

Pregledni znanstveni članek (1.02)  
 BV 70 (2010) 1, 17-24  
 UDK: 271-528"19"  
 Prejeto: 02/10

*Vladimir Vukašinić*  
**Confrontation of Liturgical Theologies  
 in Translations of Holy Liturgies into  
 Serbian Language in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century**

*Summary:* Through comparative analysis of translational solutions and by pointing out the differing theological perspectives in examples taken from various translations of the Divine Liturgy of John Chrysostom made by Justin Popović, Irinej Ćirić, Emilijan Čarnić and members of Holy Synod's Translational Committee (Serbian Orthodox Church), this paper shows how translators solved linguistic and ritualistic uncertainties along the lines of their respective theological visions and opinions of what is the place and role of theology in Church's liturgical life. These excerpts give us partial insight into the development of liturgical theology and theological self-consciousness in Serbian Orthodox Church during the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

*Keywords:* Liturgy, Priest's Service Book, Proskomide (= Prothesis = the Office of preparation for the Divine Liturgy), Mystagogy, Prayer, Great Entrance, Troparion of the Third hour.

*Povzetek:* **Primerjava liturgične teologije v prevodih svetih liturgij v srbski jezik v 20. stoletju**

Avtor primerjalno razčlenjuje prevajalske rešitve in opozarja na različne teološke poglede v primerih, ki jih jemlje iz različnih prevodov Liturgije sv. Janeza Zlatoustega, ki so jih pripravili Justin Popović, Irinej Ćirić, Emilijan Čarnić in člani prevajalskega odbora Svetega sinoda (Srbske pravoslavne Cerkve). Pokaže, kako so prevajalci reševali jezikovne in obredne nedoločenosti v skladu s svojimi teološkimi videnji in mnenji glede mesta in vloge teologije v liturgičnem življenju Cerkve. Ti izvlečki dajejo delen vpogled v razvoj liturgične teologije in teološke samozavesti v Srbski pravoslavni Cerkvi v 20. stoletju.

*Ključne besede:* liturgija, evhologij, proskomidija (= liturgija priprave), mistagogija, molitev, veliki vhod, tropar tretje ure

**T**ranslations of liturgical service books and usage of modern Serbian language in liturgical life of our Church are topics previously discussed from different angles and covered in various articles (Милошевић 2008, 47–54; Радосављевић 1987, 107–116).<sup>1</sup> In this paper I dedicate special attention to translational endeavors of Father

<sup>1</sup> In this paper Radosavljević analyses translations of liturgical books (not only the rudimentary priest's service book but also *the book of needs* and other service books) made by Irinej Ćirić, Justin Popović, Emilijan Čarnić and members of the Holy Synod's Translational Committee. With regards to the actual

Justin Popović.<sup>2</sup> All other translations are analyzed in relation to his work. Besides liturgical prayers I have taken into account also the *liturgical rubrics* – which are conveyors of a strong theological message and not just unimportant ritualistic details. I will only consider the examples from the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom.

