

## Personal Notes

1040 Missal: Fifteenth Sunday in Ordinary Time A Catholic Bible Study (120715)

© 2015

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

### Roman Missal<sup>1</sup>

In the title of their book, Anthony B. Pinn and Benjamin Valentin, eds., identify one of the problems insisting on Latin transliterations, rather than sound translations of the Italian Missal. The title is, Creating Ourselves: African American and Hispanic Americans on Popular Culture and Religious Expression.<sup>2</sup> By refusing to recognize sound vernacular translations, Rome interferes with such aspects of religion as developing identity with the theological significance of Latina artists within the Guadalupe tradition in Mexico. The Vatican is restricting all Western thought to Medieval Latin thought.

Rome blocks out how “. . . Latina bodies are portrayed in movies and how language promoting marriage is targeted to African American and Latina single mothers.” Rome is obstructing the sacrament of marriage. Finally, Rome is obstructing the findings of scholars examining the relationship between food and religion. Rome is obstructing the sacrament of the Holy Eucharist.

With its Outreach program, Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church (OLMC) in Newport News, Virginia, is accepting tension with the insular prayers of the Roman Missal. OLMC will soon be receiving its new pastor, the Reverend John David Ramsey, who may have a sense of that same tension. Ramsey writes, “. . . those called out by God as teachers and theologians are able to use their calling for the common good of the whole community . . . opens the church to a participation in the world as a whole . . . .”<sup>3</sup> Ultimately, that is the meaning of these Personal Notes paraphrasing the 2011 illiterate Roman Catholic Missal into literacy for the whole community.

The world as a whole is opening up for those paying attention to the trial of Monsignor William Lynn, the first church official in the English-speaking world indicted for the sexual abuse coverup. His trial began in Philadelphia March 26 with the expectation that it will last at least two months, which would be May 26, several months

---

<sup>1</sup> For regular readers of Personal Notes, the documentation is very repetitive. For that reason, there is an Appendix, between the end of Personal Notes and the repeated Prayers. New readers should include that Appendix as they read. Regular readers should look in the Appendix to refresh their memories.

<sup>2</sup> Andre E. Johnson, review of Anthony B. Pinn and Benjamin Valentin, eds., Creating Ourselves: African American and Hispanic Americans on Popular Culture and Religious Expression (Durham: Duke University Press, 2010) in The Journal of African American History, Vol. 96, No. 4 (Fall 2011) 579-581.

<sup>3</sup> John David Ramsey, A Precarious Faith: The Tri-une Dynamic of the Christian Life (Ph.D. Dissertation, Duke University, 2002) 10, 20.

## Personal Notes

1040 Missal: Fifteenth Sunday in Ordinary Time A Catholic Bible Study (120715)

© 2015

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

before using these Personal Notes Sunday, July 15. As the National Catholic Reporter writer, Rocco Palmo, put it, “The model of triumphalist clericalism that long defined American Catholicism’s ‘Last Empire’ is dead, and something very different is beginning to rise in its place.”

### I. Introduction

### II. Prayer before reading Sacred Scripture (Collect)

A. Missal: **O God**, who show the light of your truth to those who go astray, so that they **may** return to the right path, give all who for the faith they profess are accounted **Christians** the grace to reject whatever is contrary to the name of Christ and to strive after all that does it honor. **Through our Lord Jesus Christ**, your Son, who lives and reigns with you in **the unity** of the Holy Spirit, one God for ever [sic] and ever.

B. Italian Latin: Deus, qui errántibus, ut in viam possint redíre, veritátis tuae lumen osténdis, da cunctis qui **christiána** professione censéntur, et illa respúere, quae huic inimíca sunt nómini, et ea quae sunt apta sectári. Per Dóminum.

To make the Revised Prayers easier to find, Personal Notes repeats them on the last page. Only the heartiest souls will want to plow through the preceding Appendix (see the heading on page 4/27), week after week, after identifying more and more repetitious nonsense.

C. Revised: **Heavenly Father, with truth, show your Church the way out of confusion. Jesus Christ shows the way, along the straight and narrow path of honest virtue. Help the Faithful to follow him. We ask this through our Lord, Jesus Christ, your Son, who lives and reigns with you in the unity of the Holy Spirit, one God, forever.**

D. Comment: The Appendix explains the single-spaced material in bold print.

### III. Prayer after Communion

## **Personal Notes**

1040 Missal: Fifteenth Sunday in Ordinary Time A Catholic Bible Study (120715)

© 2015

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

- A. Missal: Having consumed these gifts, **we pray, O Lord, that**, by our participation in this mystery, its saving effects upon us **may** grow. Through Christ our Lord.
- B. Italian Latin: Sumptis munéribus, quaesumus, Dómine, ut, cum frequentatióne mystérii, crescat nostrae salútis efféctus. Per Christum.
- C. Revised: **By participating in this Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, we have participated in the love of the Holy Eucharist. Let its saving effects increase our love. We pray through Christ, our Lord.**

### V. ICEL

#### Prayer before reading Sacred Scripture (Collect)

ICEL: O God, you show the light of your truth to those who stray, that they may return to the right path. Grant that all who profess the Christian faith may reject whatever is contrary to the gospel and follow the way that leads to you.

