature of the variety of traditions within the Catholic Church.

Others, while not at all denying their commitment to the Catholic communion nor underestimating the obvious spiritual benefits it has brought their Churches, see themselves as Orthodox in communion with Rome, distinguished from their Orthodox Sister Churches in nothing but the fact of that communion and its doctrinal and ecclesial consequences. They see the latinisms that have crept into their tradition as a loss of identity, an erosion of their heritage in favour of foreign customs with which they can in no wise identify themselves. So for some, latinization is a sign of their identity, for others its negation, and both are right because they perceive themselves differently.

Underlying these issues, of course, is the more serious question of Rome's credibility: is the Holy See to be believed in what it says about restoring the Eastern Catholic heritage? The morale of some of the younger Eastern Catholic clergy has of late been deeply affected by this cul-de-sac: they feel mandated to do one thing by the Holy See – and then are criticized or even disciplined by their bishop if they try to obey.⁸⁵

The problem, as usual, is one of leadership, without which the hesitant or reluctant have no one to follow. What is needed is not just discipline and obedience, but also a clergy education loyal to the clear policy of the Church on this question, and prudent pastoral preparation. This is the only way out of the vicious circle that has been created: the proposed reforms are resisted because the clergy and people are not prepared to accept them – yet some church leaders do little or nothing to prepare the clergy and people for a renewal that the leaders themselves do not understand or accept.

⁸⁵ Emphasis added.

Although I cannot pretend to read minds, I think there are two main reasons behind this deep-rooted reluctance to welcome the clear and unambiguous policy of Rome in its program of liturgical restoration of the Eastern traditions: [1] its opponents consider the restoration a pointless archaism; and [2] they are convinced in their hearts that some of the practices proposed are not really “Catholic,” and hence not “right.” That this directly contradicts the explicit teaching of the Holy See is an irony that does not seem to dawn on them.

The first objection is easily dispensed with. The orientation of Catholic liturgical renewal is never toward the past but toward present pastoral needs. Of course the liturgical scholar studies the past, but the purpose of such historical research is not to discover the past, much less to imitate it, but to recover the integrity of the pristine tradition which the past may well have obscured. The aim is not to restore the past but to overcome it. For history is not the past, but a genetic vision of the present, a present seen in continuity with its roots. It is precisely those who do not know their past that are incapable of true, organic change. They remain victims of the latest cliché, prisoners of present usage because they have no objective standard against which to measure it.

The proposed restoration then, is not a blind imitation of a dead past, but an attempt, precisely, to free Eastern Catholics from a past in which, severed from the roots of their own tradition, they were deprived of any organic development and could conceive of growth only as sterile servility to their Latin confreres. Can one seriously propose this as a programme to be preserved in our day?

Hence the irony of those critics of the Eastern Catholic liturgical restoration who accuse its promoters of fostering a return to the Middle Ages.... It is precisely in the Middle Ages that the practices like infant communion in the Roman rite are first called into question for typically medieval motives that no one with any sense would heed today. So it is not the proponents of restoration but its opponents that are behind the times, stuck in a medieval rut out of which the major Catholic scholarly voices in this field have been leading the Church in [the twentieth] century.

A short list of the issues where renewal of the Eastern heritage has met most resistance would include dropping the Filioque from the Creed, the consecratory Epiclesis after the Words of Institution... [restoring the use of] the Byzantine zeon or teplota rite in which boiling water is added to the chalice just before communion [and] infant communion. On each of these points, the Holy See's efforts at restoration have met with massive resistance, either active or passive, from some circles.⁸⁶

It is also profitable to remember that in his landmark Apostolic Letter *Orientalis Lumen*, published on 2 May 1995, Pope John Paul II exhorted the Church on the importance of "eliminating all duplicity and ambiguity."⁸⁷ Duplicity and ambiguity have plagued the liturgical development of what is now the Pittsburgh Metropolitanate for well over fifty years; now it is time for honesty and for the realization that "he who

⁸⁶ Archimandrite Robert F. Taft, S.J., "The Liturgy in the Life of the Church," *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 40, nos. 1-4 (1999): 200-203.

⁸⁷ *Orientalis Lumen*, § 12b. With thanks to Bishop Nicholas (Samra) of Gerassa.

does what is true comes to the light, that it may be clearly seen that his deeds have been wrought in God.”⁸⁸

⁸⁸ John 3:21 (RSV).

A PROCESS OF SECRECY

The ongoing efforts which have produced this draft text have been shrouded in unnecessary secrecy. Rather than reaching out to the clergy and faithful, the bishops and the members whom the bishops have appointed to the Inter-Eparchial Liturgical Commission appear to be going to considerable lengths to maintain a “confidentiality” which verges on the clandestine and to prevent the laity and those members of the clergy who are not presumed to belong to this exclusive and anonymous “élite” from knowing or learning what, precisely, is going on. No one should be surprised that such an approach is feeding the malaise which is manifesting itself in several forms.

It is not clear what has motivated this secrecy in the first place. Possibly this was originally just force of habit: the attitude that almost any decision-making process in the Church should be confined to a small élite and only made known to the clergy and faithful when the decision was reached has been prevalent for a long time. But that approach does not prepare the ground for a peaceful reception of whatever the decision might be. As the present Pope Benedict XVI wrote some years ago:

To the God Who has a Name, in other words Who can address people and be addressed in turn, corresponds the human being who is named in the history of revelation and whose responsibility is linked to his name....The ‘new people’ is also marked by a new structure of personal responsibility which is seen in the personalization of worship; from now on everyone is called by his name in the sacrament of penance, and on the basis of the personal baptism which he received as being a particular person is

called to personal repentance by name...the liturgy does not just talk of the Church in general but presents her by name in the Eucharistic Prayer, with the names of the saints of those who bear the responsibility of unity....In the Church the leadership of the community or congregation has never been anonymous.¹

Pope Benedict XVI, as he now is, adds that “A responsibility that cannot accept responsibility is no responsibility at all.”²

Hierarchy, we should recall, means not holy domination but holy origin. Hierarchical service and ministry is thus guarding an origin that is holy, and not making arbitrary dispositions and decisions. The teaching office and indeed ministry in general in the Church is thus not a business of “leading” in the sense of the enlightened ruler who knows that he is in possession of better reasons, translates it into regulations and counts on the obedience of his subjects, who have to accept his reason and its articulation as their divinely willed standard.³

¹ Joseph Ratzinger (now Pope Benedict XVI), *Church, Ecumenism and Politics: New Essays in Eschatology*, [originally published in German as *Kirche, Ökumene und Politik*] (New York: Crossroad Publishing, 1988), 33-34. English translation slightly amended to conform to the author’s expressed preferences on such matters as so-called “inclusive language. [The English translation carries a new foreword written by Cardinal Ratzinger on All Saints Day, 1 November 1986.]

² Joseph Ratzinger (now Pope Benedict XVI), *Church, Ecumenism and Politics: New Essays in Eschatology*, [originally published in German as *Kirche, Ökumene und Politik*] (New York: Crossroad Publishing, 1988), 37 n. 18.

³ Joseph Ratzinger (now Pope Benedict XVI), *Church, Ecumenism and Politics: New Essays in Eschatology*, [originally published in German as *Kirche, Ökumene und Politik*] (New York: Crossroad Publishing, 1988), 128.

Continuing the same theme, Pope Benedict XVI wrote:

An authority that serves the truth, as should be the case with a Church authority based on the sacrament, is an obedient authority. An authority based on scepticism becomes arbitrary and high-handed. And should one not add that often it is precisely those who in the wake of the Council see themselves as the spearhead of progress who take for granted the obedience of the faithful while themselves criticizing obedience and wish to use this obedience to make of the Church what seems useful to them?⁴

In matters of liturgy particularly, one must be aware that the issue is bound to be sensitive. People who pray (and one assumes that those seriously interested in Liturgy are accustomed to pray) know that prayer is an intimate, highly personal activity which reaches to the very heart of the person who prays. Anything which might even seem to have the potential of touching this highly personal, intimate area can be perceived as a threat and thus can stimulate resentment.

At least one contemporary liturgiologist usually commences any lecture or program he offers on the subject of liturgy with the caution that this is an area in which there are strong and special temptations to quarrel rather than to engage in reasonable discourse, and he therefore invites all the participants to be particularly aware of this pitfall and strive to avoid it. A bit dramatic, perhaps, but the good professor has a valid point and his suggestion – that those involved should be aware of the problem and seek to overcome it – is quite worthwhile.

⁴ Joseph Ratzinger (now Pope Benedict XVI), *Church, Ecumenism and Politics: New Essays in Eschatology*, [originally published in German as *Kirche, Ökumene und Politik*] (New York: Crossroad Publishing, 1988), 131.

Any way of overcoming the problem of the temptation to quarrel is a commitment to the highest possible degree of openness and the greatest possible involvement of all those who will be affected by the results. No doubt this will tend to prolong the process and carry other risks, but the results are apt to be worth the effort. To take a simple example: liturgiology is a difficult field, partly because it directly involves both science and art. Liturgiologists⁵ understandably become distressed when the validity of their field of study, or their personal qualifications, or both, are called into question. Those who support the life of the Church in other ways can speedily become resentful of liturgiologists – often unreasonably, but one must still cope with the results.⁶ Prevention is better than cure; it is possible in many cases to foresee some aspects of the problem and plan deliberately to ease the situation.

A secretive élite characterized Gnosticism; it does not characterize the Church. On the contrary, such an idea is antithetical to the Catholic ethos. The document *Communio et Progresso* teaches that

the spiritual riches which are an essential attribute of the Church demand that the news she gives out of her intentions as well as of her works be distinguished by integrity, truth and openness. When ecclesiastical authorities are unwilling to give information or are unable

⁵ A bit of clarity on these terms might be useful: a *liturgiologist* is one who studies liturgy on a scientific level and who is considered well qualified in his field. A *liturgist* is one who conducts the liturgy. There is often some confusion, because people occasionally use “liturgist” when “liturgiologist” is intended.

⁶ To offer an example: when Father Archimandrite Robert Taft first published his outstanding study of the Great Entrance, a religious (who is best left unnamed) attempted to read it. The terminology was beyond her and the main result was that she was strongly resentful of the book and its author. It is unlikely that she would have felt the same resentment of a medical specialist, a physicist or even a spelunker, though each of these people would also have a professional vocabulary.

to do so, then rumour is unloosed, and rumour is not a bearer of the truth, but carries dangerous half-truths.⁷

There is no shortage of rumors purporting to reveal what “really” is going on, or has been going on, in the process which has produced this “final draft,” and some of these rumors are taken seriously. As Richard Ostling wrote in 1974:

Secrecy is impossible. Information will get out eventually, so the choice is between a timely, full, accurate, honest, useful report available to everyone; and a distorted, inaccurate hearsay account which gets to some people much earlier than others.⁸

The secrecy which some people consider indispensable manifestly does not work. Not only does this secrecy lead to half-truths, it also leads to fantasies. Those who wish to praise such-and-such a participant in the “secret” process concoct tales of his amazingly heroic behavior in defense of this or that beleaguered cause. Those who (usually for extraneous reasons) do not care for some participant in the same “secret” process concoct, augment and propagate tales of his incredibly outrageous misconduct. Still worse, as these fantasies spread, they are believed and accepted as true by people who are then proud to be in possession of what they consider “inside information.” When the truth (which more often than not is much less sensational than the fantasies) eventually emerges, it can be almost impossible to dislodge the fantasies. As the Archbishop of San Francisco has written:

Whatever may have been true in past times...in today’s world few things can be kept confidential indefinitely. If

⁷ *Communio et Progressio* § 121, English translation (provided by the Pontifical Council for the Instruments of Social Communication) in *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post-Conciliar Documents*, ed. Austin Flannery, OP (Dublin, 1975), 293-349, cited passage on 332. Latin text in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 63 (1974), 593-656.

⁸ Richard N. Ostling, *Secrecy in the Church* (New York, 1974), 81.

the policy of the ecclesiastical authorities is to withhold information, to give as little information as possible, and for the most part only to react, the possibility of presenting a story in an accurate and balanced way is lost. This defect cannot adequately be made up by later efforts to clarify or correct distortions, but will create the impression in the public mind that something has been concealed, that there has been a lack of honesty, and the credibility of the Church suffers.⁹

A recent example is the death of Pope John Paul I. In sober fact it is utterly unlikely that John Paul I was murdered, but because of the clumsy way in which the Vatican handled the news of his death, there is what amounts to a growth industry of books and articles purporting to “prove the murder,” and many people still believe this fable.

To cite Archbishop Quinn again:

Secrecy and noncooperation are not effective responses to the actual or perceived faults of the media. Nor are they a means today of preventing or limiting criticism within the Church.¹⁰

⁹ John R. Quinn, *The Reform of the Papacy: The Costly Call to Christian Unity* (New York: Herder and Herder / Crossroad Publishing, 1999), 56.

¹⁰ John R. Quinn, *The Reform of the Papacy: The Costly Call to Christian Unity* (New York: Herder and Herder / Crossroad Publishing, 1999), 58.

“INCLUSIVE LANGUAGE”¹

Both the magisterial authority of the Catholic Church and the responsible authorities of the Eastern Orthodox Church have expressed strong opposition to what has come to be called “inclusive language” – in other words, language which either removes all reference to gender, or which constantly reiterates assurances that both sexes are included. This “inclusive language” phenomenon is almost entirely confined to English. The pan-Orthodox conference which met in Thessaloniki from 29 April through 2 May 1998 to discuss the deteriorating relations between the Eastern Orthodox Church and the World Council of Churches noted that

At many WCC meetings the Orthodox were obliged to be involved in the discussion of questions entirely alien to their tradition. At the VII Assembly of Canberra in 1991 and during the meetings of the Central Committee after the year 1992 the Orthodox delegates have taken a vigorous stand...against inclusive language.²

The Catholic Church takes this matter seriously: the English translation of *The Catechism of the Catholic Church* was delayed – by Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger³ – because the Holy See would not permit the use of this “inclusive language” and required the English translation to be done again. In

¹ I wish to express particular thanks to Mr. James (Demetrios) Likoudis, who kindly provided me with much material on the topic of so-called inclusive language.

² Full text of the communiqué in *Eastern Churches Journal* 5, no. 2. (1998): 174-176.

³ Now, of course, Pope Benedict XVI.

discussing the problem of the Catechism translation, Cardinal Ratzinger observed: "We can have these new translations, but at the same time the official language of the Church in liturgy and catechesis has to preserve some continuity."⁴ Approval of both the New Revised Standard Version *and* the Revised New American Bible was withdrawn by the Holy See; "inclusive language" was among the reasons in both cases. The matter of "inclusive language" is one of the considerations which have moved the Holy See to require new translations of the liturgical books of the Roman tradition.

In 1997 Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger⁵ gave the American bishops a set of norms for the translation of Biblical texts for use in the liturgy. Some of these seem particularly relevant to the present discussion:⁶

1. The Church must always seek to convey accurately in translation the texts she has inherited from the biblical, liturgical and patristic tradition and instruct the faithful in their proper meaning.

2. The first principle...is that of fidelity, maximum possible fidelity to the words of the text.

3. The translation of scripture should faithfully reflect the Word of God in the original human languages...without "correction" or "improvement" in service of modern sensitivities.

4. Thus the word *man* in English should as a rule translate '*adam* and *anthropos* since there is no one synonym which effectively conveys the play between the individual, the collectivity and the unity of the human family so important,

⁴ Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger (now Pope Benedict XVI), *Catholic World Report*, December 1994, 24.

⁵ Now, of course, Pope Benedict XVI.

⁶ These points are published in the *National Catholic Reporter*, 4 July 1997, 8.

for example, to expression of Christian doctrine and anthropology.

The 12 October 2004 draft includes several examples of this "inclusive language" which can affect the understanding of those who hear these texts:

1) in the petition for the general commemoration of the dead, which may be included in the Great Synapte according to the Ruthenian usage, the text renders "fathers and brothers" as "clergy and monastics," which is inaccurate to the point of absurdity.⁷

2) In the prayer of the First Antiphon, the phrase ἡ φιλανθρωπία ἄφατος (Church-Slavonic: челоуѣколюбїе неизречено) is rendered "loving us all beyond expression."⁸ That cannot be considered adequate. As Dr. Catherine Tkacz has pertinently remarked: "Lover of us all" is ambiguous, and it can mean simply "Lover of us persons in this room right now."⁹

3) In the Beatitudes, the draft text under consideration reads "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they will be called *children* of God."¹⁰ The authentic text is, of course, "*sons* of God."¹¹ The difference is readily apparent in Greek; the New Testament includes the expression υἱοὶ Θεοῦ,¹² "sons of God," and also the expression τέκνα Θεοῦ,¹³ "children of God."

⁷ 12 October 2004 draft, 3, lines 38-39. All references to the draft translation are cited by page number first (e.g., page 3 in this note) followed by line number.

⁸ 12 October 2004 draft, 4, line 37.

⁹ The Byzantine Catholic Church in the New Millennium.

¹⁰ 12 October 2004 draft, 7, lines 16-17.

¹¹ Matthew 5:9.

¹² Matthew 5:9.

¹³ I John 3:2.

4) In the prayer of the Trisagion, both the Greek and the Church-Slavonic texts read: "who hast created *man* after Thine own image and likeness" (Greek: ὁ κτίσας τὸν ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα σὴν καὶ ὁμοίωσιν; Church-Slavonic: созданный человек по образу Твоему и по подобію). The draft under consideration reads instead *You created us in your own image and likeness*.¹⁴ This appears to ignore a norm stated by Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger (now, of course, Pope Benedict XVI):

The word *man* in English should as a rule translate 'adam and anthropos since there is no one synonym which effectively conveys the play between the individual, the collectivity and the unity of the human family so important, for example, to expression of Christian doctrine and anthropology.¹⁵

5) Φιλάνθρωπος, Φιλανθρωπία are difficult to translate.¹⁶ In the 12 October 2004 draft we find

- a) *you love us all*,¹⁷
- b) *loving*,¹⁸
- c) *love for all of us*,¹⁹
- d) *who loves us all*,²⁰
- e) *who love us all*,²¹
- f) *loving-kindness*,²²

¹⁴ 12 October 2004 draft, 9, lines 2-3.

¹⁵ Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, *National Catholic Reporter*, 4 July 1997, 5.

¹⁶ "Ukrainian Catholics: Four Translations of the Divine Liturgy," *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 39, nos. 2-4 (1998): 267-402, discusses this matter. Cf. in particular 308-314.

¹⁷ 12 October 2004 draft, 5, line 19.

¹⁸ 12 October 2004 draft, 11, line 25; 14, line 2; 14, line 48; 16, line 16; 17, line 13.

¹⁹ 12 October 2004 draft, 17, line 34.

²⁰ 12 October 2004 draft, 29, line 12.

²¹ 12 October 2004 draft, 30, line 17; 37, line 21.

²² 12 October 2004 draft, 31, line 20; 82, line 39.

g) *and loves us all.*²³

Since the 12 October 2004 draft was produced on a word processor, and is stated to be the final version, one is amazed that the commission needed no fewer than eight possible translations of this concept, not one of which shows any realization that this term is originally classical Greek and occurs repeatedly in the Bible, culminating in a clearly Messianic virtue. None of the eight translations can be considered adequate. Professor Catherine Tkacz has written, quite correctly: "Lover of us all" is ambiguous, and it can mean simply "Lover of us persons in this room right now." Given that the whole tenor of the revised liturgical texts seems to aim at reducing texts to what can be understood at first hearing, the phrase "lover of us all" will be taken in its simplest way.

6) The fourth petition of the ectene (which the 12 October 2004 draft inaccurately labels the "litany of fervent supplication") concludes in Church-Slavonic with the words *и всей во Христѣ братїи нашей*, which in the 1964/65 translation appears as "and for all our brethren in Christ."²⁴ Personally I would prefer "brothers" to "brethren," but *de gustibus non est disputandum*. However, the 12 October 2004 draft renders the same phrase as "and for all our brothers and sisters in Christ."²⁵ Not only is this "inclusive" language, it is likely to create in at least some of those who hear it the impression that the reference is to one's actual siblings,²⁶ rather than to those who share membership in the Church, the Body of Christ, with us (through Baptism and the Eucharist) and are

²³ 12 October 2004 draft, 39, lines 43-44; 42, line 35.

²⁴ *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1964/65), 23.

²⁵ 12 October 2004 draft, 13, lines 25-26.

²⁶ Perhaps the supporters of inclusive language should have used "and for all our siblings in Christ."

therefore our brothers in Christ regardless of physical relationship.²⁷

7) The Nicene Creed (although not the version in the 12 October 2004 draft) affirms that "for us *men* and for our salvation."²⁸ The Greek is not complicated; it reads τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. The Church-Slavonic reads насъ ради челоѡѡкъ. They both mean "for [the sake of] us men." For that matter, so does the Latin *propter nos homines*. The draft under consideration, however, simply reads "for us and for our salvation."²⁹ What has happened is entirely too clear; in imitation of the recent ICEL texts, the IELC³⁰ has simply omitted the word "men," intending thus to avoid a word which the ideologues of "inclusive language" consider to be less than "inclusive." As mentioned above, no less an authority than Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger (who is now, of course, Pope Benedict XVI) has ruled that ἄνθρωπος is to be translated *man*. Assuming only that the same applies in the plural, ἀνθρώπους is therefore *men*. In this instance, however, the "inclusive language" becomes just the opposite: "for us men" clearly includes the whole human race. But "for us" by itself could easily be understood to mean "for all of those assembled here on this particular occasion." The language choice to favor inclusiveness has thus become highly restrictive.

8) The 12 October 2004 draft offers two possible formulas for the priest (or deacon) to use when administering Holy

²⁷ Cf. Joseph Ratzinger (now Pope Benedict XVI), *The Meaning of Christian Brotherhood*, 2nd English ed. (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1993).

²⁸ Translation of this phrase as in *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1964/65), 32. Any number of other translations could easily be cited.

²⁹ 12 October 2004 draft, 22, lines 33-34.

³⁰ Which presumably means the Inter-Eparchial Liturgical Commission appointed by the Metropolitan of Pittsburgh and his suffragans, the Bishops of Pasaic, Parma and Van Nuys.

Communion to the faithful. He may say either "The servant of God, (*Name*), partakes of the precious, most holy and most pure body and blood of our Lord, God, and Savior Jesus Christ for the remission of (his-her) sins and for life everlasting" or "The servant of God, (*Name*), partakes of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ for the remission of sins and for life everlasting. Amen."³¹ This has several problems, but here we are only concerned about the matter of "inclusive language."

a) It is normal in most translations of the Divine Liturgy that when the prospective communicant is a girl or woman, she is referred to as the "handmaid of God."³² Since this appeared, as noted, in the previous official translation of the Pittsburgh Metropolia, the change must have been deliberate. It is difficult to understand what could have motivated this change, other than a wish to placate the ideologues of "gender-inclusive" language.

b) The change from "for the remission of (his-her) sins" to "for the remission of sins" depersonalises the point – the individual Christian receives Holy Communion for the remission of *his own* sins; it is Christ Who gives His Holy Body and His Precious Blood "for you and for many."

9) Only a few pages later, the 12 October 2004 draft suddenly reverses its priority and gives the option of calling the titular of the temple or chapel "the patron[s] [patroness] of this church"! If the Church may have a patroness, surely the Church may also have handmaids.

³¹ 12 October 2004 draft, 35, line 51 – 36, line 6.

³² Translation of this phrase as in *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1964/65), 43; other translations can also be cited.

10) The final Ecphonesis of the Polychronion reads in Church-Slavonic *всѣмъ отцемъ и братіямъ нашимъ*³³ The earlier Ruthenian translation expressed this quite accurately as "to all our fathers and brothers."³⁴ However, the 12 October 2004 draft gives instead "to all our brothers and sisters"³⁵ which sacrifices accuracy to pseudo-inclusivity and risks misunderstanding the point altogether.³⁶

Professor Catherine Brown Tkacz, in her admirable and excellent study *The Byzantine Catholic Church in the New Millennium*,³⁷ has expressed her opposition to this so-called inclusive language in the most unmistakable terms. Here we offer a few excerpts, but everyone is warmly encouraged to read Professor Tkacz for himself:

The revised liturgy...indicates that the Hierarchy of the Byzantine Catholic Church desires to manifest respect for women through textual changes to politically approved language, notably "humanity" and "us all" instead of "man" and "mankind." Arduous as instituting such changes would be, causing much work throughout the Metropolia for priests and for laity, these changes would nevertheless fail to address the problem adequately. Only catechesis and preaching can teach the authentic Catholic doctrines concerning women and human nature. In order to reach all of the faithful, this is likely to require both a specific addition to the formation of seminarians and also a parallel program of practical assistance to already ordained priests, so that in the parishes they can provide and direct new elements in preaching and in catechesis.

³³ *Recensio rutena Liturgicon* (Rome, 1941) [in Church-Slavonic], 125.

³⁴ *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1964/65), 46.

³⁵ 12 October 2004 draft, 40, lines 14-15.

³⁶ "Fathers and brothers" in this context could possibly be a monastic reference.

³⁷ Publication of Dr. Tkacz's study is eagerly awaited.

...verbal changes from "man" and "mankind" to "humanity" will fail to have the desired effect. Unfortunately, however, these changes will certainly have two unintended and unwanted effects: Those of the faithful, both men and women, who already understand that "mankind" and "man" have a generic and inclusive meaning, will to varying degrees be alienated. Others of the faithful, who already have a politicized notion of their human identity and of the Church, may be satisfied briefly by the verbal change but will soon press for additional changes. After all, once the liturgy has been changed by politics, then surely ecclesiastical practices regarding ordination and the sacraments can also be "reformed" by such means.³⁸

English and Slavonic both employ a generic use of grammatically masculine nouns, such as "man." In these languages are like Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, as well as many vernacular languages. However, generic language is particularly targeted as if it were bad by those who would make liturgical language politically correct. To teach and to demonstrate that generic language is in truth meant generically, some specific pastoral techniques are needed. These include: a) explaining that generic terms are in truth meant generically, b) supplementing the sometimes generic language of the liturgy with remarks in preaching which specify male and female, and c) demonstrating through preaching and catechesis that generic terms are used with a truly inclusive meaning.

It is useful to draw on the Church's own instructions on language in the liturgy, the document called *Liturgiam Authenticam* (2001), for it addresses directly the issue of generic language:

³⁸ Tkacz, op. cit., sec. II A.

In many languages there exist nouns and pronouns denoting both genders, masculine and feminine, together in a single term. The insistence that such usage should be changed is not necessarily to be regarded as the effect or the manifestation of an authentic development in 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.

In particular: to be avoided is the systematic resort to imprudent solutions such as a mechanical substitution of words, the transition from the singular to the plural, the splitting of a unitary collective into masculine and feminine parts, or the introduction of impersonal or abstract words, all of which may impede the communication of the true and integral sense of a word or an expression in the original text. Such measures introduce theological and anthropological problems into the translation.

To these concerns, two more may be added. The generic terms cited in the paragraphs just quoted carry two possible senses, and a given text can, through the providence of God, intend both meanings. That is, some references to "man" ('adam, anthropos, homo) may refer both 1) to a human person and also, in mystery, 2) to Christ, the Son of God. In fact, there is no linguistic substitute for "man" because terms such as "one" and "person" and "human being" are exclusively generic and, if they are selected for use because they are obviously and rigorously generic, they cannot convey any possibly intended reference to Christ. A reviser, moved by politically correct concerns and presuming to know the depth and height and breadth of meaning of scripture, can unwittingly render a text two-dimensional.

Further, the term "mankind" is more than sexually inclusive: It is chronologically inclusive, it refers to all human beings throughout history as well as those yet to be conceived. Use of the word "mankind" evokes the whole communion of saints. This is a point that needs to be voiced from the ambo and in the classroom, to help enliven people's sense of being in the communion of saints. Often substitutions for "man" and "mankind" intended to make it explicit that both male and female are included, wind up suggesting that only the persons in this room are included. Ironically, such "inclusive" language isolates.

In March 2001 the Vatican "Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments" – which has no jurisdiction over the Eastern Catholic Churches – issued the Instruction *Liturgiam Authenticam, On the Use of Vernacular Languages in the Publication of the Books of the Roman Liturgy*.³⁹

³⁹ *Liturgiam Authenticam* is available as a booklet from the Catholic Truth Society.

This Instruction is discussed at some length in an article in *Eastern Churches Journal*.⁴⁰ Dr. Tkacz directs our attention to some points in this document regarding so-called inclusive language:

In many languages there exist nouns and pronouns denoting both genders, masculine and feminine, together in a single term. The insistence that such usage should be changed is not necessarily to be regarded as the effect or the manifestation of an authentic development in 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.

Dr. Tkacz adds:

Moreover, as a New Feminist, one whose scholarship recovers the authentic Christian tradition

⁴⁰ "Liturgiam Authenticam: Some Greek Catholic Comments," *Eastern Churches Journal* 8, no. 1 (2001): 85-122.

of respect for women, I strongly advise against making such changes. I strongly advise strengthening the presentation of the authentic tradition of teaching that everyone, male and female, is called to holiness, and that both male and female saints are models for us all. Please do not abandon venerable, generic references to Mankind in favor of "Lover of humanity," do not change the clear, powerful monosyllables of "God with man" into "God with humanity." As an Orthodox scholar has put it, such modern revisions ultimately privilege ideology over the Incarnation.

PART II

OBSERVATIONS ON THE
12 OCTOBER 2004 DRAFT

CHAPTER 5

“THE DIVINE LITURGY
OF OUR HOLY FATHER
JOHN CHRYSOSTOM”¹

A draft dated 12 October 2004, with the above title, is circulating to a limited extent – one copy has even reached Dublin, Ireland. The title page states that “This is a final version, based on the work of the IELC² as of the date above.” Another note on the title page indicates that there is a “foreword,” and the text itself has many footnote numbers, but the copy discussed here gives no text of any footnotes or endnotes.

This seems to be the text prepared by the commission established by the Byzantine-Ruthenian Metropolitanate of Pittsburgh (including the suffragan eparchies of Passaic, Parma and Van Nuys); if so the Metropolitan and suffragan bishops are expected to announce this text and put it into effect in the near future.

There is no indication of the membership of this commission, nor is there any explanation of the criteria or the principles upon which this present text has been established. Modesty is admirable but complete anonymity makes it difficult, if not impossible, to determine who is responsible for what. “A responsibility that cannot accept responsibility

¹ Both forty years ago and in the 12 October 2004 draft, the title is mistranslated. It should read *The Divine Liturgy of our Father Among the Saints, John Chrysostom*.

² This acronym may mean “Inter-Eparchial Liturgical Commission.”

is no responsibility at all.”³ The lack of clearly-stated principles and criteria also makes it difficult to know what the anonymous translators/redactors may have had in mind. Since the overwhelming majority of the clergy and faithful of the Ruthenian Metropolitanate mainly experience the Church at the Divine Liturgy, there is bound to be interest in this new text and a wish to understand whatever changes are to be introduced.

This draft attempts to combine two goals at once: this is a major revision⁴ of the *textus receptus* of the Divine Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom, and simultaneously an effort to revise the English translation of the Divine Liturgy promulgated in 1965, for what was then the two Eparchies of Pittsburgh and Passaic.⁵ These two eparchies then included all the Byzantine-Ruthenian⁶ Catholic parishes in the USA;

³ Joseph Ratzinger (now Pope Benedict XVI), *Church, Ecumenism and Politics: New Essays in Eschatology*, [originally published in German as *Kirche, Ökumene und Politik*] (New York: Crossroad Publishing, 1988), 37 n. 18.

⁴ Based loosely on the *recensio rutena* edition published by the Holy See in Church-Slavonic (Rome, 1941).

⁵ *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1964/65. Often known as “the red book” because of the color of the binding, this book has been reprinted at least once in a reduced size, presumably for the use of priests and deacons who were not the “main celebrant.” This translation was approved by the Oriental Congregation 10 December 1964, Protocol Number 380/62.

⁶ “Byzantine” is the adjective normally used for the city known historically as Constantinople. The Byzantine liturgical tradition is the remarkable synthesis of the Christian cultural inheritance of the Greek world, the Roman world and the Semitic world which developed in Constantinople and spread through the Middle East and Eastern Europe – but many people and Local Churches to whom this word could be applied in a technical nomenclature do not care for the word and neither use it themselves nor encourage others to use it. Somewhat confusingly, “Byzantine” also refers to a specific style of architecture – thus Holy Archangels Greek Orthodox Church in Stamford, Connecticut, describes itself as the only authentic Byzantine church for miles around. Architecturally, this is quite true, but in other senses of the same word it is quite false. “Ruthenian” presents a much greater set of opportunities for confusion; the meaning of the word has changed

within this territory two more eparchies have since been created⁷ and the Metropolitanate of Pittsburgh includes all four of these eparchies. This Metropolitanate derives from the original Apostolic Exarchate of Pittsburgh, erected in 1925 to serve the Greek-Catholic faithful of Slav background from the southern slopes of the Carpathian Mountains (in other words, the Eparchy of Mukachiv, now in Ukraine, and the Eparchy of Prešov, in what is now eastern Slovakia) as well as Hungarian Greek-Catholic faithful from the Eparchy of Hajdudorog, Croatian Greek-Catholic faithful from the Eparchy of Krizevtsi, and any Catholic faithful of the Byzantine tradition who in fact were parishioners of parishes included in the Apostolic Exarchate. Under the leadership of Bishop Daniel (Ivancho) and Bishop Nicholas (Elko) this Exarchate moved decisively from Church-Slavonic and Hungarian as liturgical languages into English beginning in the nineteen-fifties; the publication of the 1965 translation marked a strong step forward in the effort to anglicize this particular Church. By the time of writing, it is relatively uncommon to find more than a few words or an occasional hymn sung in Slavonic or Hungarian in most parishes of this jurisdiction.

This Church has had a series of crises in the twentieth century, partly derived from the trauma of seeking her own place in America and partly from internal causes. The Liturgy has often been a bone of contention, so the present difficulty is nothing new.

There are other Greek-Catholic Local Churches present in America,⁸ and in other English-speaking countries⁹ but none

repeatedly in history, with the result that as a descriptive, neutral technical term, "Ruthenian" is practically useless. It is necessary to use other explanations to indicate what group or groups of peoples one wishes to discuss.

⁷ At Parma, Ohio and Van Nuys, California.

⁸ The Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church in the USA consists of the Metropolitanate of Philadelphia, with suffragan eparchies at Stamford,

of these Churches has adopted the Ruthenian translation in any official way; they prefer to use their own translations. At present there are at the very least more than 200 translations of the Divine Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom into English, more or less readily available for those interested.

In attempting to review and criticize this draft, one is handicapped by the double aim, so to speak. It would have been better for the Pittsburgh Metropolia to have done this by stages: to have produced a draft of the translation of the *textus receptus*, invited criticisms and then to have produced, based upon that draft translation as it might have been revised, a draft of the revisions or reforms or recasting which the commission desired. It would be better still to begin with a draft English translation of the Septuagint Psalter, since the liturgical text includes an abundance of quotations from the Septuagint Psalter, but either the commission did not feel equal to that work, or simply decided, perhaps under a time pressure, to proceed directly to the Divine Liturgy.¹⁰

Parma (Ohio) and Chicago; the Romanian Greek-Catholic Church in the USA consists of the Eparchy of Canton (Ohio). There are perhaps half a dozen Russian Greek-Catholic parishes and there are (or were) one or two “mission stations” of the Bulgarian Orthodox-Catholics (for complicated reasons, Bulgarians do not care to be called either Byzantines or Greeks; this community is in union with the Catholic Church). There is a functioning Italo-Greek Catholic parish in Las Vegas, Nevada, with episcopal supervision from the Byzantine-Ruthenian Eparchy of Van Nuys and there is still an Italo-Greek society in New York City which aspires to revive the long-closed parish of Our Lady of Grace. The Melkite Greek-Catholic Church in the USA consists of the Greek-Catholic Eparchy of Newton.

⁹ Canada, Australia, England and perhaps elsewhere.

¹⁰ In Ireland the same problem arose. It would have been vastly more intelligent to have done a scientific translation of the Septuagint Psalter into Irish and then proceed to translate the Divine Liturgy, but it was not certain that the time and resources available would make such an ambitious project feasible. Now, thanks to God, parishioners and friends of the Greek-Catholic parish in Dublin are beginning an Irish translation of the LXX Psalter. Please pray that this may be accomplished.

The draft discussed here provides no text for the Prothesis of the Divine Liturgy; since the pages of the draft are numbered and the text begins – on page 2 – immediately with the Enarxis, it appears that the absence of the Prothesis from this draft is intentional. One assumes that the editors or typists counted the title page as page 1.

As to liturgy: the “Ruthenian Recension” series of liturgical books (including the *Ordo Celebrationis*) published in the nineteen-forties and to a lesser extent thereafter, was formed in the context of a larger movement of liturgical reparation of the Eastern Catholic Churches. One of the key figures in this movement was Father Cyril Korolevsky. One could wish that he had written more about it, but he did write several books and articles concerning this work, so that it is at least possible to learn some of his methods and guiding principles.¹¹ An important example of the larger movement is the effort at restoring the authentic Chaldean liturgy in the Syro-Malabarese Catholic Church.¹² On the “Ruthenian Recension” it is essential to read Father Cyril’s 1936 *votum*¹³ in which he set forth much of what became the

¹¹ His general view of the situation of the Eastern Catholic Churches appears in his magnificent analytical essay *L’Uniatisme*, published as nos. 5-6, *Irènikon-Collection* (Belgium: Prieurè d’Amay, 1927), translated into English by the present writer and published in Father Cyril Korolevsky’s biography of Metropolitan Andrew (Sheptytsky), *Metropolitan Andrew (1865-1944)* (L’viv: Stauropegion, 1993).

¹² On this still-controversial and sensitive topic, cf. Cyril Korolevsky, *Living Languages in Catholic Worship*, trans. Donald Attwater (Westminster, MD: Newman Press, 1957), part III, chap. I, “Latin into Syriac in Malabar,” 117-140. The restored *Qurbana* (Divine Liturgy) of the Chaldean tradition for the Syro-Malabarese Catholic Church was published in English translation as *Syro-Malabar Missal*, Rev. Fr. George Kandathil, S.J. (Kulanada, Kerala, India: Mount Saint Mary, 1963). The work of the restoration was in great part the effort of Father Cyril Korolevsky. [With thanks to Archimandrite George Mifsud who kindly gave the present writer a copy of the now out-of-print English translation.]

¹³ *La Liturgia ed il Rito Praticati dai Ruteni*, 1937, Sacra Congregazione per la Chiesa Orientale, Prot. N. 1219/28. According to the author himself, he finished writing the *Votum* on 21 December 1936. The Italian text has

program for the repristination achieved in this series of books.

On 10 January 1938 a Plenary meeting of the Cardinals who were members of the Congregation for the Eastern Churches determined four criteria which would be applied in developing the “Ruthenian Recension” service-books. These four criteria are:

FIRST CRITERION: Preference should be given to rites¹⁴ that largely correspond to ancient tradition, where applicable to rites that existed before the Union of Brest in 1595, or to the even more ancient rites of the Church of Kiev, or to the best traditions of the ancient Byzantine rite.

SECOND CRITERION: Preference should be given to rites that are uniformly observed in other Churches of the Byzantine ritual tradition.

THIRD CRITERION: In secondary rites and ceremonies, a degree of difference and variety among the different ethnic groups within the same ritual tradition must be respected.

FOURTH CRITERION: Essentially, preference should be given to rites that originate within the particular ritual tradition and that have not been taken from another ritual tradition. Therefore all additions and translations from the Latin tradition should be eliminated.¹⁵

not been published, but can be consulted in the library of the Pontifical Oriental Institute; photocopies are in circulation. An English translation is said to be in process.

¹⁴ *Caution:* these criteria use the term “rite” in 3 distinct senses; one must determine from the context which sense is intended in each case.

¹⁵ The original Italian text of these four criteria, plus a Ukrainian translation, will be found in Єрмнх. Рафаїл Торконяк, Студ. Мон., *Літургія Передшеосвячених дарів в Українській Церкві* (Львів, 2002), 38-39. A kind friend was so generous as to translate these four criteria from the Italian original.

The Italian text of these four criteria were supplied by Father Alphonse Raes to Father Hieromonk Raphael, who included the Italian original and a Ukrainian translation in his own expanded study of the Liturgy of Presanctified Gifts in the Kyivan tradition. However, comparing the Italian original with Father Cyril Korolevsky's *Votum*, mentioned above, it becomes apparent that these four criteria are identical with four criteria proposed by Father Cyril.¹⁶ In turn, Father Cyril attributes these four criteria to Father Emile Herman, S.J., President of the Pontifical Oriental Institute, with whose *Votum* Father Cyril expresses his complete agreement.¹⁷ It appears from what Father Cyril wrote in his chapter on liturgical reform in the biography of Metropolitan Andrew that Father Herman's *Votum* was dated 28 January 1933:

The Oriental Congregation decided to consult a canonist on the legal status of all the innovations and on the path to follow in the future, without going into details on the subject. His *Votum*, dated 28 January 1933, proposed four fundamental criteria and four secondary rules; these were later adopted and led to success.¹⁸

So far, we do not know what the four secondary rules were. It is impossible to write a thorough study of the process by which the "Ruthenian Recension" was produced, and it will continue to be impossible until the Congregation for the Eastern Churches opens the relevant archives to researchers. In theory this is supposed to happen after fifty years, but fifty years have long since expired since the publication of the Ruthenian Liturgicon and the *Ordo Celebrationis* and inquiries

¹⁶ *La Liturgia ed il Rito Praticati dai Ruteni*, Sacra Congregazione per la Chiesa Orientale, Prot. N. 1219/28, 1937, 141-142.

¹⁷ *La Liturgia ed il Rito Praticati dai Ruteni*, Sacra Congregazione per la Chiesa Orientale, Prot. N. 1219/28, 1937, 129.

¹⁸ Father Cyril Korolevsky, *Metropolitan Andrew (1865-1944)* (L'viv: Stauropegion, 1993), 433.

about the opening of these archives are met with silence. Recently it has been stated that in theory Pope John Paul II should have opened the archives of the pontificate of Pope Pius XI, but did not do so. It remains to be seen what Pope Benedict XVI will do.

Since almost seventy years have gone by since the Plenary of the Cardinals of the Oriental Congregation – and that Plenary marks the official commencement of the “*Recensio Rutena*” – it is not too soon to embark upon an evaluation of the program, and perhaps to consider again certain aspects of it. But to be clear from the outset: while one may criticize some particular points of Father Cyril Korolevsky and his colleagues on the commission (a few of these points will emerge below), I am in fundamental agreement with the goal of complete liturgical repristination which that program represents and which the 1996 Instruction – discussed below in some detail – terms an “insistence on the full recuperation of Tradition.”¹⁹ Further, this radical agreement seems vindicated by the magisterial teaching of the Church, set forth in the decisions of Vatican II:

All Eastern Churches shall know and be assured that they can and should always preserve their legitimate liturgical rites and their discipline, and that changes are to be introduced solely by reason of a progress which is not alien but organic. All these, then, are to be observed with the greatest fidelity by the Eastern Churches themselves, and they must acquire a growing knowledge and a more perfect use of them, and if they, on account of contingencies of times or

¹⁹ *Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, Congregation for the Eastern Church (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996) [reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications, Fairfax, VA], § 112, b.

persons, unbecomingly have abandoned them, they shall take pains to return to their ancestral traditions.²⁰

Perhaps the best published commentary on the Vatican II *Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches* is the book by Metropolitan Neophytos (Edelby) and Father Archimandrite Ignatius Dick,²¹ many of the comments on the articles quoted here are largely from this study. The collaboration between the two authors meant that Metropolitan Neophytos wrote some sections of the commentary, and Father Archimandrite Ignatius wrote other sections; each time one or the other author is quoted, the footnotes indicate which one it is. The translation of certain passages from the French is prepared for this discussion; it would be well for the entire book to be translated into English (and other languages of the Eastern Churches) and published.

On Article 6 of the Decree, Metropolitan Neophytos writes as follows:

Observe their liturgical traditions and their disciplines always and everywhere. Let the Eastern Catholics remain faithful to what God has made them: Eastern Christians. Let them remain faithful to their spiritual patrimony, which is a sacred trust placed in their hands. This is their vocation, their mission of service to the whole Church.... They must be just as faithful to

²⁰ *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, § 6. This Decree was passed by the Council and signed by Paul VI on 21 November 1964. Some of the Chief Hierarchs of the Eastern Catholic Churches granted a brief *vacatio legis*, but in each case it was only for a matter of months.

²¹ *Les églises orientales catholiques : Décret « Orientalium ecclesiarum », texte latin et traduction française, commentaire par Neophytos Edelby, Métropolitte d'Alep et Ignace Dick, du clergé d'Alep, Unam Sanctam 76* (Paris : Les Editions du Cerf, 1970).

the East as to Catholicism...their Catholicism imposes fidelity to the East upon them.²²

Guard their patrimony from all hybrid changes....Why should we be vested like Latins? Why should we construct Roman, Gothic or rococo church edifices? Why should we have an organ or a harmonium in the Church? Why should we have lace albs, surplices and Latin stoles? Why, why? We have not completed the number of these absolutely useless hybrid borrowings, which serve no purpose but to spoil the beauty of rites which would have gained so much by remaining pure and authentic. Why is there this inferiority complex among the Eastern Catholics, which makes them think that everything in their ritual tradition which distinguishes them from Latins must be of lesser value?