First example of differing theological assumptions in translating and editing of liturgical texts we see in relation to the meaning of first particle of the third prosphora at Prothesis (Proskomide). Father Justin Popović in his older translation (Поповић 1922, 19), which was later repeated in the retyped text for the use of Krka Monastery (Поповић 1967, 58), dedicates this particle to Bodiless Heavenly Powers with a remark: »It is like that in Greek service books ... « Emilijan Čarnić<sup>3</sup>, who also translated from Greek sources, has not done that, but has left here the remembrance of Prophet, Forerunner and Baptist John. (Чарнић 1976, 23) Irinej Ćirić<sup>4</sup> links both variants into a composite one – explaining that one has Greek and the other Slavic origin (Ђирић 1942, 281). In a newer translation, father Justin sticks with his original solution: »In honor and memory of great captains Michael and Gabriel, and of all the heavenly bodiless powers« (Поповић 1978, 14) but now develops a small theological apology of his choice. He explains it by referring to contemporary Greek liturgical practice and many ancient liturgical manuscripts, both Greek and Slavic (Поповић 1978, 230–231). Additionally, he quotes from Interpretation of the Holy Liturgy by Philotheos of Constantinople, where Philotheos, speaking of Prothesis (Proskomide), directly mentions angelic powers surrounding Christ on the Holy Diskos (Holy Paten): »His Mother is through her particle on His right side, Angels and Saints on His left side ...« (Поповић 1978, 19). Father Justin demonstrates here a subtle theological sensibility for the unity of structural elements of a particular liturgical rite. This unity is never established (and because of that never determined!) exclusively by liturgical texts but also through other important elements, among which are, of course, mystagogies. A few years later the same concept was concisely expressed by R. Taft (1992, 18), who claims that in the analyses of a particular rite you cannot research only »liturgical system, but the architectural and decorative system devised to enclose it, as well as the mystagogy that explains it. I insist on all three, for the Byzantine synthesis is not just the first element, ritual celebration in a vacuum ... Byzantine Rite is precisely its intimate symbiosis of liturgical symbolism (ritual, celebration), liturgical setting (architecture/iconography) and liturgical interpretation (mystagogy). Any true history of the Byzantine Rite must account for their interaction in the evolution of the tradition.«

Justin's treatment of Angelic powers in the liturgy was encountered with both: opposition and support. Bishop Atanasije Jevtić, for example, considers remembrance of bodiless powers as characteristic of an older practice saying that it was later

---

liturgical texts he analyses only the opening lines of Great Litany and Litany of Fervent Supplication as well as the priest's exclamation at the end of the Litany of Fervent Supplication;

<sup>2</sup> Archimandrite Justin Popović (PhD) (1894-1979), was a professor at Belgrade University, an author of a large number of theological books and papers in areas of Biblical Exegesis, Dogmatics and Studies in Ascetical Literature; he translated and edited a collection of The Lives of Saints (12 volume set), Great Book of Needs, Priest's service book, Prayer book and various texts of didactic character. Justin Popović is a key inspirator of the spiritual renewal of Serbian Church in the 20th century.

<sup>3</sup> Emilijan Čarnić (PhD) (1914-1995), was a philologist, theologian, professor at Belgrade University and a translator of Biblical and Church Service Books.

<sup>4</sup> Bishop of Bačka Irinej Ćirić (1884 - 1955) (PhD), was a philologist, theologian, professor at Karlovci Seminary and a translator of Biblical and Church Service Books.

»ignorantly omitted in Russian service books.« (Јевтић 2008, 43) On the other hand, Patriarch Pavle (at that time Bishop of Raska and Prizren) also dealt with the question of remembrance of heavenly bodiless powers at *Prothesis* in his article: *Should we take out particles for the Holy Angels?* (Патријарх Павле 2007, 46–63) It was published in 1974 for the first time and therefore a few years before the first publication of father Justin's translation. He tries to deny the validity of this practice from a »dogmatical, liturgical and historical point of view.« (Патријарх Павле 2007, 47) The basic dogmatical argument he brings forward is that »Saviour's *redemptive* work wasn't carried out for the angels ... Christ's sacrifice was for mankind ... Angels are never mentioned here.« (Патријарх Павле 2007, 49) In a different place he says that purpose of taking out particles at *Prothesis* is the »remission of sins (therefore there's no need to take out the particle for the Holy Angels) and glorification of the Saints« (Патријарх Павле 2007, 63). Bishop Pavle has, in a certain way, trimmed down the notion of salvation reducing it exclusively to a concept of redemption. Due to the fact that bishop Pavle, later Serbian patriarch Pavle, was a member of Holy Synod's Committee for translating and publishing synodal editions of the priest's service book in modern Serbian language, and having in mind the views he expressed, we can explain why there is no mention of Angels in SAS's *ieratikon* (CAC 2007, 77).