We make our prayer through **our Lord Jesus Christ**, your Son, who lives and reigns with you in the unity of the Holy Spirit, God for ever [sic] and ever.

#### Prayer after Communion

ICEL: Nourished by these holy gifts, we pray to you, Lord, that each time we celebrate this mystery your work of salvation may grow within us.

Grant this through Jesus Christ our Lord.

## Appendix I

An overview of the Missal

© 2014

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

These Appendices enable the busy reader to skip repetitious and boring parts. The reason to keep repeating and detailing the material, Sunday after Sunday, is for first-time readers, especially first-time readers associated with Rome.

A further note to readers: Personal Notes are uploaded to the internet at <http://www.western-civilization.com/CBQ/Personal%20Notes/Personal%20Notes.htm> and otherwise distributed as much as three months in advance. When the time comes for actual use, two more otherwise unannounced revisions take place. The first revision occurs a week before Personal Notes are presented to <http://www.jamesriverjournal.com/>. A second revision takes place after the particular Mass in question. These latter two revisions are uploaded to <http://www.western-civilization.com/CBQ/Personal%20Notes/Personal%20Notes.htm> as they occur.

Archbishop Gregory M. Aymond tried to follow Roman directives to approve a translation that does not follow other directives Rome sets out in *Liturgiam authenticam* or *ratio translationis*. As mentioned below, on page 4 of the Missal, Aymond grants his *Concordat cum originali* (*agrees with the original*). Standard American English focuses on the care of souls, rather than preservation of the institutional Church. That is why, when I upload these ruminations to my web site at <http://www.western-civilization.com/CBQ/Personal%20Notes/Personal%20Notes.htm>, I always send a copy to the Archbishop.

With the new Missal, the Roman Catholic Church is showing for what and how to pray. According to standard American English, the prayers are so difficult to understand that I refer to the “illiterate 2011 Missal.” The revised prayers are a paraphrase of the Bible-babble in the Missal into standard American English as heard on EWTN (Eternal Word Television Network), the Weather Channel, and the evening news.

n.a., The Roman Missal: Renewed by Decree of the Most Holy Second Ecumenical Council of the Vatican, Promulgated by Authority of Pope Paul VI and Revised at the Direction of Pope John Paul II: English Translation According to the Third Typical Edition: For Use in the Dioceses of the United States of America: Approved by the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops and Confirmed by the Apostolic See (Washington, DC [sic]: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2011) 475.

**Appendix I**  
An overview of the Missal  
© 2014  
Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

James Dallen, a retired diocesan priest<sup>4</sup> and emeritus professor of religious studies at Gonzaga University in Spokane, Washington, has written an article that sheds light on the 2011 Missal. Dallen observes that an institutional Church model prioritizes preserving the Church institution, rather than the Gospel, for which the Church exists. He asks the question, “What Kind of Ecclesiology?”<sup>5</sup> His answer is that higher clergy, with an untenable and dysfunctional model of the Church as an institution, imposed the 2011 Missal on the United States and elsewhere.

Long-time readers may have noted that Personal Notes rarely uses exclamation marks. The reason is an academic preference for scholarship, rather than emotion. When a scholar like Dallen gets emotional, however, Personal Notes pays attention. In “What Kind of Ecclesiology?” Dallen avoids exclamation points, until he reaches page 27/36. With Dallen, Personal Notes is upset with *for many* versus *for all*; with priests receiving communion for and in place of the people; with the Vatican Holy See not following its own *Liturgiam authenticam* [LA] rules of “translation;” and with substituting uniformity for Christian unity.

Though ‘*many*’ and ‘*all*’ contrast in meaning in English, linguists and exegetes say that is the not case in Aramaic or Hebrew. Roman [Vatican Apostolic Holy See] authorities say otherwise and make explaining that ‘*for many*’ really means ‘*for all*’ the task of catechesis. Surely it would have been better if that had been reversed! It will be more difficult to convince people that what they hear means something entirely different. Liturgy and life are once more divorced.

*Many* promotes the institutional Church at the expense of the Gospel, *for all*.

The next exclamation point happens on page 30/36.