...When one sees certain Eastern Catholic services, one could ask just what is left of the real East in them. The Eastern Catholics must regret these hybridisms, which are the sign of an extraordinary lack of self-esteem.²³

We should note at once that the Eastern Catholics themselves have done the most to latinize the Eastern discipline.²⁴

²² Metropolitan Neophytos, in *Les églises orientales catholiques : Décret « Orientalium ecclesiarum »*, texte latin et traduction française, commentaire par Neophytos Edelby, Métropolitte d'Alep et Ignace Dick, du clergé d'Alep, Unam Sanctam 76 (Paris : Les Éditions du Cerf, 1970), 254-255.

²³ Metropolitan Neophytos, in *Les églises orientales catholiques : Décret « Orientalium ecclesiarum »*, texte latin et traduction française, commentaire par Neophytos Edelby, Métropolitte d'Alep et Ignace Dick, du clergé d'Alep, Unam Sanctam 76 (Paris : Les Éditions du Cerf, 1970), 255-256.

²⁴ Metropolitan Neophytos, in *Les églises orientales catholiques : Décret « Orientalium ecclesiarum »*, texte latin et traduction française,

The Eastern Catholics must come to know the spiritual patrimony of the East better, and must live that spiritual patrimony. It could seem astonishing that the Council recommends that the Eastern Catholics should *know* their own spiritual patrimony, but one must take the evidence into account: usually it is the Eastern Catholics who know the least about their own Christian East....So one could notice at the Council that Eastern Catholic prelates were quite up-to-date about scholastic theology, but knew practically nothing of the theology of their own Fathers.

The Eastern Catholics must also *live* their spiritual patrimony. They must faithfully practice their liturgical tradition, their discipline, their mysticism, their iconography and so forth. They must not be Eastern in manners and Western in life.²⁵

In case of need, [it is necessary to] *restore* the liturgical traditions and the discipline of the Christian East.

Whatever may have been in the past, the Council asks all the Eastern Catholics to make a sincere effort to return “to their ancestral traditions,” to restore their liturgical traditions and their discipline, to reclaim and revive their authentic purity....What is important

commentaire par Neophytos Edelby, Métropolitte d’Alep et Ignace Dick, du clergé d’Alep, *Unam Sanctam* 76 (Paris : Les Éditions du Cerf, 1970), 256. Father Cyril Korolevsky writes in the same vein, at much greater length, in his seminal study *L’Uniatisme*, published as nos. 5-6, *Irènikon-Collection* (Belgium: Prieurè d’Amay, 1927), translated into English by the present writer and published in Father Cyril Korolevsky’s biography of Metropolitan Andrew (Sheptytsky), *Metropolitan Andrew (1865-1944)* (L’viv: Stauropegion, 1993).

²⁵ Metropolitan Neophytos, in *Les églises orientales catholiques : Décret « Orientalium ecclesiarum »*, texte latin et traduction française, commentaire par Neophytos Edelby, Métropolitte d’Alep et Ignace Dick, du clergé d’Alep, *Unam Sanctam* 76 (Paris : Les Éditions du Cerf, 1970), 258-259.

is that one *is resolved upon* the restoration, that one *feels* this need and that this sentiment should be diffused as widely as possible. Then the restoration will come into the hands like a ripe fruit. Otherwise, under the pretext of liturgical or disciplinary purism, one will stir up disorders which will be worse than those that one wants to correct.²⁶

Father Archimandrite Victor (Pospishil) adds in his commentary on this article of the Decree:

The Council obliges the Eastern rites to return to their genuine tradition. The Holy See has done considerable work in the restoration of the original liturgical rites and ceremonies for the Ruthenians and the Catholic Ukrainians, although not all has been as yet applied in practice.²⁷

Of specific interest to the present topic, Father Archimandrite Victor adds:

The present trend of translating the liturgies into the vernacular does not dispense from the need to keep all innovations within the limits of the genuine characteristics of each Eastern rite.²⁸

²⁶ Metropolitan Neophytos, in *Les églises orientales catholiques : Décret « Orientalium ecclesiarum »*, texte latin et traduction française, commentaire par Neophytos Edelby, Métropolitte d'Alep et Ignace Dick, du clergé d'Alep, Unam Sanctam 76 (Paris : Les Éditions du Cerf, 1970), 259-260.

²⁷ [Archimandrite] Victor J. Pospishil, J.C.D., *Orientalium Ecclesiarum: The Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches of the II Council of Vatican: Canonical – Pastoral Commentary* (New York: John XXIII Center for Eastern Christian Studies, Fordham University, 1965), 23.

²⁸ [Archimandrite] Victor J. Pospishil, J.C.D., *Orientalium Ecclesiarum: The Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches of the II Council of Vatican: Canonical – Pastoral Commentary* (New York: John XXIII Center for Eastern Christian Studies, Fordham University, 1965), 23. A minor spelling error has been corrected.

This article of the Vatican II Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches is of special relevance to the topic:

The Holy Ecumenical Council confirms and approves the ancient discipline of the sacraments in force in the Eastern Churches, and the practice according to which the sacraments are celebrated and administered. The Council wishes that this practice should be restored if this practice has been neglected.²⁹

Father Ignatius Dick has commented on this article:

If changes have been done in [Eastern Catholic] discipline and practice to conform to Latin usages, one wants [the Eastern Catholics] to carry out a restoration to recover their own proper genius.³⁰

Many Eastern [Catholic] communities are somehow ashamed that they are not like the Latins.³¹

If, as a result of the ideas then current and of the mentality of the period, certain Eastern [Catholic] Churches have abandoned their own proper discipline to approximate the Latin discipline – whether by their own wish or by obedience to the Roman authorities – the Council desires that these Churches should *restore* their discipline and their own

²⁹ Orientalium Ecclesiarum, § 12.

³⁰ Father Ignatius Dick, in *Les églises orientales catholiques: Décret « Orientalium ecclesiarum »*, texte latin et traduction française, commentaire par Neophytos Edelby, Métropolitte d'Alep et Ignace Dick, du clergé d'Alep, Unam Sanctam 76 (Paris : Les Éditions du Cerf, 1970), 386.

³¹ Father Ignatius Dick, in *Les églises orientales catholiques: Décret « Orientalium ecclesiarum »*, texte latin et traduction française, commentaire par Neophytos Edelby, Métropolitte d'Alep et Ignace Dick, du clergé d'Alep, Unam Sanctam 76 (Paris : Les Éditions du Cerf, 1970), 390.

proper usages. The Eastern [Catholic] Churches must recover their own proper genius and return to their authentic patrimony.

This imposes a restoration on practically all the Eastern [Catholic] Churches.³²

In this connection, the following words of Archbishop Elias (Zoghby) of Baalbeck are relevant:

Papal documents such as *Orientalium Dignitas* of Pope Leo XIII, show the great esteem in which their authors held the Eastern Churches. These documents also show the official papal opposition to the Latinization of Eastern Catholics. But the results of these few papal efforts have not been sufficient. Why? Because the problem did not consist so much in preventing Latinization as in activating a de-Latinization program, or better, in returning the Orthodox ways of thought and religious attitudes to the Eastern Christians who had entered Catholicism through the Latin gate...Moreover, the instructions issued by the popes and their repeated warnings could not reach the heart of the matter, nor could they rebuild Uniatism on a better foundation. These papal warnings were aimed mostly at preventing all attacks on the integrity of the Eastern rites...As for the thorough Latinizing of Eastern Christian thought in schools and seminaries, little was done to remedy this until recent years...More important than that, the cause of the evil – I apologize for having to use that term – the cause of the evil not having been eliminated, the efforts put forth by those well-

³² Father Ignatius Dick, in *Les églises orientales catholiques: Décret « Orientalium ecclesiarum »*, texte latin et traduction française, commentaire par Neophytos Edelby, Métropolitte d'Alep et Ignace Dick, du clergé d'Alep, Unam Sanctam 76 (Paris : Les Éditions du Cerf, 1970), 390.

intentioned popes to safeguard the liturgical rites and to help the Uniates retain their original Eastern customs have achieved only mediocre results.³³

And this article of Vatican II is of critical importance:

The Eastern Churches in communion with the Apostolic See of Rome have a special duty of promoting the unity of all Christians, especially Eastern Christians, in accordance with the principles of the Decree “On Ecumenism” of this Sacred Council, in the first place by prayer, and by the example of their lives, by religious fidelity to the ancient Eastern traditions, by a greater knowledge of each other, by collaboration and a brotherly regard for objects and persons.³⁴

Archimandrite Ignatius (Dick) comments:

The Eastern Churches in union [with Rome] share with the other Eastern Churches the bearing of the ancient living tradition of the [Christian] East, complementary to the tradition of the [Christian] West, which is manifested in the discipline, liturgy, mysticism and theology of these Eastern Churches.

The Eastern Churches in union [with Rome] have their own special task: that of “promoting the unity of all Christians, especially Eastern Christians.”³⁵

³³ Archbishop Elias (Zoghby) of Baalbeck, *A Voice from the Byzantine East*, trans. R. Bernard (West Newton, MA: Educational Services, Diocese of Newton, 1992). Cited passage on 95-96, in essay on “Uniatism and Ecumenism.”

³⁴ *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, § 24.

³⁵ Father Ignatius Dick, in *Les églises orientales catholiques: Décret « Orientalium ecclesiarum »*, texte latin et traduction française, commentaire par Neophytos Edelby, Métropolitte d’Alep et Ignace Dick, du clergé d’Alep, Unam Sanctam 76 (Paris : Les Éditions du Cerf, 1970), 460.

Among the impediments to the accomplishment of this task, Archimandrite Ignatius notes:

Too often, says [Metropolitan Neophytos], the Eastern Catholics retain nothing of the Christian East but their liturgical tradition and their external appearance (and even there...). With an Eastern liturgy, they have lived out an Ignatian spirituality or something similar, a Carmelite mysticism, a Sulpician ascetism, etc.³⁶

Our misplaced pride. We have occasionally played our own part in our state of division....When we arrive at a certain level of organization, of material and numerical prosperity, we settle down in sinful contentedness, not thinking any more that in the limits of “our beloved community” we forget our Orthodox brothers and our mission in the Universal Church.³⁷

The [Eastern] Catholics must be vigilant to avoid scandalizing our brothers by our own looseness. Perhaps the Orthodox could reproach us with the weakness of the liturgical spirit among our faithful.³⁸

³⁶ Father Ignatius Dick, in *Les églises orientales catholiques: Décret « Orientalium ecclesiarum »*, texte latin et traduction française, commentaire par Neophytos Edelby, Métropolitte d'Alep et Ignace Dick, du clergé d'Alep, Unam Sanctam 76 (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1970), 462. Father Ignatius is quoting a conference by Metropolitan Neophytos, “Between Orthodoxy and Catholicism,” originally published in French in *Lumière et Vie* 55 (December 1961): 99-110; then in English in Patriarch Maximos IV, *The Eastern Churches and Catholic Unity* (Edinburgh-London: Nelson, 1963), 62-74, cited passage on 72.

³⁷ Father Ignatius Dick, in *Les églises orientales catholiques: Décret « Orientalium ecclesiarum »*, texte latin et traduction française, commentaire par Neophytos Edelby, Métropolitte d'Alep et Ignace Dick, du clergé d'Alep, Unam Sanctam 76 (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1970), 462.

³⁸ Father Ignatius Dick, in *Les églises orientales catholiques: Décret « Orientalium ecclesiarum »*, texte latin et traduction française,

We must rid ourselves of all confessional pride which exalts whatever good there is among us and systematically denigrates the others. Certain Catholics practice humility in their private lives and like to say that they are the least of men, but consider it almost an act of virtue to criticize and degrade the other Christian confessions, and systematically close their eyes to their own faults as a group.

...Let us learn to esteem both objects and men, the monasteries, the seminaries, the youth organizations, the works...³⁹ as well as the hierarchy, the clergy and the Christian people....Then one can by a healthy spiritual emulation correct one another and move forward together in the ways of the Lord.⁴⁰

It is possible to collaborate in the liturgical domain in producing joint editions of the liturgical books.⁴¹

Among the various ecumenical tasks and methods, there is one in particular which is proper to the Eastern Churches in union [with Rome] in which

commentaire par Neophytos Edelby, Métropolitte d'Alep et Ignace Dick, du clergé d'Alep, *Unam Sanctam* 76 (Paris : Les Éditions du Cerf, 1970), 471. Part of this passage is a direct quote from Patriarch Maximos IV, *The Eastern Churches and Catholic Unity* (Edinburgh-London: Nelson, 1963), 46-61, "The Eastern Rôle in Christian Reunion," cited passage on 55.

³⁹ Ellipsis in original.

⁴⁰ Father Ignatius Dick, in *Les églises orientales catholiques : Décret « Orientalium ecclesiarum »*, texte latin et traduction française, commentaire par Neophytos Edelby, Métropolitte d'Alep et Ignace Dick, du clergé d'Alep, *Unam Sanctam* 76 (Paris : Les Éditions du Cerf, 1970), 472.

⁴¹ Father Ignatius Dick, in *Les églises orientales catholiques : Décret « Orientalium ecclesiarum »*, texte latin et traduction française, commentaire par Neophytos Edelby, Métropolitte d'Alep et Ignace Dick, du clergé d'Alep, *Unam Sanctam* 76 (Paris : Les Éditions du Cerf, 1970), 472.

they cannot be replaced, not by experts on the Christian East nor by Latins who live in the Christian East. This is the “religious fidelity to the ancient Eastern traditions.” When they are perfectly Eastern and perfectly Catholic, the Eastern Churches in union [with Rome] will manifest (in a living way, not just on paper) that the Roman Primacy does not absorb the autonomy proper to the Christian East, and that the Eastern Christian tradition can be lived authentically in communion with Rome....

By the ‘Eastern Christian traditions’, one must understand the entire ecclesiastical and spiritual patrimony of the Christian East: liturgy, monasticism, spirituality, art, ecclesiastical discipline and theology.⁴²

The Decree on Ecumenism:

The Vatican II Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches itself teaches that the Eastern Catholics must promote the restoration of full communion between East and West “in accordance with the principles of the Decree ‘On Ecumenism’ of this Sacred Council.”⁴³ This in itself requires us to consider which specific articles of that decree (commonly referred to by its Latin name, *Unitatis Redintegratio*) are relevant to the topic under discussion:

14. For many centuries the Church of the East and that of the West each followed their separate ways though linked in a brotherly union of faith and sacramental life; the Roman See by common consent

⁴² Father Ignatius Dick, in *Les églises orientales catholiques: Décret « Orientalium ecclesiarum »*, texte latin et traduction française, commentaire par Neophytos Edelby, Métropolitte d’Alep et Ignace Dick, du clergé d’Alep, Unam Sanctam 76 (Paris : Les Éditions du Cerf, 1970), 473.

⁴³ *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, Vatican II, § 24.

acted as guide when disagreements arose between them over matters of faith or discipline. Among other matters of great importance, it is a pleasure for this Council to remind everyone that there flourish in the East many particular or local Churches, among which the Patriarchal Churches hold first place, and of these not a few pride themselves in tracing their origins back to the apostles themselves. Hence a matter of primary concern and care among the Easterns, in their local churches, has been, and still is, to preserve the family ties of common faith and charity which ought to exist between sister Churches.

Similarly it must not be forgotten that from the beginning the Churches of the East have had a treasury from which the Western Church has drawn extensively – in liturgical practice, spiritual tradition, and law. Nor must we undervalue the fact that it was the ecumenical councils held in the East that defined the basic dogmas of the Christian faith, on the Trinity, on the Word of God Who took flesh of the Virgin Mary. To preserve this faith these Churches have suffered and still suffer much.

However, the heritage handed down by the apostles was received with differences of form and manner, so that from the earliest times of the Church it was explained variously in different places, owing to diversities of genius and conditions of life. All this, quite apart from external causes, prepared the way for decisions arising also from a lack of charity and mutual understanding.⁴⁴

Everyone knows with what love the Eastern Christians celebrate the sacred liturgy, especially the Eucharistic mystery, source of the Church's life and

⁴⁴ Unitatis Redintegratio, § 14.

pledge of future glory. In this mystery the faithful, united with their bishops, have access to God the Father through the Son, the Word made flesh who suffered and was glorified, in the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. And so, made 'sharers of the divine nature' (2 Pt 1:4) they enter into communion with the most holy Trinity.

The very rich liturgical and spiritual heritage of the Eastern Churches should be known, venerated, preserved and cherished by all. They must recognize that this is of supreme importance for the faithful preservation of the fullness of Christian tradition, and for bringing about reconciliation between Eastern and Western Christians.⁴⁵

What has just been said about the lawful variety that can exist in the Church must also be taken to apply to the differences in theological expression of doctrine. In the study of revelation East and West have followed different methods, and have developed differently their understanding and confession of God's truth. It is hardly surprising, then, if from time to time one tradition has come nearer to a full appreciation of some aspects of a mystery of revelation than the other, or has expressed it to better advantage. In such cases, these various theological expressions are to be considered often as mutually complementary rather than conflicting. Where the authentic theological traditions of the Eastern Church are concerned, we must recognize the admirable way in which they have their roots in Holy Scripture, and how they are nurtured and given expression in the life of the liturgy. They derive their strength too from the living tradition of the apostles and from the works of the Fathers and spiritual writers of the Eastern

⁴⁵ Unitatis Redintegratio, § 15.

Churches. Thus they promote the right ordering of Christian life and, indeed, pave the way to a full vision of Christian truth.

All this heritage of spirituality and liturgy, of discipline and theology, in its various traditions, this holy synod declares to belong to the full Catholic and apostolic character of the Church. We thank God that many Eastern children of the Catholic Church, who preserve this heritage, and wish to express it more faithfully and completely in their lives, are already living in full communion with their brethren who follow the tradition of the West.⁴⁶

The Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches

The Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches is examined at length in the *Instruction on Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, which we shall discuss below. However, we do wish to remark here that Canon 903 of the Code of Canons:

The Eastern Catholic Churches have a special duty of fostering unity among all Eastern Churches, first of all through prayers, by the example of life, by the religious fidelity to the ancient traditions of the Eastern Churches, by mutual and better knowledge of each other, and by collaboration and brotherly respect in practice and spirit.⁴⁷

⁴⁶ Unitatis Redintegratio, § 17.

⁴⁷ English translation of Canon 902 from *Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches, Latin-English Edition* (Washington, D.C.: Canon Law Society of America, 1991), 439.

is almost a *verbatim* quote from the conciliar Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches:

The Eastern Churches in communion with the Apostolic See of Rome have a special duty of promoting the unity of all Christians, especially Eastern Christians, in accordance with the principles of the Decree “On Ecumenism” of this Sacred Council, in the first place by prayer, and by the example of their lives, by religious fidelity to the ancient Eastern traditions, by a greater knowledge of each other, by collaboration and a brotherly regard for objects and persons.⁴⁸

A comparison of the two texts in Latin will show the identity more clearly:

Ad Ecclesias Orientales, communionem cum Sede Apostolica Romana habentes, peculiare pertinent munus omnium christianorum unitatem, orientalium praesertim, fovendi, iuxta principia decreti huius S. Synodi ‘De Oecumenismo’, precibus imprimis, vitae exemplis, religiosa erga antiquas traditiones orientales fidelitate, mutua et meliore cognitione, collaboratione ac fraternal rerum animorumque aestimatione.⁴⁹

And

Ad Ecclesias orientales catholicas speciale pertinent munus unitatem inter omnes Ecclesias orientales fovendi precibus imprimis, vitae exemplo, religiosa erga antiquas traditiones Ecclesiarum orientalium fidelitate, mutua et meliore cognitione, collaboratione ac fraternal rerum animorumque aestimatione.⁵⁰

⁴⁸ Orientalium Ecclesiarum, § 24.

⁴⁹ Orientalium Ecclesiarum, Vatican II, § 24.

⁵⁰ Canon 902 from *Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches, Latin-English Edition* (Washington, D.C.: Canon Law Society of America, 1991), 438.

The term *munus* occurs in both texts, and indicates a serious obligation, inherent in the position, which cannot be ignored or evaded.

John Paul II's Apostolic Letter *Orientale Lumen*, issued in observance of the centenary of Leo XIII's Apostolic Letter *Orientalium Dignitas*,⁵¹ is the single most important magisterial document on the Eastern Churches since Vatican II. *Orientale Lumen* adumbrates an entire theological and even practical program for the Eastern Churches which will certainly accompany us and guide us in the twenty-first century. The entire document must be read with careful attention, particularly since John Paul II devoted about half of the document to Liturgy. But we shall quote some paragraphs here. Unfortunately, there is as yet (so far as we know) no book-length commentary.

Participation in Trinitarian life takes place through the liturgy and in a special way through the Eucharist, the mystery of communion with the glorified body of Christ, the seed of immortality.⁵²

The East expresses in a living way the reality of tradition and expectation. All its liturgy, in particular, is a commemoration of salvation and an invocation of the Lord's return. And if Tradition teaches the Churches fidelity to what give birth to them, eschatological expectation urges them to be what they have not yet fully become, what the Lord wants them to become, and thus to seek ever new ways of fidelity, overcoming pessimism because they are striving for the hope of God who does not disappoint.

⁵¹ English translation of *Orientalium Dignitas* in *Vatican Documents on the Eastern Churches* (Fairfax, VA: Eastern Christian Publications).

⁵² *Orientale Lumen*, § 6d; Cf. Saint Gregory of Nyssa, Catechetical Discourse, XXXVII: *Patrologia Graeca* 45:97.

We must show people the beauty of memory, the power that comes to us from the Spirit and makes us witnesses because we are children of witnesses; we must make them taste the wonderful things the Spirit has wrought in history; we must show that it is precisely Tradition which has preserved them, thus giving hope to those who, even without seeing their efforts to do good crowned by success, know that someone else will bring them to fulfillment; therefore man will feel less alone, less enclosed in the narrow corner of his own individual achievement.⁵³

The Eucharist is the culmination of this prayer experience, the other pole indissolubly bound to the Word, as the place where the Word becomes Flesh and Blood, a heavenly experience where this becomes an event.

In the Eucharist, the Church's inner nature is revealed, a community of those summoned to the synaxis to celebrate the gift of the One who is offering and offered: participating in the Holy Mysteries, they become "kinsmen"⁵⁴ (28) of Christ, anticipating the experience of divinization in the now inseparable bond linking divinity and humanity in Christ.

But the Eucharist is also what anticipates the relationship of men and things to the heavenly Jerusalem. In this way it reveals its eschatological nature completely: as a living sign of this expectation, the monk continues and brings to fulfillment in the liturgy the invocation of the Church, the Bride who implores the Bridegroom's return in a *maranatha*

⁵³ Orientale Lumen, § 8 e-f.

⁵⁴ [This is note 28 in the original] Cf. Nicholas Cabasilas, *Life in Christ*, IV: *Patrologia Graeca* 150:584 - 585; Cyril of Alexandria, *Treatise on John*, 11: *Patrologia Graeca* 74:561; *ibid.*, 12, l.c., 564; Saint John Chrysostom, *Homilies on Matthew*, Homily LXXXII, 5: *Patrologia Graeca* 58:743 - 744.

constantly repeated, not only in words, but with the whole of his life.⁵⁵

In the liturgical experience, Christ the Lord is the light which illumines the way and reveals the transparency of the cosmos, precisely as in Scripture. The events of the past find in Christ their meaning and fullness, and creation is revealed for what it is: a complex whole which finds its perfection, its purpose in the liturgy alone. This is why the liturgy is heaven on earth, and in it the Word who became flesh imbues matter with a saving potential which is fully manifest in the sacraments: there, creation communicates to each individual the power conferred on it by Christ. Thus the Lord, immersed in the Jordan, transmits to the waters a power which enables them to become the bath of baptismal rebirth.⁵⁶

Within this framework, liturgical prayer in the East shows a great aptitude for involving the human person in his or her totality: the mystery is sung in the loftiness of its content, but also in the warmth of the sentiments it awakens in the heart of redeemed humanity. In the sacred act, even bodiliness is summoned to praise, and *beauty, which in the East is one of the best loved names expressing the divine harmony and the model of humanity transfigured,*⁵⁷ appears everywhere: in the shape of the church, in the sounds, in the colors, in the lights, in the scents. *The lengthy duration of the celebrations, the repeated invocations, everything expresses gradual identification with the mystery celebrated with one's whole person. Thus the*

⁵⁵ *Oriente Lumen*, § 10, e, f and g.

⁵⁶ [This is footnote 29 in the original] Cf. Saint Gregory of Nazianzus, *Discourse XXXIX: Patrologia Graeca* 36:335 - 360.

⁵⁷ [This is footnote 30 in the original.] Cf. Clement of Alexandria, *The Pedagogue*, III, 1, 1: *Sources Chrétiennes* 158:12.

prayer of the Church already becomes participation in the heavenly liturgy, an anticipation of the final beatitude.

This total involvement of the person in his rational and emotional aspects, in "ecstasy" and in immanence, is of great interest and a wonderful way to understand the meaning of created realities: these are neither an absolute nor a den of sin and iniquity. In the liturgy, things reveal their own nature as a gift offered by the Creator to humanity: "God saw everything that he had made, and behold, it was very good" (*Gen* 1:31). Though all this is marked by the tragedy of sin, which weighs down matter and obscures its clarity, the latter is redeemed in the Incarnation and becomes fully "theophoric," that is, capable of putting us in touch with the Father. This property is most apparent in the holy mysteries, the sacraments of the Church.⁵⁸

Nevertheless this mystery is continuously veiled, enveloped in silence,⁵⁹ lest an idol be created in place of God. Only in a progressive purification of the knowledge of communion, will man and God meet and recognize in an eternal embrace their unending connaturality of love.

Thus is born what is called the apophatism of the Christian East: the more man grows in the knowledge of God, the more he perceives Him as an inaccessible mystery, whose essence cannot be grasped. This should not be confused with an obscure mysticism in which man loses himself in enigmatic, impersonal realities. On the contrary, the Christians of the East

⁵⁸ *Oriente Lumen*, § 11, a, b and c. Our italics.

⁵⁹ [This is footnote 35 in the original.] Silence (*hesychia*) is an essential component of Eastern monastic spirituality. Cf. *The Life and Sayings of the Desert Fathers: Patrologia Graeca* 65:72 - 456; Evagrius of Pontus, *The Foundations of Monastic Life: Patrologia Graeca* 40:1252 - 1264.

turn to God as Father, Son and Holy Spirit, living persons tenderly present, to whom they utter a solemn and humble, majestic and simple liturgical doxology. But they perceive that one draws close to this presence above all by letting oneself be taught an adoring silence, for at the culmination of the knowledge and experience of God is his absolute transcendence. This is reached through the prayerful assimilation of scripture and the liturgy more than by systematic meditation.⁶⁰

Particularly significant anniversaries encourage us to turn our thoughts with affection and reverence to the Eastern Churches. First of all, as has been said, the centenary of the Apostolic Letter *Orientalium Dignitas*. Since that time a journey began which has led, among other things, in 1917, to the creation of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches⁶¹ and the foundation of the Pontifical Oriental Institute⁶² by Pope Benedict XV. Subsequently, on June 5, 1960, John XXIII founded the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity.⁶³ In recent times, on October 18, 1990, I promulgated the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches,⁶⁴ in order to safeguard and to promote the specific features of the Eastern heritage.⁶⁵

Of course, in today's outlook it appears that true union is possible only in total respect for the other's

⁶⁰ *Oriente Lumen*, § 16 a and b.

⁶¹ [This footnote 49 in the original.] Cf. Motu proprio *Dei Providentis* (May 1, 1917): *AAS* 9 (1917): 529 - 531.

⁶² [This is footnote 50 in the original.] Cf. Motu proprio *Oriente Lumen* (October 15, 1917), *l.c.*, 531 - 533.

⁶³ [This is footnote 51 in the original.] Cf. Motu proprio *Superno Dei Nutu*, (June 5, 1960), 9: *AAS* 52 (1960): 435 - 436.

⁶⁴ [This is footnote 52 in the original.] Cf. Apostolic Constitution *Sacri Canonibus* (October 18, 1990): *AAS* 82 (1990): 1033 - 1044.

⁶⁵ *Oriente Lumen* § 20 a.

dignity without claiming that the whole array of uses and customs in the Latin Church is more complete or better suited to showing the fullness of correct doctrine; and again, that this union must be preceded by an awareness of communion that permeates the whole Church and is not limited to an agreement among leaders. Today we are conscious – and this has frequently been reasserted – that unity will be achieved how and when the Lord desires, and that it will require the contribution of love's sensitivity and creativity, perhaps even going beyond the forms already tried in history.^{66 67}

The Eastern Churches which entered into full communion with Rome wished to be an expression of this concern, according to the degree of maturity of the ecclesial awareness of the time.⁶⁸ In entering into catholic communion, they did not at all intend to deny their fidelity to their own tradition, to which they have borne witness down the centuries with heroism and often by shedding their blood. And if sometimes, in their relations with the Orthodox Churches, misunderstandings and open opposition have arisen, we all know that we must ceaselessly implore divine mercy and a new heart capable of reconciliation over and above any wrong suffered or inflicted.

It has been stressed several times that the full union of the Catholic Eastern Churches with the Church of Rome which has already been achieved must not imply a diminished awareness of their own

⁶⁶ [This is footnote 56 in the original] Cf. Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, Decree on the Catholic Eastern Churches, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, § 30.

⁶⁷ *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, § 20 c.

⁶⁸ [This is footnote 57 in the original.] Cf. John Paul II, Message *Magnum Baptismi Donum* (February 14, 1988), 4: AAS 80 (1988), 991 - 992.

authenticity and originality.⁶⁹ Wherever this occurred, the Second Vatican Council has urged them to rediscover their full identity, because they have “the right and the duty to govern themselves according to their own special disciplines. For these are guaranteed by ancient tradition, and seem to be better suited to the customs of their faithful and to the good of their souls.”⁷⁰ These Churches carry a tragic wound, for they are still kept from full communion with the Eastern Orthodox Churches despite sharing in the heritage of their fathers. A constant, shared conversion is indispensable for them to advance resolutely and energetically towards mutual understanding. And conversion is also required of the Latin Church, that she may respect and fully appreciate the dignity of Eastern Christians, and accept gratefully the spiritual treasures of which the Eastern Catholic Churches are the bearers, to the benefit of the entire catholic communion;⁷¹ that she may show concretely, far more than in the past, how much she esteems and admires the Christian East and how essential she considers its contribution to the full realization of the Church's universality.⁷²

In January 1996 the Oriental Congregation issued the *Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of*

⁶⁹ [This is footnote 58 in the original.] Cf. Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, Decree on the Catholic Eastern Churches, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, § 24.

⁷⁰ [This is footnote 59 in the original.] Cf. Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, Decree on the Catholic Eastern Churches, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, § 5.

⁷¹ [This is footnote 60 in the original.] Cf. Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, Decree on Ecumenism *Unitatis Redintegratio*, § 17; John Paul II, Address to the Extraordinary Consistory (June 13, 1994): *L'Osservatore Romano*, June 13 - 14, 1994, p. 5.

⁷² *Oriente Lumen*, § 21.

the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches.⁷³ The *Instruction* both collects the liturgical legislation of the Code of Canons and presents that legislation coherently with an authoritative commentary and represents a further development in the entire process of re-pristination. The *Instruction* also gives well-considered explanations for the various points, which is both helpful in understanding the mind of the Church and much more convincing than a simple statement of law. Here we reproduce a few excerpts from the *Instruction*, but everyone seriously interested in these matters should read and study the entire *Instruction* quite thoroughly. The *Instruction* poses some distinct objectives, including these:

- to lead to *a more profound understanding*⁷⁴ of the immense richness of the authentic Eastern traditions, which are to be scrupulously maintained and communicated to all the faithful;

- to arrange the liturgical norms valid for all the Catholic Eastern Churches in an organic summary and to introduce *recovery*,⁷⁵ where necessary, *of the Eastern liturgical authenticity*,⁷⁶ according to the Tradition which each Eastern Church has inherited from the Apostles through the Fathers;

- to exhort a permanent liturgical formation⁷⁷ to be organized on a solid basis, for both the clergy⁷⁸ –

⁷³ Libreria Editrice Vaticana. Published in Rome both in Italian and in English – the English text is available from Eastern Christian Publications. The publication in Rome was timed for an extraordinary session of the Archiepiscopal Synod of the Syro-Malabar Catholic Church.

⁷⁴ Our italics.

⁷⁵ Our italics.

⁷⁶ Our italics.

⁷⁷ Our italics.

beginning with seminarians and formation institutes – and the people⁷⁹ of God through schools of mystagogical catechesis;

- to list the principles in common for the elaboration of Liturgical Directories for the individual Churches *sui iuris*.⁸⁰

Further to the Liturgical Directory, this paragraph has particular importance to the Churches of the Byzantine liturgical tradition:

For **communities of Churches *sui iuris* belonging to the same liturgical family, such as the Churches of Constantinopolitan or of Syro-Chaldean traditions**, the Holy See will provide for the formulation of more detailed indications in collaboration with the Churches concerned. Every single Church *sui iuris* belonging to such families will provide, according to methods that will be specified, for the elaboration of a *corpus* of norms which adapt the present document and the one that will be elaborated for her entire liturgical family to her own specific situation.⁸¹

This above paragraph clarifies the situation: the individual autonomous Churches of the Byzantine liturgical tradition are not independent from each other in matters of Liturgy; they are interdependent. While a certain distinctiveness is

⁷⁸ Our italics.

⁷⁹ Our italics.

⁸⁰ *Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, Congregation for the Eastern Church (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996) [reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications, Fairfax, VA], § 5 b.

⁸¹ *Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, Congregation for the Eastern Church (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996) [reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications, Fairfax, VA], § 6 b.

certainly permitted, a certain cohesion and identity is also necessary, and the distinctiveness depends upon establishing that common identity.

Moreover, the good estate of the Eastern Liturgies, as of the Eastern Churches themselves, is the proper concern of everyone:

The conciliar documents, the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches and the repeated authoritative declarations of the Magisterium affirm the inalienable value of the particular heritage of the Eastern Churches. *Lumen Gentium*⁸² n. 23 declares that these, by divine Providence, whilst safe-guarding the unity of the faith and the unique divine structure of the universal Church, enjoy their own theological and spiritual heritage, their own discipline, and their own liturgical usage. *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* n. 1 specifies that in these shines the Tradition derived from the Apostles through the Fathers, which constitutes part of the divinely revealed, undivided heritage of the Universal Church.⁸³

The Instruction stresses the duty to protect the Eastern heritage and cautions against “the acquisition of forms of thought, spirituality, and devotions that are not coherent with their own ecclesial heritage.”⁸⁴ This paragraph also warns that:

⁸² The Vatican II Dogmatic Constitution on the Church.

⁸³ *Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, Congregation for the Eastern Church (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996) [reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications, Fairfax, VA], § 7 a.

⁸⁴ *Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, Congregation for the Eastern Church (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996) [reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications, Fairfax, VA], § 10 a.

The danger of losing the Eastern identity manifests itself particularly in a time like the present, characterized by great migrations from the East toward lands believed to be more hospitable, which are prevalently of Latin tradition.⁸⁵

Without adopting a position of absolute immobilism, the *Instruction* teaches clearly that:

the Church guards against every undue and inopportune precipitation, requiring that any eventual modification be not only well prepared, but also inspired and conforming to the genuine traditions.⁸⁶

Specifically continuing the strong encouragement of liturgical repristination in the Eastern Catholic Churches, the *Instruction* reminds us that

whenever they have fallen short, due to circumstances of time or persons, they are to strive to return to their ancestral traditions.⁸⁷...The Holy Father John Paul II sees in this a “symbol of the firm attitude held by the Apostolic See, that the Council so efficiently expressed by asking the Eastern Churches in full communion with it to have the courage to rediscover the authentic traditions of their own

⁸⁵ *Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, Congregation for the Eastern Church (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996) [reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications, Fairfax, VA], § 10 b.

⁸⁶ *Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, Congregation for the Eastern Church (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996) [reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications, Fairfax, VA], § 11.

⁸⁷ [This is footnote 17 in the original.] Cf. Vatican Council II, Decree. on the Catholic Eastern Churches *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, § 6.

identity, restoring the original purity where necessary.^{88 89}

And as Pope Paul VI put it:

Any renewal, in fact, should be coherent and agree with sound tradition, in such a way that the new norms do not appear as an extraneous body forced into an ecclesiastical composite, but blossoming as though spontaneously from already existing norms.⁹⁰

Speaking to the Romanian Greek-Catholic delegation in 1994, Pope John Paul II said:

The holy Liturgy, the place in which proclamations and adorations and the communion and fellowship among the believers are manifested, is the true former of the Christian life and the most complete synthesis of its various aspects.⁹² In fact, the Liturgy is the

⁸⁸ [This is footnote 18 in the original.] John Paul II, Homily during the Divine Liturgy in the Armenian rite (21 November 1987): *L'Osservatore Romano*, 23-24 November 1987, 6; see also in *Servizio Informazioni per le Chiese Orientali*, supplement to nn. 485-556, p. 5.

⁸⁹ *Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, Congregation for the Eastern Church (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996) [reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications, Fairfax, VA], § 12 a.

⁹⁰ [This is footnote 19 in the original.] Cf. Paul VI, Discourse of 18 March 1974; *Nuntia* 1 (1975), 6.

⁹¹ *Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, Congregation for the Eastern Church (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996) [reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications, Fairfax, VA], § 12 c.

⁹² [This is footnote 20 in the original] John Paul II, Discourse to participants of the meeting about the pastoral problems of the Catholic Church of the Byzantine rite in Romania (22 January 1994): *L'Osservatore Romano*, 22 January 1994, 5; see also in *Servizio Informazioni per le Chiese Orientali* 49 (1994): 2.

“summit and font”⁹³ of Christian life and expresses it as in a synthesis; evokes and actualizes the mystery of Christ and the Church, presents it to the contemplation of the faithful and sings it, rendering thanks to the Lord “for eternal is his love” (Ps 135 LXX).⁹⁴

The Liturgy of the Eastern Churches is of pre-eminent importance for the Universal Church. The *Instruction* explains:

The Eastern Churches have maintained in a special way the primacy of the Liturgy as the summit of Christian life, remaining thus completely faithful to the spirit of the Church of the Fathers, when the Liturgy was the place where catechesis and religious teaching occurred; the Scripture was proclaimed and commented....The whole life of the Church was, therefore, summarized in the Liturgy. Even today, it is this model which inspires the Eastern Churches and which constitutes their force. This model should be the inspiration especially for the necessary revaluation of the “mystagogical” method for the formation of the faithful: from the liturgy, understood and assimilated, progress in the life of Christ is born.⁹⁵

In addition, the liturgical life remains more essentially in the center of ecclesial concerns, expresses the faith and its content and at the same

⁹³ [This is footnote 21 in the original.] Cf. Vatican Council II, Const. on the Sacred Liturgy *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, § 10.

⁹⁴ *Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, Congregation for the Eastern Church (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996) [reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications, Fairfax, VA], § 14 b.

⁹⁵ *Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, Congregation for the Eastern Church (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996) [reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications, Fairfax, VA], § 15 a.

time guides the spiritual life of the believers. This has been made especially evident when many Eastern Churches, oppressed by persecutory regimes, were able to survive and even strengthen themselves despite having to limit the extent of their own spiritual and pastoral action only to liturgical celebration, from which the people in a certain sense drew upon the life-giving substance of their faith.⁹⁶

On the wider significance of liturgical repristination, the *Instruction* teaches:

The Eastern Catholic Churches, although having been influenced by the weight of Western tradition, have maintained in the field of liturgy a more faithful conformity to their true traditions. It is precisely their liturgies, restored to greater authenticity and vitality **by eliminating that which has altered them**, that could be the best starting point for a growth of their specific identity, from which could be drawn words and gestures capable of touching the hearts and illuminating the minds of their faithful in the present time.

The preservation of the liturgical riches will be more fruitful the more they are determined not only by normative intervention by the Hierarchy, but also by the spontaneous and faithful adhesion of the Christian people, so **educated** by their pastors.⁹⁷

⁹⁶ *Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, Congregation for the Eastern Church (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996) [reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications, Fairfax, VA], § 15 e.

⁹⁷ *Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, Congregation for the Eastern Church (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996) [reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications, Fairfax, VA], § 16.

This liturgical movement must then be solidly grounded in research and in education. The *Instruction* also reminds us of the crucial importance of Tradition:

Applied to Liturgy, Tradition has shown an extraordinary vitality in the Eastern Churches: the prayer of the Church has journeyed constantly, even if imperceptibly, not only on the basis of reforms from above – which have occurred very seldom⁹⁸ – but precisely on the basis of this living Tradition.⁹⁹

Specifically concerning “Liturgical reform and renewal” the *Instruction* teaches as follows:

The first requirement of every Eastern liturgical renewal 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....It is once again John Paul II who declares: “If, therefore, you must trim extraneous forms and developments, deriving from various influences that come from liturgical and paraliturgical traditions foreign to your tradition, it is possible that, so doing, you will have to also correct some popular habits.”^{100 101}

⁹⁸ [Of necessity, the English translation has been corrected here – the original English text reads “seldomly,” which is not found in English, since “seldom” is itself an adverb and means “rarely.” The Italian text reads “molto di rado,” which means “very rarely.”]

⁹⁹ *Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, Congregation for the Eastern Church (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996) [reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications, Fairfax, VA], § 17.

¹⁰⁰ [This is footnote 24 in the original.] John Paul II, Discourse to the participants of the Synod of the Catholic Armenian Patriarch (26 August 1989): *L'Osservatore Romano*, 27 August 1989, 7; see also in *Servizio Informazioni per le Chiese Orientali* supplement to nn. 485-556, p. 42.

We are witness today to the diffusion of a mentality that tends to overvalue efficiency, excessive activism, and the attainment of results with minimum effort and without deep personal involvement. This attitude can also negatively influence the approach towards Liturgy, even in the East. The Liturgy, rather, continues to be a demanding school which requires an assimilation that is progressive, laborious, and never completely accomplished.¹⁰²

...Tradition, even in its literal expression – as is the case for Scriptures – contains unrenouncable¹⁰³ treasures; its strengths are received, assimilated, and utilized to transmit to mankind the fullness of the Mystery of God. Indeed, it is about words of fire, just like the Word of God which is sharper than a two-edged sword and penetrates to the division of soul and spirit (cf. Heb 4:12). The fact that they are constantly repeated in the liturgy should not take anything away from their vigor and perennial timeliness.¹⁰⁴

The *Instruction* requires study prior to every modification:

¹⁰¹ *Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, Congregation for the Eastern Church (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996) [reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications, Fairfax, VA], § 18 a.

¹⁰² *Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, Congregation for the Eastern Church (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996) [reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications, Fairfax, VA], § 18 b.

¹⁰³ The correct spelling is “unrenounceable.” The Italian word used here is *irrinunciabili*.

¹⁰⁴ *Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, Congregation for the Eastern Church (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996) [reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications, Fairfax, VA], § 18 c.

It is indispensable to remember the exhortation in n. 23 of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy: “In order that sound tradition be retained, and yet the way remain open to legitimate progress, the revision of any part of the Liturgy should occur only after careful investigation – theological, historical, and pastoral.” Indeed, the liturgical reform desired by the Second Vatican Council was able to be carried out precisely because it was preceded, and successfully followed, by lengthy experimentation, intense historical studies, critical textual analyses, theological studies, biblical studies, and pastoral studies, culminating in the work of individual and committee research, both at the local and international level. Without all this, the references, frameworks, and precise contents necessary for a valid endeavor would not have been obtained.¹⁰⁵

Discussing the “criteria for liturgical renewal” the *Instruction* cautions:

In modifying ancient liturgical practice, it must be determined if the element to be introduced is coherent with the contextual meaning in which it is placed. Such a context should be understood beginning with eventual references to Sacred Scripture, interpretations of the Holy Fathers, liturgical reforms previously made, and mystagogical catechesis. Here it must be verified that the new change is homogeneous with the symbolic language, with the images and the

¹⁰⁵ *Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, Congregation for the Eastern Church (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996) [reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications, Fairfax, VA], § 19. [Whatever one may think of the liturgical changes which followed in the wake of Vatican II, there is no denying that there had been a process of decades of consistent efforts to educate clergy and faithful on liturgical matters. It would be worthwhile to do a thorough study of that process, and to consider how that process might be improved for Eastern Catholic needs.]

style specific to the Liturgy of the particular Church. The new element will have its place if, required for serious pastoral reasons, it blends within the celebration without contrast but with coherence, almost as if it had naturally derived from it. In addition, it should be ensured that it is not already present, perhaps in another form, in a different moment of the celebration or in another part of the liturgical *corpus* of that Church.

Every renewal initiative should be careful not to be conditioned by other systems, which may appear to be more efficient. From time to time, addressing the faithful of various Eastern Catholic Churches, John Paul II's vibrant and repeated exhortations refer to such caution: "Do not adhere with excessive improvisation to the imitation of cultures and traditions which are not your own, thus betraying the sensibility of your own people. (...)"¹⁰⁶ This means it is necessary that every eventual adaptation of your liturgy be founded on an attentive study of the sources, objective knowledge of the specific features of your culture, and maintenance of the tradition common to all Coptic Christianity."^{107 108}

We quote the following section, on "The ecumenical value of the common liturgical heritage," in full, since it is highly pertinent to the topic under discussion. This theme

¹⁰⁶ Ellipsis in original.