One of the questions present in contemporary Serbian liturgical polemics, although it admittedly emerges quite sporadically, is how many times are we supposed to read the prayer *Heavenly King* before the beginning of Holy Liturgy? What do our translations say about it? In all variants of translations by father Justin Popović prayer *Heavenly King* is read once (Поповић 1978, 23; 1922, 28; 1967, 68). Synodal translation explicitly says that prayer is to be read only once (CAC 2007, 87). Only in Čarnić's translation this prayer is read three times (Чарнић 1976, 32). How this came about? If we examine Irinej Ćirić's translation things are becoming clearer. While pointing out that *Heavenly King* is to be read once he instructs in the introductory rubric that priest and deacon, before reading the prayer, should »make three bows while praying inside quietly and saying« (Ђирић 1942, 288) Here words »praying inside quietly« while bowing thrice imply a personal prayer, something like the well known short repentful sighs: »God be merciful to me, a sinner,« or »God cleanse me a sinner« etc. Replacement of these prayers with *Heavenly King* led to incorrect understanding and wrong practice while reading *Heavenly King* before the liturgy.

Editorial hand of father Justin, in his latest translation from 1978, puts all Eucharistic prayers in front of their *ekphronises* (= priest's exclamations). In this way prayers are positioned in their natural place: directly in front of their *ekphronises* which anyway represent the logical endings of each prayer (Поповић 1978, 229). It is not so in his earlier translation where prayers are placed after the *ekphronises* (Поповић 1922, 33; Поповић 1967, 74) and in the middle of litanies (Поповић 1967, 85). Prayers are also placed after the *ekphronises* in Čarnić's (Чарнић 1976, 36, *et passim*) and Ćirić's (Ђирић 1942, 292, *et passim*) translations. Justin's principle was retained in the Holy Synod Committee's translation.

In his 1978's translation, father Justin introduces certain changes with regards to the act of *censing at the Holy Liturgy* in comparison to previous solutions and standard worship practices. Most important difference lies in the rubric between the Apostle and Gospel readings which now allows possibility of censing during the apostle reading, but also *after* the reading, i.e. before the reading of Holy Gospel. »Alleluia is

sung with the verses. While this is sung or before it, while the apostle is being read, deacon takes the censer with incense, asks the blessing from the priest and after receiving it censes around the holy table, inside the altar and then censes the priest« (Поповић 1978, 36). In Justin's older translation there's a rubric with censuring »while the apostle is being read« (Поповић 1967, 81 Čarnić chooses the same practice (Чарнић 1976, 42–43) but Ćirić places censuring into the period »while Alleluia is sung« (Ђирић 1942, 302) Synodal translation has the rubric identical to father Justin's 1978 translation (CAC 2007, 101).

Next typical example is *The Dialogue of Concelebrants* after the Great Entrance. In father Justin's translation (Поповић 1922, 58) that dialogue looks like this:

- Priest:* Remember me, brother and concelebrant.  
*Deacon:* May the Lord God remember your priesthood in His Kingdom.  
*Deacon:* Pray for me, holy Master.  
*Priest:* The Holy Spirit shall come upon you, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow you.  
*Deacon:* The same Spirit shall minister with us all the days of our life.  
*Deacon:* Remember me, holy Master.  
*Priest:* May the Lord God remember you in His Kingdom, always, now and ever, and unto the ages of ages.  
*Deacon:* Amen.

Emilijan Čarnić's (1976, 42–43.) and Irinej Ćirić's (1942, 302) translations also have this wider variant of the dialogue. This version, as we can see, suggests the idea that Holy Spirit concelebrates with us. This concept was strongly refuted by bishop Atanasije Jevtić who wrote: »Holy Spirit does not concelebrate with us but we concelebrate with the Holy Spirit« (Јевтић 2008, 238–291). Father Justin's translation from 1979 brings substantial changes. He now presents us with a translation from an older and more correct source, almost identical to the one in *Diataxis of Philotheos Kokkinos* (Јевтић 2008, 238–291):

- Priest:* Pray for me, [Master], brother and concelebrant.  
*Deacon:* The Holy Spirit shall come upon you, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow you.  
*Deacon:* Remember me, holy Master.  
*Priest:* May the Lord God remember you in His Kingdom, always, now and ever, and unto the ages of ages.  
*Deacon:* Amen. (Поповић 1978, 50)