A few points indicate its [General Instruction of the Roman Missal (*GIRM*)] perspective. *GIRM* says little about the Eucharist in relation to ecclesial communion. It says little about the significance of sacramental communion. Its incomplete theology of Eucharistic sacrifice centers almost solely on the priest. This Counter-Reformation clerical emphasis is central in *GIRM* and the new English translation reinforces it. This affects the theology of Eucharistic and ecclesial communion and the role of the

---

<sup>4</sup> <http://salinadiocese.org/priests/231-priests/980-dallen-rev-james> (accessed March 11, 2012.)

<sup>5</sup> <http://misguidedmissal.com/wp/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/Translation-Ecclesiology-Jim-Dallen-3-6-2012.pdf> (accessed March 11, 2012)

**Appendix I**  
An overview of the Missal  
© 2014  
Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

assembly, all of which are crucial to postconciliar reforms. It reminds us that we are not that far removed from the time when the priest “said” Mass alone and he received communion for and in place of the people!

Emphasis on institutional priorities comes at the expense of the rest of the Faithful.

The next exclamation point comes at page 32/36.

. . . A clerical perspective often overshadows the pastoral and the role of central authority is overemphasized. The consequence is to downplay the role of the assembled community and the local Church. The official English translation accentuates these attitudes beyond what is in the Latin—curiously, the requirement of literal translation (“formal correspondence”) is not always observed!

Institutional emphasis on Latin, which the Faithful do not understand, deemphasizes standard American English, which the Faithful do understand.

The final exclamation point comes at page 34/36.

Two traditional adages support making changes of this [minimal, as in the revised prayers here?] type. Even when the institutional [Church] model was dominant, an adage for interpreting canon law said *de minimis non curat lex*: law is not concerned with trivial matters. In practice, of course, the passion for uniformity regarded little as trivial. Someone once tried to calculate the stupendous number of mortal sins that a priest could commit praying the breviary! Despite that unfortunate precedent, generally mortal sin presumes grievous matter and violating the bonds of communion in liturgy presumes a substantial change of the expected texts.

The juridical Church downplays the loving Church of the Gospels. Personal Notes brings similar concerns and emotions to the illiterate 2011 Missal.

The Roman Catholic Church hierarchy is confusing care of souls with care of the institution. The institutional Church requires protection in order to pass down the Gospel from one generation to the next. Since the hierarchy functions so close to the institutional Church, its confusion is understandable, if not damnable.

The confusion in the hierarchy is evident in at least two places: first in the highly publicized sexual abuse coverup; second in the less publicized 2011 Roman Missal. First, is the sexual coverup. Lacking a true care for souls, means that the sexual abuse

**Appendix I**  
An overview of the Missal  
© 2014  
Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

coverup, including extricating Cardinal Bernard F. Law and Cardinal William J. Levada from the United States to Rome,<sup>6</sup> is an irresponsible derelict of duty, power play.

Rome promoted Law to a position helping choose bishops throughout the world. Rome promoted Levada to the position from which the Cardinal Conclave chose Pope Benedict XVI. Rome, therefore, reinforced and promoted a culture of confusion.

Such imperial Roman behavior only makes things worse. Lest there be any misunderstanding of the criminal seriousness of the sexual abuse coverup, Bishop Robert W. Finn of Kansas City-Saint Joseph, Missouri has not been able to escape. He is currently going to trial for not reporting sexual abuse.<sup>7</sup>

The second hierarchic confusion is in the 2011 Missal. Care of souls is the first responsibility of the hierarchy.<sup>8</sup> Lack of due diligence and leadership for the care of souls results in authority producing an anti-intellectual, anti-Vatican II, dysfunctional, illiterate 2011 Missal. Lack of standard American English prevents the Faithful from clear, critical thinking about God. The Apostolic See is exercising an unadulterated power play. Follow along and witness how it plays games with reality.

Imperial Rome has rules of translation from the Latin into the vernacular languages. In 2001, Pope John Paul II issued *Liturgiam authenticam*. In 2007, Pope Benedict XVI issued *ratio translationis*. The Latin promotes a focus on the institutional Church.

---

<sup>6</sup> By Rome, I mean global Church governance emanating from Rome, in which the Vatican City State is found. Sometimes *Rome* is used to mean the *Holy See* or the *Apostolic See*. *Holy See* is not quite right, because all dioceses are *Holy*. *Apostolic See* is arrogant and is how Rome prefers to refer to itself.

<sup>7</sup> Joshua J. McElwee, "Judge orders Kansas City bishop to stand trial in abuse case," National Catholic Reporter at <http://ncronline.org/news/accountability/judge-orders-kansas-city-bishop-stand-trial-abuse-case> (accessed April 5, 2012).

<sup>8</sup> Already evident in the [1545-1563] Trent] Council's teaching is that the celebration of Mass is of undoubted validity in any language but that the *cura animarum*, or care of souls, which is at stake in the participation of the faithful in the Liturgy, is the first responsibility of the Bishops, no matter what language may be used for the Liturgy. n.a., *Ratio Translationis for the English Language* (Vatican City: Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, 2007) as found at <http://www.bible-researcher.com/ratio.translationis1.pdf> for page 13 (accessed March 31, 2012).