¹⁰⁷ [This is footnote 25 in the original.] John Paul II, Homily in the Prayer of incense in the Alexandrian-Coptic rite (14 August 1988): *L'Osservatore Romano*, 16-17 August 1988, 5; see also in *Servizio Informazioni per le Chiese Orientali*, supplement to nn. 485-556, p. 24.

¹⁰⁸ *Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, Congregation for the Eastern Church (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996) [reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications, Fairfax, VA], § 20. Obviously, the Greek-Catholics are not Copts. But *mutatis mutandis*, the principle enunciated by John Paul II here applies well.

has been constant in the pronouncements of the Holy See on the subject since the time of Saint Pius X:

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.^{109 110}

¹⁰⁹ [This is footnote 26 in the original.] Cf. John Paul II, Discourse to participants of the meeting about the pastoral problems of the Catholic Church of the Byzantine rite in Romania (22 January 1994): *L'Osservatore Romano*, 22 January 1994, 5; see also in *Servizio Informazioni per le Chiese Orientali* 49 (1994): 2.

Throughout the Universal Church, and even more especially in the Eastern Churches, the Bishop is always the high priest. In this his primary task is to maintain, not to innovate, and to be vigilant for the complete authenticity of liturgical life. Thus the *Instruction* reminds us:

The Bishop, therefore, does not act solely based on [his]¹¹¹ own judgment nor based on the local customs, but refers to the specific heritage of his own Church *sui iuris*.¹¹²

In exercising his mandate as moderator of the liturgical life, the Bishop should neither act arbitrarily nor give way to the behavior of groups or factions, but, together with his clergy, let him be an attentive guardian of the liturgical awareness present and operating in the living memory of the people of God entrusted to him.¹¹³

In the Eastern Catholic Churches, there is also the necessary concern of the Apostolic See for

¹¹⁰ *Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, Congregation for the Eastern Church (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996) [reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications, Fairfax, VA], § 21 [emphasis added].

¹¹¹ The official English text uses the neuter pronoun *its* to refer to the Bishop, which is an inadmissible error that is corrected above.

¹¹² *Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, Congregation for the Eastern Church (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996) [reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications, Fairfax, VA], § 23 b.

¹¹³ *Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, Congregation for the Eastern Church (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996) [reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications, Fairfax, VA], § 23 c.

revision, in the sense of a return to ancestral traditions.^{114 115}

The fundamental importance of the liturgy as divine-human action which realizes salvation *hic et nunc* and its nature as the privileged place which preserves and expresses the *depositum fidei* are precisely that which motivates the function of guardianship and protection, even of Eastern liturgical practices, which the Apostolic See continues to perform: it is a question of guaranteeing and defending the faith in one of its most important expressions.¹¹⁶

Section 25 of the *Instruction*, concerning the approval of translations of liturgical books, offers a principle of great relevance to the topic at hand:

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.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁴ [This is footnote 28 in the original.] Cf. Vatican Council II, Decree. on the Catholic Eastern Churches, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, 6.

¹¹⁵ *Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, Congregation for the Eastern Church (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996) [reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications, Fairfax, VA], § 24 a.

¹¹⁶ *Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, Congregation for the Eastern Church (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996) [reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications, Fairfax, VA], § 24 b.

¹¹⁷ *Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, Congregation for the Eastern Church (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996) [reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications, Fairfax, VA], § 25 c.

This could lead one's thoughts in several directions. In the United States, the Greek-Catholics are in an unusual situation. Since the presence of Greek-Catholics in the United States has come about largely as the result of immigration of Greek-Catholics who felt themselves to be part of several different Local Churches in their various countries of origin in Eastern Europe, the Middle East and Italy, the American Greek-Catholics today are in a situation of jurisdictional pluralism. Among the Eastern Orthodox communities, there are notable efforts to resolve this jurisdictional pluralism, at least to some extent,¹¹⁸ but there is little or nothing by way of similar efforts to unite the Greek-Catholics with one another, or even to acknowledge that the various Greek-Catholic jurisdictions in the USA have serious common interests. This "ghettoization" of the different Greek-Catholic jurisdictions has serious consequences in many areas. It becomes tragicomic when the ever-increasing need for the use of English in the Liturgy appears. The waste of already-insufficient clergy and scarce resources means that in one town it is possible to find three or even four parishes of different Greek-Catholic jurisdictions, all these parishes being in walking distance of one another, each of these parishes offering what is supposed to be the same Divine Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom, in English – and of course using four different translations and four different "styles" of the service. Meanwhile, it is possible in other towns to find no Greek-Catholic parish at all, although an honest census of the Greek-Catholic population would reveal a sufficient number of Greek-Catholic faithful to justify and support a parish. So far no one even seems to have discussed attempting to

¹¹⁸ The Standing Conference of Canonical Orthodox Bishops in America, organized around 1960, is the most important organization effort on the national level. In most cities where there is a significant Orthodox presence, one can find Orthodox clergy fellowships which bring together the clergy of most of the Eastern Orthodox jurisdictions. Saint Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary over the years has educated clergy for most of the several jurisdictions.

resolve these pastorally disastrous anomalies in any rational way.

On the specific matter of translations, the principle we have just cited from the Instruction is indisputable, but does require some additional provisos:

- a) no translation can successfully be imposed unless it is based upon a serious scientific effort aimed at an accurate translation of the Greek original;
- b) the Divine Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom is the wrong place to begin a program of translation of the Byzantine liturgical corpus. One would correctly begin with the most important liturgical book, which in turn is quoted innumerable times in every other liturgical book: the Septuagint Psalter. It took the Orthodox a while, but the Holy Transfiguration Monastery edition of the Psalter has won wide acceptance in the English-speaking Orthodox world.
- c) One must take into account such considerations as variant readings in the linguistic traditions, particularly in Church-Slavonic, which provide a wealth which should not be jettisoned – there is no need to repeat the errors of Nikon of Moscow. One must also take into account the several chant traditions which different groups of Greek-Catholics have inherited and wish to retain, even when singing in English.

In other words, the goal of agreeing on a basic translation of the Byzantine liturgical *corpus* to be shared by the various jurisdictions concerned is a good one, and is a goal toward which it is possible to work. However, it is not a goal which can be accomplished in a matter of weeks or months. Moreover, the ecumenical dimension may not be ignored. One wants a translation either agreed with the Orthodox (which at the moment would be a problem, since there is no standard Orthodox translation into English, but there are at least some points concerning which there is a general Orthodox consensus) or distanced from the Orthodox

translations only if there is an absolute necessity,¹¹⁹ as we have seen above in section 21 of the Instruction. The *Instruction* makes this very point:

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.¹²⁰

The *Instruction* reminds us that the accurate, even punctilious, celebration of the Eucharist is the criterion of orthodoxy:

As Irenaeus of Lyons¹²¹ reminds us: “Our thought is in full accord with the Eucharist and the Eucharist, in its turn, confirms our thought.”^{122 123}

On a related topic, the Instruction teaches:

If in recent times, feasts or fasts coming from the Latin liturgy or from other incongruous liturgies have been introduced in the calendars of the Eastern Catholic Churches, necessary steps should be taken,

¹¹⁹ The only justification for a serious difference in translation which comes to mind would be a matter of accuracy – if, for example, the Orthodox translation were substituting some euphemism for the word “Catholic” where it occurs in liturgical texts. Accuracy here would also include ungrammatical texts, misspellings, the use of slang, and so on.

¹²⁰ *Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, Congregation for the Eastern Church (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996) [reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications, Fairfax, VA], § 29 a.

¹²¹ Two spelling errors have been corrected here. The Italian original reads “Ireneo di Lione.”

¹²² [This is footnote 32 in the original.] Irenaeus of Lyons, *Against heresies* IV, 18, 5: *Sources Chrétiennes* 100:610.

¹²³ *Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, Congregation for the Eastern Church (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996) [reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications, Fairfax, VA], § 32.

with pastoral prudence, to restore the calendar to its traditional structure, eliminating the elements incompatible with the spirit and features of the Eastern heritage.¹²⁴

This should – one hopes – rid us of such liturgical calques as the feasts of Corpus Christi, the Sacred Heart, the Seven Sorrows of Mary, and Christ the King.¹²⁵ Restoring the liturgical calendar to its traditional structure might well have another implication.

It is no secret that since the uncanonical “synod of Diamper” in 1599 there has been a series of latinizing synods of various Eastern Catholic Churches.¹²⁶ Inevitably, these synods had liturgical consequences. Some canonists have attempted to claim that the liturgical rules adopted at some of these assemblies are immutable. The *Instruction* takes the opposite position:

The Council, in particular, is not satisfied just to¹²⁷ confirm and praise the ancient discipline enforced by the Eastern Churches but desires it to be re-established in the places where it has weakened or fallen away. Therefore, in reviewing their own law,

¹²⁴ *Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, Congregation for the Eastern Church (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996) [reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications, Fairfax, VA], § 36 e.

¹²⁵ I have encountered the liturgical use of the feast of “Christ the King” in parishes of the Ruthenian Metropolia, although not in recent years. The other three are likelier to appear in Ukrainian calendars or practice. One can also run across traces of a “feast of the Holy Family,” although this has no basis in any quasi-official document.

¹²⁶ With reference to the Ruthenian tradition one should note the synod of Zamost’ (1720) and the synod of L’viv (1891). Neither of these lamentable synods ever had juridical authority in Transcarpathia or in the eparchies derived from the Eparchy of Mukachiv, but some of the prescriptions came into use by way of custom and have proved tenacious.

¹²⁷ A split infinitive has been corrected here.

the different Churches *sui iuris* must take into account this desire and courageously undertake, even if cautiously and gradually, the recuperation of the elements that have been lost, changing, if necessary, the most recent practice and laws, in such places where these may be in dissonance with the principles established, even if it means modifying decisions made by Synods or taking distance from indications given, in other times and for various reasons, by the Congregations of the Apostolic See.¹²⁸

The section of the *Instruction* dealing specifically with the Divine Liturgy offers a magnificent quote from the works of Saint Nicholas Cabasilas:

So perfect is this Mystery, so far does it excel every other sacred rite that it leads to the very summit of good things. Here also is the final goal of every human endeavor. For in it we obtain God Himself, and God is united with us in the most perfect union.¹²⁹
 ... Since it was not possible for us to ascend to Him and participate in that which is His, He came down to us and partook of that which is ours. So perfectly has He coalesced with that which He has taken that He imparts Himself to us by giving us what He has assumed from us. As we partake of His human Body and Blood we receive God Himself into our souls. It is thus God's Body and Blood which we receive, His soul, mind, and will, no less than those of His humanity.^{130 131}

¹²⁸ *Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, Congregation for the Eastern Church (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996) [reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications, Fairfax, VA], § 39 b. Emphasis added.

¹²⁹ Ellipsis in original.

¹³⁰ [This is footnote 54 in the original.] Cabasilas Nicholas, *The Life in Christ*, IV, 10.26: *Sources Chrétiennes*, 355, 270 and 288. English

The next paragraph of the *Instruction* offers the suggestion that:

From the treasure of the Anaphoras, rather numerous according to the various Churches, care should be taken to offer the possibility of using, as is deemed suitable, more texts of the Anaphoras, some of which are no longer in use today but should be restored.¹³²

In the context of the Byzantine tradition, this would most readily apply to the Divine Liturgy of Saint James, which has never quite died out in Byzantine usage, although it is safe to say that the majority of the Byzantine Catholic faithful are not even aware of it. For many centuries it has been used annually both in Jerusalem and on the island of Zakynthos, in Greece. In the twentieth century it was translated into Church-Slavonic, into English, into Ukrainian and possibly into other languages, which has encouraged a greater use of this ancient and edifying *taxis* of the Divine Liturgy. There does not seem to be any particular impediment to the celebration of the Divine Liturgy of Saint James, but clergy who wish to serve this form of the Divine Liturgy should exercise some pastoral caution: it may be better to have the service on the feast of the Apostle James himself, with good preparation of the deacon, the chanters¹³³ and the faithful so

translation from Carmino J. De Catanzaro (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1974), 116. 122.

¹³¹ *Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, Congregation for the Eastern Church, Libreria Editrice Vaticana (reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications, Fairfax, Virginia) 1996, § 53 d.

¹³² *Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, Congregation for the Eastern Church, Libreria Editrice Vaticana (reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications, Fairfax, Virginia) 1996, § 54 b,

¹³³ If the Divine Liturgy of Saint James is to be served with chanters and congregation expected to sing, the music must be well prepared and the chanters well rehearsed.

that everyone will know what to expect and with ample explanation of the ritual differences between this service and the more familiar Divine Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom and the Divine Liturgy of Saint Basil the Great. Above all, there must be a deacon¹³⁴ and it would be well to have a bishop¹³⁵ for the main celebrant and several priests serving with him. It should be made firmly clear that there is no intention of using the Divine Liturgy of Saint James to *replace* the Divine Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom and/or the Divine Liturgy of Saint Basil, but only to have it on an occasional basis so that the people may come to know it.

There is also the much rarer *Divine Liturgy of Saint Gregory the Theologian*, which appears to be in use – probably once a year – in Thessalonica, where the Orthodox Diocese has printed a nicely done two-color booklet suitable for both clergy and faithful.¹³⁶

Still on the Anaphora, the Instruction continues:

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.¹³⁷

¹³⁴ As always, the service of the deacon is critical, so the deacon should be especially well prepared for the Divine Liturgy of Saint James.

¹³⁵ The bishop who is to serve the Divine Liturgy of Saint James for the first time is called to a degree of liturgical heroism. If the bishop is not quite comfortable, it would be better for him to bless a priest to be the main celebrant, with concelebrating priests and deacon.

¹³⁶ Η Θεία Λειτουργία του εν Αγίοις Πατρός Ημών Γρηγορίου του Θεολόγου, Αρχιεπισκόπου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, Ιερά Μητρόπολις (Θεσσαλονίκης, 1981).

¹³⁷ *Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, Congregation for the Eastern Church (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996) [reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications, Fairfax, VA], § 54 b,

The issue of pronouncing¹³⁸ the Anaphora aloud is hotly disputed, and voices of moderation seem overwhelmed. “The voice of reason is not as loud as the cry of unreason.”¹³⁹ This matter will be considered in a separate section; here we only remark that the wording of the Instruction is quite moderate, inviting us to *study the ways* in which *at least in some circumstances* the Anaphora *could* be pronounced aloud. That is not the same as a demand that the recitation of the Anaphora aloud should become immediately mandatory.

As all students of the Liturgy are expected to know, the *normative* form of the Liturgy is what is called the Solemn Pontifical service – the Liturgy offered by the Bishop with full hierarchal ceremony. As Father Archimandrite Robert Taft once put it:

“A...full pontifical Liturgy – I am referring to one celebrated according to the liturgical books and not to the various truncated practices one finds...”¹⁴⁰ is the normative form of the Divine Liturgy.

Unfortunately, this awareness has faded from Greek-Catholic awareness to an alarming extent, although, thank God, in most Greek-Catholic jurisdictions there is still a high esteem among the faithful for the Divine Liturgy offered by the Bishop. Clergy, and even bishops themselves, are known to express annoyance and worse at the requirements of the hierarchal ceremony, and seem not to know that this is and remains the normative form of the service.¹⁴¹ Nevertheless,

¹³⁸ This well-chosen word evades the question of whether, if or when the Anaphora is offered aloud, the text should be read or chanted.

¹³⁹ Joseph Ratzinger (now Pope Benedict XVI), *Church, Ecumenism and Politics: New Essays in Eschatology*, [originally published in German as *Kirche, Ökumene und Politik*] (New York: Crossroad Publishing, 1988), 149.

¹⁴⁰ Father [Archimandrite] Robert F. Taft, S.J., review article in *Diakonia* 8, no. 2 (1973): 171.

¹⁴¹ Unfortunately, this lamentable attitude is not restricted to Catholics. Some melancholy examples could be given from Orthodox as well,

Vatican II has stressed this point¹⁴² and the Instruction directs that:

This requires that great care be taken of the eparchial liturgical life around the Bishop, such that the cathedral is the true “sanctuary” of every particular Church: thus, the liturgy at the cathedral should be celebrated in an exemplary way.¹⁴³

If this is to happen, a serious change in the criteria upon which hierarchs are elected and the preparation which they receive will be essential. Expecting the hierarch to act as if he is essentially the “Chief Executive Officer” of a religious business enterprise and that his primary responsibility is administrative will not lead to a heightened awareness of the hierarch’s liturgical importance, or even the hierarch’s awareness of the importance of Liturgy at all. Moreover, the Byzantine hierarchal ceremony is complicated; if a given hierarch is to be able to serve comfortably and smoothly, there are two essential requirements: he must be given a serious preparation for the hierarchal services¹⁴⁴ and he must be provided with a highly competent deacon who knows the hierarchal ceremonies almost from memory.¹⁴⁵

although fortunately the distaste has not gone so deep. Specific examples are not given here, because in the present state of polemics that would generate more heat than light.

¹⁴² Sacrosanctum Concilium, § 41.

¹⁴³ *Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, Congregation for the Eastern Church (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996) [reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications, Fairfax, VA], § 56.

¹⁴⁴ Among the Eastern Orthodox, this preparation is normally accomplished in a monastery and/or a cathedral. It is not unusual for a newly-consecrated Orthodox bishop to serve pontifical Divine Liturgy every day for a few weeks, so that he will be well practiced when he is to assume the main responsibility in these matters.

¹⁴⁵ Such a deacon need not be a fully educated theologian; that is not the point. He needs to know the hierarchal ceremonies and the Typicon with thorough expertise. If it is possible, one would also want the

We are all aware – or at least we all should be aware – that the Byzantine liturgical tradition is well familiar with *concelebration* of the Divine Liturgy. To some extent this had become infrequent among the Ruthenians, but it has revived quite strongly. So strongly, in fact, that the Instruction supplies an appropriate caution:

There can be reasons which advise against concelebration, particularly when the number of concelebrants is disproportionately greater than the presence of lay faithful....Care should be taken that the concelebrants are not of such quantity so as to have to overflow into the nave where the faithful are, and thus outside of the Sanctuary itself, or to occupy the space of the Sanctuary in such a way that impedes the dignified celebration of the rite.¹⁴⁶

A highly respected expert in the field of Byzantine liturgiology frequently refers to these abuses as “mob concelebrations” – and he is well justified. Oddly enough, such abuses could be described as a recent Latinization – up until Vatican II, concelebration was a rare exception in the Roman Rite.¹⁴⁷ Once Vatican II permitted the widespread use

hierarchy to have at least two subdeacons who know exactly what they are doing – and again, these men need not have a full theological education. Such men exist; the Church has only to encourage them and enable them to realize that their service is authentic and valuable to the entire Church. One might begin by providing the subdeacons with subdiaconal vestments of beauty, suitable for adults, so that no impression is given that the subdeacons are “overgrown altar boys.”

¹⁴⁶ *Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, Congregation for the Eastern Church (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996) [reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications, Fairfax, VA], § 57 a.

¹⁴⁷ In the Roman Rite, newly-ordained priests concelebrated the Mass with the ordaining bishop, and newly-ordained bishops concelebrated the Mass with the bishop who had just consecrated them – but *not* with the co-consecrators. In a very few places, concelebration remained in use on Holy Thursday, and the Missal recognized this by prohibiting private celebrations of Mass on that day.

of concelebration, Roman Rite practice went from one extreme to the other. There is no need for us to emulate this abuse.

Recently the Latin Church has introduced a serious innovation in the form of “extraordinary ministers of the Eucharist.” These are people with no ordination but who are permitted to administer Holy Communion. It is not pure coincidence that this innovation followed the introduction of “Communion in the hand,” for which there was neither pastoral necessity nor any broad desire among the faithful.

In the past few years, there have been efforts to introduce such “extraordinary ministers of the Eucharist” into the Greek-Catholic Churches in the USA. It is difficult to discern any necessity for this; relatively few parishes are blessed with such a large number of faithful parishioners as to justify the use of extraordinary ministers. Such a practice is completely unheard-of among Eastern Orthodox Christians, who tend to find even allowing a deacon to administer Holy Communion as a shock.¹⁴⁸ It is difficult to avoid the impression that the desire for such “extraordinary ministers” among Greek-Catholics arises from a desire to do whatever the Latins are doing. The Instruction offers this caution on the subject:

It should be remembered that all the Eastern traditions emphasize the greatness of the mystery of holy Communion. An ancient Syro-Chaldean

¹⁴⁸ This is written from experience, but one need not be quite so sympathetic to the Orthodox sensitivity where the deacon is concerned; there is simply no reason in the Church’s tradition to forbid the deacon to communicate the faithful. The practice of restricting this function to the priests has probably arisen because the deacons, few in number, tend to consider their proper service to be one of adding solemnity to the service rather than anything else. One sometimes can observe a deacon attempting to coërcé a young priest to consume the chalice, rather than doing it himself – because it is ‘more important’ for the deacon to go and intone the Polychronion! When a deacon considers his own proper service in the Eucharist to be beneath his dignity, it is time for a reconsideration.

commentator describes the presentation of the sacred gifts to the faithful with the following words: “The Holy One comes forth on the plate and in the cup, in glory and majesty, accompanied by the presbyters and deacons, in grand procession. Millions of angels and servants of the fire of the Spirit go before the Body of Our Lord, glorifying him. All the people and all the sons of the Church rejoice when they see the Body come from the altar.”¹⁴⁹ Therefore, reserving the distribution of the Eucharist normally to the priests has the scope of manifesting its highest sacredness. Even if this excludes enhancing the value of other criteria, also legitimate, and implies renouncing some convenience, a change of the traditional usage risks incurring a non-organic intrusion with respect to the spiritual framework to which it refers.¹⁵⁰

In the twentieth century, the Latins virtually abolished the Eucharistic Fast. At first, this was only a matter of mitigation: in view of the restoration of the offering of Mass in the evening, especially on Holy Thursday, it was pastorally necessary to provide some amelioration of the eucharistic fast for those who were to receive Holy Communion, since requiring such communicants to fast from the preceding midnight seemed unduly severe. Pope Pius XII therefore allowed a reduction of the required fast to a three-hour period before the Mass when Mass was to be offered in the evening. A few years later, Pius XII extended this to Mass when offered at any hour.¹⁵¹ Paul VI later reduced the fasting

¹⁴⁹ [This is footnote 56 in the original.] *Explanation of the Mysteries of the Church*, attributed to Narsai of Nisibis.

¹⁵⁰ *Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, Congregation for the Eastern Church (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996) [reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications, Fairfax, VA], § 58 b.

¹⁵¹ In 1957 at a Catholic high school in the USA, suddenly the Mass was offered at noon-time each day, so that the students could have breakfast before going to school and still receive Holy Communion at Mass before eating lunch.

period to one hour¹⁵² before the actual time of Holy Communion, and finally the fasting period was reduced to fifteen minutes. Again the Latins had gone from one extreme to the other.

Disciplinary decrees of Rome do not bind the Eastern Catholic Churches unless they explicitly provide otherwise. Nevertheless, the Eastern Catholics in the Diaspora were not slow to introduce these modifications in the eucharistic fast; by now it is likely that two generations have grown up without any consciousness of fasting before receiving Holy Communion. However, this was not the intention of Pope Pius XII, nor of Paul VI, and the matter was never seriously considered by any Eastern Catholic authority. The Instruction offers some cautions:

The change in the discipline of the eucharistic fast has contributed to the development of a greater participation in the Eucharist, although **it has sometimes contributed to weakening the awareness of the extraordinary value and meaning of the mystery celebrated.** Can. 707 § 1 of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches refers legislation in this regard to the particular law. An eventual restoration, at least partial, of the ancient norms for fasting in the Eastern Catholic Churches is valued opportune,¹⁵³ taking into account the meaning of both the traditional practice, which does not always exactly coincide with the Latin sensibility, and of the need to correspond with the different conditions of life in the world today.¹⁵⁴

¹⁵² A one-hour fast seemed almost derisory; on Sundays it meant that one should not eat while on one's way to Church nor during the Mass itself.

¹⁵³ Perhaps this phrase would be better translated "will be opportune"; the Italian original reads "Si valuti l'opportunita."

¹⁵⁴ *Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, Congregation for the Eastern Church (Vatican:

Clothing, strangely enough, can be a volatile issue. Unlike some other Eastern Catholic groups¹⁵⁵ the Greek-Catholics have never actually abandoned the use of Byzantine vestments *holus-bolus*, but in many places the vestments are remarkably abbreviated with an admixture of Latin and pseudo-Latin elements. In the territories from which the Byzantine-Ruthenian Metropolitanate of Pittsburgh originated, the usual clergy dress of the Christian East was in fact abandoned, and suggestions that it should be restored to use often arouse serious anger. There is a cause for this reaction: the Greek-Catholic clergy were often the victims of discrimination and their clothes marked them out for such abuse. Hence the possibility of wearing the same clergy-clothes as the Latin clergy came to be seen as a liberation and a sign of social equality.¹⁵⁶

One might believe that in the United States and other Western countries such a thought is an anachronism; Unfortunately, one would be mistaken. Even now it is possible to find Roman Catholic Benedictines who would not dream of ridiculing the religious garb of another Latin order freely mocking the clergy garb of Greek-Catholic bishops and priests. The solution, however, does not lie in dressing up like Latins or Protestants, but rather in a steady insistence that Eastern Catholics do not accept such abuse, nor do Eastern Catholics allow it to pass unnoticed. Others may think what they please, but they must treat Eastern Catholics with respect.

The Instruction addresses these problems:

Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996) [reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications, Fairfax, VA], § 62. Emphasis added.

¹⁵⁵ Such as the Maronites and the Malabarese.

¹⁵⁶ Cf. L. Huculak (now Bishop Laurence of Edmonton), *The Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom in the Kievan Metropolitan Province during the Period of Union with Rome*, *Analecta OSBM, Series II, Sectio 1* (Romae, 1990), 75.

If undue changes in the liturgical vestments have been introduced, the traditional rules should be reinstated.

As for the non-liturgical dress of the clergy, it is appropriate that the individual Churches *sui iuris* return to the style of the traditional Eastern usage.¹⁵⁷

The education of the clergy is of crucial importance if this program is to succeed. Thus the Instruction provides that:

It is, therefore, necessary that **the liturgical life be celebrated with great care and always in its integral form** in Eastern seminaries...such that the candidates may be shaped by it and learn it in all its richness and completeness, giving due space not only to the Eucharist but also to the Divine Office. The Liturgy is to be the true font of spirituality by which the candidates are formed, the element that unifies all that they learn, and the place in which doctrine becomes celebration of praise and thanksgiving and life is transformed by grace. Such prominence given to the Liturgy will allow the candidates to draw fully as much as is necessary for their interior life and will prevent their seeking it in environments foreign to the coherence of their own heritage.¹⁵⁸

All of these citations and more should leave the reader in no doubt that before any recasting of the Liturgy can be done, there is a necessary process of *liturgical education* on

¹⁵⁷ *Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, Congregation for the Eastern Church (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996) [reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications, Fairfax, VA], § 66 b & c.

¹⁵⁸ *Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, Congregation for the Eastern Church (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996) [reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications, Fairfax, VA], § 71 b. Ellipsis and emphasis added.

every level which has thus far been neglected. Father Archimandrite Robert Taft reminds us:

The liturgical movement in the West began in 19th century France. Step 1 was restoration, a process whereby rites were slowly purged of less suitable later accretions and returned to a purer and more authentic state. This restoration phase, a slow, step-by-step renewal, was based on and accompanied by a lengthy process of study, lively debated and the propagation of ideas through journals and “Liturgical Weeks”; the founding of new liturgical periodicals, centers and societies; the restoration of Gregorian Chant at Solesmes and the consequent founding of Gregorian Chant Societies throughout the world; the movement for frequent communion launched under Pope [Saint] Pius X and still underway when I was a young man; the strengthening of the “Proprium de tempore” and the return of the sanctoral [cycle] to its proper place in the calendar and breviary under the same Pontiff and his successors; then, under Pius XII, the new psalter, the wonderful reform of the Roman Easter Vigil and Holy Week, etc., – all leading, over a period of several generations, to the reforms of Vatican II. And underlying this official restoration, providing its firm foundation, was a massive effort of scholarship in the gathering, collating, editing and studying of manuscripts and other liturgical and theological sources. In short, a whole century of intensive scholarship and maturation ultimately paved the way for the liturgical reforms of the Roman Rite at Vatican II.¹⁵⁹

¹⁵⁹ *Acts of the Synod of Bishops of the Syro-Malabar Church held in the Vatican from 8 to 16 January 1996*, Servizio Informazione per le Chiese Orientali, Via della Conciliazione, 34 – 00193 Roma, Supplemento ai numeri 581–604, [Father Archimandrite] Robert F. Taft, S.J., “Intervention,” 97-111, cited passage 100-101.

Nothing of the sort has happened in *any* of the Greek-Catholic Churches. The nearest to an exception is the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church which has had and still has some significant liturgiologists who are beginning to provide essential information which will provide the foundation for a deeper understanding of the liturgical tradition.

The work of the Pontifical Oriental Institute itself must not be under-valued. The Library of that Institute has become an indispensable resource for all those interested in these matters. The works of such men as Arranz and Raes, to name only two, are of seminal importance. Father Archimandrite Robert's own historical study of the Divine Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom is still in process, but the three volumes which have already appeared make us downright greedy for the remaining volumes.

However, precious little of the work which already exists has been presented to the parish clergy, let alone the faithful, in an accessible manner. The "Liturgical Weeks" which Father Archimandrite Robert mentions are a precious memory. But when has there ever been a "Byzantine Liturgical Week"? The Byzantine-Ruthenian liturgical books in Church-Slavonic were published by the Holy See over sixty years ago (for the most part); some have yet to be translated into English and none at all have been published in a form which presents them for the study and use of lay people. It is safe to say that the overwhelming majority of lay people are unaware of the existence of the *Ordo Celebrationis* – and that this unawareness is not the fault of the laity.

There has been virtually *no* effort to inform the faithful about the relevant decrees of Vatican II, other materials of the Roman magisterium concerning the Byzantine Liturgy, the *Instruction* of January 1996, and *Oriente Lumen*.¹⁶⁰ Instead,

¹⁶⁰ *Oriente Lumen* might be considered an exception, since an admirable series of *Oriente Lumen* conferences has been taking place at several venues in the USA, Europe and Australia. One hopes that this

one might almost conclude that a semi-deliberate failure to provide this educational grounding has been the only program implemented.

promising beginning will continue and expand. But these conferences – which, again, are a most welcome and laudable initiative – have not often been directly concerned with liturgical matters, so they do not constitute an adequate preparation for a recasting of the Liturgy.

CHAPTER 6

NOTABLE IMPROVEMENTS

The most striking improvement is the restoration of the canonized dogmatic term *Theotokos* to liturgical use.¹ Those who are aware of the importance of this term should not be slow to welcome the renewed use of it.

The overblown titles mistakenly ascribed to the Pope in the Church-Slavonic text of 1941 have been pruned to the form used in Greek: “our holy father N., Pope of Rome.”² That is clear, unequivocal, accurate and not bombastic. It is to be hoped that other jurisdictions will follow suit.

The publishing of the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed without the *Filioque*, or any hint of the *Filioque*³ is a blessed gift. This merits a sincere and joyful welcome, with the hope that the Ruthenian Metropolitanate will make common cause with others who hope for a similar action on the part of the Latin Church. The *Filioque* has already grieved the Church far too long.

¹ The reasons which make this change welcome, even necessary, appear in “Ukrainian Catholics: Four Translations of the Divine Liturgy,” *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 39, nos. 2-4 (1998): 267-402. Cf. in particular 301-307.

² “Ukrainian Catholics: Four Translations of the Divine Liturgy,” *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 39, nos. 2-4 (1998): 267-402, discusses this matter. Cf. in particular 273-275.

³ 12 October 2004 draft, 22.

The 12 October 2004 draft which has reached Dublin may be the version intended for use by the faithful (hence the lack of the Prothesis, for example). If that is so, the assignment to the Deacon of those elements of the service which belong to the Deacon is encouraging; a heightened popular awareness of what a Deacon is supposed to do will increase popular appreciation for the Deacon and perhaps encourage more candidates to pursue this vocation.

A remarkable and welcome improvement is the restoration of the accurate reading and translation of the Ecphonesis following the Institution Narrative in the Anaphora. The authentic Greek text reads Τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν σοὶ προσφέροντες, as does the common Church-Slavonic version Твоя отъ твоихъ Тебѣ приносяще. Those who produced this 12 October 2004 draft have had the courage to translate this “Offering you your own...”⁴ It would be well for other translators will take note of this.

The Heirmos of the Ninth Ode of the Paschal Canon is translated accurately in this text: “O Zion, now dance and be glad.”⁵ Many other English versions find “dance” too strong an image, perhaps, but the editors deserve full congratulations on understanding and following the clear meaning of the Greek in this instance.

A small point of taste: the 1964/65 Ruthenian translation into English used the expression “we also pray” for Ἔτι δεόμεθα.⁶ *De gustibus non est disputandum*; “we also pray” is

⁴ 12 October 2004 draft, 25, line 36.

⁵ 12 October 2004 draft, 42

⁶ *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1964/65), 23-24.

defensible, but this new translation uses “again we pray,”⁷ as do many other translations. That wording seems much better.

Another small point – this new translation recognizes that people nowadays often travel by air, as well as by sea and by land.⁸

⁷ 12 October 2004 draft, 23-142.

THE ANTIPHONS OF THE ENARXIS

Many years ago Anton Baumstark wrote that liturgical reforms invariably reduce the scriptural material in favor of something else.¹ It has happened again in this draft under consideration, in this present instance the “something else” appears to be sheer abbreviation. The Antiphons have been drastically reduced: the three antiphons which the Ruthenians most often use are left with only one psalm verse for each antiphon.² The “Typical Psalms” are reduced to one verse for each Psalm.³ Since it is impossible to do the Little Entrance during the Third Antiphon with decorum if the Third Antiphon consists of only one psalm verse and one refrain, the rubrics of this redaction prescribe that “the Little Entrance is made during the Hymn of the Incarnation and the Third Antiphon (or Beatitudes).”⁴ This might alleviate the time problem, although if the priest is to offer (quietly) the prayers of the two missing synapses and then perform the Little Entrance, there may still be either unseemly haste or a few moments of quasi-silence.

Rather than reducing the Third Antiphon, it would make more sense to extend it. Psalm 94 (LXX) is clearly an entrance psalm and makes excellent sense for the Little Entrance. Following the *recensio vulgata* Epistle book, and other sources, we would suggest the following for the Third Antiphon when

¹ Anton Baumstark, *Comparative Liturgy*, rev. Dom Bernard Botte, English ed. F. L. Cross (Westminster, MD: Newman Press, 1958), chapter II, “The Laws of Liturgical Evolution,” 15-30, particularly 22-23.

² 12 October 2004 draft, 5 and 6.

³ 12 October 2004 draft, 6.

⁴ 12 October 2004 draft, 7.

the Beatitudes are not sung and there is no proper festal Third Antiphon:

Come, let us sing joyfully to the Lord; let us acclaim God our Savior⁵ (we retain here the translation of this verse as given in the text we are considering).

Refrain: O Son of God...

Let us come before His countenance with thanksgiving, and with psalms let us shout in jubilation unto Him.⁶

Refrain: O Son of God...

For the Lord is a great God and a great king over all the earth.⁷

Refrain: O Son of God...

For in His hand are the ends of the earth, and the heights of the mountains are His.⁸

Refrain: O Son of God...

For the sea is His, and He made it; and the dry land His hands have fashioned.⁹

Refrain: O Son of God...

⁵ Psalm 94:1 LXX.

⁶ Psalm 94:2 LXX.

⁷ Psalm 94:3 LXX.

⁸ Psalm 94:4 LXX.

⁹ Psalm 94:5 LXX.

[*Deacon: Wisdom! Arise! Faithful:*] Come, let us worship and bow before¹⁰ [Christ] (translation as in the text under consideration).

Refrain: O Son of God...

That arrangement makes sense, allows sufficient time for the Little Entrance and puts Psalm 94:6 into its context.

The text of the Beatitudes is given in full¹¹ but with no hint of the troparia to be intercalated according to the service-books. These intercalated troparia are seldom used in practice,¹² but without a reference to them the *Glory...Both...* used during the troparia after the Little Entrance makes no sense.

¹⁰ Psalm 94: 6 LXX.

¹¹ 12 October 2004 draft, 7.

¹² Restoring the troparia during the Beatitudes to use in the parishes would be counter-productive. Using these troparia could well be appropriate in monasteries.

RUBRICAL PROBLEMS WITH THIS DRAFT

At this juncture in the history of the Church – and particularly the Church in the Anglophone world – rubrics are not a popular topic of discussion. Some object that rubrics are artificial, that they stifle spontaneity, that they are unrealistic...many readers will be familiar with these arguments. In part, this is a reaction to the *Missale Romanum* as it was from the time of Saint Pius V until the conclusion of the Second Vatican Council: it was common teaching that the rubrics of the missal were “binding under pain of mortal sin.” However, in practical experience of that form of Liturgy, the rubrics were often and flagrantly violated; evidently some rubrics were more binding than others. Still, it is the perception of that period more than the reality which forms today’s atmosphere.

Nobody would seriously claim that every rubric in the Divine Liturgy binds under pain of mortal sin. Clearly, the rubrics requiring bread and wine for the Eucharist are of incalculably greater importance than the rubrics about the opening and closing of the curtain across the Royal Doors. But it is strange; almost simultaneously there is a great fear of liturgical “anarchy” – this in the Byzantine-Ruthenian Pittsburgh Metropolia, which for at least the past fifty years has been characterized by an exaggerated insistence on liturgical uniformity without serious consideration of the proper basis of that uniformity.

Father Protopresbyter Alexander Schmemmann addressed this exaggerated insistence on liturgical uniformity in a letter published more than thirty years ago:

In all liturgical discussions the constant and popular reference to *uniformity* as a decisive argument is both useless and harmful. Perfect liturgical uniformity has never existed in the Church, even as an ideal, for the Church has never considered it to be the condition and expression of her unity. Her liturgical unity was always that of a general structure or *ordo*, never that of details and applications. Even today the Orthodox Church does not have one single Typikon, and there exists a great variety in practices among Orthodox Churches. Such variety has existed also within the same national Church: thus in Russia, for example, there were differences between Moscow and Kiev, between different monastic traditions, etc. It is simply dangerous – spiritually and pastorally – to make our people believe that uniformity in all practices is the touchstone and essence of Orthodoxy; dangerous because they already seem to have an unhealthy obsession with the externals at the expense of meaning. It is dangerous also because of the great liturgical diversity in America where all traditions are represented in one way or another. If the Orthodox Church in America is to be the sign of Orthodox unity in this country, it will never achieve that unity by imposing on all one tradition be it Russian, Greek, Serbian, Romanian, or any other. It will achieve it only by searching, on the one hand, for that which is truly *universal* in the Orthodox Tradition and, on the other hand, for that which will *incarnate* that Tradition in our own situation.¹

Father Schmemmann's comments as quoted above are equally applicable to the Byzantine Catholic Church.

¹ Protopresbyter Alexander Schmemmann, "On the Question of Liturgical Practices: A Letter to My Bishop," *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 17, no. 3 (1973): 239-243. Cited passage in Section V.

This desired liturgical uniformity is not based upon genuine fidelity to the rubrics of the service-books and the prescriptions of the *Ordo Celebrationis*, but rather upon what was in the time of Bishop Nicholas Elko an open campaign against the service-books and the *Ordo Celebrationis*. Since Bishop Nicholas's removal there has been a vague miasma of refusal to comply with the service-books and the *Ordo Celebrationis*, without ever saying in so many words just what the objections are.

Now, with a new translation of the Divine Liturgy and a serious recasting of the rubrics themselves, the least one might expect is rubrics stated clearly, intelligibly and unambiguously, a genuine fidelity to the service-books and the *Ordo Celebrationis* (since demanding strict obedience to disobedience is unlikely to succeed) and convincing explanations of any changes which have been introduced. This chapter attempts to examine certain difficulties with the rubrics which the draft presents, in an effort to determine how well these expectations have been met. As before, there has been no access to the text or rubrics which precede the Enarxis, nor to any of the footnotes.

1) The 1941 Church-Slavonic text of the *Recensio Rutena* edition of the Divine Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom retains the traditional rubrics for the opening and closing of the Holy Doors of the Altar at various points during the service.² These

² *Holy and Divine Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom* [in Church-Slavonic; hereafter, *Recensio Rutena*] (Rome, 1941), 34, 46, 57, 69 and 115. A peculiar error common to all editions influenced by the Nikonian reform omits the closing of the Royal Doors after the Great Entrance (which is prescribed in the *Ordo Celebrationis* §§ 19d and 120), but includes the opening of the Royal Doors before the communion of the faithful. The rubric to close the Royal Doors after the Great Entrance, missing in the Nikonian and Nikonian-influenced editions, appears in the Old Ritualist text of the Divine Liturgy: *Літургія Святого Іоанна Златоустаго*, Imprimatur of Metropolitan Alympyi, Russian Old Ritualist Orthodox

rubrics are retained in the 1964/65 Ruthenian translation for the Eparchies of Pittsburgh and Passaic.³ The *Ordo Celebrationis* stresses these rubrics, indicating an awareness that

in some regions, it is customary to keep the royal doors and veil open from the beginning to the very end of the Divine Liturgy.... **This practice is not to be extended to other regions**; on the contrary, it is to be urged that **people everywhere should become accustomed to a more accurate observance of the rite.**⁴

Nevertheless, the text under consideration requires the deacon to open the Holy Doors just before the beginning of the Enarxis⁵ and close them after the Dismissal [and Polychronion or requiem chant, if either is to be used].⁶

Church (“Pечатnik” Typography, Vereshchagino, Russia, Christmas Day [Old Style, of course], A.D. 2002), 73 *verso*. This edition is a facsimile reprint of an edition done in Moscow shortly before the Russian Revolution with the Imprimatur of the Old-Ritualist Archbishop Joseph, and itself reproducing the service-book printed in the fifth year of the pontificate of Patriarch Joseph of Moscow – in other words, shortly before the lamentable Nikon became Patriarch of Moscow. Perhaps the members of the commission who have produced the 12 October 2004 draft, and the bishops to whom they are responsible, might wish to ponder the pastoral results of Nikon’s reform.

³ *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1964/65), 14, 20, 23, 27 and 43.

⁴ *Ordo Celebrationis Vesperarum, Matutini et Divinae Liturgiae iuxta Recensionem Ruthenorum*, Sacred Congregation for the Eastern Churches [in Latin] (Rome, 1944), § 19, final paragraph. English translation from the 1996 edition published by Eastern Christian Publications (Fairfax, VA), 5. Emphasis added.

⁵ 12 October 2004 draft, 2.

⁶ 12 October 2004 draft, 40.

2) Just before the “Blessed is the Kingdom...” which opens the Enarxis, a rubric appears, reading, “*The celebrant, making the sign of the cross horizontally over the holy table with the holy gospel, intones:*” There is no such rubric in the 1941 Church-Slavonic edition of the *Recensio Rutena* Divine Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom.⁷ With the probable exception of the Old Ritualists, the custom of making the sign of the Cross over the Holy Table during this ecphonesis is nearly universal among those who serve the Byzantine Liturgy, and the practice is prescribed in the *Ordo Celebrationis*.⁸ However, although in fact this is done horizontally (while holding the Gospel Book vertically in both hands) there is seldom any rubric to that effect. The history of the development of rubrics causes a suspicion that something strange may have been going on.

3) In the 1941 Church-Slavonic edition of the *Recensio Rutena* Divine Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom,⁹ the Great Synapte is printed without any title or rubric, with the exception of one word to indicate that this is for the deacon. The 12 October 2004 draft styles the Great Synapte “litany of peace”¹⁰ and adds an unnecessarily verbose rubric: “*The Litany of Peace including special petitions, if any, is now intoned by the deacon at his usual place at the ambon.*” There is no need for the passive voice here; the sentence would be better if it read, “*The deacon intones...*” The deacon should not need to be told where he is to stand for the Great Synapte!

4) A hitherto-unknown rubric directs that the deacon “enters the sanctuary through the southern door” when the Monogenes (the “Hymn of the Incarnation”) is sung.¹¹ The

⁷ *Recensio Rutena* (Rome, 1941), 38.

⁸ *Ordo Celebrationis*, § 119.

⁹ *Recensio Rutena* (Rome, 1941), 36.

¹⁰ One does encounter the term ΕΙΣΗΥΚΑ in Greek, but it saves confusion to reserve one term – the Great Synapte – for that element of the Liturgy.

¹¹ 12 October 2004 draft, 5, lines 27, 28 and 29.

reason for this innovation is to make it possible for the Little Entrance to take place during the Monogenes.¹² But that is contrary to the standard rubrics of the Divine Liturgy and also to the *Ordo Celebrationis*, which unanimously testify that the deacon enters the Altar immediately after the second Small Synapte; the royal doors are then opened and the Little Entrance commences.

5) Following the 1941 *Recensio Rutena* Church-Slavonic edition,¹³ the 12 October 2004 draft, draft omits the appropriate responses to the priest's blessing of the assembly before the Prokeimenon.¹⁴ As a result, the priest's blessing is unreturned and the faithful must listen to this haphazard aggregate of liturgical debris:

Deacon: Let us be attentive!

Priest: Peace be to all.

Deacon: Wisdom! Be attentive!

Surely no one will seriously argue that this is as it should be.¹⁵ Likewise there is no reason for the priest's blessing of the Lector after the Epistle to go without a response. The commission evidently feels able to introduce innovations; why have these two responses, which would disturb no one, not been restored?