Contemporary synodal priest's service book has the dialogue in this form (CAC 2007, 120–121). Father Justin explains how his choice of this variant of the dialogue is based upon manuscripts, old printed service books, but also »Archieratikon (Bishop's service book, *transl.*), because it represents an older and more correct form of mutual remembrance and blessing between concelebrants. It is a well known thing among orthodox liturgologists that the service order of Archieratical Liturgy in its unchangeability, liturgical fullness and consistency, is older and more preserved than the service order of a liturgy led by a parish priest, which is how our contemporary priest's service books are now printed. That is why the service order of Archieratical Liturgy always is the measure and an estimation of a priest's service book.« (Поповић 1978, 58)

This question is dealt with extensively in Robert Taft's well known study *The Great Entrance. A History of the Transfer of Gifts and other Pre-anaphoral Rites*. He shows that idea of the concelebration of the Holy Spirit (and not our concelebration with the Holy Spirit) appears for the first time in 15th century manuscripts, and then becomes finally codified in printed editions from the 16th century. It enters Slavic Arhieraticons through Russian liturgical reforms of Moscow Council in 1666–1667 (Taft 1978, 198–304).

Leaving aside the elaboration of the question how old might be the liturgical gesture of lifting the Gifts before priest's exclamation ends the Prayer of Anamnesis – »Yours from your own offering to You, on behalf of all and for all« – we conclude that father Justin correctly solved the uncertainty *who* should lift the Gifts. He wrote that officiating priest (and not the deacon) should lift the Gifts: »... crosses his arms, right over left, and takes holy diskos with his right and holy chalice with his left, and elevates them making the sign of the cross with great attention ...« (Поповић 1978, 58). This clearly demonstrates that deacon's liturgical capacity does not include direct offering to God but only the transfer, i.e. offering of laity's gifts to higher clerics. We have the deacon, however, as the performer of this liturgical action in the following translations: Justin's from 1922 (»then priest (or the deacon) ...«) (Поповић 1922, 69; 1967, 110) and Committee's translation (priest lifts the Gifts »if there is no deacon«) (САС 2007, 131). In these two translations deacon is a possible but not a required performer of this action. Čarnić (1976, 64) and Ćirić (1942, 320) consider the deacon a primary performer of the Eucharistic lifting of gifts.

Problem with the Troparion of Third hour (insertion of this troparion breaks both: logical structure and literary flow of the anaphoral prayer) is one of the most discussed questions in contemporary Serbian liturgical polemics. Let us see now, how various translations resolve this question. Father Justin Popović, in his translation from 1922, puts the troparion into brackets explaining in the footnote: »This is present only in Church Slavonic and not in the Greek text« (Поповић 1922, 70.) Bishop Irinej Ćirić does not put the troparion into brackets but makes the note just like father Justin – that Greeks don't have it (Ћирић 1942, 320). Čarnić (1976, 64) leaves the troparion without brackets and without any comments. In his last translation from 1978 father Justin left the troparion in brackets, and in so doing, made it *liturgically optional* (Поповић 1978, 59). We should pay special attention to the retyped Justin's translation »edited by priestmonk Artemije« for Krka Monastery. Brackets were removed in the retyped version thus making the reading of this troparion *obligatory and not optional* (Поповић 1967, 111) Because of that, clerics who used this particular service book can claim how inclusion of the troparion of the Third hour is an integral part of father Justin's editorial work, not knowing, at the same time, that this version of the text suffered one more editorial revision.

Father Justin writes extensively in the epilogue about his reasons for placing the troparion into brackets: »Certain texts, which were only recently included into the order of the Liturgy and were not accepted by all Orthodox Churches (i.e., Litany for the Departed after the Litany of Fervent Supplication, Troparion of the Third hour in the Eucharistic Canon) are put here in brackets. It is not up to us to exclude them; however, we should also not miss the opportunity to point out their recent introduction into the order of Liturgy. This is particularly true concerning the inclusion of troparion of the Third hour into the Eucharistic Canon. Many orthodox hierarchs, litur-

gists and theologians think that it should either be completely omitted or, at least, placed in front of the epiclesis, which is what we have done here ... In this manner it makes less of a break in liturgical and logical continuity of the Holy Anaphora's text ... Absence of this troparion in older (earlier than 16th century) priest's service book manuscripts, Greek and Serbian, and all contemporary Greek priest's service books should not have to be proven here.« (Поповић 1978, 229–230)