**Appendix I**  
An overview of the Missal  
© 2014  
Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

In apparent loyalty to the institutional Church, in agreement that the 2011 Missal follows the rules of translation, Archbishop Gregory M. Aymond grants his *Concordat cum originali* (*agrees with the original*), on page 4. The Missal does not have an Imprimatur (let it be printed) or Nihil obstat (contains nothing contrary to faith and morals), the standard Roman Catholic procedures for permission to publish.

Closer examination of the Missal reveals how Rome perverts reality to protect itself, much like where Shakespeare, in “The Taming of the Shrew,” has Petruchio publically breaking the will of Katherina to agree with whatever nonsense Petruchio proclaims. In real life, the Apostolic See has publically broken the will of Archbishop Aymond to agree with whatever nonsense the Apostolic See proclaims.

From “The Taming of the Shrew:”<sup>9</sup>

- **Petruchio (Imperial Rome).** Come on, a [sic] God's name; once more toward our father's. Good Lord, how bright and goodly shines the moon!
- **Katherina (Archbishop Aymond).** The moon? The sun! It is not moonlight now.
- **Petruchio (Imperial Rome).** I say it is the moon that shines so bright.
- **Katherina (Archbishop Aymond).** I know it is the sun that shines so bright.
- **Petruchio (Imperial Rome).** Now by my mother's son, and that's myself, It shall be moon, or star, or what I list, Or ere I journey to your father's house. Go on and fetch our horses back again. Evermore cross'd and cross'd; nothing but cross'd!
- **Hortensio (The Faithful).** Say as he says, or we shall never go.
- **Katherina (Archbishop Aymond).** Forward, I pray, since we have come so far, And be it moon, or sun, or what you please; And if you please to call it a rush-candle, Henceforth I vow it shall be so for me.
- **Petruchio (Imperial Rome).** I say it is the moon.

---

9

[http://www.opensourceshakespeare.org/views/plays/play\\_view.php?WorkID=tamingshrew&Act=4&Scene=5&Scope=scene&displaytype=print](http://www.opensourceshakespeare.org/views/plays/play_view.php?WorkID=tamingshrew&Act=4&Scene=5&Scope=scene&displaytype=print) (accessed March 30, 2012).



## **Appendix I**

An overview of the Missal

© 2014

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

- **Katherina (Archbishop Aymond).** I know it is the moon.
- **Petruchio (Imperial Rome).** Nay, then you lie; it is the blessed sun.
- **Katherina (Archbishop Aymond).** Then, God be bless'd, it is the blessed sun; But sun it is not, when you say it is not; And the moon changes even as your mind. What you will have it nam'd, even that it is, And so it shall be so for Katherine [sic].
- **Hortensio (The Faithful).** Petruchio, go thy ways, the field is won.

Katharina's spirit is broken. Petruchio's power play has won. As the audiences watching poor Katherina try to cope with Petruchio's nonsense, their hearts go out to her. Likewise, hearts must go out to Archbishop Aymond.

The Missal contains compound, complex, convoluted sentences, often extending over forty words, resulting in non-standard American English. The Teaching Magisterium imposes such nonsense, read from the altar each Sunday, with the excuse that is a better translation of the Latin, thereby focusing on the institutional Church. English sentence structure forced into Latin sentence structure is a frustrating, unmitigated, tragic farce.

Poor Archbishop Aymond knows all of these things, but must grant his *Concordat cum originali* in the 2011 Missal in order to remain subservient to the imperial power in Rome. As the audience at the play hopes that Katherina can live with the conscience of a broken spirit, the Faithful can only hope that Archbishop Aymond can live with the conscience of his broken spirit. Only time will tell what Rome will do next.

The faithful deserve readability, integrity, scholarship, “‘language which is easily understandable’ to the faithful.”<sup>10</sup> “. . . *Liturgiam authenticam* calls for the development and consistency of a distinctive translation style with these principal characteristics . . . (2) easy intelligibility . . . ”<sup>11</sup> that *easy intelligibility* is the reason for Personal Notes.

---

<sup>10</sup> “. . . It is important to note that vernacular renderings of a Latin text must be made in a ‘kind of language which is easily understandable’ to the faithful . . . ” n.a., *Ratio Translationis for the English Language* (Vatican City: Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, 2007) as found at <http://www.bible-researcher.com/ratio.translationis1.pdf> for page 10 (accessed March 31, 2012) #9.

<sup>11</sup> n.a., *Ratio Translationis for the English Language* (Vatican City: Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, 2007) as found at

**Appendix I**  
An overview of the Missal  
© 2014  
Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

That is why Personal Notes pays attention to the Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level Readability. That nothing coming from the Apostolic See recognizes a need to check Grade Level Readability brings to mind “The Taming of the Shrew.”