6) The incensation before the Gospel (during the Alleluia) seems to have been reduced to the Holy Table and the

¹² 12 October 2004 draft, cf. rubric, 7, lines 26-27.

¹³ *Recensio Rutena* (Rome, 1941), 52.

¹⁴ 12 October 2004 draft, 10.

¹⁵ "Ukrainian Catholics: Four Translations of the Divine Liturgy," *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 39, nos. 2-4 (1998): 267-402, discusses this matter. Cf. in particular 280-282.

faithful.¹⁶ This is certainly a direct translation of the corresponding rubric in Church-Slavonic,¹⁷ but it ignores the rubric of the *Ordo Celebrationis*.¹⁸

7) Just before taking up the Holy Gifts from the Prothesis Table in order to make the Great Entrance, a rubric in the 12 October 2004 draft,¹⁹ reads, “*The celebrant, taking the censer, incenses the holy gifts, saying the following quietly one time: [the brief prayer which follows is the prayer of the publican, Luke 18:13].*” The Roman edition of the Ruthenian Liturgicon does not specify how many times the priest should offer the brief prayer,²⁰ nor does the *Ordo Celebrationis*,²¹ nor does the 1964/65 translation.²² The tradition given in the rubrics of the “Mohyla” series is that the priest offers the brief prayer three times.²³ The 1905 L’viv *Leiturgikon*²⁴ also leaves the matter open.²⁵ So do the 1929 L’viv edition²⁶ and the 1930 L’viv

¹⁶ 12 October 2004 draft, rubric, 11, lines 18-20.

¹⁷ *Recensio Rutena* (Rome, 1941), 55.

¹⁸ *Ordo Celebrationis*, § 126.

¹⁹ 12 October 2004 draft, 18, lines 34, 35 and 36.

²⁰ *Recensio Rutena* (Rome, 1941), 73.

²¹ *Ordo Celebrationis*, § 129.

²² *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1964/65), 28.

²³ E.g. *Leiturgiarion* (Kiev: Monastery of the Caves, 1639; reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications [Fairfax, VA] and Stauropegion [L’viv and New York], 1996), Divine Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom, 302. Cf. L. Huculak (now Bishop Laurence of Edmonton), *The Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom in the Kievan Metropolitan Province during the Period of Union with Rome*, *Analecta OSBM*, Series II, Sectio 1 (Romae, 1990), 271.

²⁴ Sometimes called the *Missale Ruthenum*.

²⁵ *Leiturgikon* (L’viv: Stauropegion, 1905; offset reprint, Mundare, Alberta, undated [during World War II]), 295.

²⁶ *Leitourgikon*, with the *Imprimatur* of Metropolitan Andrew (Sheptytsky) (L’viv: Stauropegion Institute, 1929), 76.

edition.²⁷ So why does the 12 October 2004 draft state that the priest should offer the brief prayer one time?

8) The rubric in the 12 October 2004 draft²⁸ directs that immediately before the Great Entrance, the priest “takes the Aer and places it on the deacon’s left forearm...” This is seriously inaccurate. The *Ordo Celebrationis* prescribes that the priest places the Aer upon the left *shoulder* of the deacon.²⁹ The corresponding rubric in the Pittsburgh-Ruthenian 1964/65 edition reads, “*The priest takes the Aer and places it on the deacon’s left shoulder...*”³⁰ which means that the commission charged with preparing the present draft should certainly have known that the shoulder was intended. There is a difference in this matter between the Greeks and the Slavs: the Greek Churches tie the Aer over *both* shoulders of the deacon; for this purpose a Greek Aer is provided with tapes. The Slav Churches follow the rubric strictly, placing the Aer over the deacon’s left shoulder and tucking a corner of the Aer under the deacon’s sticharion, so that the Aer will not fall from the deacon’s shoulder during the Great Entrance (the deacon needs both his hands to hold the Discarion). For the deacon to hold the Aer over his left forearm, in the manner of a restaurant waiter with a napkin, is pointless, even risky – some brocades (from which one makes the Aer) are lightweight and slippery, so that, given the angle at which the deacon must hold the Discarion, an Aer over the deacon’s forearm might fall to the floor. The rubric should be restored

²⁷ *Mikron Leitourgikon*, with the *Imprimatur* of Metropolitan Andrew (Sheptytsky) (L’viv: Stauropegion Institute, 1930), 28.

²⁸ 12 October 2004 draft, 18, lines 42-43.

²⁹ *Ordo Celebrationis*, § 129; Pittsburgh 1954 English translation, 56; Fairfax 1996 English translation, 48. Cf. also *Christ With Us* (Stamford, CT, 1954), 68-69 (reference here and elsewhere to the pocket-size edition).

³⁰ *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1964/65), 28.

to the wording found in the 1964/65 translation.³¹ To be fair, it is possible that those who prepared the 12 October 2004 draft thought that they had found some justification for their erroneous translation in the 1988 Basilian Press translation of the Divine Liturgy; in that edition the translation of the rubric reads: “*Picking up the Aer, the priest places it on the deacon’s left arm...*”³² Here a linguistic misunderstanding has occurred. The Church-Slavonic rubric reads *И іерей, вземъ воздухъ, возлагаетъ на лѣвое рамо ево...*³³ In Church-Slavonic, *рамо* means, quite plainly, *shoulder*.³⁴ Patriarch Joseph’s Ukrainian translation retains the Church-Slavonic word *рамо* in this rubric³⁵ (Patriarch Joseph had a taste for archaic words – however in this particular instance his translation follows the translation of the same rubric in the Ukrainian rubric given in 1954³⁶), but in the form *рамя*. The Basilian Press, Toronto, 1988 translation retains the word but with the spelling *рам’я*,³⁷ which is slightly more archaic, since the hard sign is almost never used in modern Ukrainian. But in Polish (!) *ramie* can mean *arm*.³⁸ It is possible that the translators of the 1988 Basilian Press edition mistook the Church-Slavonic word for the Polish word and mis-translated accordingly. As mentioned

³¹ Of course there are exceptions, but in general the translation of the rubrics in the 1964/65 edition is accurate and good.

³² *The Sacred and Divine Liturgy of our Holy Father John Chrysostom* (Toronto: Basilian Press, 1988), 85.

³³ *Recensio Rutena* (Rome, 1941), 73.

³⁴ Diachenko, *Полный Церковно-Славянский Словарь* (Moscow, 1899), 542 а.

³⁵ *Священна І Божественна Літургія во Святих Отця нашого Йоана Золотоустого* (Rome, 1968), 43. The Basilian Press (Toronto, 1988) translation (p. 84) retains the word.

³⁶ *Christ With Us* (Stamford, CT, 1954), 68-69 (reference here and elsewhere to the pocket-size edition).

³⁷ *The Sacred and Divine Liturgy of our Holy Father John Chrysostom* (Toronto: Basilian Press, 1988), 84.

³⁸ Diachenko, *Полный Церковно-Славянский Словарь* (Moscow, 1899), 542 а.

above, the Greek Churches place the Aer across both shoulders; the relevant rubric reads ἐπὶ τῶν ὤμων.³⁹ ὤμος (plural ὤμων) means *shoulder*.⁴⁰ Since the 1954 Ukrainian translation of the rubric matches the parallel English translation of the same rubric – which is accurate,⁴¹ those responsible for the 1988 translation should have realized that this word warranted serious attention.⁴² Also in 1988 the translators of the English version may have wanted to maintain some “uniatized” practice. But this was eight years before the publication of the *Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*. That document provides clearly:

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

³⁹ *The Divine Liturgies of our Fathers Among the Saints, John Chrysostom and Basil the Great, with that of the Presanctified...*, ed. with the Greek text by J. N. W. B. Robertson (London: David Nutt, 1894), 280.

⁴⁰ *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint, Part II, K – Ω*, compiled by Lust, Eynikel and Hauspie (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1996), 526 col. b. Also Liddell and Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 2033 col. b.

⁴¹ *Christ With Us* (Stamford, CT, 1954), 68-69 (reference here and elsewhere to the pocket-size edition).

⁴² One of the defenders of the 1988 translation referred to the 1967 Greek-Italian parallel edition published by the Holy See for the Italo-Greeks; apparently he thought that the Italian was a reliable guide to the meaning of the Greek. Had he checked the Italian in this case, he would have done well; the Italian reads *sulle spalle del Diacono*. *Spalle* means *shoulders*.

in daily receiving the same spiritual nourishment from practicing the same common heritage.⁴³

There is nothing contrary to Catholic faith and morals either in the accurate translation of this rubric nor in the accurate application of this rubric. Those who wish to see for themselves that the Orthodox brethren serve in this particular way can certainly find photographs and video-recordings illustrating it.

9) Still on the Great Entrance, the next rubric in the draft under consideration reads, “*The celebrant gives the diskos to the deacon and then takes the chalice in his right hand. With the deacon going first, they process through the northern door to stand in front of the holy doors. They are preceded by candle-bearers and servers carrying the incense. If there is a second deacon, he carries the censer; otherwise, it is given to a server.*”⁴⁴ The 1964/65 translation gives what is purportedly the same rubric, also in English, as follows: “The priest then takes the holy discos and places it carefully and reverently upon the head of the deacon who holds the censer with one finger of his right hand.”⁴⁵ The priest takes the chalice in his hands and then both go out through the north door, praying and preceded by candle-bearers.”⁴⁶ This earlier translation is accurate.⁴⁷ There are problems with the newly-revised version:

⁴³ *Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, § 21.

⁴⁴ 12 October 2004 draft, 19, lines 1-8.

⁴⁵ Comparing this with the *Ordo Celebrationis* there is a slight discrepancy; the *Ordo Celebrationis* prescribes that the deacon should have the censer suspended from the ring finger of his left hand. *Ordo Celebrationis*, § 129 (Pittsburgh 1954 English translation of the *Ordo Celebrationis*, 56).

⁴⁶ *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1964/65), 29.

⁴⁷ Compare with the same rubric in Church-Slavonic: *Recensio Rutena* (Rome, 1941), 73.

a) The 12 October 2004 draft translation of the rubric makes no mention of placing the Discarion on the head of the deacon.⁴⁸

b) The 12 October 2004 draft translation of the rubric makes no mention of the deacon holding the censer suspended from one finger of his hand.

c) The 12 October 2004 draft translation calls for “servers carrying the incense” which makes very little sense, since it is unlikely that there will be a need to add incense to the thurible during the Great Entrance. Nor does there seem to be any reason to carry the incense-boat during a procession unless the procession is of such length as to make the incense-boat a practical necessity.

d) In contradiction of the actual rubric of the Liturgicon, the 12 October 2004 draft rubric prescribes that either a second deacon or a server should carry the censer. The deacon with the Discarion properly carries the censer – *if* there is a second deacon, he may perhaps carry the censer and turn to cense the Holy Gifts. If there is no deacon at all, a subdeacon or senior acolyte may carry the censer.

10) Concluding the Great Entrance, after the commemorations, the rubric in the 12 October 2004 draft directs that the celebrant places the chalice upon the holy table and places the diskos to the left of the chalice. He removes the small veils from the chalice and diskos and lays them to one side. Then he takes the Aer, incenses it, and covers the holy gifts with it, saying quietly...⁴⁹

⁴⁸ This is prescribed in the *Ordo Celebrationis*, cf. § 129 (Pittsburgh 1954 edition, 56).

⁴⁹ 12 October 2004 draft, 19, lines 41-46.

The corresponding rubric in the 1964/65 Ruthenian translation reads: “The priest then places the holy chalice upon the holy altar; and taking the holy discos from the deacon’s head, he also places it upon the holy altar. Then taking the veils off the sacred discos and the holy chalice, he places them to one side of the altar; and taking the Aer from the deacon’s shoulder and incensing it, he covers the holy gifts with it, saying...”⁵⁰

Here again the 12 October 2004 draft has suppressed the mention of the deacon holding the Discarion on his head, and the place of the Aer on the deacon’s shoulder.

11) Following the Great Entrance, and just before the one surviving petition of the Synapte with Aitesis, a rubric (or heading) in the 12 October 2004 draft announces the “PRAYER OF PREPARATION FOR THE ANAPHORA.”⁵¹ Father Archimandrite Robert Taft, building upon the work of Father Juan Mateos,⁵² has devoted considerable effort to demonstrating that this is an *Accessus ad altare* prayer and not a prayer of offering.⁵³ However, in Archimandrite Robert’s own words: “Be that as it may, the term ‘proskomide’ is now proper to this prayer.”⁵⁴ Hence the correct name of the prayer remains what it was, “The prayer of offering, after the divine

⁵⁰ *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1964/65), 29.

⁵¹ 12 October 2004 draft, 20, lines 46-47; upper case as in original.

⁵² Juan Mateos, S.J., *La Célébration de la Parole dans la Liturgie Byzantine : Étude historique*, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 191 (Roma: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1971), Appendice: Deux problèmes de traduction dans la Liturgie Byzantine de S. Jean Chrysostom, I. “La prière de la proskomidie,” 174-179.

⁵³ Archimandrite Robert Taft, “Translating Liturgically,” *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 39, nos. 2-4 (1998): 155-190, cited passage on 171.

⁵⁴ Archimandrite Robert Taft, “Translating Liturgically,” *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 39, nos. 2-4 (1998): 155-190, cited passage on 172.

gifts have been placed on the holy table.”⁵⁵ Incidentally, the Greek title of the prayer includes the direction that the priest says this prayer quietly.⁵⁶ If the title which presently appears in the liturgical books is to be changed to reflect the scholarship of Mateos and Taft, such a change requires a consensus of the large majority – indeed, preferably a unanimity – of those who use the Divine Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom, rather than a unilateral act which can only add to the confusion.

12) Immediately after the “Amen” which concludes the Ecphonesis of “The prayer of offering, after the divine gifts have been placed on the holy table” [to give that prayer its correct title], the 12 October 2004 draft introduces another heading. “THE PROFESSION OF FAITH.”⁵⁷ This heading, found in no altar edition of the Divine Liturgy, thus directly precedes the priest’s blessing of the people, the Kiss of Peace, and the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed.

Not only is this heading an innovation, it is also inaccurate. The priest blesses the faithful with the words “Peace unto all” four times during the Divine Liturgy.⁵⁸ On only one of these four occasions does that blessing even appear to introduce the Kiss and the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed. This blessing also occurs at Vespers, at Orthros, and at many other services and has no connection with either the Kiss or the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed.

⁵⁵ *Recensio Rutena* (Rome, 1941), 78.

⁵⁶ *The Divine Liturgies of our Fathers Among the Saints, John Chrysostom and Basil the Great, with that of the Presanctified...*, ed. with the Greek text by J. N. W. B. Robertson (London: David Nutt, 1894), 286-287.

⁵⁷ 12 October 2004 draft, 21, lines 21-22. Capitalization as in original.

⁵⁸ After the Trisagion or its equivalent, before the Gospel (but not in the Old Rite), before the Kiss of Peace and after the Lord’s Prayer.

But that is not the only reason to call this heading inaccurate. It is true, beyond any doubt, that the Byzantine ordering of the Kiss, the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed and the Anaphora is not haphazard. To offer our gifts, we must first be reconciled with our brother; we have that on the Highest authority of the Gospel.⁵⁹ It is also true that those who would offer the Eucharist together and partake of the Holy Gifts together must be one in the Orthodox Faith. Hence the Kiss is intended to establish that we are one in love, and the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed is intended to establish that we are one in faith – Orthodox in Faith and Catholic in love, to use the edifying expression beloved of Pope John Paul II. But therein lies the rub; the Kiss of Peace is not itself a “profession of faith”; people may kiss one another regardless of their religious affiliations, if any. It would be unusual to suggest that kissing one’s relatives, for example, should be forbidden unless the relatives belong to the same Church as oneself. If for whatever reason the commission which produced this 12 October 2004 draft felt a need to include a title not found in the original Greek text or Slavonic text, the title should follow the priest’s blessing and should read “Kiss of Love,” which is the accurate technical name of this particular liturgical element.

It seems likely, though, that “Profession of Faith” was intended to refer primarily to the Creed.⁶⁰ In that event, then including such a heading is still an innovation – and rather a pointless innovation – but it should at least read “Symbol of Faith”⁶¹ or, if desired, “The Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed” and be placed directly before that text.

13) In the deacon’s Ecphonesis immediately before the Symbol of Faith, the words *The doors! The doors!* appear in

⁵⁹ Matthew 5:23-24.

⁶⁰ Since the draft in general is not free from typographic errors, it is at least possible that this novel heading was simply misplaced by a typist.

⁶¹ The traditional title.

brackets.⁶² These brackets do not appear in any Greek or Church-Slavonic edition.⁶³ The brackets or another indication that “The doors! The doors!” should be optional can be found in a few English translations. Perhaps another comment from Father Archimandrite Robert Taft would be appropriate. Even if they seem peculiar to us, a specific liturgy’s peculiarities should be respected; “any good translation should, where possible, preserve the peculiarities of the original text, not just wish them away.”⁶⁴

14) Directly before the paragraph of the Anaphora “Moreover we offer you this [rational service] for those departed in faith: the forefathers, fathers, patriarchs, prophets...” The 12 October 2004 draft adds a rubric, directing that “*the celebrant takes the censer and incenses, commemorating the dead and praying aloud.*” It is difficult even to guess the source of this innovative rubric; both the Church-Slavonic Liturgicon⁶⁵ and the *Ordo Celebrationis*⁶⁶ are agreed that no rubric appears until just before the Ecphonesis “Especially for our most holy, most pure,...” whereupon the rubric only directs the priest to accept the thurible and intone the Ecphonesis. The commemoration of the dead comes a moment or so later, after the commemoration of the saint of the day.⁶⁷ Surely there is no convincing reason to commemorate the dead twice in the space of one or two minutes. Probably this is nothing more than a typographical error.

⁶² 12 October 2004 draft, 22, line 10.

⁶³ It’s a big world, and somewhere such a book might exist in Greek or Church-Slavonic. But it would be quite rare by comparison to the other editions which print this Ecphonesis normally.

⁶⁴ Archimandrite Robert Taft, “Translating Liturgically,” *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 39, nos. 2-4 (1998): 155-190, cited passage on 170.

⁶⁵ *Recensio Rutena* (Rome, 1941), 94.

⁶⁶ *Ordo Celebrationis* § 136; Pittsburgh 1954 English translation, 60-61.

⁶⁷ 12 October 2004 draft, 27, lines 33-34 and 40-41.

15) Perhaps this is not precisely a “rubric” in the strict sense of the term. But following the second (normally the third) petition of the Synapte with Aitesis following the Anaphora and preceding the Lord’s prayer, a line occurs straight across the page, and a similar line occurs just before the final petition [in which we commit ourselves and one another and all our lives to Christ our God].⁶⁸ This would appear to mean that the use of the Aitesis at this point in the Liturgy is optional. Since the Aitesis does not appear at all in the version of the 12 October 2004 draft following the Great Entrance⁶⁹ evidently the redactors anticipate the complete disuse of the Aitesis in the Divine Liturgy – since in the present state of the world, options are likely to be exercised in favour of brevity.

As it happens, however, the world is also becoming a more cosmopolitan place. The presence of the Aitesis both before and after the Anaphora can easily be an asset where there is a need, or a wish, to use more than one language in the Divine Liturgy: it is possible to pray the first Aitesis in one language and the second Aitesis in another language, with no offence to anyone.

16) Between the *incipit* of the Lord’s Prayer and the Lord’s prayer itself, the draft gives the following rubric: “*The celebrant elevates his hands and prays the Lord’s Prayer together with the faithful:*”⁷⁰ At this point in the Greek text there is only a brief rubric to indicate that either the people or the Superior shall pronounce the Lord’s Prayer.⁷¹ The Church-Slavonic text gives the one-word rubric *Ликъ*,⁷² indicating that the chanters

⁶⁸ 12 October 2004 draft, 29, line 20; p. 30, line 7.

⁶⁹ 12 October 2004 draft, 20-21.

⁷⁰ 12 October 2004 draft, 30, lines 31-32.

⁷¹ Η ΘΕΙΑ ΛΕΙΤΟΥΡΓΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΕΝ ΑΓΙΟΙΣ ΠΑΤΡΟΣ ΗΜΩΝ ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΧΡΥΣΟΣΤΟΜΟΥ (with parallel Italian translation) (Rome, 1967), 120. The Greeks generally recite the Lord’s Prayer rather than singing it.

⁷² *Recensio Rutena* (Rome, 1941), 103.

should sing the Lord's Prayer. The *Ordo Celebrationis* prescribes simply, "When the Lord's Prayer is sung, the priest elevates his hands on high."⁷³

17) In the 12 October 2004 draft, a rubric appears directly after the silent prayer which precedes the elevation of the Lamb with the words Τα ἄγια τοῖς ἁγίοις [Church-Slavonic Святая святѣмъ, often alluded to by the Latin translation *Sancta sanctis*]; this rubric reads: "The deacon girds himself with the orarion in the form of a cross, if he has not already done so at the Lord's Prayer."⁷⁴ The corresponding rubric in the Church-Slavonic text reads: "While this prayer is being said, the deacon, standing before the Holy Doors, girds himself with the orarion in the form of a cross."⁷⁵ The text of this rubric in the 12 October 2004 draft has been adapted slightly from the *Ordo Celebrationis*, which directs that "standing before the royal doors, the deacon binds his orarion about himself in the form of a cross, if he had not already done so during the Lord's Prayer."⁷⁶ So why is there a problem? Simply put, there is not really sufficient time for the deacon to re-arrange his orarion as prescribed if he waits until this moment; that is why the *Ordo Celebrationis* foresees that the deacon may do this during the Lord's Prayer instead. Any professional deacon will take that option; the manœuvre involved is a bit complicated and better done during the

⁷³ *Ordo Celebrationis Vesperarum, Matutini et Divinae Liturgiae iuxta Recensionem Ruthenorum*, Sacred Congregation for the Eastern Churches [in Latin] (Rome, 1944), § 137, paragraph b. English translation from the 1996 edition published by Eastern Christian Publications (Fairfax, VA), 54. One should note that the custom of the priest raising his hands during the Lord's Prayer is by no means universal.

⁷⁴ 12 October 2004 draft, 31, lines 39 – 41.

⁷⁵ *Recensio Rutena* (Rome, 1941), 106.

⁷⁶ *Ordo Celebrationis Vesperarum, Matutini et Divinae Liturgiae iuxta Recensionem Ruthenorum*, Sacred Congregation for the Eastern Churches [in Latin] (Rome, 1944), § 137 d. English translation from the 1996 edition published by Eastern Christian Publications (Fairfax, VA), 55.

Lord's Prayer, when a few extra seconds can make all the difference. Still more: since the rubric as given in the 12 October 2004 draft does not appear until the Lord's Prayer is finished, the deacon could easily not realize that he has the option of re-arranging his orarion during the Lord's Prayer instead of waiting. So it would be well to have a rubric *before* the Lord's Prayer⁷⁷ advising the deacon that he may re-arrange his orarion during the Lord's Prayer. Such a rubric is supplied in *Christ With Us*: "During the chanting of the Lord's Prayer, the Priest lifts his arms. The Deacon girds the orarion cross-wise about himself."⁷⁸

18) Normal texts of the Divine Liturgy provide that immediately after the chanting of "One is Holy, One is Lord ..." the chanters should continue with the Koinonicon of the day. There are a total of 25 different koinonica in current Byzantine use; only two of these are not taken from Scripture.⁷⁹ These two are the sticheron "Of Thy Mystical Supper, O Son of God," used on Holy Thursday (when it also replaces the Cherubicon and also, in many places, the singing of "We have seen the true Light"); and "Receive the Body of Christ; taste the fountain of immortality," which is only sung as a Koinonicon on Pascha and during Bright Week. Each of these two non-Scriptural texts is often sung during the Communion of the faithful, without reference to the calendar. The rubrical problem with the 12 October 2004 draft is that, as mentioned above, the Koinonicon normally follows the chanting of "One is Holy, One is Lord." However, the 12 October 2004 draft

⁷⁷ As we have seen above, the 12 October 2004 draft has inserted a rubric for the priest during the Lord's Prayer even though there is no such rubric in the Liturgicon.

⁷⁸ *Christ With Us* (Stamford, CT, 1954), 108 (reference here and elsewhere to the pocket-size edition).

⁷⁹ Robert F. Taft, S.J., *A History of the Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom, Volume V, The Pre-communion Rites*, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 261 (Rome, 2000, 264-267 gives the complete set).

would stop the chanting immediately after “One is Holy...” so that most of the Fraction, the Commixture, the Zeon, the reception of the Particles of the Holy Lamb by the celebrating priest, the concelebrating priests, and the deacon will be done in silence. Then the clergy and faithful *together*⁸⁰ are to recite the prayers “O Lord, I believe and profess...” before Holy Communion; the faithful are directed to chant the Koinonicon when the priests and deacons actually partake of the Particles of the Holy Lamb.⁸¹ This seems an unnecessary interference with the usual order. The Byzantine Liturgy does not appreciate silent periods; if the Koinonicon is not sung in its normal place, the clergy at the Holy Table will feel an obligation to rush at a moment when haste would be disedifying and inappropriate.⁸² There is no reason to object to the faithful offering the “I believe, O Lord, and I confess...” set of prayers during the Communion of the clergy – both the texts of these prayers and the moment when they used are variable anyway.

19) The rubric in the 12 October 2004 draft⁸³ indicates that the [main] celebrant should communicate the deacon[s] from the Lamb *before* the concelebrating priests take each his particle

⁸⁰ 12 October 2004 draft, 34, line 1.

⁸¹ 12 October 2004 draft, 34, line 36.

⁸² Robert F. Taft, S.J., *A History of the Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom, Volume V, the Pre-communion Rites*, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 261 (Rome, 2000), suggests reviving the seventh-century practice of using an entire Psalm with today’s Koinonicon as a refrain. That would certainly be more desirable than the custom one often finds in practice of choirs singing an elaborate “concert” (that’s really what they call it!) during the Communion of the clergy – or, worse yet, turning the Communion of the clergy into a time for the “entertainment” of the faithful, perhaps with a pageant of some sort (out of charity no specific examples are mentioned here, but there is no lack of them).

⁸³ 12 October 2004 draft, 33.

from the Lamb. This follows the *Ordo Celebrationis*,⁸⁴ but it is apt to provoke a controversy, since in general at Holy Communion the higher rank in Major Orders precedes the lower rank. This is clearly to be seen at the Pontifical Liturgy, especially if there are several hierarchs. In Eastern Orthodox practice at a concelebration involving priests and deacons but no bishop, the priests alone receive Holy Communion from the Lamb, then pray the “I believe, O Lord, and I confess...” The first priest receives the Precious Blood and communicates the deacon[s] from the Lamb while the concelebrating priests each receive the Precious Blood from the chalice.⁸⁵

20) The rubrics in the 12 October 2004 draft indicate that the [main] celebrant communicates the deacon[s] from the Precious Blood as well as from the Lamb.⁸⁶ This follows the *Ordo Celebrationis*,⁸⁷ but in good practice it is not at all unusual for a concelebrating priest to communicate the deacon or deacons from the Precious Blood. This practice is particularly desirable if there are several deacons.

21) The rubric in the 12 October 2004 draft directs that **before** the Communion of the faithful, “the deacon then places the remaining particles for the communion of the faithful into the chalice and covers it. He places the asterisk and the veils on the diskos.”⁸⁸ This is an abridgement of the corresponding rubric in the Church-Slavonic edition,⁸⁹ which reads (in English translation) as follows: “It is to be noted that if there are any who wish to partake of the holy mysteries, the priest

⁸⁴ *Ordo Celebrationis*, § 203.

⁸⁵ Cf. *Abridged Typicon*, ed. Feodor S. Kovalchuk, 2nd ed. (South Canaan, PA: St. Tikhon’s Seminary Press, 1985), 85.

⁸⁶ 12 October 2004 draft, 33 and 35.

⁸⁷ *Ordo Celebrationis*, § 203.

⁸⁸ 12 October 2004 draft, 36, lines 31-33.

⁸⁹ *Recensio Rutena* (Rome, 1941), 115.

breaks the two particles, NI and KA, into smaller particles and the deacon (with a sponge) puts these and the other particles together with the consecrated lamb into the holy chalice.”⁹⁰ This clearly implies – indeed, requires – that the commemorative particles for the Holy Theotokos, the Saints, the living and the dead are to go into the Chalice along with the Particles from the Holy Lamb with which the priest is to give Holy Communion to the faithful. But it is impossible for the priest to distinguish the Particles from the Holy Lamb from the commemorative particles once they are all in the Chalice! This leaves only two possibilities, neither of which is desirable: either the priest is to administer the particles in the Chalice indiscriminately to the faithful (since the particles are then immersed in the Precious Blood, perhaps the ancient idea of concomitance could apply in this instance), or there are no commemorative particles to begin with because the priest did not observe the directions for the Prothesis. To resolve this difficulty, we may resort to an unimpeachably Ruthenian source: the *Leitourgiarion* of [Saint] Peter Mohyla. The corresponding rubric provides as follows: “After the Communion of the clergy the Priest, if there are lay people or monastics to Holy Communion, breaks over the Holy Chalice (with all attention, that not even the smallest Particle may fall anywhere) the two remaining Particles of the Holy Lamb, NI and KA (which he takes from the Holy Discarion carefully), into smaller Particles, so that there will be enough for all the communicants, and puts these smaller Particles into the Holy Chalice. He goes and absterges his hands.”⁹¹ He leaves on the Discarion all the other holy Particles so that he may communicate the lay people as prescribed. If the Priest is

⁹⁰ English translation from *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1964/65), 43.

⁹¹ The present Ruthenian Recension Liturgicon has the final washing of the hands of the priest and deacon at the very end, after the Dismissal of the post-communion prayers. Cf. *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1964/65), 47.

serving alone, with no Deacon, he does not wash his hands at this point, but later, after consuming the Holy Mysteries, as a Deacon would.”⁹² This might well form the basis of the corresponding rubric in an English-language text, so that everyone receives Holy Communion from the Holy Lamb, as is prescribed. **After** the Communion of the faithful and before the transfer of the Holy Gifts to the Prothesis table, the same source provides the following rubric: “Be it known, that if there should remain particles on the Holy Discarion before the transfer,⁹³ the Deacon, having unveiled the Holy Chalice, and holding with all attention the holy Discarion over the Holy Chalice, with great care and caution puts all the remaining particles into the Holy Chalice, ensuring that not the slightest particle remains on the holy Discarion, nor falls anywhere. If there should be some small piece from the holy particles on the Antimys,⁹⁴ which the Deacon scrutinizes carefully, with the holy Sponge he places that small piece on the holy Discarion, and then from the holy Discarion into the holy Chalice. Always, when a priest serves or a Deacon does this, he takes good care that nothing of the holy particles shall ever remain on the Antimys. As soon as this is done, he covers the holy Chalice with its Veil, and sets the Asterisk, the veil [for the Discarion] and the Aer on the holy Discarion and, stepping back slightly, having taken the thurible with incense he gives it to the Priest, kissing the Priest’s right hand. The Priest

⁹² *Leiturgiarion* (Kiev: Monastery of the Caves, 1639; reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications [Fairfax, VA] and Stauropegion [L’viv and New York], 1996), 381-382 (following the Arabic pagination of the facsimile edition).

⁹³ As would be the case if there had been laity or monastics to Holy Communion.

⁹⁴ N. B. This is not a misspelling; spelled as above it refers to the older style of Antimension before the introduction of elaborate art work. This spelling is retained in Romanian.

censes the Holies thrice, bowing low, and says quietly...”⁹⁵ Again, these rubrics from the *Leiturgiarion* of Saint Peter Mohyla, could simply be re-written, bearing in mind that rubrics are best expressed in a functional variety of the language which is aimed at clarity and intelligibility; while irreverence is not appropriate, the rubrics need not be poetic nor in a particularly sacral idiom.

22) The rubric for the transfer of the Holy Gifts back to the table of preparation after Holy Communion specifies that “the celebrant then gives the censer and the diskos and veils to the deacon who takes them with reverence and goes to the table of preparation.”⁹⁶ This is an incomplete translation of the corresponding rubric in Church-Slavonic, which reads: “Then, taking the holy diskos, the priest sets it on the deacon’s head, and the deacon, holding it with reverence, gazing towards the Holy Doors, saying nothing, goes to the preparation table and sets [the diskos] down.”⁹⁷ In addition, the *Discarion* should have on it the folded *Aer*, the folded small veil for the *Discarion* itself, the Communion Spoon wrapped in the purificator,⁹⁸ and the asterisk. The deacon sets all this carefully on the table of preparation, turns towards the priest and censes as the priest approaches with the Chalice (which still contains the Holy Gifts); the priest sets the Chalice on the table

⁹⁵ *Leiturgiarion* (Kiev: Monastery of the Caves, 1639; reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications [Fairfax, VA] and Stauropegion [L’viv and New York], 1996), 391-392 (following the Arabic pagination of the facsimile edition).

⁹⁶ 12 October 2004 draft, 36, lines 37-39.

⁹⁷ *Recensio Rutena* (Rome, 1941), 117-118 [English translation by SK].

⁹⁸ Many priests prefer to leave the Communion Spoon in the Chalice after Holy Communion. But any priest or deacon who has ever seen the Communion Spoon fly out of the Chalice, scattering the Holy Gifts – as can happen only too easily – will never again leave the Communion Spoon in the Chalice.

of preparation and either the priest or the deacon censes the Chalice three times.

23) Immediately prior to the “Ambon Prayer”⁹⁹ the 12 October 2004 draft has the following rubric: “*The same celebrant or concelebrant intones the following prayer or a prayer proper to the day.*”¹⁰⁰ This “prayer proper to the day” is a reference to a variable number of different “prayers behind the ambo,” some of which are found in the Roman edition of the Greek *Ieratikon* and others of which can be found in several sources. The only one of these texts which still remains in use is that prescribed for the Divine Liturgy of Saint Basil the Great (hence *not* the Divine Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom); in practice that variant is used only in Greek and Antiochian Churches, and only on the Feast of Saint Basil the Great – and in many places is not used even then. Virtually all these variant prayers behind the ambo suffer from the same fault: they are addressed to the Lord Jesus Christ, while the prayer which actually appears at this point in the Divine Liturgy is addressed to God “the Father of Lights.” What is to be gained by seeking to revive these variant prayers now?

24) A rubric in the 12 October 2004 draft (following the prayer before the consuming of the Holy Gifts) directs that *the deacon girds himself with the orarion in the form of a cross and consumes the gifts with fear and all care*. There is no reference to this girding of the deacon with the orarion in the form of a cross for the consumption of the Holy Gifts at the end of the Divine Liturgy in the Greek *textus receptus*,¹⁰¹ nor in the pre-Nikonian

⁹⁹ The correct title is “the prayer behind the ambo” – cf. *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1964/65), 45.

¹⁰⁰ 12 October 2004 draft, 18, lines 51-52.

¹⁰¹ Cf. *The Divine Liturgies of our Fathers Among the Saints, John Chrysostom and Basil the Great, with that of the Presanctified . . .*, ed. with the Greek text by J. N. W. B. Robertson (London: David Nutt, 1894), 338-339.

Church-Slavonic text retained by the Old Ritualists,¹⁰² nor in the Old Kyivan *Leiturgiarion* of Saint Peter (Mohyla),¹⁰³ nor in the Nikonian service-book,¹⁰⁴ nor in the “*Missale Ruthenum*,”¹⁰⁵ nor in the present *Recensio Rutena* Liturgicon,¹⁰⁶ nor in the previous Pittsburgh English translation,¹⁰⁷ nor in Huculak,¹⁰⁸

¹⁰² Cf. Old Ritualist text of the Divine Liturgy: *Літургія Святого Іоанна Златоустазо*, Imprimatur of Metropolitan Alympyi, Russian Old Ritualist Orthodox Church (“Pechatnik” Typography, Vereshchagino, Russia, Christmas Day [Old Style, of course], A.D. 2002), 106 *recto* and *verso*. This edition is a facsimile reprint of an edition done in Moscow shortly before the Russian Revolution with the Imprimatur of Archbishop Joseph, and itself reproducing the service-book printed in the fifth year of the pontificate of Patriarch Joseph of Moscow – in other words, shortly before the lamentable Nikon became Patriarch of Moscow.

¹⁰³ Cf. *Leiturgiarion* (Kiev: Monastery of the Caves, 1639; reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications [Fairfax, VA] and Stauropegion [L’viv and New York], 1996), Divine Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom, 399-400 (Arabic pagination). In case this source should strike someone as insufficiently “Catholic,” I am in possession of a photocopy of the 1712 L’viv Stauropegion *Leiturgiarion*, published three years after the Stauropegion had accepted the Union – and the copy from which my photocopy was made is also bowdlerized by Athanasius Sheptytsky to conform it to the requirements of the lamentable Synod of Zamost. Even in that bowdlerized condition, the 1712 *Leiturgiarion* retains the rubric directing the Deacon to consume the Holy Gifts, but makes no reference at all to any re-arranging of the oration for this particular purpose. Cf. 123 *verso*, 124 *recto*.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. *Службникъ*, vol. 1 (Moscow Patriarchate, 1977), 172 – innumerable other printings of the Nikonian service-book could be cited.

¹⁰⁵ Cf. *Λειτουργικὸν σιρῆς Службникъ* (L’viv: Stauropegion, 1905 [reprinted in Mundare, Alberta, c. 1941]), 315 and 317. This edition prescribes that the priest himself, at the Holy Table, should consume the Holy Gifts.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. *Recensio Rutena* (Rome, 1941), 123.

¹⁰⁷ *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1964/65), 45.

nor in the *Ordo Celebrationis*.¹⁰⁹ The commission should make known the source which they have followed in this instance. It could, of course, be a typographic error, but that seems quite unlikely, since it would involve the inadvertent insertion of a 12-word phrase.

25) The rubrics of the 12 October 2004 draft have completely suppressed every allusion to the Antidoron.¹¹⁰ Yet it is prescribed in the Church-Slavonic Ruthenian edition,¹¹¹ and the *Ordo Celebrationis*.¹¹² Nor is it unheard-of in the Transcarpathian tradition: this can often be experienced in their churches, particularly on major feast days (when it is usually associated with a festal anointing). It is true that almost invariably the Antidoron is distributed after the Dismissal instead of during Psalm 33¹¹³ (which the 12 October

¹⁰⁸ Cf. L. Huculak (now Bishop Laurence of Edmonton), *The Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom in the Kievan Metropolitan Province during the Period of Union with Rome*, Analecta OSBM, Series II, Sectio 1 (Romae, 1990), 350-352. Bishop Laurence rather tendentiously describes the Missals of Cyprian Zhokhovskiy and his followers as the “Catholic Texts,” for all the world as though the Mamonych 1617 edition (produced by no less than Saint Josaphat of Polotsk), the 1712 L’viv Stauropegion edition (either the original or the later bowdlerized version) and the L’viv 1929 editions are not “Catholic.”

¹⁰⁹ Cf. *Ordo Celebrationis Vesperarum, Matutini et Divinae Liturgiae iuxta Recensionem Ruthenorum*, Sacred Congregation for the Eastern Churches, Rome, 1944 (in Latin); § 144 f. English translation from the 1996 edition published by Eastern Christian Publications, Fairfax, Virginia, USA, p.60.

¹¹⁰ Cf. 12 October 2004 draft, 38.

¹¹¹ Cf. *Recensio Rutena* (Rome, 1941), 123.

¹¹² Cf. *Ordo Celebrationis Vesperarum, Matutini et Divinae Liturgiae iuxta Recensionem Ruthenorum*, Sacred Congregation for the Eastern Churches [in Latin] (Rome, 1944), § 144 g. English translation from the 1996 edition published by Eastern Christian Publications (Fairfax, VA), 60.

¹¹³ With the exception of the Old Ritualists, who have an interesting practice: the priest distributes the Antidoron as prescribed during Psalm

2004 draft also does not mention), but that need pose no problem: if the commission considers it appropriate, it is only necessary to move the rubric by a few paragraphs, so that it follows the Dismissal, or even the Polychronion.

26) Following the Polychronion, the 12 October 2004 draft adds the Requiem intonation and the response “Eternal memory,”¹¹⁴ although neither the intonation nor the response appear at this point in either the Church-Slavonic original or the earlier Pittsburgh edition.

33, and then after the Dismissal the congregation comes again to the priest, this time to kiss the Cross.

¹¹⁴ 12 October 2004 draft, 40, lines 29-34. This chant is normally sung at the end of funeral services and other Requiem services.

CONCLUSION

The rubrical problems seem to indicate that the compilers of this draft are paying relatively little attention to the Church-Slavonic service-books and the *Ordo Celebrationis*. Some apologists for the draft under consideration assert that this translation and this recasting represent what the Eastern Orthodox, at least in the USA, truly want. Perhaps the 12 October 2004 draft could be sent to Saint Vladimir's Seminary with a request for a thorough review and study by several Orthodox specialists, to be published in the *Saint Vladimir's Theological Quarterly*.

The rubrics themselves are confused and inadequate. There is a serious need to rewrite these draft rubrics in a scientific way, in the light of the problems mentioned above and others which may have been overlooked. To leave these rubrics as they are would encourage chaos.

TEXTUAL INACCURACIES

In translating anything, including liturgical texts or even Holy Scripture, one is faced with a paradox of sorts. There is an obligation to strive for the highest possible accuracy. But a perfect translation of such material is an unattainable goal. That awareness does not excuse the translators from making the effort; it requires the translators to be open to considering the insights of others in the field, to be willing to learn, and to be tolerant of variant translations. There are at least five or six major variant versions of the Church-Slavonic liturgical texts,¹ so there is no reason to be shocked or amazed that it is difficult to reach agreement on English translations.

At the same time, the obligation to strive for accuracy is a serious one. A genuine difference of informed opinion as to the meaning of a particular word or phrase is one thing, but a poor or even incorrect translation of a word or phrase² is quite

¹ These include: the pre-Nikonian Muscovite version, still in use among the Old Ritualists; the Nikonian Muscovite version used by the Russian Orthodox Church and most Ukrainian Orthodox and Belarusian Orthodox Churches; the Kyivan version associated particularly with the name of Saint Peter Mohyla with remained in use to some extent in Transcarpathia until World War I; the heavily Latinized Uniate versions descending from the *Missale Ruthenum* of Metropolitan Cyprian Zhokhovskiy (Vilna, 1692); the *Recensio Rutena* series published in Rome beginning in 1941, and the modern Bulgarian version (which closely follows the modern Greek liturgical books).

² The following example is deliberately chosen from material which has no close connection with the Byzantine Liturgy. In doing a rushed translation of a theological book by the late Professor Louis Bouyer, the translator did not understand the French phrase *le dernier cri*. In his haste, the translator attempted a literal translation which in turn was actually published, and Father Bouyer was mortified to discover that a book bearing his name described some theological insight as “the dying gasp”! (For readers who do not speak or read French, *le dernier cri* means “the last word” or “the utmost refinement,” usually in the sense of

another. It is necessary to distinguish between matters of taste, in which the principle *de gustibus non est disputandum* comes into play, and matters of precision, particularly in theological terminology (where accuracy, not taste, must determine the translation). There is a difference between a translation of a word or phrase which can be questioned, and a translation which is seriously inadequate. Thus the present study dedicates a separate chapter to questionable translations, and this current chapter to more clear-cut problems. There are some instances in the text which are not matters of taste; they are simply erroneous. This involves such instances as the following:

1) Δέσποτα in Greek (or Владыко in Church-Slavonic) does not mean “Reverend Father”; this word means “Master” in the vocative (it can sometimes be translated “Lord”).³ This word occurs in classical Greek, where it is connected with the idea of ruling, of governing (it is the root of the English word *despot* and its adjective *despotic*). Δέσποτα occurs in the Septuagint, where it also means “Master”: Genesis 15:18 gives Δέσποτα Κύριε, “Master [and] Lord” which also occurs often in the Byzantine liturgical corpus – in the Prayer of the Little Entrance, for example, which the 12 October 2004 draft translates acceptably as “Lord, our Master and God.”⁴

This word also occurs in the New Testament, including the Prayer of Saint Simeon⁵ (which in the Byzantine tradition is sung at Vespers every day outside of Bright Week).

fashion or art. The publishers discovered that thanks to this pot-boiler translation they had become the laughing-stock of the English-speaking theological community.)

³ Cf. Liddell and Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 381 col. a.

⁴ 12 October 2004 draft, 8, line 1.

⁵ Luke 2: 29-32.

When the deacon is addressing the priest,⁶ the text under consideration consistently renders *Δέσποτα* as “Reverend Father” (which is inaccurate) but in most cases retains the accurate meaning “Master” in prayers addressed to Christ.⁷ This seems inexplicable. There is, however, an exception which makes matters worse. The draft offers us the following as the *incipit* to the Lord’s Prayer: “And make us worthy, O Lord God of heaven, that we may with confidence and without condemnation dare call you ‘Father’ and say:”⁸ Not only is it obvious to anyone familiar with the Lord’s Prayer that that Prayer is addressed to God the Father, but the *incipit* makes it clear that both the *incipit* and the Prayer which it introduces are addressed to God the Father. In the Byzantine liturgical vocabulary, the term *Κύριος* (*Lord*) is normally used with reference to God the Son, Our Lord Jesus Christ. This is not absolutely inflexible (and it cannot be absolutely inflexible, since the Byzantine liturgical corpus is packed with Psalm verses, some of which inevitably address God as *Κύριος*. One of the most important examples is Psalm 109, which begins “The Lord said unto my Lord...” The Church understands this Psalm as an important reference to the Trinity in the Old Testament; this Psalm is used as the Third Antiphon and Introit for the Nativity of Christ), but still the custom of reserving *Κύριος* for the Lord Jesus Christ, our God and Saviour, is sufficiently prevalent as to make it inadvisable to introduce another exception without the strongest possible reason. In this instance, the unwarranted exception is found, unfortunately, in the 1964/65 version;⁹ those who produced the 12 October 2004 draft have repeated this without any necessity at all.