Blessed Elder was, however, wrong in his assumptions. Contemporary Serbian liturgical polemics shows the opposite tendency. Let us, therefore, attempt to make a shortest possible review of the developments in this issue, which confirm and completely justify father Justin's intervention. *Troparion of the Third Hour* was inserted for the first time into the Eucharistic Anaphora at the beginning of the 15th century in Constantinople (Јевтић 2007, 136). Practices of liturgical worship of Orthodox Churches were influenced through the breakthrough of printed priest's service books, first the Greek ones (printed in Venice) in the 16th century and then the Ukrainian and Russian publications in the 17th century (142) but also by a widely circulated production of manuscripts. With regard to the Russian – Muscovite – printed books it is worth knowing that Troparion of the Third hour existed in printed priest's service books before patriarch Nikon's reform, but was considered optional. In the printed service book from 1646, after the Epiclesis, there is a rubric: *If a priest wishes to invoke the Holy Spirit* (as if he has not already done just that!) *deacon lays down the fans (ripidia) ...* then the whole text ... and then *Lord, who at the third hour...* This optionality was abolished by Nikon in his first printed edition of the new priest's service book from 1655 in which he removed the mentioned rubric. However, we should keep in mind that patriarch Nikon only followed the service order of a Greek Euchologion printed in 1602 in Venice (Meyendorff, 1991, 189–190).

Emergence of the Troparion of Third hour *in Serbian manuscript Tradition* requires an ample and detailed analysis. Leonine part of this task was done by Bishop Atanasije Jevtić in his latest works – particularly in the three volumes of his liturgical compendium *Христос Нова Пасха, Божанствена Литургија – свештенослужење, причешће, заједница богочовечанског Тела Христовог* (*Christ the New Pasha, Divine Liturgy - Priestly Service. Holy Communion, Communion of the theanthropical Body of Christ*). Bishop Atanasije states, in different passages, that this troparion is absent from the vast heritage of Serbian liturgical manuscripts (all he managed to *examine*), dating from 15th until the 17th century. He also writes that Troparion of the Third hour started to appear in some Slavic manuscripts quite sporadically as early as 16th century, but that these cases are extremely rare (Јевтић 2007, 142). He also mentions that Russian Synodal Library possesses a copied manuscript of a South Slavic translation of the Holy Liturgy with the Troparion of Third hour contained within what he describes as *Priest's Service Book: Book of Needs from the 16th century*. (116). Is it then a coincidence that a hand written *Priest's Service Book: Book of Needs Пећ №80* (Вукашиновић 2009, 187–204) unlike all other liturgical manuscripts from the Library of Patriarchate of Peć Monastery, has the Troparion of Third hour in *both Liturgies: John Chrysostom's and Basil the Great's*. This priest's service book of Vlachian editorial origin, created somewhere between 1510 and 1520, seems to be, to the best of our knowledge, the oldest example of the existence of Troparion of Third hour in Eucharistic Anaphora in our preserved handwritten heritage. We find this troparion in the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom (page 276): »...then he makes three bows, saying: Lord, who sent down your All-Holy Spirit...«, and the same text in the Liturgy of St.

Basil the Great (page 51a). First Serbian printed priest's service books, as well as those that Serbs printed for others, do not contain Troparion of the Third hour. This is true for *Служабник јеромонаха Макарија (Priest's Service Book of priest monk Makarije)*, Трговиште (Trgovishte), 1508; *Служабник Гораждански (Priest's Service Book Gorazhdanski)*, 1519–1520, which has obvious graphical, and not only graphical similarities with the previous one; *Служабник Божидача Вуковића (Priest's Service Book of Bozhidar Vukovich)*, Венеција (Venice), 1519–1520; *Служабник Вићенца Вуковића (Priest's Service Book of Vicenco Vukovich)*, Венеција (Venice), 1554; and two *Priest's Service Books by Jerolim Zagurović*, also printed in Venice around 1570 (which are actually repeated Vukovich's editions).