The fifty word 23.9 post graduate Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level Readability sentence that follows, from *ratio translationis*, exemplifies that it is the moon, or the sun, or whatever else it may be that the Apostolic See declares.

Even if it has [sic] perhaps [sic] become less frequently used in contemporary English than in the past, subordination remains comprehensible to the speaker and hearer of English, and therefore should be used to the extent that is necessary in order to translate accurately the prayers of the Roman Rite.<sup>12</sup>

Personal Notes strongly disagrees with the above run-on sentence but agrees with and offers paraphrasing, which *ratio translationis* legitimates in another place.<sup>13</sup> Personal Notes, then, *paraphrases*, rather than *translates*, the illiterate 2011 Missal into standard American English.

The otherwise unattributed eight page Louisville Liturgy Forum points to nonsense in the Roman Missal with three exclamation points. After listing seven countries that speak English, the Forum posits: “Anyone who has visited those countries knows that they all speak English differently!”<sup>14</sup> The remaining two

---

<http://www.bible-researcher.com/ratio.translationis3.pdf> for page 78 (accessed March 31, 2012); <http://www.bible-researcher.com/ratio.translationis4.pdf> for pages 100-130 (accessed March 31, 2012) #114 .

<sup>12</sup> n.a., *Ratio Translationis for the English Language* (Vatican City: Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, 2007) as found at <http://www.bible-researcher.com/ratio.translationis2.pdf> for pages 40 (accessed March 31, 2012).

<sup>13</sup> . . . Translations may not be made from a translation of the editio typica . . . Paraphrase, as a method of restating a perceived meaning in terms other than those found in the original Latin, is not to be equated with translation. Paraphrase aims to convey meaning directly and quickly in a given language . . . n.a., *Ratio Translationis for the English Language* (Vatican City: Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, 2007) as found at <http://www.bible-researcher.com/ratio.translationis2.pdf> for pages 34-36 (accessed March 31, 2012) 41., 42.

**Appendix I**  
An overview of the Missal  
© 2014  
Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

exclamation points belong to the quintuple, “*And with your spirit.*” The Forum posits, “Wrong! The new response translates the Latin [*Et cum spiritu tuo*] more clumsily, not more accurately.” Finally,

Now, wait a minute! . . . Everyone’s personal spirit or soul is not the same as god’s spirit, or the Holy Spirit. When the people say “And with your spirit,” they are referring to the priest’s soul, not to the Holy Spirit, and so it is not a reference to the spirit that is needed “to celebrate these awesome mysteries.” You can’t use the presence of the Holy Spirit during worship to prove that “and with your spirit” refers to the presence of the Holy Spirit.

*Boring detail*, at least here, is essential for making the case that the Apostolic See is vacillating and arbitrary, expecting others to follow directives, it, itself, ignores. Not to burden the ordinary reader, with the compound, complex, confusing sentences from the Apostolic See, Personal Notes relegates these sentences to the Appendices for the more curious readers.

Commentator Todd Flowerday uncovers some of the secrecy involved, hiding the Apostolic See standards of translation. Flowerday explains, “PrayTell was tipped to the leak of this document, a secret/private one, which is here. This [*ratio translationis*] document was produced in the middle of the last decade, and holds a 2007 copyright.”<sup>15</sup> The Apostolic See is secretive and, because secretive, also arbitrary.

Regular readers will note that capitalization in English does not follow capitalization in Latin. *Liturgiam authenticam* offers some special rules. When *LORD*

---

<sup>14</sup> Pages 2, 4, and 5/8 <http://liturgyforum.wordpress.com/2011/11/18/five-minute-catechesis-text-and-commentary/#more-105> (accessed April 15, 2012).

<sup>15</sup> When it may be deemed appropriate by the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, a text will be prepared after consultation with Bishops, called a “*ratio translationis*”, to be set forth by the authority of the same Dicastery, in which the principles of translation found in this Instruction will be applied in closer detail to a given language. This document may be composed of various elements as the situation may require, such as, for example, a list of vernacular words to be equated with their Latin counterparts, the setting forth of principles applicable specifically to a given language, and so forth. <http://catholicsensibility.wordpress.com/2011/07/24/> (accessed April 1, 2012) 9.

## **Appendix I**

An overview of the Missal

© 2014

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

means the untranslatable name for God, translators are to capitalize all letters.<sup>16</sup> So far, that has not been the case in any of the prayers translated here, from the 2011 Missal. Allowing for exceptions from what is capitalized in Latin is new (as of July 1, 2012) to Personal Notes. *Ratio translationis* lists Terms for Capitalization,<sup>17</sup> a list unavailable until April 1, 2012, mainly because of my unwillingness to start research until the text for the 2011 Missal became fully available, just in time for Advent 2011. On April 1, I was developing material for July 1.