⁶ 12 October 2004 draft, 2, 8, 10, 11, 18, 20, 26 (three times), 32, 33 and 35.

⁷ E.g. 12 October 2004 draft, 11, line 25;

⁸ 12 October 2004 draft, 30, lines 27-29..

⁹ *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1964/65), 38.

As many people are aware, the traditional Byzantine terminology always describes the Table of Sacrifice as “the Holy Table” and uses the term “altar” to designate the entire area behind the iconostasis – the area which the Latins would term the “sanctuary.” But in the translation under consideration, while the term “Holy Table” is consistently and properly used, the rubrics invariably refer to the “sanctuary” rather than the altar – with the result that anyone reading the rubrics would form the impression that such a religious edifice has no altar at all. But where the term “altar” occurs in the actual prayer-texts, this translation retains that term. There is something strange about this, but in the absence of any explanation, it is difficult to deduce what precisely may have motivated this idiosyncratic usage.

2) Χώρα both in classical Greek and in the Septuagint means place, land, country, region, district, or something of the sort. This is a rich word; Liddell and Scott¹⁰ give it almost an entire column. Nowhere does this word mean “community,” but that is how the text under consideration renders it in the Great Synapte.¹¹ The same petition omits the usual alternative of “village” instead of “city” where appropriate – but surely neither villages nor village churches have ceased to exist.

3) “Orthodox” does not mean “faithful,”¹² “true believers,”¹³ “of the true faith”¹⁴ or any other euphemism; there is no possible reason to shy away from this word. Mistranslations of the word *Orthodox*¹⁵ occur throughout¹⁶ and the choice of

¹⁰ Cf. Liddell and Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 2015 col. a.

¹¹ 12 October 2004 draft, 3, line 17.

¹² 12 October 2004 draft, 3, line 41.

¹³ 12 October 2004 draft, 27, line 46.

¹⁴ 12 October 2004 draft, 13, line 29; 19, lines 19 and 34; and 40, line 15.

¹⁵ In this context, the term *Orthodox* is not only a generic modifier (as it would be in such an expression as “orthodox Marxist”) but is also a specific denominational expression. Cf. “Виголопування слова

euphemisms is not even consistent. This is an embarrassment; a return to the obvious correct word is long overdue. The large majority of the faithful of the Byzantine-Ruthenian Metropolitanate in the USA will either be indifferent to the liturgical use of the term “Orthodox” or will welcome it.

4) εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων (or in Nikonian Church Slavonic во вѣки вѣковъ) means *unto ages of ages*.¹⁷ The text under consideration uses “forever,”¹⁸ which is not an adequate translation and which causes problems with the rhythm of the ecphrases.

5) The Prayer of the Little Entrance includes the phrase “make this our entrance an entrance of holy angels, *concelebrating with us...*” The verb in Greek is συλλειτουργούντων, which evidently posed a temptation that the translators were unable to resist. Συλλειτουργούντων, however, means “serving with”¹⁹ or even plain “working with.” The corresponding expression in Church-Slavonic, *сослужащихъ*, simply means *those serving together*. The

‘Православный’ на Богослужениях,” Patriarch Joseph (Cardinal Slipyi), *Litterae-Nuntiae* vol. 3-4 (1967), 269-273. In English such a word is a “proper noun” or “proper adjective” and is therefore capitalized. Cf. *Byzantine Daily Worship*, letter of approbation from Patriarch Maximos V of Antioch, Alexandria, Jerusalem and all the East, 30 April 1968: “You have restored to honor among our people the terms Orthodox and Orthodoxy, thus sharing with our brethren of the Orthodox Churches the fullness of the True Doctrine.”

¹⁶ 12 October 2004 draft, 3, line 41; 13, line 40; 19, lines 19 and 34; 27, line 46; and 40, line 15.

¹⁷ My article “Ukrainian Catholics: Four Translations of the Divine Liturgy,” *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 39, nos. 2-4 (1998): 267-402, discusses this matter. Cf. in particular 284-297.

¹⁸ This expression occurs so frequently that there would be no particular point in providing page references. Suffice it to say that the expression occurs on a majority of the pages.

¹⁹ Cf. Liddell and Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 1672 col. b.

1964/65 translation²⁰ rendered this phrase correctly: “make this our entrance to be an entrance of holy angels, *serving together with us...*”²¹ The 12 October 2004 draft becomes considerably worse right after the Great Entrance, when the draft directs the celebrant to address the deacon with these words: “May the Spirit himself concelebrate with us...”²²

6) The second phrase of the Trisagion, in Greek Ἅγιος Ἰσχυρός (in Slavonic Святыи Кръпкѣи) is properly translated into English *Holy Strong [One]*.²³ The draft under consideration translates this phrase *Holy and Mighty*.²⁴ The 1964/65 translation did the same.²⁵ As I have written previously, “This is a divine, Messianic attribute. For example, II Kings: Ὁ ἰσχυρός, ἄμωμος ἢ ὁδὸς αὐτοῦ, τὸ ῥῆμα Κυρίου κραταίον... Τίς ἰσχυρός πλὴν Κυρίου.²⁶ This can be translated “The Strong One, His path is blameless; the word of the Lord is powerful... Who is Strong save the Lord?” Likewise in the Apocalypse: ὅτι ἰσχυρός Κύριος ὁ Θεός. “For Strong is the Lord God.”²⁷ Many translators do not wish to apply the adjective ‘Strong’ to God, and instead use the not-quite-synonym ‘Mighty’, finding this, perhaps, less physical and therefore perhaps less

²⁰ *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1964/65), 20.

²¹ Church-Slavonic (and both Ukrainian and Russian) have no word meaning “to concelebrate” in the strict sense used both by the Latins and by the *Ordo Celebrationis*.

²² 12 October 2004 draft, 20.

²³ “Ukrainian Catholics: Four Translations of the Divine Liturgy,” *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 39, nos. 2-4 (1998): 267-402, discusses this matter. Cf. in particular 299-300. Also Liddell and Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 843 col. b – 844 col. a.

²⁴ 12 October 2004 draft, 9, line 44.

²⁵ *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1964/65), 5.

²⁶ II Kings 22:31-33 (LXX; the Masoretic text differs).

²⁷ Apocalypse 18: 8b.

anthropomorphic.²⁸ However, Ἅγιος Ἰσχυρός refers to God the Son, regardless of whether one prefers the earlier Christological meaning of the Trisagion or the later (and Byzantine) Triadological meaning; accepting the Triadological understanding of the Trisagion, and interpreting the text in the light of the Pentecost doxology...²⁹ Ἅγιος Ἰσχυρός is the “Holy Strong One, through Whom we came to know the Father and through Whom the Holy Spirit came to the world,” that is to say God the Son, Jesus Christ the Lord, Incarnate of the Virgin Mary. Thus ‘strong’ is the appropriate translation of Ἰσχυρός.^{30 31}

7) The final petition of the ektene (according to the *recensio rutena*) includes the phrase за творящихъ намъ милостыню.³² The 1964/65 version translates this as “for those who showed us mercy”;³³ the 12 October 2004 draft gives “for those who show us mercy.”³⁴ Both are mistaken; the phrase actually means “for those who have given us alms.”³⁵ The *Old Orthodox*

²⁸ This is, admittedly, a matter for speculation.

²⁹ Doxasticon of the Aposticha of Second Vespers of Pentecost

³⁰ Archimandrite Ephrem, who did the greater part of the translation in *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father among the Saints John Chrysostom*, [Archimandrite Ephrem Lash, ed., (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), has prepared a series of papers explaining the various choices made in this translation, including the Trisagion. We hope that these papers will soon be published.

³¹ “Ukrainian Catholics: Four Translations of the Divine Liturgy,” *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 39, nos. 2-4 (1998): 299-300.

³² *Recensio Rutena* (Rome, 1941), 60.

³³ *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1964/65), 24.

³⁴ 12 October 2004 draft, 13, lines 38-39.

³⁵ Cf. Luke 12:33. *Старославянский Словарь* под редакцией Р. М. Цейтлин, Р. Вечерки и Э. Благовой, Институт Славяноведения и Балканистики Российской Академии Наукъ, «Русский Язык». (Москва, 1994), 327 col. a.

*Prayer Book*³⁶ correctly translates за творящихъ милостыню as “for those who give alms.”³⁷

8) The priest’s prayer during the ektene includes the phrase τοὺς οἰκτιροῦς σου κατάπεμψον ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς (Church-Slavonic щедроты Твоя низпосли на ны). The 1964/65 version translates this as “send down Your benefits upon us.”³⁸ The 12 October 2004 draft gives “Be compassionate to us.”³⁹ Neither is accurate. The verb κατάπεμψον clearly carries the meaning of *send down*.⁴⁰ The noun οἰκτιροῦς in the plural occurs in the Septuagint, where it means *compassionate feelings, mercies*.⁴¹ Hence the better translation might be “send down Your compassions upon us.”

9) In the priest’s prayer immediately after the petitions for the dead, the phrase ἐν τόπῳ χλοερῶ, ἐν τόπῳ ἀναψύξεως (Church-Slavonic въ мѣстѣ злачнѣ, въ мѣстѣ покойнѣ) appears. The Greek word χλοερῶ derives from χλόη and

³⁶ ДревнеПравославный Молитвенникъ *Old Orthodox Prayer Book*, 2nd ed., trans. and ed. Hieromonk German Ciuba, Hieromonk John Berzins, Archpriest Pimen Simon and Priest Theodore Jurewicz, Russian Orthodox Church of the Nativity of Christ (Old Rite) (Erie, PA, 2001). Since some texts of the Old Kyivan (or “Ruthenian”) tradition are also found in the pre-Nikonian Russian tradition, this prayer-book is of serious value to the student researching the Old Kyivan tradition.

³⁷ ДревнеПравославный Молитвенникъ *Old Orthodox Prayer Book*, 2nd ed., trans. and ed. Hieromonk German Ciuba, Hieromonk John Berzins, Archpriest Pimen Simon and Priest Theodore Jurewicz, Russian Orthodox Church of the Nativity of Christ (Old Rite) (Erie, PA, 2001), 104.

³⁸ *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1964/65), 23.

³⁹ 12 October 2004 draft, 13, lines 47-48.

⁴⁰ Cf. Liddell and Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 904, col. b.

⁴¹ *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint, Part II, K – Ω*, compiled by Lust, Eynikel and Hauspie (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1996), 326, col. b.

refers to young green growth or tender grass.⁴² The Church-Slavonic word *злачнѣ* has the same meaning as the Greek, referring again to tender green (or verdant) grass. The classical Greek word *ἀναψύξεως*⁴³ clearly implies cooling, relief; it occurs in Exodus, 8:11 (LXX) with the same meaning. Thus *refreshment*, reminiscent of the Latin *refrigerium*, is an apt translation. But the Church-Slavonic text seems to have been unable to deal with this word adequately, and simply used *покойнѣ*. Hence the 1964/65 version reads “a place of refreshment, a place of repose”⁴⁴ and the 12 October 2004 draft reads “a place of...joy, and peace.”⁴⁵ Neither of these will do. A better translation might be “a place of verdure,”⁴⁶ a place of refreshment.” This problem might serve as a reminder that one should always check the original Greek.

10) In the first prayer of the faithful, the 12 October 2004 draft refers to “the people’s failings.”⁴⁷ The 1964/65 translation gives “the people’s transgressions.”⁴⁸ Neither of these seems adequate. The Greek text is *τοῦ λαοῦ ἀγνοημάτων*. *Ἀγνοημάτων* occurs several times in the Septuagint and has to do with *ignorance* and the mistakes, even sins, which arise

⁴² *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint, Part II, K – Ω*, compiled by Lust, Eynikel and Hauspie (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1996), 517, col. a. The same word, *Chloe*, appears as a name for a shepherdess in pastoral poetry.

⁴³ Cf. Liddell and Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 127, col. a.

⁴⁴ *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1964/65), 25.

⁴⁵ 12 October 2004 draft, 14, lines 46-47.

⁴⁶ If “verdure” should seem an obscure word, it is also possible to say “a place of green pasture.”

⁴⁷ 12 October 2004 draft, 16, line 50. The copy of the draft which has reached me indicates a footnote numbered “51,” but without the text of the footnotes it is impossible to verify what this might refer to.

⁴⁸ *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1964/65), 26.

from ignorance.⁴⁹ In classical Greek one finds the same connotation, with the meaning of *a fault of ignorance*.⁵⁰ The Church-Slavonic text is невѣдѣніихъ, which is in effect a calque of ἀγνοημάτων and means “ignorances,” or by extension sins committed through ignorance. This word also occurs in Acts 3:17 with the same connotation – but reminding us that a sin committed through ignorance may nevertheless be of great seriousness.

One wants, then, a translation of the phrase taking this meaning into account. Robinson gives “the errors of the people.”⁵¹ *Christ With Us* gives “ignorance of the people.”⁵² The Orthodox Church in America’s translation gives “for the errors of all Thy people.”⁵³ Archimandrite Lazarus Moore’s translation gives “the errors of the people.”⁵⁴ The 1988 English translation published by the Basilian Press gives “for the sins of ignorance of the people”⁵⁵ The SCOBA draft translation from the early nineteen-nineties gives “the failings of the people.”⁵⁶ One could continue the list almost indefinitely.

⁴⁹ *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint, Part I, A – I*, compiled by Lust, Eynikel and Hauspie (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1992), 4, col. b.

⁵⁰ Cf. Liddell and Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 12, col. a.

⁵¹ *The Divine Liturgies of Our Fathers Among the Saints, John Chrysostom and Basil the Great, with that of the Presanctified...*, ed. with the Greek text by J. N. W. B. Robertson (London: David Nutt, 1894), 273.

⁵² *Christ With Us* (Stamford, CT, 1954), 59.

⁵³ *The Divine Liturgy According to Saint John Chrysostom*, Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of America (1967), 50.

⁵⁴ *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Among the Saints John Chrysostom*, trans. the Right Reverend Archimandrite Lazarus (reprinted with permission by St. John of Rila Eastern Orthodox Monastery, Setauket, New York, 1983), 33.

⁵⁵ *The Sacred and Divine Liturgy of our Holy Father John Chrysostom* (Toronto: Basilian Press, 1988), 75.

⁵⁶ Pan-Orthodox Translation prepared by the liturgical commission of the Standing Conference of Canonical Orthodox Bishops in America,

Almost any of these translations just cited would do; probably “the ignorances of the people” is a good choice.

11) Just before the Great Entrance, at the Prothesis Table, the priest sets the aer on the deacon’s left shoulder,⁵⁷ saying (according to the 12 October 2004 draft): “Lift up your hands to the holy gifts⁵⁸ and bless the Lord.” This is impossible. This text is a Psalm verse.⁵⁹ In the context of the Divine Liturgy, especially as the priest is giving the deacon the aer just before the Great Entrance, “the holy gifts” can only refer to the contents of the Discarion and the Chalice. Do the compilers of this draft seriously suggest that the Psalmist here is directly prophetic of the Christian Eucharist? The phrase in Greek is εἰς τὰ ἅγια, which can either mean “unto the holies” or “to the holy place(s).” At that point, the choice is the translator’s, but “the holy gifts” is indefensible. These are some translations of this phrase from other versions:

Lift up your hands to the holies, and bless the Lord.⁶⁰

Lift up your hands to the holies, and bless ye the Lord.⁶¹

Lift up your hands to the holy place, and bless ye the Lord.⁶²

reproduced in Antiochian, Greek and Slavonic variants, but so far unpublished – the copies have no dates.

⁵⁷ See the chapter on rubrical problems.

⁵⁸ Emphasis added.

⁵⁹ Psalm 133:3 LXX, to be precise. Or in some editions (e.g., Brenton) Psalm 133:2a LXX.

⁶⁰ *The Divine Liturgies of Our Fathers Among the Saints, John Chrysostom and Basil the Great, with that of the Presanctified...*, ed. with the Greek text by J. N. W. B. Robertson (London: David Nutt, 1894), 280-281. It would be well worth reprinting this now-rare book.

⁶¹ *Christ With Us* (Stamford, CT, 1954), 68-69 (reference here and elsewhere to the pocket-size edition).

Lift up your hands to the Holies, and bless the Lord.⁶³

Lift up your hands unto the holies, and bless the Lord.⁶⁴

Lift up your hands toward the holy places and bless the Lord.⁶⁵

Lift up your hands unto the holies, and bless the Lord.⁶⁶

And so on – but the citations given here will probably suffice.

12) During what is sometimes called the *Oratre Fratres* dialogue between the priest and the deacon immediately following the Great Entrance, the setting of the Chalice and Discarion on the Holy Table, the brief censuring and the closing of the Royal Doors,⁶⁷ the Deacon addresses the priest with the words *Духъ свѣтъый найдеть на тя, и сила Вышняго осѣнить тя.*⁶⁸ Both in Greek and in Church-Slavonic, these words are a direct quote from the Gospel of Luke. In 1964/65⁶⁹

⁶² *The Divine Liturgy According to Saint John Chrysostom*, Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of America (now the Orthodox Church in America) (New York, 1967 [reprinted 1977]), 54.

⁶³ *The Divine Liturgy*, ed. and trans. Mitred Archpriest Michael G. H. Gelsinger (1971 mimeographed draft; this unfortunately has not yet been published), unpaginated.

⁶⁴ *The Psalter According to the Seventy...* Translated from the Septuagint Version of the Old Testament by the Holy Transfiguration Monastery, (Boston, 1974), 237.

⁶⁵ *The Sacred and Divine Liturgy of our Holy Father John Chrysostom* (Toronto: Basilian Press, 1988), 85.

⁶⁶ *The Liturgikon: The Book of Divine Services for the Priest and Deacon*, Antiochian Orthodox Christian Archdiocese of North America (Antakya Press, 1989), 277.

⁶⁷ *Ordo Celebrationis* § 131; 1954 Pittsburgh English translation p. 57.

⁶⁸ *Holy and Divine Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom* [in Church-Slavonic; recensio ruthena], Rome, 1941, p. 77.

⁶⁹ *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom*, Byzantine Seminary Press, Pittsburgh, Pa., 1964/65, p. 30.

and in the 12 October 2004 draft⁷⁰ this is translated *The Holy Spirit shall come upon you, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow you*.

This is an accurate translation of the words as they appear in the Gospel, where the context makes it clear that the meaning is future indicative. However, in the Divine Liturgy these words are in a different context; the context requires that in English this phrase should be in the *optative* mood, and hence should read “May the Holy Spirit come upon you, and the power of the Most High overshadow you.” One must translate taking into account what Father Archimandrite Robert Taft aptly terms the *Sitz im Gottesdienst*.

This particular mistranslation is surprising, because Father Archimandrite Robert made a point of mentioning it with some emphasis during his presentation at the Stamford conference on English translation of the Divine Liturgy,⁷¹ for which it seems that at least two members of the commission which has produced the draft under consideration were present. Several other translations correctly put this phrase in the optative mood:

- a) May the Holy Ghost come upon thee and the power of the Most High overshadow thee.⁷²
- b) May the Holy Spirit descend upon you, and the power of the Most High overshadow you.⁷³
- c) May the Holy Spirit come upon you and the Most High overshadow you.⁷⁴

⁷⁰ 12 October 2004 draft, p. 20, lines 29-31.

⁷¹ Archimandrite Robert Taft, “Translating Liturgically,” *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 39, nos. 2-4 (1998): 155-190, cited passage on 166.

⁷² *Christ With Us* (Stamford, CT, 1954), 74.

⁷³ *The Divine Liturgy According to Saint John Chrysostom*, Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of America (now the Orthodox Church in America) (New York, 1967 [reprinted 1977]), 56.

d) May the Holy Spirit descend upon thee, and the power of the Most High overshadow thee.⁷⁵

e) May the Holy Spirit descend on you, and the power of the Most High overshadow you.⁷⁶

13) The second petition of the synapte with aitiseis following the Great Entrance – and in the 12 October 2005 draft only this one solitary petition remains – reads, according to the draft, “For the precious gifts placed before us, let us pray to the Lord.”⁷⁷ This is problematic. The Greek original of the key phrase reads Ὑπὲρ τῶν προτεθέντων τιμίων δώρων. The Church-Slavonic text reads ω предложенныхъ честныхъ дарѣхъ. Προτεθέντων comes from the verb προτίθημι, which means *to set* (as in *set the table* or *set one’s heart*) or *to set forth*.⁷⁸ Προτεθέντων, an adjectival form, means something which is *set* or *set forth* – in this case, the precious gifts [that is, the bread and wine which have been set for the Eucharist]. But neither the Greek nor the Slavonic give any indication that the precious gifts are set forth before *us* at this point in the service. One might speculate that the precious gifts are set forth before God, Who will then return them to us in Holy Communion, but that is indeed speculation, and unnecessary speculation. It is quite possible to translate this phrase in such a way as to

⁷⁴ 1973 draft translation by Father Joseph Shary and Father John Weisengoff, 36.

⁷⁵ *The Liturgikon: The Book of Divine Services for the Priest and Deacon*, Antiochian Orthodox Christian Archdiocese of North America (Antakya Press, 1989), 280.

⁷⁶ *The Divine Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom, Slavonic Version, A Pan-Orthodox Translation*, draft distributed by Standing Conference of Canonical Orthodox Bishops in America (c. 1995, still unpublished), 20.

⁷⁷ 12 October 2004 draft, 20, lines 51-52.

⁷⁸ Liddell and Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 1536, col. a – b; *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint, Part II, K – Ω*, compiled by Lust, Eynikel and Hauspie (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1996), 407, col. b; *Thayer’s Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI, n.d.), 552, col. a.

leave the question open, with something along the lines of “the precious gifts here set forth.” Here are some samples of translations which have done that or something similar:

- a) For the precious Gifts that have been set forth⁷⁹
- b) For the precious gifts placed here⁸⁰
- c) For the precious Gifts now set forth⁸¹
- d) For the precious gifts now set forth⁸²
- e) For the precious gifts here presented⁸³
- f) For the precious gifts presented here⁸⁴
- g) For the precious Gifts that have been set forth⁸⁵

The list could be continued, but the point is clear. A similar phrase occurs in the priest’s prayer of *accessus ad altare*⁸⁶ which the priest according to the *textus receptus* would pray quietly⁸⁷ but which the 12 October 2004 draft requires the priest to pray

⁷⁹ *The Divine Liturgies of Our Fathers Among the Saints, John Chrysostom and Basil the Great, with that of the Presanctified...*, ed. with the Greek text by J. N. W. B. Robertson (London: David Nutt, 1894), 286-287.

⁸⁰ *Christ With Us* (Stamford, CT, 1954), 76 (reference here and elsewhere to the pocket-size edition).

⁸¹ *The Divine Liturgy*, ed. and trans. Mitred Archpriest Michael G. H. Gelsinger (1971 mimeographed draft; this unfortunately has not yet been published), unpaginated.

⁸² *The Liturgikon: The Book of Divine Services for the Priest and Deacon*, Antiochian Orthodox Christian Archdiocese of North America (Antakya Press, 1989), 281.

⁸³ *The Divine Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom, Slavonic Version, A Pan-Orthodox Translation*, draft distributed by Standing Conference of Canonical Orthodox Bishops in America (c. 1995, still unpublished), 21; 20 (Antiochian version); 16 (Greek version).

⁸⁴ *The Sacrifice of Praise* (Parma, 1996), 179.

⁸⁵ *The Divine Liturgies of Our Fathers Among the Saints, John Chrysostom and Basil the Great, with that of the Presanctified...*, ed. with the Greek text by J. N. W. B. Robertson (London: David Nutt, 1894), 286-287.

⁸⁶ To use Father Archimandrite Robert Taft’s phrase.

⁸⁷ Μυστικῶς in the Greek editions; cf. *Ordo Celebrationis*, § 132.

aloud.⁸⁸ The penultimate phrase of the draft translation reads *on these gifts here present*. The Greek text of this phrase is ἐπὶ τὰ προκειμένα Δῶρα ταῦτα, which in Church-Slavonic becomes на предлежащихъ дарѣхъ сихъ. Here the draft translation is defensible, but *here set forth* would be more precise. The “gifts” in question are the Holy Gifts, the bread and wine which have just been “set forth” on the Holy Table. As will appear below, the same phrase occurs in the Greek text of the Anaphora as part of the Epiclesis.

14) Twice during the Anaphora the draft translates τὴν λογικὴν ταύτην [καὶ ἀναίμακτον] λατρείαν as *this spiritual [and unbloody] sacrifice*.⁸⁹ Modernists to the contrary, λογικός does not mean “spiritual.” This word has to do with speech, with thought, with rationality⁹⁰ – which is why many translations prefer the word “rational.” Stipulating for the sake of argument that the soul or spirit is a necessary component of the reasoning faculty of man, being spiritual alone does not necessarily make one rational – it is not difficult to find people who are undeniably spiritual but whose rationality is open to question. There are several examples of various English translations of the Bible employing this expression, and four examples of English translations of the Byzantine Liturgy;⁹¹ there is no particular reason to repeat them here. No scholarship in the intervening years requires a reconsideration of the matter. One may still regard the translation “rational worship”⁹² as the best alternative, though Bishop Kallistos of Diokleia, who is a scholar of the highest standing, is undecided on the matter.

⁸⁸ 12 October 2004 draft, 21, line 3.

⁸⁹ 12 October 2004 draft, 25, lines 47-48 and 26, 52-53.

⁹⁰ Liddell and Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 1056 col. a. Also *Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI, n.d.), 379, col. b.

⁹¹ *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 39, nos. 2-4 (1998): 340-341.

⁹² *The Sacred and Divine Liturgy of our Holy Father John Chrysostom* (Toronto: Basilian Press, 1988), 109, 113.

15) As mentioned above, the 12 October 2004 draft translates the second petition of the synapte with Aitesis following the Great Entrance as “For the precious gifts placed before us, let us pray to the Lord.”⁹³ As noted in commenting on that petition, the assumption that προτεθέντων (Greek text) – предложенныхъ (Church-Slavonic) means that something is set forth *before us* is gratuitous and unwarranted. At the Epiclesis, just before the priest blesses (with the sign of the Cross) the Holy Gifts, he prays, according to the 12 October 2004 draft, “Send down your Holy Spirit upon us and upon these gifts lying before us.”⁹⁴ Here also, the assumption that the gifts are lying *before us* is gratuitous and unwarranted. The Greek text of this phrase in the Epiclesis is exactly the same as the same phrase in the *accessus ad altare* prayer: ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα Δῶρα ταῦτα. The Church-Slavonic version is very slightly different; in the Epiclesis the phrase reads: на подлежащия дары сѣя. The difference is not significant. But one wonders why the identical phrase in Greek (and the virtually identical phrase in Church-Slavonic) should be translated in two different ways. As was written above, *on these gifts here present*⁹⁵ is at least defensible, although not optimal, but *upon these gifts lying before us*⁹⁶ is simply incorrect.

16) The phrase ὀρθοτομούντων (ὀρθοτομοῦντας) τὸν λόγον τῆς σῆς ἀληθείας⁹⁷ occurs twice in the Anaphora, both times with reference to the activity of the bishop(s). The 12 October 2004 draft renders ὀρθοτομούντων (ὀρθοτομοῦντας) *faithfully impart*.⁹⁸ Various translations of the New Testament give this expression as:

⁹³ 12 October 2004 draft, 20, lines 51-52.

⁹⁴ 12 October 2004 draft, 25, lines 49-50.

⁹⁵ 12 October 2004 draft, 21, lines 12-13.

⁹⁶ 12 October 2004 draft, 25, lines 49-50.

⁹⁷ 2 Timothy 2:15.

⁹⁸ 12 October 2004 draft, 27, line 46; 28, line 13.

- a) rightly handling⁹⁹
- b) rightly dividing¹⁰⁰
- c) rightly handling¹⁰¹
- d) kept a straight course¹⁰²
- e) rightly dividing¹⁰³

And some translations of the Divine Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom give these possible equivalents:

- a) rightly dividing¹⁰⁴
- b) rightly dividing¹⁰⁵
- c) rightly dispensing¹⁰⁶
- d) faithfully dispense¹⁰⁷
- e) rightly to define¹⁰⁸
- f) strict in dividing¹⁰⁹

⁹⁹ Douay-Rheims Version

¹⁰⁰ King James Version

¹⁰¹ Revised Standard Version

¹⁰² Jerusalem Bible.

¹⁰³ New King James Version.

¹⁰⁴ *The Liturgies of Ss. Mark, James, Clement, Chrysostom and Basil, and the Church of Malabar*, trans. with introduction and appendices by J.M. Neale and R. F. Littledale, 2nd ed. (London: J. T. Haves, 1869), 117.

¹⁰⁵ *The Divine Liturgies of Our Fathers Among the Saints, John Chrysostom and Basil the Great, with that of the Presanctified...*, ed. with the Greek text by J. N. W. B. Robertson (London: David Nutt, 1894), 306-307.

¹⁰⁶ *Christ With Us* (Stamford, CT, 1954), 100-101 (reference here and elsewhere to the pocket-size edition).

¹⁰⁷ *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1964/65), 36.

¹⁰⁸ *The Divine Liturgy According to Saint John Chrysostom*, Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of America (now the Orthodox Church in America) (New York, 1967 [reprinted 1977]), 70.

¹⁰⁹ *The Divine Liturgy*, ed. and trans. Mitred Archpriest Michael G. H. Gelsinger (1971 mimeographed draft; this unfortunately has not yet been published), unpaginated.

- g) rightly teaching¹¹⁰
- h) rightly dividing¹¹¹
- i) rightly teaching¹¹²
- j) rightly teaching¹¹³
- k) rightly dispensing¹¹⁴

Impart is sufficiently archaic as to seem a trifle odd in a draft which otherwise strives for “modern” English, and in any event the meaning of *impart* is not clearly connected to the Greek or Slavonic term.¹¹⁵ A good choice might well be *rightly dividing*, but in a context of an attempt at “modern” English, *rightly teaching* is probably the best alternative.

17) The 12 October 2004 draft gives the following as the second petition of the synapte with Aitesis which follows the Anaphora and precedes the Lord’s Prayer:

For the precious gifts offered and consecrated, that our God who loves us all may receive them on his holy, heavenly and mystical altar as an aroma of spiritual

¹¹⁰ *The Divine Liturgy of the Great Church...*, rev. and annotated Paul. N. Harrilchak (Reston, VA, 1984), 92.

¹¹¹ *The Liturgikon: The Book of Divine Services for the Priest and Deacon*, Antiochian Orthodox Christian Archdiocese of North America (Antakya Press, 1989), 291.

¹¹² *The Divine Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom, Slavonic Version, A Pan-Orthodox Translation*, draft distributed by Standing Conference of Canonical Orthodox Bishops in America (c. 1995, still unpublished), 28; 27 (Antiochian version); 23 (Greek version).

¹¹³ *The Sacrifice of Praise* (Parma, 1996), 192, 193.

¹¹⁴ *The Divine and Holy Liturgy of our Father among the Saints John Chrysostom*, trans. Archbishop Joseph (Raya) (Alleluia Press, 2001), 69.

¹¹⁵ Etymologically *impart* does have the meaning of dividing or distributing from one’s own abundance, so it is at least defensible – but most people are unlikely to realize that.

fragrance, and send down upon his in return his divine grace and the gift of the Holy Spirit, let us pray.¹¹⁶

This presents more than one problem:

a) the redactors of the draft have conflated two petitions into one. The standard text of the Divine Liturgy, as appears in the 1964/65 translation, renders these two petitions as follows:

For the precious gifts offered and consecrated, let us pray to the Lord.

Response: Lord, have mercy. That our God, in His love for man, may receive them on His holy and heavenly and mystical altar, unto an aroma of spiritual fragrance, may send down upon us in return the divine grace and gift of the Holy Spirit, let us pray to the Lord.

Response: Lord, have mercy.¹¹⁷

In one respect, the 12 October 2004 draft is significantly improved: the end of the longer petition is not “let us pray to the Lord,” but simply “let us pray.”¹¹⁸

But it is not self-evident that conflating the two petitions into one does anything worthwhile, particularly since the Byzantine Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom has been getting along with these two petitions for many centuries without any particular complaint. One could perhaps be forgiven for suggesting that this conflation represents nothing but a desire to have change for the sake of change.

¹¹⁶ 12 October 2004 draft, 29, lines 11-16.

¹¹⁷ *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1964/65), 37.

¹¹⁸ This can easily be verified in any Greek or Slavonic text of the Divine Liturgy.

As noted in the section on so-called “inclusive language,” and as others have also noted, the expression “our God who loves us all” is no adequate euphemism for “our God Who loves mankind” or “our man-befriending God.” It is indisputably true that God loves us all – but in this liturgical context, the question immediately arises as to precisely who is understood to be the antecedent of the first-person plural objective pronoun “us.” Does this refer to “us all” in the sense of the specific assembly here present, or does it refer to all mankind? If one insists on “inclusive language,” it would be theoretically possible to use “our God Who loves humankind,” but that is not normal English. “Our God Who loves humanity” sounds as though God has a preferential option for the New York Subway at rush hour. It certainly does not call to mind a regal virtue, predicated of a King.¹¹⁹

So the best solution here is to restore the two petitions, use a normal form of “Our God, the Lover of men,” and retain the corrected version of the end of the second petition.

18) The final petition of the (optional?) Aitesis before the Lord’s Prayer reads in the 12 October 2004 draft: “For a Christian, painless, unashamed, peaceful end of our life, and for a good account before the fearsome judgement-seat of Christ, let us beseech the Lord.”¹²⁰ Having translated the ending correctly for the second (in normal use, the third) petition of the synapte with aitesis on the previous page,¹²¹ the redactors have left a virtually identical error in place here. The

¹¹⁹ Cf. “Ukrainian Catholics: Four Translations of the Divine Liturgy,” *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 39, nos. 2-4 (1998): 308-314, especially nn. 196, 187, 188, 189, 190 and 191. No one has yet attempted to dispute the meaning of Φιλάνθρωπος suggested here.

¹²⁰ 12 October 2004 draft, 30, lines 1-3.

¹²¹ 12 October 2004 draft, 29, lines 15-16.

end of the petition should read “and for a good account before the fearsome judgement-seat of Christ, let us beseech.”¹²²

19) As mentioned above,¹²³ there is a serious mistranslation in the *incipit* to the Lord’s Prayer.

20) In the Lord’s Prayer itself, the phrase καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν, ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφίεμεν τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν clearly requires the translation “forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors.”¹²⁴ The draft under consideration has used the Protestant translation “forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us.”¹²⁵ The other passage of particular interest in the Lord’s Prayer is the line ῥῶσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ. The “classic” translations, including the *Book of Common Prayer*, the King James Version, Douay-Rheims, and so forth, render this phrase “deliver us from evil.” Many Orthodox prefer “deliver us from the evil one,” and Biblical scholars are coming to agree. The Revised Standard Version gives “deliver us from the evil one” as a variant reading. The Jerusalem Bible gives “save us from the evil one.” The New American Bible gives “deliver us from the evil one.” But the 12 October 2004 draft gives just “deliver us from evil.”¹²⁶

21) According to the 12 October 2004 draft, the Prayer Before Holy Communion includes this paragraph:

O Lord, I also believe and profess that this, which I am about to receive, is truly your most precious body and

¹²² This can easily be verified by reference to any standard Greek or Church-Slavonic edition of the Divine Liturgy.

¹²³ Section 1 of this present chapter.

¹²⁴ “Ukrainian Catholics: Four Translations of the Divine Liturgy,” *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 39, nos. 2-4 (1998): 267-402. Cf. in particular 344-345.

¹²⁵ 12 October 2004 draft, 30, lines 36-37.

¹²⁶ 12 October 2004 draft, 30, line 38.

your life-giving blood, which, I pray, make me worthy to receive for the remission of all my sins and for life everlasting. Amen.¹²⁷

This text is not to be found in the Ruthenian Church-Slavonic version,¹²⁸ nor does it occur in the pre-Nikonian Muscovite version¹²⁹ nor in the series of service-books associated with Saint Peter (Mohyla),¹³⁰ with the exception of the 1712 L'viv edition (the unbowdlerized version), which gives a slightly longer text of this prayer. This text did not appear in the indescribably bad Slovak recasting of the Divine Liturgy published for the Eparchy of Prešov in 1985/86;¹³¹ it also does not appear in the recent Slovak translation of the *Recensio Rutena* Divine Liturgy, which carries the approval of the

¹²⁷ 12 October 2004 draft, 34, lines 23-27.

¹²⁸ *Recensio Rutena* (Rome, 1941), 111-113.

¹²⁹ Old Ritualist text of the Divine Liturgy: *Літургія Святого Іоанна Златоустазо*, Imprimatur of Metropolitan Алыппи, Russian Old Ritualist Orthodox Church ("Pечатник" Typography, Vereshchagino, Russia, Christmas Day [Old Style, of course], A.D. 2002), 95 verso – 96 verso. This edition is a facsimile reprint of an edition done in Moscow in 1911 with the Imprimatur of Archbishop Joseph, and itself reproducing the service-book printed in the fifth year of the pontificate of Patriarch Joseph of Moscow – in other words, shortly before the lamentable Nikon became Patriarch of Moscow. Also cf. *Old Orthodox Prayer Book*, 2nd ed., trans. and ed. Hieromonk German Ciuba, Hieromonk John Berzins, Archpriest Pimen Simon and Priest Theodore Jurewicz, Russian Orthodox Church of the Nativity of Christ (Old Rite) (Erie, PA, 2001), 115-116,

¹³⁰ *Leiturgiarion* (Kiev: Monastery of the Caves, 1639; reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications [Fairfax, VA] and Stauropegion [L'viv and New York], 1996), Divine Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom, 373-375 (Arabic pagination).

¹³¹ *Gréckokatolícky Liturgikon*, Vydal Spolok Sv. Vojtecha v Trnave, pre Gréckokatolícky Biskupsky Úrad v Prešove, v Cirkevnom Nakladateľstve Bratislava, Czechoslovakia, 1986, Imprimatur No. 800/85, Prešov, 27 August 1985, Mons. Jan Hirka, ordinar – apostolic administrator. Evidently Msgr. Hirka failed to realize that an administrator does not innovate. Cf. Communion prayers on page 41-42. This book was universally deplored and was eventually withdrawn from use.

Oriental Congregation.¹³² It can be found in the “*Missale Ruthenum*” of 1905, but with a prefatory rubric saying “*Add this prayer if you so desire.*”¹³³ Although it was suppressed in the 1941 Roman edition of the Ruthenian Liturgicon, as noted above, in 1953 Bishop Daniel (Ivancho), Apostolic Exarch of Pittsburgh, requested a *temporary* dispensation to continue using this prayer.¹³⁴ The Sacred Congregation for the Eastern Churches granted this particular dispensation, but with the phrase “*tollerare provvisoriamente.*”¹³⁵ That which is “provisionally tolerated” has no standing in law. In any event, this dispensation has long since lapsed, because it was given in view of an expected implementation of the official service-book and the *Ordo Celebrationis* which did not materialize for reasons described in another chapter, and because more than fifty years have gone by since the dispensation was given. An English translation of this peculiar prayer appears in the 1964/65 Pittsburgh translation of the Divine Liturgy, without any indication of the provisional character which would affect its use.¹³⁶

¹³² Svätá Božská Liturgia Nášho Otca Svätého Jána Zlatousteho – this was received over the Internet, without publication data or pagination.

¹³³ *Leiturgikon* (L’viv: Stauropegion, 1905; offset reprint Mundare, Alberta, undated [during World War II]), 313.

¹³⁴ Cf. “Letter of His Excellency, Bishop Daniel Ivancho, to His Eminence Eugene Cardinal Tisserant, Dated October 31, 1953,” Latin original followed by English translation, *Ordo Celebrationis*, Pittsburgh 1954 English translation, xiv – xix; cited passage on xvi (in Latin) and xix (in English translation); Fairfax 1996 English translation, 116-119, cited passage on 119.

¹³⁵ Sacra Congregatio “Pro Ecclesia Orientali,” Prot. N. 908/48, 27 November 1953, “A Sua Eccellenza Mons. Daniel Ivancho Esarca Apostolica,” Italian original followed by English translation, *Ordo Celebrationis*, Pittsburgh 1954 English translation, xx - xxiii; cited passage on xxi (in Italian) and xxiii (in English translation); Fairfax 1996 English translation, 120-122; cited passage on 121.

¹³⁶ *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1964/65), 42.

The 12 October 2004 draft does not appear to assign any footnote to this prayer, nor to give any indication that this prayer is *not* in the official text of the Divine Liturgy. To be frank, it seems to be well time that this prayer should no longer appear at all. But if, for whatever reason or reasons, either the commission or the hierarchs consider that the prayer should continue to appear, the least that should be done is to set the prayer off in brackets or in a text box, with a footnote to indicate its provisional status.

22) The Πληρωθήτω (Да исполнятся) chant after Holy Communion has two inaccuracies in the translation:

a) The draft under consideration reads “May our mouth be filled.”¹³⁷ The Greek text is στόμα, which does indeed mean mouth, and in the singular at that.¹³⁸ One might perhaps argue that in English, at any rate, mouth in this context should be in the plural, but de gustibus non est disputandum. However, the Church-Slavonic text is оу̑ста,¹³⁹ which is related to the Greek

¹³⁷ 12 October 2004 draft, 36, line 49.

¹³⁸ Liddell and Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 1648 col. b and 1649 col. a.

¹³⁹ Pre-Nikonian Old Ritualist text of the Divine Liturgy: *Литургия Святого Иоанна Златоустаго*, Imprimatur of Metropolitan Алыпυι, Russian Old Ritualist Orthodox Church (“Pечатnik” Typography, Vereshchagino, Russia, Christmas Day [Old Style, of course], A.D. 2002), 95 verso – 102 verso. This edition is a facsimile reprint of an edition done in Moscow in 1911 with the Imprimatur of Archbishop Joseph, and itself reproducing the service-book printed in the fifth year of the pontificate of Patriarch Joseph of Moscow – in other words, shortly before the lamentable Nikon became Patriarch of Moscow. Also cf. *Old Orthodox Prayer Book*, 2nd ed., trans. and ed. Hieromonk German Ciuba, Hieromonk John Berzins, Archpriest Pimen Simon and Priest Theodore Jurewicz, Russian Orthodox Church of the Nativity of Christ (Old Rite) (Erie, PA, 2001), 117; Old Kyivan *Leiturgiarion* (Kiev: Monastery of the Caves, 1639; reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications [Fairfax, VA] and Stauropegion [L’viv and New York], 1996), Divine Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom, 393 (Arabic pagination); Nikonian Muscovite *Служебникъ* vol. 1, Издание Московской Патриархии (1977), 169; “*Missale Ruthenum*”

στόμα but means “lips.”¹⁴⁰ Hence the better translation reflecting the Church-Slavonic text is that of the earlier Ruthenian translation: “May our lips be filled.”¹⁴¹

b) In the same chant, the draft under consideration gives the text “Your holy, divine, immortal, pure, and life-creating mysteries.”¹⁴² The word ἀχράντων¹⁴³ occurs in the Greek *textus receptus*,¹⁴⁴ but neither a Slavonic equivalent of this term nor the Slavonic word *pure* occur in the pre-Nikonian Muscovite Church-Slavonic text,¹⁴⁵ nor in the Nikonian Church-Slavonic text,¹⁴⁶ nor in the Ruthenian Church-Slavonic text from Rome.¹⁴⁷ Hence the word *pure* should be omitted if the translators wish to be faithful to the official Ruthenian Church-Slavonic text; this word does not occur in the previous Ruthenian translation.¹⁴⁸ This word *does* occur

ΛΕΙΤΟΥΡΓΙΟΝ (L'viv, 1905), 315; *Recensio Rutena* (Rome, 1941), 118. Other Church-Slavonic editions could easily be cited.

¹⁴⁰ Diachenko, *Полный Церковно-Славянскій Словарь*, vol. 2 (Moscow, 1899), 762 col. b. Cf. *Oxford Russian Dictionary*, 3rd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 90 col. b and *Ukrainian-English Dictionary*, ed. M. L. Podvesko (1962, no other publication data), 211 col. a

¹⁴¹ *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1964/65), 44.

¹⁴² 12 October 2004 draft, 36, lines 51-52.

¹⁴³ Ἀχράντος means *undefiled* or *immaculate*. Cf. Liddell and Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 297 col. b.

¹⁴⁴ *The Divine Liturgies of Our Fathers Among the Saints, John Chrysostom and Basil the Great, with that of the Presanctified...*, ed. with the Greek text by J. N. W. B. Robertson (London: David Nutt, 1894), 330-331. It would be well worth reprinting this now-rare book.

¹⁴⁵ *Old Orthodox Prayer Book*, 2nd ed., trans. and ed. Hieromonk German Ciuba, Hieromonk John Berzins, Archpriest Pimen Simon and Priest Theodore Jurewicz, Russian Orthodox Church of the Nativity of Christ (Old Rite) (Erie, PA, 2001), 117.

¹⁴⁶ *Служебникъ*, vol. 1, Издание Московской Патриархии (1977), 169.

¹⁴⁷ *Recensio Rutena* (Rome, 1941), 118.

