

## **COMPARISON OF THE TWO TRANSLATIONS OF THE *ORDO CELEBRATIONIS***

The “Ordo Celebrationis Vesperarum, Matutini et Divinae Liturgiae Iuxta Recensionem Ruthenorum” was published by the Sacred Congregation for the Eastern Church at Rome in 1944.

It was translated into English by Father Matthew A. Berko at Washington in 1958 and titled “ The Order for the Celebration of Vespers, Matins and the Divine Liturgy According to the Ruthenian Recension”. The Library of Congress Card Number is 58-11870. It was printed by the “Redeemer’s Voice” in Yorkton, Sask. This version contains 122 pages.

Another translation was made by Archimandrite Serge Keleher and Jack Figel in 1996. Its title is the same as Father Berko’s . This translation was published by Eastern Christian Publications in Fairfax, Virginia. The ISBN is 0-9640512-4-9. It contains 172 pages.

Father Berko’s translation contains an imprimatur given by Archbishop and Apostolic Exarch Constantine at Philadelphia on October 25, 1957. The imprimatur is not found in the Eastern Christian Publications edition.

Fr. Berko’s translation includes a short introduction by himself which states the aim of the Ordo , namely, that practices determined “as foreign to the Ruthenian ritual were to be purged, and the ritual predating the Synod of Zamosc( 1720) was to be restored in essence.”

This same edition also includes a glossary of 46 words with both English and Slavonic ( actually largely Greek in Cyrillic letters) vocabulary.

The translation by Archimandrite Serge Keleher and Jack Figel contains considerably more supplementary material than that by Fr. Berko i.e

- Paragraph 37 of Orientalis Lumen by Pius XII
- A foreword giving giving some important history about the Ordo. This foreword notes that no translation has juridical authority, but only the Latin text remains official.
- Illustrations throughout the text of the Ordo.
- A glossary containing 70 terms. The Greek or Slavonic terms are not given. Besides giving more terms than in Fr. Berko’s edition, the explanations are more detailed.
- An appendix containing:
  - Circular of the Sacred Congregation for the Eastern Church to Ruthenian Ordinaries
  - Translation of the letter of Bishop Ivancho to Eugene Cardinal Tisserant, October 31, 1953.

- Translation of the Response of the Sacred Congregation for the Eastern Church to Bishop Ivancho's Request.
- Promulgation Letter of Bishop Emil Mihalik
- Notes. 392 of them which are extremely helpful in clarifying the text and various items found in the appendix.

As regards the translation of the text of the Ordo Celebrationis the following is noted.

It would appear that Archimandrite Serge Keleher and Jack Figel took Fr. Berko's translation as their starting point and made some alterations in vocabulary or phraseology as they saw fit. The flow and sentence structure are, for the most part, quite the same in both translations.

In the 1958 edition, liturgical quotations are given in Slavonic in Cyrillic letters, while the 1996 edition gives only the English liturgical text.

The 1996 edition changes some terminology, for example, Fr. Berko uses the word altar while Archimandrite Serge prefers the word Holy Table and uses, in some places, the word Altar( literally raised area)for the sanctuary.

I will give a detailed comparison of just a few points as they are indicative of the general differences between the translations. As can be seen, the translations are virtually the same except for a few stylistic and vocabulary changes.

## 1958

### I. Prefatory Notes

#### Concerning the Sanctuary and Altar

In order to celebrate the Divine Office properly and with suitable religious ceremony, certain points regarding the sanctuary and altar should be noted.

1.It is customary to erect the sanctuary at least one step higher than the nave of the church. Within the sanctuary itself, there should be no other steps leading the altar.

2.The altar is square; detached from the wall, it is located in the center of the sanctuary so that it may be circumambulated. The Proskomedia table is placed against the northern wall while the Diaknikon( vestment table) is placed

## 1996

### I. *Preliminary* Notes

#### The Sanctuary and *Holy Table*

In order to celebrate *divine services* properly and *suitably*, certain points regarding the sanctuary and *Holy Table* must be noted.

1. It is customary to *build* the sanctuary at least one step higher than the nave of the church. Within the *Altar* itself, there should be no *further* steps leading to the Holy Table.

2.The *Holy Table* is square *and* detached from the wall. *The Holy Table* is located in the center of the *Altar* so that *one may walk all around it*. *The Prothesis( Prosokomede)* is placed against the northern wall while *another table for sacred vestments* is

against the southern wall.

3. The artophorion or tabernacle, which is set in the center of the altar, should be constructed in the image of a small church or sepulcher. It should not be so high or wide that the liturgical actions of the celebrant or concelebrants would be impeded or rendered more difficult.

44. He says the Great Ektenia before the royal doors, and after the exclamation he returns to the sanctuary via the southern door.

93. After the Apolysis, the royal doors are closed and the priest divests of the felon and reads the First Hour (Час).

placed against the southern wall.

3. The artophorion or tabernacle, which is in the center of the *Holy Table* should be *made* in the image of a small church or sepulchre. It should not be so high or wide *as to obstruct or interfere* with the liturgical actions of the celebrant or concelebrants.

44. He says the *Great Synapte* before the royal doors, and after the *ekphonesis* he returns to the *Altar* via the southern door.

93. After the *Dismissal*, the royal doors are closed, the priest *takes off the phelonion* and *the First Hour is read*.

The above examples are indicative of the differences between the two translations. There is no need to give details about every paragraph. As can be seen, it is a question of preferences in vocabulary and style. While the two translations are very close, the 1996 edition contains a wealth of very valuable information not found in the 1958 edition.

*Fr. Robert A. Anderson*  
*January 2006*