In other cases, translators are to follow, with some exceptions, Latin capitalization.<sup>18</sup> Flowerday commented above.

“ . . . The following translation of the **Collect** for the Mass of the Eleventh Sunday of the year [sic] . . . ’ The reference is to the Eleventh Sunday *in Ordinary Time*, rather than *of the year*. The text is from **Prayer over the Offerings**, rather than the **Collect**.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> in accordance with immemorial tradition, which indeed is already evident in the above-mentioned “Septuagint” version, the name of almighty God expressed by the Hebrew tetragrammaton (YHWAH) and rendered in Latin by the word Dominus [sic], is to be rendered into any given vernacular by a word equivalent in meaning. <http://catholicsensibility.wordpress.com/2011/08/24/liturgiam-authenticam-41/> (accessed March 31, 2012).

<sup>17</sup> n.a., *Ratio Translationis for the English Language* (Vatican City: Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, 2007) as found at <http://www.bible-researcher.com/ratio.translationis4.pdf> for pages 117-122 (accessed March 31, 2012).

<sup>18</sup> The use of capitalization in the liturgical texts of the Latin editiones typicae as well as in the liturgical translation of the Sacred Scriptures, for honorific or otherwise theologically significant reasons, is to be retained in the vernacular language at least insofar as the structure of a given language permits. <http://catholicsensibility.wordpress.com/2011/08/20/liturgiam-authenticam-32-33/> (accessed March 31, 2012) 33; n.a., *Ratio Translationis for the English Language* (Vatican City: Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, 2007) as found at <http://www.bible-researcher.com/ratio.translationis3.pdf> for page 82, 83 (accessed March 31, 2012) #17, #19.

<sup>19</sup> <http://www.clerus.org/bibliaclerusonline/en/> (accessed April 1, 2012). Go to pagina 461 #56 .

## **Appendix I**

An overview of the Missal

© 2014

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

The Apostolic See attacks the venerable Chicago Manual of Style.<sup>20</sup> The problem is that the 2007 *Ratio* is citing a 1982 Chicago Manual. 1982 is the Twelfth Edition. By 2007, the Chicago Manual was in the 2003 Fifteenth Edition.<sup>21</sup> Like Petruccio, the Apostolic See is making it up as it goes along.

By its use of the word *noble* twice and *nobility* once, the Apostolic See continues to regard itself as part of Medieval nobility, rather than modern democracy.<sup>22</sup>

“However, the use of “sense lines” or colometry (‘the measuring of the length of phrases’) has now been introduced into liturgical books . . . ”<sup>23</sup> except the Italian Latin. Personal Notes, therefore, is not able to compare English with Latin colometry.

The illiterate 2011 Missal is a model for lack of academic integrity. Personal Notes only examines **Collects**, **Prayers after Communion**, and an occasional **Blessing over the People**. Personal Notes examines the Latin in the context of the translations.

---

<sup>20</sup> In sum, no style sheet can be used to “restrict the full sense of the original text within narrower limits” than is intended by the Liturgy itself. The *Chicago Manual of Style* (University of Chicago Press, 1982), p., 208, for example, instructs its readers that the names of rites other than the Eucharist “are not capitalized in run [sic] of the text,” including all the Sacraments, whereas clearly in English-language liturgical books it has been a long-standing and well-founded practice to capitalize the words such as “Confirmation” as the proper name of a particular sacrament. n.a., *Ratio Translationis for the English Language* (Vatican City: Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, 2007) as found at <http://www.bible-researcher.com/ratio.translationis2.pdf> for pages 52 (accessed March 31, 2012) 79. .

<sup>21</sup> <http://www.worldcat.org/title/chicago-manual-of-style/oclc/51553085/editions?editionsView=true&referer=br> (accessed April 1, 2012).

<sup>22</sup> n.a., *Ratio Translationis for the English Language* (Vatican City: Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, 2007) as found at <http://www.bible-researcher.com/ratio.translationis3.pdf> for page 78, (accessed March 31, 2012).

<sup>23</sup> n.a., *Ratio Translationis for the English Language* (Vatican City: Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, 2007) as found at <http://www.bible-researcher.com/ratio.translationis4.pdf> for page 126 (accessed March 31, 2012) #6.

**Appendix I**

An overview of the Missal

© 2014

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

**Appendix II**  
Specific Comments for this Sunday  
© 2012  
Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

*Collect* is the technical term for *Prayer before reading Sacred Scripture*.

On the first sentence of the *Collect*, my version of Microsoft Word 2010 Spelling & Grammar checker remarks:

**"That" or "Which"**

Do not use a comma before the pronoun "that". If these words are not essential to the meaning of your sentence, use "which" and separate the words with a comma.