¹⁴⁸ *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1964/65), 44.

in the Old Kyivan text¹⁴⁹ and in the text found in the standard compendium of Transcarpathian Church-Slavonic liturgical chant.¹⁵⁰ If the commission is interested in restoring the Old Kyivan textual tradition, that would be of considerable interest, but this is the first trace found of such a goal in the 12 October 2004 draft.

23) This seems strange, and is both inaccurate and (potentially) annoying. The draft under consideration gives this invocation for the dead: “In blessed repose, grant, O Lord, eternal rest to your departed servant(s) and remember (him-her-them) forever,”¹⁵¹ to which the assembly should reply “Eternal memory...”¹⁵² In these few words there are two problems.

In Church-Slavonic (Вѣчная Память) the invocation ends with the same words as the response,¹⁵³ so that the one leads into the other quite naturally; this is familiar to anyone who has ever sung that response. But in the present draft the invocation ends “remember (him-her-them) forever,” while response remains “Eternal memory....” Confusion is the likely result.

Moreover, the meaning of the invocation is altered. The intention here is not to ask God to remember someone eternally (that prayer is expressed elsewhere in the Requiem services) but to ask God to grant that the memory of this

¹⁴⁹ *Leiturgiaron* (Kiev: Monastery of the Caves, 1639; reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications [Fairfax, VA] and Stauropegion [L'viv and New York], 1996), 393 (Arabic pagination).

¹⁵⁰ Бокшай и Малиничъ, Церковное Простопѣніе (Užhorod, 1906 [reprint by Pittsburgh Byzantine Diocesan Press, 1950, Lisle, IL]), 181 # 3.

¹⁵¹ 12 October 2004 draft, 40, lines 29-31.

¹⁵² 12 October 2004 draft, 40, lines 33-34.

¹⁵³ *Recensio Rutena* (Rome, 1941), 150.

person should be eternal – in other words, that he should inhabit the Kingdom of Heaven.

This has happened because of the decision to alter the text of the invocation, and it can be resolved by restoring that text to “grant him eternal memory,” which will again lead naturally into the response, and will not alter the meaning.

CONCLUSION

Inevitably there will be those who disagree on one or another of the points raised. But clearly there are a sufficient number of points of genuine significance¹⁵⁴ to demonstrate that the 12 October 2004 draft cannot be considered accurate, let alone definitive.

¹⁵⁴ Obviously, each individual point is not of the same degree of significance as every other point.

QUESTIONABLE TRANSLATIONS
IN THE 12 OCTOBER 2004 DRAFT

There is, of course, no perfect translation. Among other things, translation, particularly translation of liturgical texts, is an art as well as a science. Involved with the process one will always find such factors as the choice of the functional variety of the receptor language, the desirability of using certain expressions or turns of phrase which may have become traditional, and the need to determine the literary quality of a proposed wording in the receptor language. These are often matters of taste. Taste and beauty are not to be despised, but they cannot be measured with scientific accuracy.

In addition, the simplest words often have more than one meaning. Those who composed and elaborated the Byzantine liturgical tradition knew this, and put it to good use, frequently employing plays on words. This poses difficult problems – sometimes even insolvable problems – for translators of these texts.¹

Moreover, words change their meaning (even in so-called “dead” languages). The Greek of the Byzantine liturgical corpus ranges all the way from classical Greek, through the Greek of the Septuagint, through what is called *koine*, through Patristic Greek, well into the second millennium. As a result, attempting to discern the precise meaning of a particular word or phrase can present a pretty puzzle.

Even mistakes sometimes become “canonized” by long usage. The very word “Orthodox” is an important example of

¹ The Akathistos Hymn to the Holy Theotokos is a well known case in point, replete with plays on words which defy translation.

this process. Father Archimandrite Robert Taft enjoys remarking that the common idea in the Eastern Churches that “Orthodox” means “right glory” is a misunderstanding. He is unquestionably right if the discussion is confined to etymology. But therein lies the rub; the question is *not* confined to etymology in this instance, because a great many respected authors have used the word in the sense which Father Archimandrite Robert deplores, so that meaning also must now be taken into account.

As indicated in the previous chapter of this study, the 12 October 2004 draft has a number of serious inaccuracies in the proposed text. There are also a number of translations which can be questioned. Some of these are perennial questions; other are newly appeared in the 12 October 2004 draft. In each case raised below there is an attempt to provide some analysis of the question or questions, and sometimes an attempt to provide what may be better ways to express the word or phrase in English. The best is often the enemy of the good, but while things are in the draft stage, it is entirely appropriate to strive for the best. The specific words or phrases are as follows:

1) Θεοφιλεστάτος is in classical Greek a flowery and flattering epithet with no serious meaning. The word itself can be analysed to mean “beloved of God” or for that matter “beloved of the gods,” which is how it is used in classical Greek.² So far as Christians are concerned, that sense of the word is pointless, because God loves all men. This consideration may explain why the expression has almost passed out of use in liturgical Byzantine Greek – it is found in some editions of the service book as an adjective for the bishop, but one does not often hear the term used in that way, unless perhaps it is included in a Polychronion or other solemn commemoration for the sake of sonority.

² Cf. Liddell and Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 792 col. a.

Θεοφιλεστατος, however, can also have the meaning of “God-loving,” and when the Slavs borrowed this word and reconstructed it in Church-Slavonic (in which it becomes Боголюбивый), that is the meaning which they ascribed to it. The standard Church-Slavonic dictionary³ defines Боголюбивый as исполненный любви къ Богу, which means “filled with love towards God.” That is how translators have consistently understood Slavic texts which apply this epithet to the bishop – it is usually rendered in English “God-loving.” This has the virtue of fidelity to the Slavonic understanding of the term, and of giving the term a serious meaning – while it is theologically certain that God loves all men, it is far from certain that all men love God.

Describing the bishop, then, as the 12 October 2004 draft does, with the phrase “whom God loves” seems a pedantic return to an antiquated meaning of the term and accomplishes nothing. Catherine Tkacz has cogently remarked:

Regarding the phrase naming the bishop, “God-loving” is obviously not the same as “whom God loves.” Describing the bishop as “God-loving” is an affirmation that we, the faithful and the celebrant leading us, trust the bishop to be our pastor, because he loves God. God loves everyone, so there is no special reason to say that He loves the bishop. Frankly, the change rather suggests that the Church is not going to commit itself to asserting that any given bishop loves God; that has to mean that the orthodoxy of any given bishop may be suspect. But that kind of hedging of bets does not belong in the liturgy. We do not, after all sing “Maybe we praise you, maybe we bless you” or “Some of us praise you, some of us bless you.” Liturgy

³ Diachenko, *Полный Церковно-Славянскій Словарь* (Moscow, 1899), 51.

is to transform the faithful through time into saints,
and theosis is for bishops as well.⁴

2) An article published in 1998⁵ reports that Archbishop Alexis (van der Mensbrugghe) of Dusseldorf, “became convinced that Εὐλογημένη ἡ Βασιλεία⁶ should properly be translated “Blessed is the Kingship.”⁷ In defense of this view, Archbishop Alexis cited⁸ Apocalypse 1:6, καὶ ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς Βασιλεῖς καὶ ἱερεῖς τῷ Θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ. Kyr Alexis did not have much success convincing others of this; he did not take Mark 11:10 into account, and Nestle gives a preferred variation of Apocalypse 1:6: καὶ ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς Βασιλείαν, καὶ τῷ Θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ, which supports the customary “Blessed is the Kingdom.” However, Archimandrite Ephrem’s observation during the Stamford Symposium that in the phrase “when You come in Your Kingdom” Βασιλεια really means “kingly power” could well give Archbishop Alexis’s position substantial support.” A good friend, keenly interested in these matters, has recently remarked that a strong consciousness of God’s *kingship* in our lives is becoming increasingly characteristic of Evangelical Christians, so that this translation of the phrase might well become a serious

⁴ “The Byzantine Catholic Church in the New Millennium,” 28 April 2005, Catherine Brown Tkacz.

⁵ “Ukrainian Catholics: Four Translations of the Divine Liturgy,” *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 39, nos. 2-4 (1998): 267-402. Cf in particular 322.

⁶ Mark 11:10.

⁷ *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father among the Saints John Chrysostom, an English version of its Euchology*, Alexis, Bishop of Philadelphia (Philadelphia, 1969; unpublished manuscript; photocopy in possession of the present writer), 8. The Archbishop came to America in 1967 and produced his 1969 translation with the intention of publishing it for use in the United States. There is also in the possession of the present writer a photocopy of an earlier unpublished manuscript translation by Archbishop Alexis; in this earlier version, which unfortunately has no date, Εὐλογημένη ἡ Βασιλεία is originally translated “Blessed is the kingdom” but Archbishop Alexis, in his own handwriting, corrected it to read “Blessed is the Kingship”.

⁸ In conversations with the present writer and others.

point of contact between ourselves and the Evangelicals. Perhaps others will consider this idea and add their own thoughts in the matter.

3) The petition of the Great Synapte for the government and the armed forces omits all reference to the possibility of a monarchy⁹ and bowdlerizes the armed forces into “all in the service of our country,” so that the entire petition reads: “For our government and for all in the service of our country, let us pray to the Lord.”¹⁰ The same problem arises each time the 12 October 2004 draft must cope with the prayer for the government and the armed forces. Contrast this with the same petition in the 1964/65 translation: “For our civil authorities (for our divinely-protected Emperor N. or King N.) and all our armed forces, let us pray to the Lord,” which is reasonably accurate.¹¹

4) In the optional petitions for the dead the phrase “where all the saints and just repose” occurs.¹² The same phrase occurs in the 1964/65 translation.¹³ However, *just* is not the best choice; δίκαιοι has a broader meaning and is better translated as *righteous*.¹⁴

5) Although the 12 October 2004 draft presents its version of the Divine Liturgy as one or more priests would serve with a deacon, the translators seem to have an aversion to the term

⁹ Which is strange, since Australia, Canada and England are all English-speaking monarchies (with the same person as monarch) and there are dioceses of Byzantine Catholics in each of these countries).

¹⁰ 12 October 2004 draft, 3, lines 13-14.

¹¹ *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1964/65), 15. The only difference between this text of the petition and the original Church-Slavonic is that in Church-Slavonic the mention of the Emperor or King comes first, with the “republican” alternative following in brackets as an option.

¹² 12 October 2004 draft, 3 line 47.

¹³ 12 October 2004 draft, 16.

¹⁴ Cf. Liddell and Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 429 col. a.

“priest.”¹⁵ In most of the rubrics, “celebrant” replaces “priest.”¹⁶ Neither the original Greek¹⁷ nor the Church-Slavonic¹⁸ texts justify the use of the term “celebrant” in this way. In some instances this unusual term may appear in an effort to clarify what is to be done when several priests serve together, but that information does not normally appear in the rubrics of the *Liturgicon*. The 12 October 2004 draft appears to insist that the senior priest must give all the blessings himself, but in practice there is no reason not to permit the senior priest to invite one or another of the other priests serving with him to give this or that shorter blessing. There is nothing in the *Ordo Celebrationis* which restricts such a practice.¹⁹

6) In the fourth petition of the Great Synapte and elsewhere the 12 October 2004 draft²⁰ translates οἶκος (Greek: *house*; Church-Slavonic храмъ, which means *temple*) with *church*.²¹ Not only is this inaccurate, it is also confusing – those who will hear these texts read aloud or chanted will have difficulty distinguishing the Church from the local worship edifice.

¹⁵ In the prayer-texts, the word “priest” occurs on 33, 34, 38 and 40. In the rubrics, the word “priest” occurs on 20, 35, 39, 40 and 42.

¹⁶ 12 October 2004 draft, 2 (3 times), 4 (3 times), 5 (twice), 7 (6 times), 8 (8 times), 9 (4 times), 10 (5 times), 11 (6 times), 12 (8 times), 13 (3 times), 14 (3 times), 15 (twice), 16 (5 times), 17 (3 times), 18 (8 times), 19 (7 times), 29 (9 times), 21 (8 times), 22 (3 times), 23 (8 times), 24 (8 times), 25 (14 times), 26 (10 times), 27 (3 times), 28 (9 times), 30 (7 times), 31 (6 times), 32 (10 times), 33 (9 times), 34 (3 times), 35 (7 times), 36 (7 times), 37 (9 times), 38 (7 times) and 39 (6 times).

¹⁷ In Greek the relevant word as used in the *Ieratikon* is ἱερεὺς.

¹⁸ In Church-Slavonic the relevant word as used in the *Recensio Rutena* books is Іерей.

¹⁹ When several bishops serve together, it is not unusual for the senior bishop to invite the other bishops also to give blessings more-or-less by turns. If a bishop is *not* serving but is present at the Divine Liturgy, it is normal for the priest who is serving to pronounce the words of the blessing, but for the bishop to bestow the blessing with his own hands.

²⁰ 12 October 2004 draft, 3, line 1 and elsewhere.

²¹ The 1964/65 translation does the same.

7) The commission which produced the 1964/65 translation was committed to “modern English,”²² and evidently so is the commission which produced the 12 October 2004 draft. Trouble is apt to arise as a result. In any number of places in Scriptural and liturgical texts, one is apt to find the expression “Thou who didst...” or “Thou who hast...” In Greek this is accomplished by a grammatical construction; in Church-Slavonic this often involves the use of *Иже*. The 1964/65 translation and many others tried in some places to cope with this by using the form “You, who promised...”²³ “You, who alone are gracious”²⁴ “You Who are seated on high...”²⁵ but in American English this has an unpleasant sound.²⁶ The 12 October 2004 draft has managed to eliminate most of these “yoo-hoos,” but retains the example in the Prayer of the Cherubikon.²⁷ The combination of the repudiation of the second person singular and the reluctance to allow the dreaded “yoo-hoo” often changes the meaning of the texts altered to suit the fashion.

8) In the Beatitudes,²⁸ the word *shall* normally occurs seven times. In each instance, the draft changes *shall* to *will*. Has the word *shall* been deleted from the English language in the past four decades?

²² “Modern English” is a category of discussion which defies definition, but seems to exclude the second person singular forms of the English language.

²³ *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1964/65), 19, prayer of the Third Antiphon.

²⁴ *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1964/65), 26, prayer during the Cherubic Hymn.

²⁵ *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1964/65), 39, prayer before the elevation.

²⁶ Many people complain that the sound resembles the slang expression “Yoo-hoo!” A certain active and productive translator of liturgical texts from Church-Slavonic into hieratic English refers to the proponents of “modern English” for such a purpose as “the yoo-hoo-ers”!

²⁷ 12 October 2004 draft, 17, line 42.

²⁸ 12 October 2004 draft, 7, lines 5 – 22.

9) The blessing of the Little Entrance in this draft reads “Blessed is the entrance into your holy of holies, always, now and ever and forever.”²⁹ A better translation might be “into Your Holy Place” (the Holy Place and the Holy of Holies are two distinct locations in the Temple – or, to be more precise, the Holy of Holies is a distinct portion of the Holy Place).

10) Translating the Greek word Ὁρθοί (Church-Slavonic прѡсти) into any vernacular language is apt to be a challenge, but “Be attentive” certainly will not do. The draft translates the same Greek (and Church-Slavonic) original as “let us stand,”³⁰ which is an improvement, and “Arise!”³¹ which is the best of the three alternatives that the draft offers.

11) The last phrase before the Ecphonesis of the prayer of the Trisagion reads in Greek τῶν ἀπ’ αἰῶνός σοι εὐαρεστησάντων and in Church-Slavonic отъ вѣка Тебѣ благоугодившихъ, which could be translated correctly into English *who have pleased Thee from the ages*. The 1964/65 translation gives *who have pleased You from the beginning of time*³² and the draft under consideration gives *who have pleased you since time began*.³³ Why does the commission dislike the word *ages* in this context?

12) In the blessing of the deacon just before the Gospel, the 1964/65 translation³⁴ and the 12 October 2004 draft have the priest say *the holy, glorious and illustrious apostle*.³⁵ The Greek word which the 12 October 2004 draft inaccurately translates as *illustrious* does occur in the Church-Slavonic texts,³⁶ it does

²⁹ 12 October 2004 draft, 8, lines 18-19.

³⁰ 12 October 2004 draft, 12, line 18.

³¹ 12 October 2004 draft, 37, line 12.

³² *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1964/65), 21.

³³ 12 October 2004 draft, 9.

³⁴ *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1964/65), 22.

³⁵ 12 October 2004 draft, 12, line 2.

³⁶ *Recensio Rutena* (Rome, 1941), 55.

not occur in the Greek editions at this point, so the problem will be discussed at greater length in the context of the Anaphora, where the Greek word and its Church-Slavonic calque are to be found in most editions in those languages.

13) “Homily” is a word which does not occur in the Church-Slavonic or Greek text of the Divine Liturgy. It does not appear in the *Ordo Celebrationis* either. Yet the 12 October 2004 draft gives the word “homily” in capital letters after the Gospel, and then adds the phrase “after the homily” to the following rubric. In itself this is something of a problem; it would indicate that there must be a “homily” at every Divine Liturgy. The real point, however, is linguistic. Such a careless change raises a question: does whoever added this word know what a homily actually is and what distinguishes a homily from a sermon?

14) In the first prayer of the faithful, the 12 October 2004 draft gives this phrase: “Enable us, whom you have placed in this your *ministry*...”³⁷ Apart from capitalizations, this reproduces exactly the wording of the 1964/65 Ruthenian translation.³⁸ In accepting this wording, the commission which produced the 12 October 2004 draft has accepted a problem. *Ministry* in English, particularly American English,³⁹ is apt to be understood as a reference to the Protestant ministry. Hence, while “ministry” is not hopelessly incorrect, there are other possible words available which will better translate the Greek and avoid this confusion.

³⁷ 12 October 2004 draft, 17, lines 1-2.

³⁸ *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1964/65), 26.

³⁹ Outside the USA, “ministry” is a word normally used to mean a government department – yet another reason to avoid this word in ecclesiastical use.

The Greek text reads εἰς τὴν διακονίαν σου ταυτην... Διακονία means *service*;⁴⁰ the word occurs in the Septuagint⁴¹ with that meaning and also in the New Testament.⁴²

The Church-Slavonic text in this instance reads и удовли насъ, ихже положилъ еси въ службу Твою сїю...служба means, quite simply, *service*, which is entirely consistent with the Greek original. So the best translation is “Enable us, whom Thou hast placed in this, Thy service...” Robinson gives “Enable us, whom thou hast appointed unto this thy service...”⁴³ The Orthodox Church in America’s translation gives “And enable us also, whom Thou hast placed in this, Thy service...”⁴⁴ Anything along those lines will be adequate and accurate.

15) A similar problem arises in the first sentence of the priest’s prayer during the Cherubicon. The text of the 12 October 2004 draft is “No one who is bound... or to *minister* to you, the King of Glory, for to *minister* to you is great and awesome...”⁴⁵ The 1964/65 Ruthenian version is virtually identical.⁴⁶ But the problem is more complicated. The Greek text uses two different verbs: ἡ λειτουργεῖν σοι, βασιλεῦ τῆς δόξης· το

⁴⁰ *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint, Part I, A – I*, compiled by Lust, Eynikel and Hauspie (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1992), 104 col. a.

⁴¹ I Maccabees 11:58.

⁴² Acts 6:1 and 4. Cf. Liddell and Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 398 col. a. Also Hebrews 1:14 et al.; cf. *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint, Part II, K – Ω*, compiled by Lust, Eynikel and Hauspie (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1996), 137b –138a.

⁴³ *The Divine Liturgies of Our Fathers Among the Saints, John Chrysostom and Basil the Great, with that of the Presanctified...*, ed. with the Greek text by J. N. W. B. Robertson (London: David Nutt, 1894), 273.

⁴⁴ *The Divine Liturgy According to Saint John Chrysostom*, Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of America (now the Orthodox Church in America) (New York, 1967 [reprinted 1977]), 50.

⁴⁵ 12 October 2004 draft, 17, lines 31-32.

⁴⁶ *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1964/65), 28.

γὰρ διακονεῖν σοι μέγα καὶ φοβερόν...Λειτουργεῖν is an interesting word, which at the root means to engage in any sort of public work, service or function.⁴⁷ (A colleague who teaches Liturgy professionally was once quite fascinated to find, in an Athens hotel, a metal plate posting the directions for how to use the self-service elevator; the term λειτουργία was employed for this purpose, in a context where the word did not have the slightest “religious” significance.) In the Septuagint this word refers to a public, religious or liturgical service (particularly of a priest).⁴⁸ In the New Testament this meaning is retained, and thus passes into patristic use.⁴⁹ The Church-Slavonic text of this phrase translates *both* Greek verbs as *служити*,⁵⁰ which simply means *to serve*.⁵¹ This is correct for the second verb, but inadequate for the first. After consulting several existing translations translate λειτουργεῖν σοι as *to offer You the Liturgy* seems the best alternative. This is something of an evasion,⁵² but at least offers the possibility of further explanation in catechesis.⁵³ Διακονεῖν σοι then becomes *to serve Thee*. That leaves the lesser problem of the word “awesome.” The Greek word is φοβερόν, which the Church-Slavonic translates as *страшно*. Φοβερόν appears in

⁴⁷ Cf. Liddell and Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 1036b – 1037a.

⁴⁸ Exodus 37:19: “So that the λειτουργία should belong to the Levites, through Ithamar the son of Aaron the priest”; Number 4:24; Cf. *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint, Part II, K – Ω*, compiled by Lust, Eynikel and Hauspie (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1996), 279 col. a.

⁴⁹ Cf. Thayer’s *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI, n.d.), 875b – 876a.

⁵⁰ *Recensio Rutena* (Rome, 1941), 70.

⁵¹ This verb remains in use in modern Russian and modern Ukrainian, and need not have any religious connotation.

⁵² Though it’s probably better than “to liturgize to You,” which one version gives.

⁵³ Cf. *The Divine Liturgy of the Great Church...*, rev. and annotated Paul. N. Harrilchak (Reston, VA, 1984), 67b n. 3.

the Septuagint and means *fearful, terrible* or *dreadful*.⁵⁴ In the New Testament φοβερόν means *inspiring fear, terrible, formidable*.⁵⁵ “Awesome” here is ridiculous – in the strict sense; the word may provoke ridicule. The word is far too weak. *Fear of the Lord* is one of the Gifts of the Holy Spirit,⁵⁶ but of recent decades some people seem strangely reluctant to refer to “fear” as a proper attitude towards God.⁵⁷ Moreover, “awesome” has become a slang term and is likely to be read in that way – which is why it might provoke ridicule. So the whole phrase might read: “to offer the Liturgy to you, the King of Glory, for to serve you is great and fearful...”

16) Further in the prayer of the Cherubicon, the 12 October 2004 draft reads: “who alone are holy and dwell in the holy sanctuary.”⁵⁸ The Greek original is ἐν Ἁγίοις ἀναπαυόμενος. The Church-Slavonic translation⁵⁹ is во святыхъ почиваяй. This could be translated in one of three ways: “who alone are holy and rest among the Saints,” “who alone are holy and rest in the Holy Place” or “who alone are holy and rest in the Holy of Holies.” The 1964/65 text reads: “who alone are holy and dwell in the saints.”⁶⁰

⁵⁴ Genesis 28:17; Deuteronomy 1:19; 2:7; 8:15; 10:17, Isaias 21:1; Wisdom 10:16. Cf. *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint, Part II, K – Ω*, compiled by Lust, Eynikel and Hauspie (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1996), 505 col. b.

⁵⁵ Hebrews 10:27, 31; 12:21. Cf. *Thayer’s Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI, n.d.), 655 col. b.

⁵⁶ Isaias 11:2; *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, English translation (Dublin: Veritas, 1994), § 1831.

⁵⁷ Perhaps they have been overly inspired by Franklin D. Roosevelt’s famous expression during World War II: “We have nothing to fear but fear itself!”

⁵⁸ 12 October 2004 draft, 17, lines 40-41.

⁵⁹ *Recensio Rutena* (Rome, 1941), 70-71.

⁶⁰ *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1964/65), 28.

The point is that God dwells in the Holy Place, or the Holy of Holies. In the context of that particular prayer, this phrase, ἐν Ἁγίοις ἀναπαυόμενος, indicates the abiding presence of God in the Holy of Holies (which is a sub-division of the Holy Place).

17) Again in the Prayer of the Cherubicon, the draft under consideration reads “nor exclude me from among your children.” The original reads: μηδὲ ἀποδοκιμάσης με ἐκ παίδων σου. Παῖς can certainly mean a child. But it can also mean a slave or a servant, and the context of the phrase in this prayer makes it reasonable to assume that *servant* is the intended meaning.⁶¹ The Church-Slavonic word Огрокъ is a direct translation of παῖς and is equally ambiguous.⁶²

18) In the Anaphora the draft under consideration gives this translation for the Ecphonesis following the Institution Narrative: *Offering you your own, from your own, always and everywhere*.⁶³

The first part of this Ecphonesis, restoring the participle to its proper use, is most welcome. But the final part of the Ecphonesis is a problem. Κατὰ πάντα καὶ διὰ πάντα – ω всѣхъ и за вся – is *hapax legomenon*, so far as present-day scholars know, which makes it difficult to determine the meaning. The editors of the draft under consideration have used *always and everywhere*, which seems to have appeared first in the versions of New Skete,⁶⁴ inspired, according to one commentator, by “a hypothesis of Raes.”⁶⁵

⁶¹ Cf. Liddell and Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 1289 col. a; *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint, Part II, K – Ω*, compiled by Lust, Eynikel and Hauspie (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1996), 347 cols a-b; *Thayer’s Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI, n.d.), 473 b – 474 a.

⁶² Diachenko, *Полный Церковно-Славянскій Словарь* (Moscow, 1899), 397 b – 398 a.

⁶³ 12 October 2004 draft, 25, lines 36-37.

⁶⁴ *The Ritual of Ordination to the Priesthood According to the Byzantine Rite* [including Pontifical Divine Liturgy] (1968), 35. [This booklet was

It is best to strive for the simplest possible translation and leave questions of interpretation open. *In behalf of all and for all* comes closest to that suggestion; *in all and for all* is a trifle more elegant, in the strict sense of the term.⁶⁶

19) There is a disagreement about a phrase in the Epiclesis. The *textus receptus* reads Ὡστε γενέσθαι τοῖς μεταλαμβάνουσιν εἰς νῆψιν ψυχῆς, which means *that they may be to those who partake unto sobriety of soul*. Some authorities maintain that this is inaccurate, and that the word underlined is actually νῆψιν, in which case the phrase means *that they may be to those who partake unto purification of soul*.⁶⁷ According to Father Archimandrite Robert Taft⁶⁸ this reading is supported by the ancient Georgian translation of the Liturgy.⁶⁹

Father Paul Harrilchak offers this explanation:

printed for the ordination of Father Alexei Michalenko, M.I.C. by Bishop Andrew of Nauplia, and notes on the title page *verso* that “Translation based on text by Father Laurence, New Skete, Cambridge, New York.”] *The Divine Liturgy*, trans., arranged, and published by the Monks of New Skete (Cambridge, NY, 1987), 106. This particular phrase was used in celebrations at New Skete in the late nineteen-sixties.

⁶⁵ *The Divine Liturgy of the Great Church*, rev., annotated and set to the melodies by Paul N. Harrilchak (Reston, VA, 1984), 86 n. m.

⁶⁶ “Ukrainian Catholics: Four Translations of the Divine Liturgy,” *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 39, nos. 2-4 (1998): 339.

⁶⁷ Father Juan Mateos, S.J. defends this thesis in “L’Action du Saint-Esprit dans la liturgie dite de S. Jean Chrysostome,” *Proche-Orient Chrétien* 9 (1959): 193-208; cf. particularly 200.

⁶⁸ Robert F. Taft, S.J., *A History of the Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom*, vol. 5, *the Pre-Communion Rites*, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 261 (Rome, 2000), 114-115. The learned author refers to his previous article “The Fruits of Communion in the Anaphora of St. John Chrysostom” in I. Scicolone, ed., *Psallendum. Miscellanea di studi in onore del Prof. Jordi Pinell i Pons, O.S.B.*, *Analecta Liturgica* 15 (= *Studia Anselmiana* 105) (Rome, 1992), 275-302, particularly 286-288.

⁶⁹ For this information, Taft refers to A. Jacob, “Une version géorgienne inédite de la Liturgie de S. Jean Chrysostome,” *Le Muséon* 77 (1964): 65-117, particularly 108.

Greek: $\nu\eta\psi\iota\nu$ $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta\varsigma$ (sobriety or wakefulness of soul) is meaningless in this context, already in the VIII/IX-century Codex Barbarinus, it is probably an ancient copyist's error. The Syrian Antiochian Archdiocese (1960), followed by the Orthodox Church in America (1967) corrects to $\nu\iota\psi\iota\nu$ $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta\varsigma$ [Syrian Antiochian Archdiocese: cleansing of soul; Orthodox Church in America: purification of soul;⁷⁰ Abba Laurence⁷¹ (1965 and 1978) agrees]. Our rendering is intended to evoke that concrete image of the Lord's love found in Jn. 13:1-20, the washing of the disciples' feet. Therein the connection of $\nu\iota\psi\iota\nu$ (washing) with the Mystical Supper and the Eucharist is established, even though John never recounts the institution of the Eucharist. O[scar] Cullman reads John as using the foot-washing to express important Eucharistic doctrine. Summarizing his exegesis: the Lord Jesus's Eucharistic $\nu\iota\psi\iota\varsigma$ is a partial washing, and repeatable; the propriety of and need for which Jesus Christ insists on, while contrasting it with the total and unrepeatable cleansing of Baptism. Effects of this washing (which Simon Peter at first refuses) are cleansing, and loving fellowship with (Revised Standard Version: part in) the Lord Jesus Christ and his disciples (exactly what the Consecration is describing at this point). [See Cullman, *Early Christian Worship*, pp. 105-110. He defends the received Greek text of Jn. 13:10 rejected by Bultmann, the New English Bible, and the Jerusalem Bible.] Like other instances of ancient liturgical language, "washing of soul" is paired with a less ancient explanatory gloss,

⁷⁰ *The Divine Liturgy According to Saint John Chrysostom*, Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of America (now the Orthodox Church in America) (New York, 1967 [reprinted 1977]), 67.

⁷¹ At the time that Father Paul was writing, Father Laurence (Mancuso) was Superior of New Skete, a *sui generis* monastery of the Orthodox Church in America in upstate New York. Father Laurence was an active translator and reformer of the Liturgy and in several places it appears that Father Paul was influenced by Father Laurence's ideas and praxis.

“forgiveness of sins.” The dusty feet of daily sin (there is no thought here of deadly, excommunicatory sin) are an obstacle to full communion with Christ. So the Lord Jesus Christ Himself washes them clean in the Eucharist, bestowing on the communicant loving fellowship that has cosmic and moral consequences.⁷²

Father Paul Harrilchak has stated his point well. It cannot be denied that some translators have treated this phrase accordingly. The earliest English translation to do so may be that of John Mason Neale, who gives “for purification of soul.”⁷³

In 1884 Father Nicholas Bjerring’s translation followed John Mason Neale on this point: “for purification of soul.”⁷⁴

Later English translations in the nineteenth century do not seem to have followed Neale on this matter. Thus, for example:

Robertson: unto sobriety of soul.⁷⁵

⁷² *The Divine Liturgy of the Great Church*, rev., annotated and set to the melodies by Paul N. Harrilchak (Reston, VA, 1984), 88-89 n. q. One hopes that Father Paul Harrilchak will revise this valuable work and publish it in a more durable form, making use of up-to-date word processing methods.

⁷³ *The Liturgies of Ss. Mark, James, Clement, Chrysostom and Basil, and the Church of Malabar*, trans., with introduction and appendices, by J.M. Neale and R. F. Littledale, 2nd ed. (London: J. T. Haves, 1869), 115.

⁷⁴ *The Offices of the Oriental Church with an Historical Introduction*, ed. Rev. Nicholas Bjerring (New York, 1884; AMS Press reprint, New York, 1969), 62 col. a. It is likely that this was the first English translation of the Divine Liturgy to be published in the USA. Unfortunately the Introduction does not indicate whose translations Father Bjerring used for reference, but it is apparent from the texts of the various services that he was following the practice of the Nikonian Russian Church.

⁷⁵ *The Divine Liturgies of Our Fathers Among the Saints, John Chrysostom and Basil the Great, with that of the Presanctified...*, ed. with the Greek text by J. N. W. B. Robertson (London: David Nutt, 1894), 302-303. It would be well worth reprinting this now-rare book.

In the first half of the twentieth century, the translation of this passage seems to have been made from the *textus receptus*. The earliest twentieth-century English translation made from the variant reading is that of Father Clement Englert:

- a) Fordham: a cleansing for the soul.⁷⁶
- b) Greek Archdiocese: the purification of the soul.⁷⁷
- c) *Byzantine Missal*: unto the cleansing of their souls⁷⁸
- d) Syrian Archdiocese: unto cleansing of soul⁷⁹
- e) Pittsburgh 1964/65: for the purification of the soul⁸⁰
- f) Lazarus Moore: for the purification of the soul⁸¹
- g) *Byzantine Daily Worship*: for the cleansing of the soul⁸²
- h) New Skete: That they may cleanse the souls⁸³

⁷⁶ *The Byzantine Liturgy: A New English Translation of the Liturgies of St. John Chrysostom and St. Basil the Great*, trans. Clement Englert, C.Ss.R. (New York: Fordham Russian Center, Fordham University, 1953), 49.

⁷⁷ *The Divine Liturgy*, Greek Archdiocese of N. & S. America (no publication data), 24. This book was certainly on the market by the mid-nineteen-fifties. The English text of this phrase follows the variant reading, but the parallel Greek text retains the *textus receptus*.

⁷⁸ *Byzantine Missal for Sundays and Feast Days*, Reverend Joseph Raya and Baron Jose de Vinck (Tournai, Belgium: Desclée & Cie, 1958), 96.

⁷⁹ *Service Book of the Holy Eastern Orthodox Catholic and Apostolic Church*, Antiochian Orthodox Christian Archdiocese of New York and all North America (1960; 5th ed., 1971), 114. Commissioned by Metropolitan Antony (Bashir), who actively promoted the use of English in divine services, this translation was largely the work of Father Stephen Upson, who in turn had been a student of Mitred Archpriest Michael G. H. Gelsinger.

⁸⁰ *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1964/65), 35.

⁸¹ *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Among the Saints John Chrysostom*, trans. Right Reverend Archimandrite Lazarus (c. 1965; reprinted with permission by St. John of Rila Eastern Orthodox Monastery, Setauket, Long Island, NY, 1983), 46.

⁸² *Byzantine Daily Worship*, Archbishop Joseph (Raya) of Akka, Haifa, Nazareth and all Galilee, and Baron José de Vinck (Alleluia Press, 1969), 285.

- i) Kucharek: for a cleansing of the soul.⁸⁴
- j) Fr. Paul Harrilchak: so that when we partake they bring washing of soul⁸⁵
- k) New Skete: May they cleanse the souls of those who share in them.⁸⁶
- l) Syrian *Liturgikon*: unto cleansing of soul⁸⁷

However, the scholarly pendulum began to swing back towards the *textus receptus*. The following newer translations illustrate this:

- a) Basilian: sobriety of soul.⁸⁸
- b) SCOBA draft: vigilance of soul.⁸⁹
- c) Parma (Ukrainian Eparchy): alertness of soul.⁹⁰
- d) Jordanville: unto sobriety of soul.⁹¹

⁸³ *The Ritual of Ordination to the Priesthood According to the Byzantine Rite* [including Pontifical Divine Liturgy] (1968), 37. [This booklet was printed for the ordination of Father Alexei Michalenko, M.I.C. by Bishop Andrew of Nauplia, and notes on the title page *verso* that “Translation based on text by Father Laurence, New Skete, Cambridge, New York”.]

⁸⁴ Casimir Kucharek, *The Byzantine-Slav Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom; its Origin and Evolution* (Alleluia Press, 1971), 614. Unfortunately the author did not provide a commentary on this particular passage.

⁸⁵ *The Divine Liturgy of the Great Church*, rev., annotated and set to the melodies by Paul N. Harrilchak (Reston, VA, 1984), 89.

⁸⁶ *The Divine Liturgy*, trans., arranged, and published by the Monks of New Skete (Cambridge, NY, 1987), 108.

⁸⁷ *The Liturgikon: The Book of Divine Services for the Priest and Deacon*, Antiochian Orthodox Christian Archdiocese of North America (Antakya Press, 1989), 289. This book is widely used even beyond the Antiochian Archdiocese.

⁸⁸ *The Sacred and Divine Liturgy of our Holy Father John Chrysostom* (Toronto: Basilian Press, 1988), 108-109.

⁸⁹ *The Divine Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom, Slavonic Version, A Pan-Orthodox Translation*, draft distributed by Standing Conference of Canonical Orthodox Bishops in America (c. 1995, still unpublished), 28 (Slavonic version); 26 (Antiochian version); 22 (Greek version).

⁹⁰ *The Sacrifice of Praise* (Parma, 1996), 190.

e) (Raya): for the vigilance of the soul.⁹²

So one might have concluded that the draft under consideration did well to use “spirit of vigilance.” However, another piece of the puzzle has recently become available. While almost all Church-Slavonic versions translate the disputed Greek word here as трезвѣніе,⁹³ the pre-Nikonian Church-Slavonic version still in use among the Old Ritualists uses the word оумовѣніе!⁹⁴ This is exactly the same Church-Slavonic word which designates the washing of the feet on Holy Thursday.⁹⁵ In modern Russian омовѣніе means “ablution.”⁹⁶ It seems surprising that Paul Meyendorff did not comment on this point in his study of the Old Rite.⁹⁷

So it appears now that Father Paul Harrillchak’s commentary is justified; the pre-Nikonian Old Rite text is itself

⁹¹ *Service Book: The Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom*, published with the blessing of His Eminence Archbishop Laurus of Syracuse and Holy Trinity [Monastery] (1999), 94. (Archbishop Laurus is now the Metropolitan and Chief Hierarchy of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia.)

⁹² *The Divine and Holy Liturgy of our Father among the Saints John Chrysostom*, trans. Archbishop Joseph (Raya) (Alleluia Press, 2001), 68.

⁹³ *Recensio Rutena* (Rome, 1941), 94.

⁹⁴ Литу́ргія Св. Іоанна Златоустаго, напечатана по благословенію Преосвященнейшаго митрополита Алімпія в г. Верешагіно в типографіи ООО “Печатник” в 2002 г. на Рождество Христово, 85 verso. This book is a reproduction of the same book published by Archbishop Joseph of Moscow in the Old-Ritualist Press at the Rogozhskoie Cemetery in Moscow in the year 7420 (from the creation of the world – in the reign of Tsar Nicholas II), and reproducing faithfully the service-book printed in the fifth year of the pontificate of Patriarch Joseph of Moscow and All Rus (who preceded Nikon), hence c. A.D. 1646 “Nativity of Christ 2002” almost certainly means 7 January 2003.

⁹⁵ *Чиновникъ Архіерейскаго Священнослуженія*, vol. 2, Moscow Patriarchate (Moscow, 1983), 82.

⁹⁶ *Oxford Russian Dictionary*, 3rd ed., Russian-English ed. Marchus Wheeler and Boris Unbegaun, rev. and updated Della Thompson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 289 col. a.

⁹⁷ Paul Meyendorff, *Russia, Ritual & Reform* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1991), 192.

a translation of Greek manuscripts from several centuries before the days of the printing press; evidently the copyist's error was either absent from or removed from the copy of the manuscript from which the early Church-Slavonic translation was made. And, of course, the 12 October 2004 draft should be revised accordingly, to read “washing of soul” instead of “spirit of vigilance.” This does not necessarily mean that the problem is now definitively solved; the South-Slavic eleventh-century manuscript *Euchologium Sinaiticum*⁹⁸ gives бѣдрость (meaning sobriety or vigilance⁹⁹) and the fourteenth-century manuscript reproduced by Panteleimon Kovaliv also gives бѣдрость.¹⁰⁰ Still other information and older manuscripts may yet come to light. But the evidence from the Old-Ritualist text is strong enough to support the view that this understanding fits the preponderance of evidence, at least for now.

20) Still during the Anaphora, while the choir or the people sing the anthem to the Theotokos, the priest quietly prays, in the version of the 1964/65 translation¹⁰¹ and the 12 October 2004 draft translation, for the holy, glorious and illustrious apostles.¹⁰² “Illustrious” seems a strange adjective to select here. Illustrious comes from the Latin verb *illustrare* and means “notably or brilliantly outstanding because of dignity

⁹⁸ “Text in R. Nahtigal, *Euchologium Sinaiticum*. Starocerkvenoslavanski glagolski spomenik, I. Fotografski posnetik, II. Tekst s komentarjem (Ljubljana 1941-1942)” from Taft, op. cit, 115 n. 201.

⁹⁹ Cf Diachenko, *Полный Церковно-Славянский Словарь* (Moscow, 1899), 54 col. b, and *Oxford Russian Dictionary*, 3rd ed., Russian-English ed. Marchus Wheeler and Boris Unbegaun, rev. and updated Della Thompson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 25 col. b.

¹⁰⁰ Panteleimon Kovaliv, *Prayer Book: A Monument of the XIV Century* (New York: Scientific Theological Institute of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of U.S.A., 1960), 25 in the manuscript reproduction. This manuscript is believed to have been written no later than A.D. 1347.

¹⁰¹ *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1964/65), 36.

¹⁰² As mentioned above, the same problem also occurs in the Church-Slavonic version of the blessing of the deacon before the Gospel.

or achievements or actions”¹⁰³ But the Greek adjective in this liturgical text is πανευφήμων, which means all-praiseworthy.¹⁰⁴ The Church-Slavonic adjective here is всехвальныхъ, which means worthy of all praise,¹⁰⁵ and might as well be a calque from the Greek word. Hence this adjective can easily and accurately be translated all-laudable or all-praised, without causing any problem. The same problem recurs in the dismissal.

21) A few lines down in the Anaphora, the priest prays for the episcopate, the presbyterate, the diaconate in Christ and every holy order.¹⁰⁶ This is a defensible translation; the Greek phrase reads καὶ παντὸς Ἱερατικοῦ Τάγματος.¹⁰⁷ The Church-Slavonic version reads и всякій священнической чинъ. In both languages, the adjective Ἱερατικοῦ, священнической means hieratic or priestly. The Greek adjective is derived from the noun Ἱερεὺς, meaning priest; the Church-Slavonic adjective is derived from the noun священникъ, meaning priest. The problem with the 12 October 2004 draft is that “holy order” could easily be taken to mean some paramonastic community. The 1964/65 translation reads “all others in holy orders,”¹⁰⁸ which is a bit clearer, since “holy orders” is often used as the name of the sacrament conferred by ordination. Here are some other translations:

¹⁰³ *Webster’s Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary* (Springfield, MA: G.&C. Merriam Company, 1965), 415 col. b.

¹⁰⁴ Liddell and Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 1297 col. b.

¹⁰⁵ Diachenko, *Полный Церковно-Славянский Словарь* (Moscow, 1899), 104 col. b.

¹⁰⁶ 12 October 2004 draft, 27, line 48

¹⁰⁷ So the *textus receptus*. However, a common variant reading in Greek is παντὸς Ἱερατικοῦ καὶ μοναχικοῦ Τάγματος and many translations from the Greek reflect this: every priestly and monastic order.

¹⁰⁸ *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1964/65), 36.

- a) Robertson: every Sacerdotal Order.¹⁰⁹
- b) Stamford: every sacerdotal order.¹¹⁰
- c) Orthodox Church in America: every order of the
- d) clergy.¹¹¹ This is still a little ambiguous (the hieratic orders are the diaconate, the presbyterate, and the episcopate).
- e) Gelsinger: every hieratic order.¹¹²
- f) Basilian 1988: every sacred order.¹¹³ Again this is a bit ambiguous.
- g) SCOPA draft: every Priestly order.¹¹⁴

22) At the commemoration of the hierarchs during the Anaphora, the draft under consideration gives the people's response as "And remember all your people."¹¹⁵ This wording does not actually appear in the earlier Ruthenian translation, which gives *Also all men and women*.¹¹⁶ This is an attempt to give an accurate translation of the original Greek (καὶ πάντων

¹⁰⁹ *The Divine Liturgies of Our Fathers Among the Saints, John Chrysostom and Basil the Great, with that of the Presanctified...*, ed. with the Greek text by J. N. W. B. Robertson (London: David Nutt, 1894), 306-307.

¹¹⁰ *Christ With Us* (Stamford, CT, 1954), 68-69 (reference here and elsewhere to the pocket-size edition).

¹¹¹ *The Divine Liturgy According to Saint John Chrysostom*, Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of America (now the Orthodox Church in America) (New York, 1967 [reprinted 1977]), 69.

¹¹² *The Divine Liturgy*, ed. and trans. Mitred Archpriest Michael G. H. Gelsinger (1971 mimeographed draft; this unfortunately has not yet been published), unpaginated.

¹¹³ *The Sacred and Divine Liturgy of our Holy Father John Chrysostom* (Toronto: Basilian Press, 1988), 112-113.

¹¹⁴ *The Divine Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom, Slavonic Version, A Pan-Orthodox Translation*, draft distributed by Standing Conference of Canonical Orthodox Bishops in America (c. 1995, still unpublished), 28; 27 (Antiochian version); 22 (Greek version).

¹¹⁵ 12 October 2004 draft, 28, line 18.

¹¹⁶ *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1964/65), 36.