Troparion of the Third hour had an interesting fate in contemporary Serbian editions of the Priest's Service Book. Priest's Service Book printed in Belgrade in 1986, has the Troparion of Third hour in the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, but it is placed in brackets (CAC 1986, 103–104) The same is repeated in the Liturgy of St. Basil the Great (160). New Priest's Service Book printed in Belgrade in 1998 (as well as the one from 2007) will repeat the same thing: keeping the troparion in brackets in Chrysostom's liturgy (CAC 1998, 107) This trend was unexpectedly changed with the publication of the new Church Slavonic edition of the Priest's Service Book in 2001 in Belgrade. This edition abolishes the option to read or avoid reading the Troparion of Third hour in Liturgies of John Chrysostom (CAC 2007, 151–154) and Basil the Great (243–244. ) by removing brackets before and after the troparion.

Everything we mentioned in this paper leads to the conclusion that all analyzed translations have distinct and typical theological – in places almost ideological – positions or standpoints. Liturgical uncertainties were solved according to these positions, but they also steered and changed the former, established liturgical practices. What was changed, when, by whom and why was it changed in the liturgical Church worship, as well as what do expressions like *old* and *new* liturgical styles and ethos actually mean – all these piping hot questions of our present Church life – can be resolved, we believe, only through impartial and unbiased investigations. This paper tries to serve this humble purpose.

## References

### Sources

- Поповић, Јустин, прев.** 1922. *Божанствена Литургија Светога оца нашега Јована Златоуста*. Београд.
- . 1967. *Служабник на српском језику, средио јеромонах Артемије [Радосављевић]* сулпент. Манастир Крка (машинопис) ПБ I 4177
- . 1978. *Божанствене Литургије*, Београд.
- САС.** 1986. *Служабник*, превод Комисије Светог архијерејског синода СПЦ, Београд.
- . 1998. *Служабник*, превод Комисије Светог архијерејског синода СПЦ, Београд.
- . 2007. *Служабник*, превод Комисије Светог архијерејског синода СПЦ, Београд.
- Ђирић, Иринеј, прев.** 1942. *Недеља Свете Педесетнице - празничне службе*. Ујвидек [= Нови Сад].
- Чарнић, Емилијан, прев.** 1976. *Чин свештене и божанствене Литургије светог Јована Златоуста*. Диселдорф.

## General studies

- Вукашиновић, Владимир.** 2009. *Тропар трећег часа у литургијама рукописног службеника из XVI века (№80) библиотеке манастира Пећке Патријаршије, 187–204.* Манастир Каленић: у сусрет шестој стогодишњици - Научни скуп, ур. Ј. Калић, САНУ одељење историјских наука. Београд – Крагујевац.
- Јевтић, Атанасије.** 2007. *Христос Нова Пасха: Божанствена Литургија 2 – свештенослужење, причешће. заједница богочовечанског Тела Христовог.* Београд – Требиње.
- . 2008. *Христос Нова Пасха: Божанствена Литургија 3 – свештенослужење, причешће. заједница богочовечанског Тела Христовог.* Београд – Требиње.
- Meyendorff, Paul.** 1991. *Russia, Ritual and Reform: The Liturgical Reforms of Nikon in the 17th Century.* New York: Crestwood.
- Милошевић, Ненад.** 2008. *Допринос архимандрита Јустина Поповића унапређењу литургијске свести код Срба.* Српска теологија у двадесетом веку: истраживачки проблеми и резултати, књ. 3. Београд.
- Патријарх Павле.** 2007. *Да нам буду јаснија нека питања наше вере III,* друго издање. Београд.
- Радосављевић, Артемије.** 1987. *Новију богослужбени преводи код нас,* Богословље, свеска 2.
- Taft, Robert.** 1978. *The Great Entrance. A History of the Transfer of Gifts and other Pre-anaphoral Rites. Vol II, A History of Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom.* 2. ed. Roma.
- . 1992. *The Byzantine Rite. A Short History.* Minnesota: Collegeville.