Instead of: Did you learn the dance, that is from Guatemala?

Consider: Did you learn the dance, which is from Guatemala?

Or consider: Did you learn the dance that is from Guatemala?

Instead of: I read the book, that is on the counter last year.

Consider: I read the book that is on the counter last year.

Or consider: I read the book, which is on the counter, last year.

Consider: The chefs have not yet made the eclairs.

*God, who show* is not standard American English. *God, who shows* is standard American English. Lack of subject-verb agreement sounds like Black or African American Language (BL or AAL), defined as "a style of speaking English words with Black flava—with Africanized semantic, grammatical, pronunciation, and rhetorical patterns."<sup>24</sup> I have a reservation about this definition, because my students, both Black and White, pointed out that Blacks learned their English mainly from lower-class Whites. I have heard Whites speaking Black English, not with the sophistication Smitherman brings to the subject, but at least in diction and pronunciation.

---

<sup>24</sup> Geneva Smitherman, Word from the Mother: Language and African Americans (New York: Routledge, 2006) 3. Also see 6, 9, which is not my meaning or concern.

**Appendix II**  
Specific Comments for this Sunday  
© 2012  
Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

Dallen points out that none of the heads of the Congregation of Divine Worship were fluent in English.<sup>25</sup> I am not sure what Dallen means by *fluent*. When I spoke with Cardinal Paul Augustin Mayer, O.S.B. in 2000 we seemed to have no trouble communicating in English. Admittedly, the first language for Mayer was German.

*Might* versus *may* in the Missal: *might* connotes ability, wish, or desire;<sup>26</sup> *may* connotes permission. According to the Dictionary, *may* is used in auxiliary function to express a wish or desire especially in prayer, imprecation, or benediction <*may* he reign in health> <*may* they all be damned> <*may* the best man win>. I think *might* sounds better, because the faithful are expressing a desire, rather than asking for permission. The Little, Brown Handbook explains, “the helping verbs of standard American English may be problematic if you are used to speaking another language or dialect.”<sup>27</sup>

The Latin does not capitalize *christiána*, but the Missal does capitalize *Christians*. *Christians* is not on the list of words capitalized, regardless of the Latin.<sup>28</sup> Since the Faithful will not hear the difference between an upper and lower case word, there is no reason to stray from the Latin, except, perhaps, to show the arrogance of the translator in the face of anyone objecting to the illiterate 2011 Missal. The revision takes into account the hearing of the faithful.

Dallen comments,<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> James Dallen, “What Kind of Ecclesiology?” <http://misguidedmissal.com/wp/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/Translation-Ecclesiology-Jim-Dallen-3-6-2012.pdf> (accessed March 11, 2012), page 11-12/36.

<sup>26</sup> <http://unabridged.merriam-webster.com/cgi-bin/unabridged?va=might&x=15&y=10> (accessed January 29, 2011).

<sup>27</sup> H. Ramsey Fowler and Jane E. Aaron, Eleventh Edition: The Little, Brown Handbook (New York: Longman, 2010) 274.

<sup>28</sup> n.a., Ratio Translationis for the English Language (Vatican City: Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, 2007) as found at <http://www.bible-researcher.com/ratio.translationis4.pdf> for page 117 (accessed March 31, 2012).

<sup>29</sup> James Dallen, “What Kind of Ecclesiology?” <http://misguidedmissal.com/wp/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/Translation-Ecclesiology-Jim-Dallen-3-6-2012.pdf> (accessed March 11, 2012), page 2/36.



## **Appendix II**

Specific Comments for this Sunday

© 2012

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

Unfortunately, catechesis is also needed to explain that what we hear at worship is not what we really mean. Unfamiliar words can be misleading. Grammar and style intended more for the eye and ear can be misheard or misunderstood or ignored. . . . Even more dangerously, language communicates attitudes and outlooks at a level deeper than the surface meaning of words. . . .The new translation (and the hype surrounding it) presents views on Church, tradition, unity, Eucharist, priesthood, laity, liturgical assembly, symbol, and liturgical participation. Sometimes these are unclear or conflicting or at odds with Vatican Council II perspectives.

The Little, Brown Handbook has some more advice, of which the 2011 illiterate Roman Missal seems entirely oblivious.<sup>30</sup>

. . . writing for readers is not the same as speaking to listeners. Whereas a reader can go back and reread a written message, a listener cannot stop a speech to rehear a section. Several studies have reported that immediately after hearing a short talk, most listeners cannot recall half of what was said.

Effective speakers adapt to their audience's listening ability by reinforcing their ideas through repetition and restatement. They use simple words, short sentences, personal pronouns, contractions, and colloquial expressions. In formal writing, these strategies might seem redundant and too informal; but in speaking, they improve listeners' comprehension.