καὶ πασῶν) which is reproduced reasonably accurately in Church-Slavonic (И всѣхъ и вся).¹¹⁷ Explaining the meaning of this brief response is not difficult; it means “and all [masculine gender] and all [feminine gender].” The problem is that English does not contain masculine and feminine variants of the pronoun¹¹⁸ “all.”¹¹⁹ The translation “And remember all your people” seems to have come into usage in the then Eparchies of Pittsburgh and Passaic very soon after the 1964/65 book appeared; many faithful and even clergy are surprised that the 1964/65 edition does not give this version.

It would be possible to offer here a selection of translations of this short response, but it doesn’t really seem worth the bother. It may be of some slight interest to mention that the 12th century Latin translation of Leo Tuscan gives *Et pro omnium et universorum*, which is ingenious but does not solve the problem in English. French translations give *et de tous et de toutes*,¹²⁰ which is accurate but again does not solve the problem in English. Father Archimandrite Robert Taft has offered the translation “and [for] each and [for] all.”¹²¹ To omit “for”¹²² and use simply “and each and all” is a simple solution, as good as any and better than some.

23) The 12 October 2004 draft translates the final Ecphonesis of the Anaphora as “And grant with one voice...” This might be

¹¹⁷ *Recensio Rutena* (Rome, 1941), 98.

¹¹⁸ “All” is not always a pronoun, but in this case and some others it is – as for example “all are welcome to attend.”

¹¹⁹ Cf. “Ukrainian Catholics: Four Translations of the Divine Liturgy,” *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 39, nos. 2-4 (1998): 342-343.

¹²⁰ Father Archimandrite Robert F. Taft, S.J. *A History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom*, vol. 4, *The Diptychs*, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 238 (Roma: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1991), 149.

¹²¹ Father Archimandrite Robert F. Taft, S.J. *A History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom*, vol. 4, *The Diptychs*, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 238 (Roma: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1991), 14, 15, 17, 19, 20, 21 and 119.

¹²² Except at Pontifical celebrations.

justified as poetic license, but the Greek ἐν ἐνὶ στόματι clearly means *with one mouth*.¹²³ The Church-Slavonic Уста can mean either mouth or lip.¹²⁴ In this instance the phrase единѣми оусты means *with one mouth*. Many translations of the Divine Liturgy could be cited using *with one mouth* in this instance.

24) The proposed text of the prayer which the priest (in the normal usage) should offer quietly during the Synapte with Aitesis following the Anaphora almost drives me to despair. Here is the entire text according to the 12 October 2004 draft:

The celebrant prays aloud:¹²⁵

Celebrant: To you, O Master who love us all, we commit our whole life and hope, and we implore, pray, and entreat you: make us worthy to partake with a clear conscience of your heavenly and awesome mysteries from this sacred and spiritual table. May they bring about the remission of sins, the pardon of transgressions, the communion of the Holy Spirit, the inheritance of the kingdom of heaven, confidence in you, not judgment or condemnation.¹²⁶

Several friends have listened patiently to a slow, careful reading of this text aloud. No one has been able to understand it all without having the text in front of them, and even then they find it difficult to follow. Surely this is not what one wants from a text designed (according to the redactors of this draft translation) to be pronounced aloud.

¹²³ Liddell and Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 1648 col. b – 1649 col. a.

¹²⁴ Cf. Diachenko, *Полный Церковно-Славянский Словарь* (Moscow, 1899), 762 col. b.

¹²⁵ There is, of course, no such rubric. In Greek, there is a rubric which says “The priest prays in mystica” – which means that the priest reads this prayer in a low voice. In Church-Slavonic, there is an even shorter rubric which says “the priest prays.”

¹²⁶ 12 October 2004 draft, 30, lines 15-25.

There are some specific difficulties with the translation, as will appear below, but the real problem seems to be of a literary nature: this draft translation of the text does not seem to belong to any specific literary genre.

The specific difficulties include:

- a) the use of “Master who love us all.” This has been discussed already but in the 12 October 2004 draft, for some reason, it seems even more irritating – probably because this particular prayer-text translation is in general hard to follow, so any difficulty is bound to call attention to itself.
- b) There are places in the text where it is possible to use shorter sentences without disturbing the meaning, and there are other places where using shorter sentences will damage the meaning. This version seems to get it wrong both ways. Some examples follow.
- c) “To you, O Master who love us all, we commit our whole life and hope” – which in the 12 October 2004 draft version is not a sentence but a part of a much longer sentence – could easily have been rendered as “We commit our whole life and hope to you, O Master who love us all.” An English sentence is supposed to contain a complete thought; the suggested sentence does so.
- d) On the other hand, the reader – or, still worse, the listener – is confronted with this sentence: “May they bring about the remission of sins, the pardon of transgressions, the communion of the Holy Spirit, the inheritance of the kingdom of heaven, confidence in you, not judgment or condemnation.” This sentence has the third-person plural pronoun “they” for the subject. The antecedent of this pronoun is “your heavenly and awesome mysteries,” but it takes fairly careful examination of the preceding sentence to determine this, even with the text in front of one’s eyes.

e) As already remarked elsewhere in this critique, “awesome” is a word to be avoided unless one is writing for specialists.

f) The second of the two elongated sentences is not a sentence at all in the original Greek nor in Church-Slavonic, and turning it into an English sentence does not improve the style nor enhance the probable comprehension of the hearer. The opening four words of the second sentence, “May they bring about” are pure invention on the part of the translators of this version.

g) Father Archimandrite Robert Taft holds¹²⁷ that the Greek word παρρησία¹²⁸ which appears towards the end of the prayer is best understood as *filial confidence*, is there sufficient reason to disagree with him? The confidence which befits the sons of God is assuredly a filial confidence.

Perhaps it will be well to compare the 12 October 2004 draft version with some other translations of the same prayer. Here are several translations into sacral or hieratic English, followed by translations seeking a modern English idiom:

a) Gelsinger: To thee we commit all our life and our hope, manbefriending¹²⁹ Sovereign Lord,¹³⁰ and we entreat thee, and pray thee, and supplicate thee:

Account us worthy to partake of thy heavenly and

¹²⁷ Robert F. Taft, S.J., *A History of the Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom*, vol. 5, *The Pre-Communion Rites*, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 261 (Rome, 2000), 125-127.

¹²⁸ Liddell and Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 1344 col. a.

¹²⁹ “Manbefriending” was Father Michael Gelsinger’s solution to the problem of translating the adjectival form of Φιλάνθρωπος. This problem is discussed here in the section on “inclusive language.”

¹³⁰ Sovereign Lord was the phrase which Father Michael Gelsinger used to translate Δέσποτα when this word is addressed to God. Not perhaps entirely satisfactory, but interesting.

terrible mysteries of this sacred and spiritual Table with a clean conscience, for remission of sins, for forgiveness of offences, for communion of [the] Holy Spirit, for inheritance of the Kingdom of Heaven, for boldness toward thee; not for judgment, nor for condemnation.¹³¹

b) Fellowship of Saints Alban and Sergius: Unto thee we commend all our life and our hope, O Master and lover of mankind, and pray and beseech and implore thee: count us worthy to partake of thine appalling¹³² and heavenly mysteries at this hallowed spiritual table, with a pure conscience, unto the remission of sins, the forgiveness of offences, the participation of the Holy Spirit, the inheritance of the kingdom of heaven, and unto boldness towards thee, not unto judgment, nor unto condemnation.¹³³

c) *Christ With Us*: To Thee, O Master and Lover of men, we commend our whole life and hope, and we beseech, and pray, and humbly entreat: make us worthy to partake of Thy heavenly and dread mysteries, of this holy and spiritual altar, with a pure conscience, for the forgiveness of sins, for the pardon of our offenses, for the communion of the Holy Ghost, for the inheritance of the kingdom of heaven, for confidence in Thee: not for judgment, nor for condemnation.¹³⁴

¹³¹ *The Divine Liturgy*, ed. and trans. Mitred Archpriest Michael G. H. Gelsinger (1971 mimeographed draft; this unfortunately has not yet been published), unpaginated.

¹³² Well-intentioned, no doubt, but that word obviously will not do in reference to any attribute of God!

¹³³ *The Orthodox Liturgy...*, Fellowship of Ss. Alban and Sergius (London: SPCK, 1939; reprinted 1964), 83. The translators are not named; they appear to have attempted to take their inspiration from the King James Bible and the Book of Common Prayer.

¹³⁴ *Christ With Us* (Stamford, CT, 1954), 105-106 (reference here and elsewhere to the pocket-size edition).

d) Syrian Antiochian Archdiocese (1960): Unto thee we commend our whole life and our hope, O Master who lovest mankind; and we beseech thee, and pray thee, and supplicate thee: make us worthy to partake of the heavenly and terrible Mysteries of this sacred and spiritual table, with a pure conscience: unto remission of sins, unto forgiveness of transgressions, unto communion of the Holy Spirit, unto inheritance of the Kingdom of Heaven, unto boldness towards thee, and not unto judgment nor unto condemnation.¹³⁵

e) Orthodox Church in America: Unto Thee we commend our whole life and our hope, O Master who lovest mankind. We ask Thee, and pray Thee, and supplicate Thee: Make us worthy to partake of the heavenly and awesome¹³⁶ Mysteries of this sacred and spiritual table with a pure conscience: for remission of sins, for forgiveness of transgressions, for the communion of the Holy Spirit, for the inheritance of the Kingdom of Heaven, for boldness towards Thee, but not for judgment or condemnation.¹³⁷

f) Russian Church Abroad: Unto thee we offer our whole life and hope, O Master, Lover of mankind; and we ask thee, and pray thee, and supplicate thee: vouchsafe us to partake of Thy heavenly and dread Mysteries of this holy and spiritual table, with a pure conscience, unto remission of sins, unto pardon of

¹³⁵ *Service Book of the Holy Eastern Orthodox Catholic and Apostolic Church, Antiochian Orthodox Christian Archdiocese of New York and all North America* (1960; 5th ed., 1971), 118. Commissioned by Metropolitan Antony (Bashir), who actively promoted the use of English in divine services, this translation was largely the work of Father Stephen Upson, who in turn had been a student of Mitred Archpriest Michael G. H. Gelsinger.

¹³⁶ This was published in 1967, when the word “awesome” had not become common in American colloquial speech.

¹³⁷ *The Divine Liturgy According to Saint John Chrysostom, Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of America* (now the Orthodox Church in America) (New York, 1967 [reprinted 1977]), 73.

offences, unto communion of Thy Holy Spirit, unto inheritance of the kingdom of heaven, unto boldness towards thee; not unto judgment nor unto condemnation.¹³⁸

g) 1964/65: In You, O gracious Master, we place our whole life and hope, and we beseech, pray, and implore You: make us worthy to partake with a pure conscience of your heavenly and awesome¹³⁹ mysteries from this sacred and spiritual altar, for the remission of sins, for the pardon of transgressions, for the communion in the Holy Spirit, for the inheritance of the kingdom of heaven, for trust in You, and not judgment, or condemnation.¹⁴⁰

h) Kucharek (1971): To you, Lord and Lover of mankind, we commend our whole life and hope. We implore you, we pray you, we entreat you: make us worthy, with a pure conscience, to partake of the heavenly and awesome¹⁴¹ mysteries from this holy and spiritual altar for the remission of sins, the forgiveness of offenses, for the communion of the Holy Spirit, the inheritance of the heavenly Kingdom, for confidence in you and not for judgment or condemnation.¹⁴²

i) Taft (2000): To you, O Master, lover of humankind, we entrust our whole life and hope. And we implore

¹³⁸ *Service Book: The Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom*, published with the blessing of His Eminence Archbishop Laurus of Syracuse and Holy Trinity [Monastery] (1999), 101. [Archbishop Laurus is now the Metropolitan and Chief Hierarch of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia.]

¹³⁹ This was published in 1965, when the word “awesome” had not become common in American colloquial speech.

¹⁴⁰ *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1964/65), 38.

¹⁴¹ This was published in 1965, when the word “awesome” had not become common in American colloquial speech.

¹⁴² Casimir Kucharek, *The Byzantine-Slav Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom: Its Origin and Evolution* (Alleluia Press, 1971), 646.

and pray and entreat you, make us worthy to receive your heavenly and [dread]¹⁴³ mysteries from this holy and spiritual table with a pure conscience, for the forgiveness of offenses, for the communion of the Holy Spirit, for the inheritance of the heavenly kingdom, for filial confidence to approach you, nor for judgment or condemnation.¹⁴⁴

There are many other translations, of course, but that should suffice for an idea of how this prayer has been done into English. One of the causes of puzzlement at the difficulty with the 12 October 2004 draft under consideration is that the original text really does not pose many problems. The members of the commission which seems to have produced the draft do not appear to have considered that a text which is to be pronounced aloud should be governed by somewhat different criteria from a text which will be read silently. Taking the above translations into account, and so far as is possible (as will appear, there is one specific case where it seems impossible) to follow the apparent criteria of the 12 October 2004 draft, the following translation might be more accurate and more suitable for the purpose.¹⁴⁵ The point of departure is Father Archimandrite Robert Taft's text, quoted above; his translation is accurate beyond cavil.

We entrust our whole life and hope to You, Master and Lover of mankind.¹⁴⁶

¹⁴³ Father Archimandrite Robert replaced "awesome" with "dread" later in the same book (512), so this change should be accepted without difficulty.

¹⁴⁴ Robert F. Taft, S.J., *A History of the Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom*, vol. 5, *The Pre-Communion Rites*, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 261 (Rome, 2000), 55-56.

¹⁴⁵ It is not necessarily true that this prayer *must* be pronounced aloud, but it is not difficult to translate it in a manner which will lend itself to that use.

¹⁴⁶ This is the only substantial change from Father Archimandrite's text. I remain unconvinced that any of the "inclusive" translations for this term

We implore You,

we pray You

and we entreat You:

make us worthy to receive Your heavenly and dread mysteries

from this holy and spiritual table

with a pure conscience,

for the forgiveness of offenses,

for the communion of the Holy Spirit,

for the inheritance of the heavenly kingdom,

for filial¹⁴⁷ confidence to approach¹⁴⁸ You,

but not for judgment or condemnation.

If the priest is to chant or read this aloud, he should pause for breath at the end of each line.

25) The incipit introducing the Lord's Prayer. The 12 October 2004 draft reads:

"And make us worthy, O Lord God of heaven, that we may with confidence and without condemnation dare call you "Father" and say:"¹⁴⁹

There are a few problems with this translation:

which have so far been suggested can be considered even satisfactory, let alone acceptable.

¹⁴⁷ Father Archimandrite Robert's argument for this understanding of *παρορησία* is convincing. But do most people today understand the word "filial"?

¹⁴⁸ Here Father Archimandrite Robert is using a slight paraphrase, but the Greek seems to warrant it.

¹⁴⁹ 12 October 2004 draft, 30, lines 27-29.

- a. The Greek original begins Καὶ καταξίωσον ἡμᾶς, Δέσποτα... There is no possible justification for translating “Δέσποτα” as “O Lord God of heaven.” The phrase τὸν ἐπουράνιον Θεὸν appears later in the incipit; it is not a vocative. The word Κύριος appears nowhere at all in the incipit. The actual meaning of this term, as discussed above, is “Master.” Father Michael Gelsinger used “Sovereign Lord” when this appears as a title of address to God; that suggestion might be pleasant, but it is difficult to defend it and one could not insist upon it.
- b. Again Father Archimandrite Robert Taft is convinced that the Greek word παρηγοσία¹⁵⁰ which appears in the incipit to the Lord’s Prayer is best understood as *filial confidence*, and there seems to be no reason to disagree with him. The confidence which befits the sons of God is assuredly a filial confidence. But to what degree are the faithful apt to understand the word “filial” correctly?
- c. Since this is the incipit of the Lord’s Prayer, and the 12 October 2004 draft retains the second person singular both in the Lord’s Prayer itself and in the Ecphonesis, it would be sensible to retain the second person singular form in the incipit as well, so that the priest does not call God “you” and in the next line the people chant “hallowed be Thy name.”

So the incipit to the Lord’s Prayer might be worded as follows:

And make us worthy, Master, with [filial] confidence
and without condemnation to dare to call [upon] Thee,
the heavenly God,¹⁵¹ [as]¹⁵² “Father” and to say:

¹⁵⁰ Liddell and Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 1344 col. a.

¹⁵¹ So both the Greek and the Church-Slavonic. In English “the God of Heaven” is more euphonious, but neither alternative is perfect, so a more literal version may be preferable.

26) The Lord’s Prayer itself. Here the draft reverts to a “traditional” English version, as follow:

Our Father,
 who art in heaven,
 hallowed be thy name;
 thy kingdom come;
 thy will be done on earth
 as it is in heaven.
 Give us this day our daily bread;
 and forgive us our trespasses
 as we forgive those who trespass against us;
 and lead us not into temptation,
 but deliver us from evil.

Two or three versions of the Lord’s Prayer, none of them strictly accurate, are considered traditional in English. Most of the translations of the Divine Liturgy which strive to offer a modern or contemporary idiom nevertheless retain one of these “traditional” texts of the Lord’s Prayer;¹⁵³ thus, for instance, second person singular pronouns found nowhere else in the given translation survive in this one text.¹⁵⁴

Two expressions in the Lord’s Prayer are of particular interest. The original Greek καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν, ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφίεμεν τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν clearly requires the translation “forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors.” Catholics sometimes object that “forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors” is Protestant. That

¹⁵² If there is not at least a particle between “God” and “Father,” some priests whose diction is less than perfect will elide the two words, so as to sound like “the heavenly godfather,” which is best avoided.

¹⁵³ A recent exception is the translation approved by the Archdiocese of Thyateira and published by Oxford University Press (1995), 39. The translation of the Lord’s Prayer is in the same style as the rest of the English translation.

¹⁵⁴ Though these translations, having used “hallowed be *Thy* Name, *Thy* Kingdom come, *Thy* will be done ...” then suddenly switch to “For *yours* is the kingdom, the power and the glory ...”: (Parma 1996), 198.

impression is strong, and has been circulating for quite a while, but one wonders how it originated. The *Book of Common Prayer*, both 1549 and 1552, uses “forgive us our trespasses as we forgive them that trespass against us.” Most Catholics will readily agree that Cranmer was a Protestant and that his *Prayer Book* is a Protestant book. The Douay-Rheims Bible, on the other hand, gives “and forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors.”¹⁵⁵ If one were to go by popular impressions of the Lord’s Prayer, one would conclude that the *Book of Common Prayer* is Catholic, and the Douay-Rheims Bible is Protestant, which is the reverse of the truth. The Jerusalem Bible¹⁵⁶ gives: “And forgive us our debts as we have forgiven those who are in debt to us.” One finds other translations of the Bible which also support “debts...debtors...”¹⁵⁷

The other passage of particular interest in the Lord’s Prayer is the line ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ. The “classic” translations, including the *Book of Common Prayer*, the King James Version, Douay-Rheims, and so forth, render this phrase “deliver us from evil.” Many Orthodox prefer “deliver us from the evil one,”¹⁵⁸ and Biblical scholars are coming to agree. The Revised Standard Version gives “deliver us from the evil one” as a variant reading. The Jerusalem Bible gives “save us from the evil one.” The New American Bible gives “deliver us from the evil one.”¹⁵⁹

Moreover, there are also obligations of filial piety. Metropolitan Joseph (Raya) insisted that the opening phrase of

¹⁵⁵ Matthew 6:12.

¹⁵⁶ Researched and translated under Catholic auspices.

¹⁵⁷ “Ukrainian Catholics: Four Translations of the Divine Liturgy,” *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 39, nos. 2-4 (1998): 343-344.

¹⁵⁸ At least the present writer cannot be accused of national chauvinism on this point; the preferred Hiberno-English version is “deliver us from all evil”!

¹⁵⁹ “Ukrainian Catholics: Four Translations of the Divine Liturgy,” *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 39, nos. 2-4 (1998): 267-402. Cited passage on 345.

the Lord's Prayer should accurately be "Our Father, Who art in the heavens." The Greek, Church-Slavonic and several other versions support him in this position.¹⁶⁰

If these three corrections were applied, the text would read:

Our Father,
who art in the heavens,
hallowed be Thy name;
Thy kingdom come;
Thy will be done on earth
as it is in heaven.
Give us this day our daily bread;
and forgive us our debts
as we forgive our debtors;
and lead us not into temptation,
but deliver us from the evil one.

Any change in the customary text of the Lord's Prayer will require teaching and habituation – but this caution applies to all such texts.

27) There are a few small problems in the prayer at the Inclination.¹⁶¹

a) the draft text¹⁶² uses the phrase "in the greatness of your mercy."¹⁶³ Following the Greek and Church-Slavonic,

¹⁶⁰ *The Divine and Holy Liturgy of our Father among the Saints John Chrysostom*, trans. Archbishop Joseph (Raya) (Alleluia Press, 2001), 25.

¹⁶¹ In the interests of evolving a standard terminology, it is well to follow Father Archimandrite Robert Taft in using the word "inclination" here.

¹⁶² 12 October 2004 draft, 31, lines 10-11.

¹⁶³ The draft text has taken this from *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1964/65), 39.

Father Archimandrite Robert Taft suggests “in the abundance of your mercy”;¹⁶⁴ Perhaps this will be good.

b) This criticism is purely a matter of punctuation: there is a semi-colon which should be a comma.¹⁶⁵

c) The prayer refers to “you, the awesome God.”¹⁶⁶ For reasons which have already been given this would be better: “You, the God who is to be feared,” since the rubric in the 12 October 2004 draft¹⁶⁷ requires that this prayer should be offered aloud.

d) In what is acknowledged to be the most difficult phrase in the prayer, the draft text¹⁶⁸ has “make smooth for the good of all the path that lies ahead, according to the need of each.” Father Archimandrite Robert gives “smooth out for all *of us*,¹⁶⁹ unto good, according to each one’s need, whatever lies before us,” which seems smoother,¹⁷⁰ clearer and well suitable for offering aloud.

28) This is not the fault of the draft translation, but rather a slight difference between the Greek and Church-Slavonic texts in the opening word of the prayer just before the elevation. The Greek text gives Πρόσχες, the Church-Slavonic text gives Воньмѣ.¹⁷¹ The two words are closely related, but they are not quite the same. In both cases this is a first-person singular

¹⁶⁴ Robert F. Taft, S.J., *A History of the Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom*, vol. 5, *The Pre-Communion Rites*, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 261 (Rome, 2000), 155.

¹⁶⁵ 12 October 2004 draft, 31, line 13.

¹⁶⁶ 12 October 2004 draft, 31, line 14.

¹⁶⁷ 12 October 2004 draft, 31, line 6.

¹⁶⁸ 12 October 2004 draft, 31, lines 15-16.

¹⁶⁹ Emphasis added; the italicized phrase is supported by the Greek original but is absent in the draft under consideration.

¹⁷⁰ No pun intended.

¹⁷¹ Daniel IX:18 gives Πρόσχες Κύριε.

imperative and could hypothetically be translated “pay attention,” but one could scarcely address God in that fashion. In Slavonic, the word has come to be understood as “hear.”¹⁷² But it is quite possible to “pay attention” to something or someone in certain circumstances without using one’s aural faculties. So translations from the Greek are apt to give:

Attend.¹⁷³

Look down¹⁷⁴

Look down¹⁷⁵

Attend¹⁷⁶

give heed¹⁷⁷

Give heed¹⁷⁸

¹⁷² Cf. Diachenko, *Полный Церковно-Славянский Словарь* (Moscow, 1899), 81.

¹⁷³ *The Divine Liturgies of Our Fathers Among the Saints, John Chrysostom and Basil the Great, with that of the Presanctified...*, ed. with the Greek text by J. N. W. B. Robertson (London: David Nutt, 1894), 316-317.

¹⁷⁴ *Byzantine Missal for Sundays and Feast Days*, Reverend Joseph Raya and Baron Jose de Vinck (Tournai, Belgium: Desclée & Cie, 1958), 103.

¹⁷⁵ *Service Book of the Holy Eastern Orthodox Catholic and Apostolic Church, Antiochian Orthodox Christian Archdiocese of New York and all North America* (1960; 5th ed., 1971), 119. Commissioned by Metropolitan Antony (Bashir), who actively promoted the use of English in divine services, this translation was largely the work of Father Stephen Upson, who in turn had been a student of Mitred Archpriest Michael G. H. Gelsinger.

¹⁷⁶ *The Divine Liturgy According to Saint John Chrysostom*, Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of America (now the Orthodox Church in America) (New York, 1967 [reprinted 1977]), 75.

¹⁷⁷ *Byzantine Daily Worship*, Archbishop Joseph (Raya) of Akka, Haifa, Nazareth and all Galilee, and Baron José de Vinck (Alleluia Press, 1969), 289.

Attend¹⁷⁹Give heed¹⁸⁰

Translations from Slavonic usually prefer the other option:

a) Hear us¹⁸¹

29) The draft under consideration alters the sentence structure here and there any number of times – which is a legitimate thing to do in the process of translating.¹⁸² However, one must be careful not to obstruct the meaning of the original. In the prayer which precedes Τα ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις the last sentence reads in Greek: Καὶ καταξίωσον τῇ κραταίᾳ σου χειρὶ μεταδοῦναι ἡμῖν τοῦ ἀχράντου Σώματός σου, καὶ τοῦ τιμίου Αἵματος καὶ δι' ἡμῶν παντὶ τῷ λαῷ. The 12 October 2004 draft translates this as “Deign to give us your most pure body and precious blood with your mighty hand and, through us, to all the people.”¹⁸³ This is a bit of a challenge to the understanding and is best remedied by moving the phrase “with your mighty hand” back as follows: “With your mighty hand deign to give us your most pure body and precious blood and, through us, to all the people.”

30) This is also not the fault of the 12 October 2004 draft translation, but can nevertheless give rise to a question, albeit

¹⁷⁸ *The Divine Liturgy*, ed. and trans. Mitred Archpriest Michael G. H. Gelsinger (1971 mimeographed draft; this unfortunately has not yet been published), unpaginated.

¹⁷⁹ *The Divine Liturgy of the Great Church*, rev., annotated and set to the melodies by Paul N. Harrilchak (Reston, VA, 1984), 101.

¹⁸⁰ *The Divine and Holy Liturgy of our Father among the Saints John Chrysostom*, trans. Archbishop Joseph (Raya) (Alleluia Press, 2001), 73.

¹⁸¹ John Glen King, *The Rites and Ceremonies of the Greek Church in Russia* (London, 1772), 173

¹⁸² Anyone who wants to see the reverse should look at an interlinear translation of the New Testament. An interlinear translation is necessary and useful, but nobody would enjoy trying to read it aloud.

¹⁸³ 12 October 2004 draft, 31, lines 35-37.

a question which is easily answered. Several times in the course of the Divine Liturgy the clergy will bow three times, saying each time “O God, be merciful to me a sinner.”¹⁸⁴ This is simply the prayer of the publican in the temple (Luke 18:13). A question could arise because both the Greek books and the Nikonian Church-Slavonic books give instead the prayer “O God, cleanse me a sinner and have mercy on me,” so some will wonder why the difference. The use of the prayer of the publican for this purpose is supported by the series of Kyivan service-books associated with the name of Saint Peter Mohyla¹⁸⁵ as well as by the Roman edition (and other editions) of the Ruthenian Liturgicon,¹⁸⁶ so this is a well-established Kyivan variation.

31) The 12 October 2004 draft translates Τα ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις [Church-Slavonic Святая святымъ, often alluded to by the Latin translation *Sancta sanctis*] as *Holy gifts to holy people!*¹⁸⁷ That is unquestionably a translation which could be defended. But it may not necessarily be optimal. Father Archimandrite Robert Taft devotes six pages to exploring the meaning of this short admonition, and shows that the understanding of its significance has changed slightly over the centuries.¹⁸⁸ In view of this, it might be better to prefer a more “elegant”¹⁸⁹ translation so as to leave options open. The *sancta* here are

¹⁸⁴ 12 October 2004 draft, 18, line 38 (one time only according to the draft); 31, lines 47-48 and some moments not given in the draft under consideration.

¹⁸⁵ E.g. *Leiturgiarion* (Kiev: Monastery of the Caves, 1639; reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications [Fairfax, VA] and Stauropegion [L’viv and New York], 1996), *Divine Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom*, 187, 189, 193, 199, 302, and 358 (page numbers following the Arabic pagination in the 1996 facsimile edition).

¹⁸⁶ *Recensio Rutena* (Rome, 1941), 10, 15, 73 and 106.

¹⁸⁷ 12 October 2004 draft, 32, line 8

¹⁸⁸ Robert F. Taft, S.J., *A History of the Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom*, vol. 5, *The Pre-Communion Rites*, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 261 (Rome, 2000), 234-240.

¹⁸⁹ In the strict sense of the term.

clearly the Holy Gifts; that is not disputed. The *sanctis* are the saints – but the saints still here on earth, who are able to receive the Holy Communion. But does this simply mean all the baptized faithful, as it often does in the New Testament?¹⁹⁰ That understanding still appears in important commentaries of the late fourth century, when the *Sancta sanctis* itself appears.¹⁹¹ Or does this refer directly to one's *personal* holiness, as Saint John Chrysostom himself suggests?¹⁹² Saint Nicholas Cabasilas later expanded on this theme.¹⁹³ Is this perhaps a reference, as Saint Maximos the Confessor taught, “to the whole sacramental economy of Christ, which makes us holy”?¹⁹⁴ Germanus I of Constantinople teaches that the *Sancta Sanctis* is “a confession by the priest of his own sinfulness in the face of God’s holiness.”¹⁹⁵ Finally, though no one seems to have mentioned the possibility, are the *sanctis* simply the faithful at this particular celebration of the Divine Liturgy?

So with all these contending ideas, a good suggested translation might well be “Holy Things for the Holy,”¹⁹⁶ “Holy Gifts for the Holy,” or even “The Holies for the Holy.”¹⁹⁷ One wants a laconic form of words which will leave the nuances open for mystagogic catechesis and explanation.

32) At the Prayer Behind the Ambo – which the draft under consideration terms the Ambon Prayer – one finds the phrase “all generous giving.”¹⁹⁸ This seems unusual, although

¹⁹⁰ Taft offers several references at 234 n.148.

¹⁹¹ Taft, *op. cit.*, 235-236.

¹⁹² Taft, *op. cit.*, 237-238

¹⁹³ Taft, *op. cit.*, 238-239.

¹⁹⁴ Taft, *op. cit.*, 238.

¹⁹⁵ Taft, *op. cit.*, 238.

¹⁹⁶ Taft, *op. cit.*, 260.

¹⁹⁷ *The Divine Liturgy*, ed. and trans. Mitred Archpriest Michael G. H. Gelsinger (1971 mimeographed draft; this unfortunately has not yet been published), unpaginated, gives “The Holies are for the holy.”

¹⁹⁸ 12 October 2004 draft, 38, lines 8-9.

defensible. But this wording appears neither in the New American Bible nor in the Revised New American Bible, nor in the Jerusalem Bible. This wording also does not appear in the King James Version, the Revised Standard Version, the Revised English Bible or in the New Jerusalem Bible; the New Revised Standard Version offers “every generous act of giving,” which is not the exact wording of the draft but may have inspired that wording. The earlier Pittsburgh translation,¹⁹⁹ the Orthodox Church in America’s translation²⁰⁰ and many other translations use “every good gift”; that wording probably should be retained. No one will claim that “every good gift” is unclear, archaic or inaccurate.

33) This is more a question than a criticism: in the troparion of Saint John Chrysostom, the 12 October 2004 draft uses the phrase “it has stored up in the world the treasure of disdain for wealth.”²⁰¹ In Greek this phrase reads ἀφιλαργυρίας τῷ κόσμῳ θησαυροὺς ἐναπέθετο. In classical Greek ἐναπέθετο can certainly mean “stored up.”²⁰² However, other English translations of this troparion which render ἐναπέθετο in that way are either scarce or nonexistent. Here are several examples:

“enriched the universe”²⁰³

“bestowed on the world”²⁰⁴

¹⁹⁹ *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1964/65), 45.

²⁰⁰ *The Divine Liturgy According to Saint John Chrysostom*, Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of America (now the Orthodox Church in America) (New York, 1967 [reprinted 1977]), 85.

²⁰¹ 12 October 2004 draft, 41, lines 23-24.

²⁰² Cf. Liddell and Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 555 col. b.

²⁰³ *The Liturgies of Ss. Mark, James, Clement, Chrysostom and Basil, and the Church of Malabar*, trans., with introduction and appendices, by J.M. Neale and R. F. Littledale, 2nd ed. (London: J. T. Haves, 1869), 126.

“won for the world”²⁰⁵

“disclosed to the world”²⁰⁶

“shown to the world”²⁰⁷

“bestowed upon the world”²⁰⁸

“implanted in the world”²⁰⁹

“bestowing on the world”²¹⁰

“gained for the world”²¹¹

²⁰⁴ *The Divine Liturgies of Our Fathers Among the Saints, John Chrysostom and Basil the Great, with that of the Presanctified...*, ed. with the Greek text by J. N. W. B. Robertson (London: David Nutt, 1894), 339.

²⁰⁵ *The Orthodox Liturgy...*, Fellowship of Ss. Alban and Sergius (London: SPCK, 1939; reprinted 1964), 101. The translators are not named; they appear to have attempted to take their inspiration from the King James Bible and the Book of Common Prayer.

²⁰⁶ *The Divine Liturgy*, Greek Archdiocese of N. & S. America (no publication data), 45. Also *The Liturgikon: The Book of Divine Services for the Priest and Deacon*, Antiochian Orthodox Christian Archdiocese of North America (Antakya Press, 1989), 330. Also *Service Book: The Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom*, published with the blessing of His Eminence Archbishop Laurus of Syracuse and Holy Trinity [Monastery] (1999), 130. [Archbishop Laurus is now the Metropolitan and Chief Hierarch of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia.]

²⁰⁷ *The Divine Liturgy According to Saint John Chrysostom*, Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of America (now the Orthodox Church in America) (New York, 1967 [reprinted 1977]), 110.

²⁰⁸ *Byzantine Missal for Sundays and Feast Days*, Reverend Joseph Raya and Baron Jose de Vinck (Tournai, Belgium: Desclée & Cie, 1958), 113.

²⁰⁹ *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Saint John Chrysostom* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1964/65), 46.

²¹⁰ *The Sacred and Divine Liturgy of our Holy Father John Chrysostom* (Toronto: Basilian Press, 1988), 151.

²¹¹ *The Sacrifice of Praise* (Parma, 1996), 320.

So here is the puzzle. Looking carefully, there seems to be no existing English translation which matches the idea of “storing up” something in the world; rather the idea seems to be that God gives something or discloses something to the world. It is possible that the commission has discovered a serious basis for translating ἐναπέθετο here as one would translate the same word from classical Greek. A computer search through the *Patrologia Graeca* for this word might turn up other examples not yet known. But if the commission has made such a discovery, one seriously hopes that they will inform the whole Byzantine liturgical community without delay; such matters are important and of legitimate common interest. Otherwise, it will be better to return to the previous consensus.

The 12 October 2004 draft offers a sufficient number (32) of questionable translations to make the idea of giving this draft a careful and thorough review before allowing it to come into use seem prudent and sensible. The discussion of the individual 32 points seeks to indicate what is specifically problematic in each one. More passages could certainly have been discussed, but no doubt other students will turn their attention to these. It is much easier to review the draft now than to seek to change it once it is in use.

OFFERING THE ANAPHORA ALOUD

This practice – which the rubrics in the 12 October 2004 draft would require¹ for most (but not all) of the Anaphora – bids fair to become the most polarizing and contested issue in discussions of the draft. Perhaps in this case the voice of unreason is louder than the voice of reason.²

It is probable that in the very early years of the Church, the Anaphora was offered aloud in most circumstances, though it cannot be proved beyond doubt. But there is reason to believe that “in Jerusalem, from a very early time, parts of the Canon were prayed in silence.”³ Both in the East and in the West,⁴ the impulse towards a nearly inaudible offering of the Anaphora developed early in the Patristic period, so that the practice became universal and remained so, even after the Great Schism.

One may reasonably inquire why it became the custom to offer what is indisputably the central prayer of the Divine Liturgy almost inaudibly.⁵ It is easy, even facile, to say that

¹ 12 October 2004 draft, 23, line 36; 24, line 19; 25, lines 2, 21 and 45; 26, lines 7, 21, 34 and 50; 28, line 20. .

² Joseph Ratzinger (now Pope Benedict XVI), *Church, Ecumenism and Politics: New Essays in Eschatology*, [originally published in German as *Kirche, Ökumene und Politik*] (New York: Crossroad Publishing, 1988), 149. [The English translation carries a new Foreword written by Cardinal Ratzinger on All Saints Day – 1 November – 1986.].

³ Joseph Ratzinger (now Pope Benedict XVI), *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, trans. John Saward (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2000), 215.

⁴ Note, however, that in the West at sung Masses the first section of the Anaphora – called in Latin the *Preface* – was prescribed to be chanted aloud by the priest.

⁵ According to custom, the Bishop should offer the Anaphora just loudly enough for the priests serving with him to be able to hear the prayer, so

this custom is an expression of reverence – but that won't really do. Nor can it be explained by the *disciplina arcani*. The Lord's Prayer was not revealed to catechumens until they were taught it only a day or so before their Baptism, but both in the East and in the West the Lord's Prayer is chanted at the solemn Liturgy. Indeed, there are serious scholars who consider the Lord's Prayer to be part of the Anaphora, although that is, perhaps, an exaggeration.

In Latin, the Anaphora is sometimes referred to as the *actio Missae*. The few paragraphs of the Roman Canon which change on great feasts are described as *infra actionem*. This language may give a hint as to what the issue is here.

By the *actio* of the liturgy the sources mean the Eucharistic Prayer. The real liturgical action, the true liturgical act, is the *oratio*, the great prayer that forms the core of the Eucharistic celebration, the whole of which was, therefore, called *oratio* by the Fathers.⁶

But there is more to it than that. The Anaphora is “addressed to God in full awareness that it comes from Him and is made possible by Him.”⁷ The learned Author continues:

The Anaphora “is really more than speech; it is *actio* in the highest sense of the word. For what happens in it is that the human *actio* (as performed by priests in the various religions of the world) steps back and makes way for the *actio divina*, the action of God. ...the priest speaks with the *I* of the Lord – ‘This is My Body’, ‘This is My Blood’. He knows that he is not now

that they should not have to recite it themselves. Strangely, the 12 October 2004 draft (23, lines 36-37) requires the celebrant to offer the prayer aloud while the concelebrants simultaneously recite the same prayer inaudibly.

⁶ Joseph Ratzinger (now Pope Benedict XVI), *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, trans. John Saward (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2000), 172.

⁷ Joseph Ratzinger (now Pope Benedict XVI), *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, trans. John Saward (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2000), 172.

speaking from his own resources but in virtue of the Sacrament that he has received, he has become the voice of Someone Else, Who is now speaking and acting. This action of God, which takes place through human speech, is the real 'action' for which all of creation is in expectation. The elements of the earth are transubstantiated, pulled, so to speak, from their creaturely anchorage, grasped at the deepest ground of their being, and changed into the Body and Blood of the Lord. The New Heaven and the New Earth are anticipated. The real 'action' in the liturgy in which we are all supposed to participate is the action of God Himself. This is what is new and distinctive about the Christian liturgy: God Himself acts and does what is essential."⁸

"It must be plainly evident that the [*Anaphora*] is the heart of the matter, but that it is important precisely because it provides a space for the *actio* of God."⁹

One might assert that what is *done* in the Anaphora is infinitely more important than what is *spoken*.

Nothing in *Sacrosanctum Concilium*¹⁰ gives any hint at the offering of the Anaphora aloud. Instead, *Sacrosanctum Concilium* teaches that:

"We ought to try to discover a new reverence for the Eucharistic mystery. Something is happening that is greater than anything we can do. The liturgy is the summit toward which the activity of the Church is directed; it is the font from which all her power flows."¹¹

⁸ Joseph Ratzinger (now Pope Benedict XVI), *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, trans. John Saward (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2000), 172-173.

⁹ Joseph Ratzinger (now Pope Benedict XVI), *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, trans. John Saward (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2000), 174.

¹⁰ The Vatican II Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy.

¹¹ *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, § 10.

The *Novus Ordo Missae* of Pope Paul VI does not require the priest to offer the Eucharistic Prayer aloud. However, everyone who attends the Roman Mass according to the Pauline Missal from time to time will bear witness that it is unheard-of for the Eucharistic Prayer to be offered inaudibly in that rite. Since that Missal has been in use since 1970, and since even in the years between Vatican II and the promulgation of the Pauline Missal it became common to hear the Anaphora aloud and in vernacular languages, one may ask what the result has been. Is there a heightened appreciation of the Roman Canon – one of the most ancient Anaphoras anywhere in the Church? Has understanding notably increased? Has reverence grown?

Again, those who have attended this rite of Mass from time to time know the answers to these questions. Although the Roman Canon is the first of the four Anaphoras in the Pauline Missal, its use in practice has become very rare.¹² The second Anaphora – which is the shortest – is the most often used; the third Anaphora is used on more solemn occasions. Very seldom does one find the fourth Anaphora used, in any language.¹³

Far from understanding increasing, there has been an insatiable demand for “new” Anaphoras – the modern Roman Liturgy now has Anaphoras for use during Mass celebrated with children¹⁴ and Anaphoras for use when Mass is

¹² Most years on the night of 24 December there is an Irish-language Sung Mass at University College, Dublin. Each time, someone suggests that since the Roman Canon has exceptional prayers for Christmas, it would be nice to use the Roman Canon. Each year the priests agree, but regret that it is impossible to use the Roman Canon *because the text is not in the leaflet missalette!*

¹³ In the run-up to the introduction of the Pauline Missal, there were proposals that certain Anaphoras should be assigned to certain days. The group making decisions opposed this, on the ground that it would under-cut spontaneity.

¹⁴ In all the history of the Church no one ever heard of such a thing.

celebrated in conjunction with the Sacrament of Holy Penance.¹⁵ But even this does not satisfy the insatiable demand for innovation – an uncountable number of “unofficial” Anaphoras circulate widely and are much used.

Since the reform of the liturgy, an attempt has been made to meet the crisis by incessantly inventing new Eucharistic Prayers, and in the process we have sunk farther and farther into banality. Multiplying words is no help – that is all too evident. The [liturgiologists¹⁶] have suggested all kinds of remedies, which certainly contain elements that are worthy of consideration. However, as far as I can see, they balk, now as in the past, at the possibility that silence, too, silence especially, might constitute communion before God.¹⁷

As for an increase of reverence: when John Paul II fell asleep in the Lord and a fortnight later Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger was elected and became Pope Benedict XVI,¹⁸ naturally there were many solemn celebrations of Mass in Rome; one could watch these over television. Amazingly, while the Camerlengo and later the Holy Father offered the Anaphora, usually in Latin, a lay person (often a woman) recited the Anaphora right along with the hierarchs and priests¹⁹ but in English for the dubious benefit of the viewers.

¹⁵ Such a combination was also previously unheard-of.

¹⁶ The translator here used “liturgists,” which is not quite accurate. Liturgiologists is not really satisfactory either, since there are highly educated and respected liturgiologists who do no such thing as what the learned Author is quite properly opposing: the late Msgr. Klaus Gamber comes to mind at once, as does Archimandrite Boniface (Luykx) of blessed memory.

¹⁷ Joseph Ratzinger (now Pope Benedict XVI), *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, trans. John Saward (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2000), 215.

¹⁸ The Lord preserve him, and give him live, and make him blessed upon the earth, and deliver him not to the will of his enemies!

¹⁹ Pope John Paul II specifically forbade any practice of one or more lay people reciting all or part of the Anaphora during the celebration of Mass.

This was quite unnecessary; it would have been easy to prepare the Eucharistic Prayer in subtitle form in whatever language one might wish and run the subtitles if the Vatican TV station considered that necessary. It would have been easy to advise the prospective viewers that they would do well to provide themselves at least with the texts of the Ordinary of the Mass. One might even have assumed that after nearly four decades of hearing Mass in the vernacular with the Anaphora offered aloud, most lay Catholics would be sufficiently familiar with the Anaphora not to require any special help in following it, regardless of what language might be used.

So perhaps one might wonder whether it was absolutely necessary to make the offering of the Anaphora aloud virtually mandatory in the modern Roman rite.

A contributory factor in this development from the nineteen-sixties²⁰ is a radical change in the understanding of the priesthood.

The priest is defined in a narrowly sociological and functionalist way as the “presider” at the liturgical celebration, which is thought of as a kind of meeting... But the priest’s duties in the Mass are much more than a matter of chairing a meeting.”²¹

Suggestions that the priest retains a unique sacrificial and hieratic ministry and that silence is conducive to that ministry seem unbearable to a certain mind-set. No doubt there is a complex of motives supporting that mind-set, but a strong element is surely a rejection of the traditional understanding of the priesthood itself, and a dislike of the idea that the

²⁰ As any number of commentators have noted, the Church has a remarkable penchant for picking up styles from the world just as the world is discarding the same styles. A multitude of examples can easily be cited.

²¹ Joseph Ratzinger (now Pope Benedict XVI), *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, trans. John Saward (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2000), 212.

Mystery of salvation is expressed in the liturgical surroundings of Mystery. It is surely not sheer coincidence that the near-mandatory recitation of the Anaphora aloud accompanied the near-mandatory celebration of the Roman Mass “facing the people” and the widespread practice of “Communion in the hand” as well as “lay ministers of the Eucharist”; each of these innovations has contributed to a serious reduction in the Faith concerning the Divine Liturgy and the Holy Gifts. One may question whether such results are desirable in the Greek-Catholic Church.

The first occasion in modern times – in the second millennium – that there was any serious effort to promote the mandatory offering of the Anaphora aloud came from the Renovators, also called the “Living Church,” sponsored by the Soviets in the nineteen-twenties:

...different attempts were made to celebrate Mass no longer²² within the *sanctum* of the altar room but instead in the center of the church. The Liturgy was translated into modern Russian and prayers were supplemented by using parts from other liturgies. *The private prayers of the priest were recited publicly so that the faithful could hear them.* The singing of church hymns by the faithful was introduced to replace the traditional chants sung by the choir, and so on and so forth.^{23 24}

Saint Tychon, the martyred Patriarch of Moscow, condemned these innovations in unmistakable language:

²² A split infinitive which disfigures the English translation of Msgr. Gamber's book has been corrected.

²³ [This is footnote 119 in Gamber] See Levitin Krasov, *Böse Jahre (Bad Years)*, 175.

²⁴ Msgr. Klaus Gamber, *The Reform of the Roman Liturgy: Its Problems and Background*, trans. from the original German by Klaus D. Grimm (San Juan Capistrano, CA: Una Voce Press and Harrison, NY: The Foundation for Catholic Reform, 1993), 93.

All this is done under the pretext that the liturgy has to be adjusted to meet the demands of our time, to revitalize our worship, and thus to attract the faithful and bring them back into our churches. We withhold our blessing for violations of this kind, from the self-styled activities of a few individuals conducting their own form of liturgical worship services. We do not give our blessing, *because we cannot do this in good conscience*. The divine beauty of our liturgy, as it has been set down by the Church in her ritual manuals, her rubrics and her instructions, must remain intact and inviolate in the Russian Orthodox Church, *because they are our greatest and most holy possession*.²⁵

The experience of the Renovationists or “Living Church” was completely negative. This Soviet-sponsored parody of a Church failed for lack of support by the Orthodox faithful. Anything reminiscent of that lamentable movement can expect an uphill struggle.

Sometimes supporters of the offering of the Anaphora aloud assert that this practice is already in use among some Orthodox Christians and that many more would like to have this practice. The Eastern Orthodox Church is a body including many millions of Christians and if one were to search carefully enough, no doubt some Eastern Orthodox who would like to have the Anaphora offered aloud could be found. However, they would be a small minority indeed. It is quite safe to say that the overwhelming majority of Eastern Orthodox Christians have never even heard of such an idea, and are not seeking such an innovation.

²⁵ Quoted in Msgr. Klaus Gamber, *The Reform of the Roman Liturgy: Its Problems and Background*, trans. from the original German by Klaus D. Grimm (San Juan Capistrano, CA: Una Voce Press and Harrison, NY: The Foundation for Catholic Reform, 1993), 177-178.

One need not immovably oppose *any* offering of the Anaphora aloud. There is no reason to *require* the offering of the Anaphora aloud and there is good reason to establish some specific norms for the offering of the Anaphora aloud.

First, liturgical education ought to aim at making the faithful familiar with the essential meaning and fundamental orientation of the [Anaphora].²⁶

This, of course, is best done in a setting other than that of the actual celebration of the Divine Liturgy. With children, it is a question of explaining the different portions of the Anaphora in a way suitable to their age and mental development. With adults, it is a question of going through the actual text of the Anaphora together, with explanation of what comes from where²⁷ and with encouragement to ask questions, to think, reflect and pray.

It is also sensible to provide the actual text of the Anaphora to the worshippers at the Divine Liturgy. The print should be large enough, and the lighting sufficient, for the text to be legible. The various Ecphoneseis, and the portions sung by the choir or assembly, are sufficient to enable the worshippers to follow the action in their own prayers. "Anyone who has experienced a church united in the silent praying of the [Anaphora] will know what a really *filled* silence is."²⁸ The Church has known this for more than a millennium; the Quakers know it now. Why should the Church abandon it?

²⁶ Joseph Ratzinger (now Pope Benedict XVI), *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, translated by John Saward, Ignatius Press, San Francisco, 2000, p. 215.

²⁷ This demands a complete set of Scriptural references, as complete a set of patristic references as possible and an instructor who knows the development of the Eucharist thoroughly.

²⁸ Joseph Ratzinger (now Pope Benedict XVI), *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, trans. John Saward (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2000), 215.

It really is not true that reciting the whole [Anaphora] out loud is a prerequisite for the participation of everyone in this central act of the [Divine Liturgy].²⁹

Sometimes the proponents of having the Anaphora proclaimed aloud in the Byzantine-Ruthenian Pittsburgh Metropolitanate remark that there is no rubric in the 1941 Roman edition in Church-Slavonic of the Byzantine-Ruthenian Divine Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom requiring that the Anaphora should be prayed *in mystica*. This observation is true, but hardly conclusive. There is also no such rubric in the Nikonian or "*Recensio vulgata*" edition, nor in the pre-Nikonian edition still retained by the Old Ritualists.³⁰ To account for this lacuna is not difficult; by the time that these versions were done into Church-Slavonic, it would have been approximately one thousand years since there had been any custom of proclaiming the Anaphora aloud. One need not always trouble to tell people to do what they are going to do anyway.

During the [Anaphora] the altar was hidden behind curtains. As Saint John Chrysostom has reported, the curtains would be lifted again only after the litany had been sung by the deacon.^{31 32}

²⁹ Joseph Ratzinger (now Pope Benedict XVI), *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, trans. John Saward (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2000), 215.

³⁰ *Recensio Rutena* (Rome, 1941), 86, 88, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95 and 98; *Recensio vulgata* (Rome, 1941), 87, 89, 92, 94, 95, 97 and 100; *Old-Ritualist Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom* (in Church-Slavonic) (Vereshchagino, 2002; repr. from Moscow 7420 (=A.D. 1912) with the Imprimatur of Archbishop Joseph, in accordance with the Service-Book printed in the fifth year of the Patriarchate of Patriarch Joseph of Moscow and all Rus), 80 *recto*, 82 *recto*, 83 *recto*, 83 *verso*, 84 *recto*, 84 *verso*, 85 *recto*, 85 *verso*, 86 *verso*, 87 *recto*, 88 *recto*, 88 *verso* and 89 *recto*.

³¹ [This is footnote 110 in Gamber] See Fr. Van de Pavard, "Zur Geschichte der Messliturgie in Antiocheia und Konstantinopel gegen Ende des 4. Jh." (About the History of the Liturgy of the Mass in Antioch and Constantinople Towards the End of the Fourth Century), *Orientalia*

It seems reasonable to assume that if the altar was deliberately hidden behind curtains during the Anaphora, the bulk of the Anaphora would be offered *in mystica*. At present most Byzantines, both Catholic and Orthodox, close the Royal Doors for the Anaphora (this would make it strange to offer the Anaphora aloud – which may explain why the 12 October 2004 draft mandates serving the Divine Liturgy with open Royal Doors throughout), but it seems that only the Old-Ritualists³³ and perhaps some monasteries on Athos maintain the practice of offering the Anaphora (*in mystica*) with the curtain closed as well.

Pertaining to the specific Old Kyivan or Ruthenian tradition, there is another source to bear in mind: the service-books of the series associated with Saint Peter Mohyla, Metropolitan of Kyiv from 1632 until 1646. His books *do* include the rubrics prescribing that the Anaphora should be read *in mystica*, save for the ecphoneseis and the choral responses.³⁴

Moreover, the *Ordo Celebrationis*, published to accompany the *Recensio Rutena* Liturgicon, clearly requires that the Anaphora shall be offered *secreto (in mystica)*.³⁵

Christian Analecta 187 (1970), 42 ff., 187 ff.; see also the review of this work in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 65 (1972), 371 ff.

³² Msgr. Klaus Gamber, *The Reform of the Roman Liturgy: Its Problems and Background*, trans. from the original German by Klaus D. Grimm (San Juan Capistrano, CA: Una Voce Press and Harrison, NY: The Foundation for Catholic Reform, 1993), 82-83.

³³ Cf. video-recording of the consecration of Dormition of the Mother of God Russian Old Rite Orthodox Church, Sydney, Australia, and the Pontifical Divine Liturgy in the same church, offered by Metropolitan Leonty of Belaia Krenitsa and all the Old Orthodox Christians and Archbishop Sofrony of the United States, Canada and Australia.

³⁴ *Leiturgiarion* (Kiev: Monastery of the Caves, 1639; reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications [Fairfax, VA] and Stauropegion [L'viv and New York], 1996), 324, 328, 331, 334, 335, 336, 338, 341 and 346.

³⁵ *Ordo Celebrationis*, editio altera (Romae, 1953), §§ 133, 134, 135 and 136.

The Instruction on applying the Code of Canons in liturgical matters prescribes that

it is appropriate to study the ways in which, at least in some circumstances, [the Anaphora] could be pronounced aloud, so as to be heard by the faithful.³⁶

By all means. But to *study* the ways in which something might be done *in some circumstances* is not the same as ordering the clergy to do it, immediately and everywhere. Those who wish to advance this idea could and should publish such studies, with particular attention to the problems which have arisen in the Western Church and specific suggestions as to how our Churches might avoid those problems.

If there is to be a real *participatio actuosa*, there must be silence. In this silence, together, we journey inward, becoming aware of word and sign...Liturgy's tension, tautness, does not come from "variety"...but from the fact that it creates a space in which we can encounter what is truly great and inexhaustible, something that does not need "variety" because it *suffices*, namely truth and love...I must add, though it conflicts with the accepted view, that it is not essential for the entire [Anaphora] to be recited aloud on every occasion. The idea that it *must* rests on a misunderstanding of its nature as proclamation. Where a community has undergone the requisite process of liturgical education, the congregation is well acquainted with the component parts of the Church's eucharistic prayer. In such a case it is only necessary to pray aloud the first few words of each section of the prayer – the headings, as it were; in this way the congregation's participation (and hence the quality of proclamation) will often be

³⁶ Instruction on Applying The Liturgical Prescriptions Of The Code Of Canons Of The Eastern [Catholic] Churches, Congregation for the Eastern Churches, 6 January 1966, § 54.

far greater than when its internal appropriation of the words is not stifled by an uninterrupted loud recitation. The unhappy multiplication of eucharistic prayers which we see...is symptomatic of a very serious situation, quite apart from the fact that the quality and the theological content of some of these productions are hardly bearable. The continual recitation of the [Anaphora] aloud results in the demand for "variety," but the demand is insatiable, however much these eucharistic prayers may proliferate. There is only one solution: we must address ourselves once again to the *intrinsic tension of the reality itself*. In the end even variety becomes boring. This why, here especially, we are in such urgent need of an education toward inwardness. We need to be taught to enter into the heart of things. As far as liturgy is concerned, this is a matter of life or death. The only way we can be saved from succumbing to the inflation of words is if we have the courage to face silence and in it learn to listen afresh to the Word. Otherwise we shall be overwhelmed by "mere words" at the very point where we should be encountering *the Word*, the Logos, the Word of love, crucified and risen, Who brings us life and joy.³⁷

There is one specific case as an example of an exceptional situation which could make the chanting of the Anaphora aloud appropriate: the Divine Liturgy of Saint Basil the Great. The Anaphora of this Liturgy is probably the most beautiful and theological Anaphora known to the Church. Sadly, in many cases, it is not really known to the faithful at all. One could seriously, albeit cynically, ask to what extent the clergy knew this Anaphora and used it.

³⁷ Joseph Ratzinger (now Pope Benedict XVI), *Feast of Faith: Approaches to a Theology of the Liturgy*, tran. Graham Harrison (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1986), 72-73.

The Anaphora of Saint Basil is also lengthy – and that is probably almost all that even relatively well-educated parishioners know about it. To give some idea of the relative length, the Anaphora in the Divine Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom as printed in the service-book used by the Orthodox Church in America³⁸ begins on page 62 and concludes on page 70. In the same book, the Anaphora in the Divine Liturgy of Saint Basil the Great begins on page 127 and continues to page 142 – so the Anaphora of Saint Basil is about twice as long as the Anaphora of Saint John Chrysostom.

Offering this Anaphora *in mystica* will have one of two results: no matter how fast the priest reads the Anaphora there will be an inordinate silence, which is a phenomenon quite uncharacteristic of the Byzantine Liturgy, or the chanters or choir(s) will use music especially written for the Anaphora of Saint Basil, prolonging the singing to provide sufficient time to “cover” the quiet reading of the Anaphora. Neither of these can be considered satisfactory, especially when so many people honestly do not know this Anaphora at all. Each of these unsatisfactory solutions will pressure the priest to attempt to read through the Anaphora at a rate of speed incompatible with genuine prayer.

Moreover, the Byzantine tradition only offers the Anaphora of Saint Basil ten times a year.³⁹ So offering this particular Anaphora aloud would in practice be something clearly exceptional, would enable – even require – the priest and others in the Church who are responsible for education to see to it that an effective preaching and explanation of this

³⁸ *The Divine Liturgy According to Saint John Chrysostom*, Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of America (now the Orthodox Church in America) (New York, 1967 [reprinted 1977]). Page numbers as mentioned above.

³⁹ On the five Sundays of Great Lent (not including Palm Sunday), on Holy Thursday, on Holy Saturday, on Christmas Eve, on Theophany Eve, and on the feast of Saint Basil the Great.

magnificent Anaphora is made known to the faithful, and would discourage the abuses just mentioned.⁴⁰

This would necessitate some attention to training the priests in how to *chant* the Anaphora of Saint Basil in such a way as to be intelligible and edifying. It would also necessitate making the text available to the faithful, both by way of preparation and for use in following the Anaphora during the Divine Liturgy.⁴¹

This also means withdrawing from use the prolonged musical settings mentioned earlier and providing simple settings for the hymn “All Creation Rejoices” usually sung to the Holy Theotokos during this Anaphora. But this is not much of a problem.

This leads to another consideration in the offering of the Anaphora aloud: those who do this seem almost invariably to recite the Anaphora rather than chant it. The Pauline Missal provides music, both in Latin and in vernacular languages, for the chanting of the Anaphora – but little of this music is ever used. Even in Latin Masses broadcast from Rome, one can hear the anomalous recitation of the Institution Narrative, followed by the priest chanting the two words *Mysterium Fidei*. Would anybody defend the idea that the two words *Mysterium Fidei* are more important than the Institution Narrative? But that is precisely the impression given by chanting the one and reading the other aloud. One wonders how successful an

⁴⁰ Plus worse abuses which I have not mentioned and which are much worse.

⁴¹ “Faith comes by hearing” (Romans 10:17) and many liturgical experts do not approve of encouraging the laity to follow the service from a printed text. However, in this instance when the clergy and the assembly must attempt to grasp this long prayer as a unity, and encourage others to do the same, the combination of chanting the text intelligibly *and* providing a printed text for the faithful to follow will reinforce the message and encourage people to make this prayer their own.

effort would be at requiring the priests to chant the Anaphora of Saint John Chrysostom or Saint Basil.⁴²

Throughout these protracted reflections on the 12 October 2004 draft text, there are many references to the works of Father Archimandrite Robert Taft, S.J. All those who care about such matters have cause to be grateful to Father Archimandrite for his meticulous study of the history and development of the Divine Liturgy, and his study of related questions. There is no doubt but that the Churches will still be using his work when this present generation will have long been gone to the eternal reward.

For that very reason, honesty requires an acknowledgement that Father Archimandrite Robert does not agree with the present writer on the issue of the offering of the Anaphora aloud, and would probably deplore at least this particular section of these present comments on the 12 October 2004 draft. He himself has written clearly that:

From a pastoral point of view the main liturgical problem of the Byzantine eucharistic anaphora is...the silent recitation of the anaphora....Any restoration of pristine usage must give precedence to the audible recitation of that central prayer of the service"⁴³

In that paragraph Father Archimandrite did not give his reasons, but one hopes that he will do so in his forthcoming volume on the Anaphora, which should be read and studied with respectful and thankful attention. Father Archimandrite Robert has never objected to a scholarly difference between himself and others (on the contrary, he rather enjoys

⁴² The chant need not be elaborate – the sort of chant normally used for the solemn prayers at the Great Blessing of Waters, for example, would do nicely.

⁴³ [Father Archimandrite] Robert F. Taft, S.J., *A History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom*, vol. 4, *The Diptychs*, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 238 (Roma: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1991), 194.

recounting anecdotes of how his own former students have managed to best him in such disagreements – which is very much to his credit).

In the midst of requiring the offering of the Anaphora aloud, the rubrics of the 12 October 2004 draft suddenly require that the portion of the Anaphora between the hymn to the Holy Theotokos “It is truly proper to glorify you”⁴⁴ and the commemoration of the hierarchs by name⁴⁵ should be done “quietly.”⁴⁶ This is incongruous, even strange, because this section of the Anaphora includes the commemorations of the dead and:

Every pastor knows that people wish to hear read aloud in church the names of those for whom they have made an offering and requested prayers.⁴⁷

This is absolutely true and every pastor does indeed know it to be true. An effective practice is to chant these names (of both the living and the dead) aloud during the appropriate petitions of the Ektene⁴⁸ and again at the Great Entrance, thus making sure that those who have requested the prayers will hear them. Even priests who offer the Anaphora *in mystica* will often notice the acolytes watching closely as the priests read these names a third time during this particular section of the Anaphora.⁴⁹

⁴⁴ 12 October 2004 draft, 27, lines 10-20.

⁴⁵ 12 October 2004 draft, 28 lines 8-13.

⁴⁶ 12 October 2004 draft, 27, lines 22 and 43.

⁴⁷ [Father Archimandrite] Robert F. Taft, S.J., *A History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom*, vol. 4, *The Diptychs*, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 238 (Roma: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1991), 36.

⁴⁸ The petitions which follow the Gospel (and sermon, if there is one); the Ektene is particularly flexible.

⁴⁹ The exception occurs on the five “Saturdays of the Dead,” when there are so many names that one must resort to other expedients. On these Saturdays there is normally the Trisagion for the Dead (Panychyda)

So it is strange that the 12 October 2004 draft prescribes that this one section of the Anaphora should be read quietly. Perhaps this is simply a *lapsus calami* and it was intended that this section, like the rest of the Anaphora according to the draft, is meant to be offered aloud. It is also possible that whoever took the decision to have this section read quietly was moved to do so by the consideration that the hymn to the Holy Theotokos is often sung at length and with enthusiasm, so that the priest would appreciate being allowed to use this time to read the section in question quietly. But until and unless someone gives an explanation, it is impossible to be certain.

For a final thought on the offering of the Anaphora aloud, two phenomena occur in the discussion: several people have commented that the recitation of the Anaphora aloud “sounds Roman Catholic” somehow. This has produced spirited responses from advocates of the practice, insisting that there is no Roman Catholic inspiration at work here.

That might indicate that it is precisely *recitation* of the Anaphora, not chanting of the Anaphora, which is being introduced – and it is no wonder that this “sounds Roman Catholic,” since that is how it is done in Masses celebrated according to the Missal of Pope Paul VI.

It is not hard to understand that those who advocate the offering of the Anaphora aloud in the Divine Liturgy are offended and annoyed at the implication that there is some Roman Catholic inspiration in back of their agenda here. But is it really credible that after at least 1,500 years of the offering of the Anaphora *in mystica* in the Byzantine Churches, a hitherto-unknown demand for the offering of the Anaphora aloud has suddenly appeared *without* any inspiration coming from the

directly after the Divine Liturgy, and all the names are offered then, in a moderate chant, while the assembly slowly chants *Kyrie, eleison* as many times as necessary – This is the usage in Saint George’s Cathedral in L’viv, and even so it takes a good hour to read out all the names.

new Roman practice? If so, that would be a remarkable coincidence.

“For everything there is a season, and a time for every purpose under heaven:...a time to keep silence and a time to speak.”⁵⁰ The Anaphora is an excellent and acceptable time to keep silence!

⁵⁰ Ecclesiastes 3:1, 7a.

PART III

CONCLUSION

CHAPTER 12

SOME UNANSWERED QUESTIONS

Some other points seem puzzling. Thus, for example, it would appear that the use of the Zeon (hot water added to the chalice before the priest's communion) is not optional but required – yet there is no mention whatever of the sponge. Why would the commission wish to restore the Zeon but not the sponge?¹

Page 32 and page 33 of the 12 October 2004 draft both state clearly that the NI and KA sections of the Holy Lamb are to be used in giving Holy Communion to the faithful. Page 35 directs that “the deacon then places the remaining particles for the communion of the faithful into the chalice and covers it.” But the next sentence reads, “He [the deacon] places the asterisk and the veils on the diskos.” If the commemorative particles, which are *not* intended for the communion of the faithful, are immersed in the Precious Blood in the chalice before the Communion of the faithful is completed, it will be virtually impossible for the priest to discern which particles he is to use in administering Holy Communion. If these commemorative particles are still on the Discarion, one would scarcely place the asterisk and veils on top of them.

The 12 October 2004 draft rubrics² refer to the antimension, not the iliton, and make it clear that it is the antimension which is first unfolded (before the Great Entrance) and then

¹ The collapse or survival of Western civilization is not contingent upon the presence or absence of the liturgical sponge! But the point is not without interest – and it is not a matter which will distress most of the laity one way or the other.

² 12 October 2004 draft, 16 and 37.

folded again (after all have received Holy Communion and the Holy Gifts have been returned to the Prothesis Table). Many priests were already doing this, and this is consistent with the overwhelming majority practice of Eastern Orthodoxy, so in Father Peter Galadza's pleasant phrase one may say that in this matter the new translation/redaction restores the κοινῆ to κοινονία.³ However, it might have been better to leave this as an option – because the practice of keeping the antimimension under the katasarka, or between the katasarka and the endition, is much older and is still in use among the Old Ritualists.

There are innovations which distinguish this text from the standard Byzantine order of service. Some drastic omissions and abbreviations have happened in connection with the synaptēs, the ektene and the aiteseis. Perhaps one or more of the redactors has an aversion to the diaconal petitions as they are found in the *textus receptus* of the Divine Liturgy. In the Great Synapte (which the editors call the “litany of peace”) there is a separate petition reading “For our holy father (*Name*), pope of Rome, let us pray to the Lord,”⁴ followed by another petition for the Metropolitan and the bishop. This must be considered odd;⁵ the Pope is not in a different category from other bishops. The Pope is a bishop among bishops and should be commemorated as such.

Four of the six petitions of the “Litany for the Catechumens” have been conflated into one petition.⁶ Since

³ Father Peter Galadza, *Logos* 35, nos. 1-4 (1994) : 173.

⁴ 12 October 2004 draft, 3.

⁵ Such a petition does indeed occur in the original Church-Slavonic *recensio rutena* edition of the Divine Liturgy (Rome, 1941, p. 37), but on 31 October 1953 a letter of Eugène Cardinal Tisserant (protocol number 908/48) permitted Bishop Daniel Ivancho, the Apostolic Exarch in Pittsburgh, to conflate the petition for the Pope with the petition for the hierarchy. The same conflation was done for general use in the Church-Slavonic *recensio rutena* edition of the *Arkhieratikon* (Rome 1973).

⁶ 12 October 2004 draft, 15.

the draft makes this “Litany” optional anyway, such a conflation also seems pointless.

The identical prayer of the priest during the second “Litany of the faithful” appears twice, in full – to be said aloud on page 16 and quietly on page 17. One can only assume that someone made a mistake with the word processor.

The plerotika after the Great Entrance are reduced to one single petition (the second of the standard order) and the Aitesis is omitted completely.⁷

The second and third petitions of the synapte after the Anaphora are conflated into one. The Aitesis appears, but is set off in such a way as to give the impression that its use is optional.⁸

The normal postcommunion synapte has three diaconal petitions; this text gives only the first one,⁹ followed by the praying aloud of the priestly prayer and its Ecphonesis. This seems strange, because the time thus “saved” is minimal and the second of the missing petitions occurs *only* at this point. Among Eastern Orthodox, there are only two examples of this particular abbreviation. One is in a service-book translated, arranged and published by New Skete.¹⁰ This is a small monastery in upstate New York, originally derived from the Franciscans. New Skete has effectively abandoned the normal Byzantine liturgical tradition and created its own forms of the Divine Liturgy and other services. New Skete belongs to the Orthodox Church in America but does not use the official

⁷ 12 October 2004 draft, 20-21.

⁸ 12 October 2004 draft, 29-30.

⁹ 12 October 2004 draft, 37

¹⁰ *The Divine Liturgy* (Cambridge, NY: New Skete, 1987), 124-125.

liturgical publications of that judicatory. The other example is in a book for use in one mission parish in Virginia.¹¹

There is no hint of the Antidoron, let alone the distribution of the Antidoron.¹²

¹¹ *The Divine Liturgy of the Great Church*, rev., annotated and set to the melodies by Paul N. Harrilchak (Reston, VA, 1984), 113. This book has many indications of a strong influence from Father Laurence of New Skete, who was himself the prime mover in the liturgical innovations of that monastery. Nevertheless, despite disagreeing with the particular abbreviation under discussion, it is only fair to add that Father Paul Harrilchak is no mean scholar; his book is worth-while and useful, and his efforts to adapt music from several different traditions of the Byzantine family for congregational singing in English have serious merit.

¹² 12 October 2004 draft, 38.

WHAT NOW?

The process by which the draft of 12 October 2004 has been developed, and by which – it seems – the commission would like to see the draft of 12 October 2004 imposed, is disquieting. The unfortunate history of the liturgical development of the jurisdiction which is now the Byzantine-Ruthenian Catholic Metropolitanate in the USA urges caution. Moreover, there has been a serious lack of consultation, a strong reliance upon secrecy and haste which is inappropriate with regard to a work that is of legitimate broad concern to the people who will be most affected by it: those who presently attend the churches of the Byzantine-Ruthenian Metropolitanate of Pittsburgh. There is also the inescapable question of the responsibility of that Metropolitanate to the larger Orthodox context, as Vatican II, the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches, *Orientalis Lumen* and the *Instruction on Applying the Liturgical decrees of the Code of Canons* all state clearly. If this 12 October 2004 draft were to be adopted as it stands, it would distance the Byzantine-Ruthenian Catholic Metropolitan of Pittsburgh still further, both from the other Greek-Catholics in the United States and from Eastern Orthodox in the United States. That is a severe drawback. Other considerations must be addressed if there is to be any perspective for the future.

The honor of the Catholic Church is involved. Rome urges Greek-Catholics to be conscious of the liturgical and spiritual treasures which Greek-Catholics hold *in common with the Eastern Orthodox*. If this draft were to be adopted, it would give substance to the accusation that such pious statements from Rome are simply window-dressing and that in reality Rome wants a revisionist liturgy to drive a further wedge between the Greek-Catholics and the Eastern Orthodox.

Before doing anything else, it would be sensible, even necessary, to begin the regular use of the complete Divine Liturgy as published in Church-Slavonic in 1941 and in English in 1964/65, taking account of the *Ordo Celebrationis* as published in Latin in 1944 and the *Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, Congregation for the Eastern Church, Libreria Editrice Vaticana (reprinted by Eastern Christian Publications, Fairfax, VA) 1996.¹ This will require a serious, concerted effort to introduce these texts and documents to the faithful and even to some of the clergy, in the context of the Vatican II *Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches* and Pope John Paul II's Apostolic Letter *Oriente Lumen*.

It is sensible and necessary to allow the clergy and the faithful the opportunity to appreciate and understand the Divine Liturgy and the accompanying liturgical books of the *Recensio Rutena* as published by the Holy See in the early nineteen-forties and the years which followed. Given the linguistic context of the Byzantine-Ruthenian Metropolitanate of Pittsburgh, that can only be accomplished through the English language, yet several of these books have *never* been translated into English, in all these decades. Celebrations of the Divine Liturgy according to the official Liturgicon and the *Ordo Celebrationis* are not quite nonexistent in the US Byzantine-Ruthenian Catholic Metropolitanate – there are already a few priests who serve in what is, after all, the officially prescribed way – but many priests who want to serve according to the official books have been and still are intimidated. The overwhelming majority of the faithful have not had and do not have access to such celebrations, or even to the complete text of the Divine Liturgy.

¹ It appears that the hierarchy of the Pittsburgh Byzantine-Ruthenian Catholic Metropolitanate has already agreed on the suppression of the *Filioque*, the restoration of the Zeon and the use of the sponge. These matters were left to the discretion of the hierarchy in 1941. In some parishes, there is still a need to install an iconostasis.

This state of affairs is not merely wrong, it is indefensible. In the words of Bishop Kallistos:

Any serious translation should have the deacon's part and all the litanies...as a matter of principle, it is bad practice not to translate the liturgy in its integrity."²

If the Divine Liturgy according to the liturgical books is as inappropriate as the proponents of the 12 October 2004 draft evidently believe, then there is every reason to demonstrate this unsuitability, by encouraging such celebrations and allowing all to see for themselves that the faithful do not care to attend such services – if this turns out to be the case.

The principle remains: it is not possible to have a successful reform of that which one does not thoroughly know. So those who want such a reform to succeed will do well to begin by insisting on a serious and persevering effort to practice the Divine Liturgy in particular according to the liturgical books – in English translation, of course. This is not an argument to reinstate the *Filioque*, for example: the official Ruthenian books leave that up to the ruling hierarch. Nor is it an argument for the retention of blatantly inaccurate English “translations”; there has been too much of that already. In that regard there is acute consternation at the failure to reinstate the word “orthodox” where it belongs in the liturgical texts. This change could and should be accomplished without any need for altering the whole Divine Liturgy. Why, then, is this almost the only change which is so conspicuously not introduced?

When this has been accomplished, when the official Liturgy has been in use for a sufficient number of years to enable the compilation of credible data on the reception of the official Liturgy by the faithful and when necessary scholarly

² *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 41-42 (2000-2001): 115-116.

work (some of which is now in progress) is advanced to a more complete level, then there *might* be a suitable moment to consider both new translations and some degree of recasting.

In introducing liturgical novelties, it is well to keep in mind that most people do not like upheaval. Hence a perceived need for change requires careful consideration, both of the need itself and of the process for which such change may be introduced with a minimum of pastoral disruption.³ Even so, the question will arise: is the disruption worth the gain?

So far, at least, it is difficult even to guess what the *criteria* of translation accepted by the commission are. But before one can translate anything of any importance, one must establish these criteria. To offer two examples:

In preparing the *Festal Menaion*, which has certainly been a successful and influential translation, the translators published their criteria for all to read.⁴ One may not agree with those criteria, but at least the criteria are available to the public.

Likewise, the ICEL translators, regardless of what may be thought of the results, also published their criteria for anyone to read. Again, it is possible to know what their goals were, what their standards of English were, and it is possible to gain some idea of how they applied those goals and standards in practice.

³ The need for care and patience does not mean to do nothing. The official Liturgy was published in 1941, well over sixty years ago. In 1954 Bishop Daniel Ivancho began what could have been a peaceful, gradual introduction of the official Liturgy. Had this been allowed to continue, the situation now would be much easier.

⁴ *The Festal Menaion, Translated from the original Greek*, Mother Mary and Archimandrite Kallistos [now Bishop Kallistos of Diokleia] (originally published London: Faber and Faber, 1969; fifth printing South Canaan, PA: St. Tikhon's Seminary Press, 1996), 13-16.

Something similar must be developed for any proposed translation and recasting of the Byzantine-Ruthenian Divine Liturgy. Developing and publishing a clear set of criteria – which must include a reasonable definition of “modern American English,” since that is the idiom which the Byzantine-Ruthenian Church evidently wishes to use – is indispensable for the sake of consistency and intelligibility. Since so much Byzantine liturgical material is Scriptural in origin, there is a need for serious consideration of what English translation or translations of the Bible should be the reference source for the various excerpts which are found in the liturgical texts.

Publishing these criteria might stimulate a discussion. In turn, a broad, free discussion might mean that the clergy and faithful feel a sense of “ownership” of eventual translations, which would be all to the good. *Secrecy* is certainly not an acceptable way forward in a matter which is of intimate concern to so very many people.

Two specific problems involved in the use of modern American English for liturgical purposes must be kept in mind: using modern American English as the standard will inevitably mean that other Anglophone countries and societies find it difficult to use such a translation, and in practice it becomes harder to insist upon a literal, word-for-word use of the published text, because when clergy and people are using their own vernacular language, varying degrees of departure from the printed text are almost inevitable. Moreover, since nothing is more out-dated than yesterday’s “modernity,”⁵ it will be necessary to revise such a translation at ever-shorter intervals to keep up with linguistic changes. English in particular is a remarkably flexible language – that is not a criticism; this flexibility is among the factors which have made English such a strong international language. But texts which

⁵ We are loudly informed on all sides that we are now living in the time of “post-modernism,” whatever such an expression might mean.

seemed modern, even daring, in the nineteen-seventies can seem curiously quaint and dated now. Is it practical to re-translate the entire Byzantine liturgical corpus at such brief intervals? Those who make this choice should realize and consider the implications.

In 2001 Metropolitan Joseph (Raya), Archbishop-Emeritus of St. Jean d’Acre, Haifa, Nazareth and All Galilee published his new translation of the Divine Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom.⁶ The Archbishop restored the use of second-person singular pronouns and other characteristics of the hieratic functional variety of English in addressing God (the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit), the Holy Theotokos and the Saints.⁷ Archbishop Joseph said that in view of the developments in the Church since 1969,⁸ he had reconsidered the philosophy of liturgical translations carefully and concluded that the use of an overly informal functional variety of English contributed to the general pattern of irreverence and even to a neo-Nestorian Christology which the Archbishop found destructive.

Archbishop Joseph’s 2001 translation is regularly used for the Divine Liturgy at Madonna House, where His Eminence spent his last years.⁹ Priests and people at Madonna House report that the older people rather like this new translation; those of middle years seem strongly opposed to the return to hieratic English – but young people and young visitors in particular absolutely love the 2001 translation, so Madonna House bears witness to the positive value of hieratic English.

⁶ *The Divine and Holy Liturgy of our Father among the Saints, John Chrysostom* (Allendale, NJ: Alleluia Press, 2001).

⁷ This translation retains the use of second-person plural pronouns in addressing the priest, the deacon and the lector.

⁸ In that year Archbishop Joseph published *Byzantine Daily Worship* (Alleluia Press). This became the official English translation used by the Eparchy of Newton in the USA and has since been reprinted.

⁹ Archbishop Joseph Raya fell asleep in the Lord on 10 June 2005, as this study was in preparation. Memory Eternal!

Those who wish to translate liturgical texts have their work cut out for them. At the time of writing, there is only one English translation of the Ruthenian edition of the *Small Trebnyk*;¹⁰ that translation was privately produced in 1983 and is now unobtainable, nor is it likely that the 1983 translation will be issued again. There is no translation at all of the *Book of Molebens*, which is startling since the Byzantine liturgy is often castigated as “unpastoral”; those texts are quite pastoral, for specific pastoral needs. The pastoral needs have not disappeared. There is no complete translation of the Epistle book. There is not even a translation of the abridged Epistle Book. There is no complete translation of the *Horologion*, nor of the *Archieratikon*. Meanwhile, there are at least two hundred published English translations of the Divine Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom, in print and available – surely there is a translation of the Chrysostom Liturgy to suit almost any taste. Amidst this *embarrass des richesses*, it is difficult to appreciate the haste with which the 12 October 2004 draft is being fast-tracked. What is the urgency?¹¹

If there is a genuine need for more work on English translations of the Divine Liturgy it is, again, only sensible to lay a solid foundation for the production of such a translation. This would mean:

a serious, scholarly project to translate the Greek text of the Septuagint Psalter into English, with a serious critical apparatus and a constant awareness that this English

¹⁰ *The Small Trebnyk or Abbreviated Euchologion* (Detroit, MI: St. Joseph’s Institute, 1983). Translators were Father John P. Weisengoff and Canon Joseph Shary; both have since reposed. These two priests did a prodigious amount of work without financial recompense, purely for the pastoral good of the Church.

¹¹ It has been suggested that there is no “haste” in the matter, since it is said that written approval from Rome for this text was received several years ago, in the time of Metropolitan Judson. However, no one has produced this claimed written approval, nor has there been any circulation of the proposed text with an invitation for clergy and laity, including scholars and monastics, to offer criticisms.

translation is meant for Byzantine liturgical use. Sometimes this means retaining words, phrases or even verses which contemporary scholars may think should be removed, but which are nevertheless in Byzantine liturgical use. Such a translation of the Septuagint Psalter would be no mean piece of work, but it would be an accomplishment of lasting value, in which the workers would have every reason to take pride and which would do credit to the Byzantine Catholic Church; this must be a translation of the Septuagint *textus receptus* Psalter as it is used in the Byzantine liturgical tradition. Our Church does not currently have the resources to produce a complete critical edition of the Septuagint Psalter in the original Greek. In 1985 an English Psalter appeared which was the work of Father Shary and Father Weisengoff; they had translated it from the Church-Slavonic translation of the Septuagint Psalter.¹² Our Church needs such an English Psalter translated directly from the Greek, but this was at least a step in the right direction.

A “working translation” of the Divine Liturgy, not for immediate use in services – and certainly not for immediate imposition as a mandatory text – but for circulation among concerned scholars and all those who are interested. Using the Internet, it is possible to do this with relative ease.

Patience! Many people are often inclined to suspect any invocation of the need for patience to be a thinly-veiled injunction to forget the whole thing. In this instance, that is *not* the idea. There is a shortage of liturgiological and patristic stars in the Byzantine firmament, but no one will deny the erudition and ability of Father Archimandrite Robert Taft. He has already published three volumes of his

¹² Specifically from the liturgical Psalter in Church-Slavonic published by the L'viv Stauropegion Brotherhood in 1901. This recension of the Church-Slavonic Psalter differs from the Nikonian version.

projected *History of the Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom* and he assures everyone that the rest is nearly ready for the printers. Eastern Orthodox and Greek-Catholics must not begrudge him the time to proof-read his volumes before giving the final approval and printing them; this *History of the Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom* will be of the first importance for decades, perhaps even centuries, to come. It is reasonable to await the fruits of his work before publishing yet more translations of the Divine Liturgy (unless it is a question of a translation of the Divine Liturgy into a language which does not already have such a translation and where a pastoral need has appeared recently¹³).

Yves Congar “suffered greatly from the Church and...nevertheless loved the Church greatly.”¹⁴ His own comments on evangelical patience are thus of immense credibility:

[Patience] is a certain quality of mind, or rather of soul, which takes root in these profound convictions: first, that God deals the cards and fulfils in us his plan of grace; second, that for great things, certain delays are necessary for maturation. Those who do not know how to suffer no longer know how to hope. ... If the patience is that of the sower, it must be accompanied by the Cross. “Those who sow in tears, reap in song,”¹⁵ but at times they do not reap at all for “it is one who

¹³ The collapse of Communism in Eastern Europe and the consequent extension of the “Byzantine diaspora” to countries and linguistic communities where there was no such presence until quite recently has created a need for translations into languages not previously thought of – but such translations can only be provisional until there is adequate ground work for a more definitive translation. The Irish translation is an obvious case in point.

¹⁴ John R. Quinn, *The Reform of the Papacy: The Costly Call to Christian Unity* (New York: Herder and Herder / Crossroad Publishing, 1999), 72.

¹⁵ Psalm 125:6 LXX.

sows and another who reaps.”¹⁶ The Cross is the condition of every holy work...Only through the Cross do we ourselves achieve authenticity and depth of existence. Nothing is worth doing unless one agrees to pay the price.”¹⁷

4) *Appreciation of additional sources.* The Old-Ritualist service books (which is to say the Muscovite service books from before the Nikonian reform) are being reprinted; several are already available. They are not expensive to purchase. The content of these books is of major importance for the understanding of the Byzantine liturgical corpus – especially, but not exclusively, the Byzantine-Slavonic liturgical corpus. Scholars are beginning to appreciate the importance of the Kyivan liturgical books, particularly those associated with the work of Saint Peter (Mohyla), but these books, although of pan-Orthodox interest, are of special importance to the Ruthenian liturgical heritage.

5) The patristic context: the study of the patristic context of the Byzantine liturgical corpus is not yet fully developed, but it is critical if the Church is to understand her own liturgical texts accurately. With “state of the art” computer technology, this is a feasible endeavor and the results will make the liturgical translations far more accurate and clear.

6) As mentioned at the beginning of this study, the Holy See has expressed the intention of elaborating a *corpus* of norms, in collaboration with the Churches concerned, to adapt the 1996 Instruction for applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern

¹⁶ John 4:3-7.

¹⁷ Yves Congar, *Dialogue Between Christians*, trans. Phil Loretz, S.J., (Westminster, MD: Newman Press, 1966), 40; cited in Quinn, op. cit., 73.

Churches¹⁸ for the entire Byzantine liturgical family and yet for each specific Local Church. Clearly the Universal Church expects the entire Byzantine liturgical family to take a fraternal interest in these matters. The very process of elaborating this work will reveal many insights of serious assistance to the project which currently those who have developed the 12 October 2004 draft appear to wish to undertake in isolation.

Most of all, there must be a strong program of *education*. The Church's worship is not an exclusive clerical preserve; all the people of the Church need to know, and have a right to know, what is going on at the divine services. The reform of the Roman Liturgy associated with Vatican II has been roundly criticized. But at least the reform was prepared by six decades of educational work: publications, liturgical weeks, schools of liturgy, efforts to encourage greater knowledge of the Church's worship...our Church needs to do *more*, not less.

It is urgently necessary – and not only for liturgical reasons! – that the Greek-Catholic faithful be provided a serious educational program covering (but not limited to) such documents as *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, *Oriente Lumen*, the 1996 *Instruction*, and in the Ruthenian tradition the official service-books and the *Ordo Celebrationis*. People are capable of grasping that these documents treat of matters which are at the heart of their Church life; if offered a fair opportunity, many will pay close attention and will make a serious effort to grasp the meaning of these documents. Moreover, especially in the Anglophone countries of the West, the present atmosphere demands a great openness and transparency to

¹⁸ Congregation for the Eastern Churches (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996), § 6b.

any process of change in Church life; people are no longer willing to place blind trust in religious leaders.¹⁹

Especially in difficult and confusing times, most people prefer stability, and in particular most people want stability and reassurance in their Church life. There is joy and comfort in the year-after-year observance of the feasts and fasts: Holy Supper this Christmas, the Great Blessing of Waters this Theophany, the services and Divine Liturgy for the dead on the appointed Saturdays, Divine Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts this Lent, the Epitaphios this Good Friday, the triumphant procession and Resurrection Orthros this Pascha – few people seriously want new services every year for the familiar feast days.

Father Archimandrite Robert Taft has written cogently that:

For the Christian East, the Church's liturgy is not something we appropriate to our needs by reducing it to the level of our own banality. Rather, it is the Church's ideal of prayer to which we must rise. We are not the measure of the liturgy; the Church's liturgy is the yardstick that measures us.

Eastern liturgy has created a symbiosis of prayer and local culture in ways not verified in the West. This may well be unravelling as Orthodox countries move toward modernity. But it still exists. Eastern liturgy has also retained a synthesis of ritual, art, church design and symbolic structure that may at times seem inflexible, but which permits it to do what liturgy is supposed to without the self-consciousness of present-day liturgy in the West. For liturgy serves no purpose

¹⁹ There should be no necessity to explain precisely what horrific circumstances have ensured that people must be given a clear understanding of what is going on in the Church.

outside itself. Like a living language, it cannot be reduced to sociology or anthropology, it cannot be invented or created, it simply is. And though it has a history, as I am well aware, having spent my life retracing it, that history cannot be accelerated and overridden. In the West, the Protestant Reformation tried to do so, with results that are available for all to see.

This does not mean that liturgy cannot change. It does indeed change, and of course it changes because people change it. Nor is what I am saying intended as criticism of the reforms of Vatican II, with which I have always, in principle, been in complete agreement. But it does mean that change programmed from above entails risks, and can succeed...or fail for reasons not always easy to grasp.

Here too, if the West would learn something pastoral from the East, it must not get tripped up in its own clichés. Liturgy should avoid repetitions? Repetition is of the essence of ritual behavior! Liturgy should offer variety? Too much variety is the enemy of popular participation! Liturgy should be creative? Indeed, but whose creativity? Most contemporary Western liturgical creativity is just one more cover for a neo-clericalism. The liturgical 'creators' do not mean the creativity of the People of God, but of the celebrant and of the liturgical-establishment professionals.

There is a sameness and a familiarity and a repetitiveness that is at the very basis of day-to-day human culture. Men and women eat dinner at more or less the same time and in the same way every day except, perhaps, Sundays and holidays. And a community of Christians that wishes to gather morning and evening to praise God at the beginning

and end of the day must learn a similar regularity and consistency, or their prayer will not survive. Our people are sick to death of professional coteries constantly reinventing the wheel.²⁰

If criticisms of the 12 October 2004 draft lead to a greater consideration of the need for celebration and appreciation of the existing official Liturgy, of the need for a serious translation of the Septuagint Psalter, of the need to involve as many people as possible in preparing liturgical translations, of the need to be patient with the scholars who must produce serious works on these matters, and of the need for education on every level, the Church will profit abundantly. If anyone feels that what I have written has offended him, I ask forgiveness for the sake of Christ.

Dublin 2005

In spe melioris aevi.

²⁰ Archimandrite Robert Taft, S.J., "The Contribution of Eastern Liturgy to the Understanding of Christian Worship," 1997 annual public lecture of "The Sir Daniel and Countess Bernardine Murphy Donahue Chair in Eastern Catholic Theology at the Pontifical Oriental Institute," *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 37, nos. 1-4 (1996): 273-298, cited passage on 287-288.