Language is the tool humans use to think. All languages have some thoughts that cannot be expressed in other languages. Language is the window of the mind to reality. Because language matters, the 2011 illiterate Roman Missal matters.

The Missal translates the Latin Missale into English. I name the Missale *Italian Latin*, because of the accent marks, which do not appear elsewhere. See pagina 465 at <http://www.clerus.org/bibliaclerusonline/en/> The Holy See, Congregation for the Clergy runs this website. (accessed March 18, 2012).

The first sentence of the **Collect** contains fifty-seven words, in a 21.3 College Graduate School Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level Readability. It is a fused sentence. See Chapter 18, "Comma Splices, Fused Sentences," H. Ramsey Fowler and Jane E.

---

<sup>30</sup> H. Ramsey Fowler and Jane E. Aaron, Eleventh Edition: The Little, Brown Handbook (New York: Longman, 2010) 856.

**Appendix II**  
Specific Comments for this Sunday  
© 2012  
Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

Aaron, Eleventh Edition: The Little, Brown Handbook (New York: Longman, 2010) 339-444.

My version of Microsoft Word 2010 Spelling & Grammar checker provides the Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level Readability.<sup>31</sup> Dallen explains, “Applying readability criteria indicates that the number of years of formal education required for understanding Eucharistic Prayers on first reading has increased from 10.75 to 17.21,”<sup>32</sup> from sophomore high school to graduate school college.

The first sentence of this **Prayer after Communion** contains twenty-four words, in a 11.4 third year high school Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level Readability. It is a fused sentence. The revised **Prayer after Communion** has a 7.2 Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level Readability.

The second sentence of the **Collect** has twenty-four words with a 9.7 Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level Readability. That is reading at the sophomore high school level. The Little, Brown Handbook has a section, “Writing Concisely” that is helpful for the wordiness here.<sup>33</sup>

You may find yourself writing wordily when you are unsure of your subject or when your thoughts are tangled. It’s fine, even necessary, to stumble and grope while drafting. But you should straighten out your ideas and eliminate wordiness during revision and editing.

. . . wordiness is not a problem of incorrect grammar. A sentence may be perfectly grammatical but still contain unneeded words that interfere with your idea.

---

<sup>31</sup> For a description of readability levels, go to [http://www.online-utility.org/english/readability\\_test\\_and\\_improve.jsp](http://www.online-utility.org/english/readability_test_and_improve.jsp) (accessed March 11, 2012).

<sup>32</sup> James Dallen, “What Kind of Ecclesiology?” <http://misguidedmissal.com/wp/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/Translation-Ecclesiology-Jim-Dallen-3-6-2012.pdf> (accessed March 11, 2012), page 17/36. Dallen cites <http://www.praytelligblog.com/index.php/2011/02/18/readability-tests-on-the-eucharistic-prayers/> that I accessed March 11, 2012.

<sup>33</sup> 8. Effective Words, 39. Writing Concisely,” H. Ramsey Fowler and Jane E. Aaron, Eleventh Edition: The Little, Brown Handbook (New York: Longman, 2010) 523-524.

**Appendix II**  
Specific Comments for this Sunday  
© 2012  
Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

That is why the revised **Collect** has four, rather than two, sentences. The revised **Collect** has a 5.7 Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level Readability.

Non-American English, such as Scottish or British, can appear illiterate to Americans in the United States.<sup>34</sup> That is why oral prayers in anything other than standard American English are irrelevant, in the United States. An exception to this may be African American Language (AAL),<sup>35</sup> but no one is trying that scenario.

Because American English is not the first language for many Catholics in the United States, pastoral care requires standard American English. Otherwise, the Faithful are subject to two contrary conclusions about the readings. The first conclusion for the Faithful is that the Church does not respect what the marginalized, particularly immigrants, are doing to learn standard American English. In addition to the laity, twenty-two percent of the active diocesan priests in the United States are from outside the country.<sup>36</sup> They need their local ordinaries (bishops) to insist they keep improving their use of standard American English. The second conclusion is that the Church is actively sabotaging any attempt to learn standard American English, just as it is sabotaging Vatican II.

The respective ICEL **Collect** and **Prayer after Communion** have 9.1, and 6.5 Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level Readabilities.

The Latin omits the **O** in the **Missal O God** and **O Lord**. The argument that the English is to stay close to the Latin does not hold up. The English has **O Lord**. The Latin has only **Dómine**, without the **O**. **O** is a Latin word. Cassell's Latin Dictionary: Latin-English and English-Latin, revised by J. R. V. Marchant, M.A. and Joseph F. Charles, B.A. (New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company, 1952) 371.

---

<sup>34</sup> Bette Mae K. Jirran reads widely in fiction and cites the following as examples. Emily Brightwell, Mrs. Jeffries Forges Ahead, (New York: Berkley Prime Crime, 2011); Jude Deveraux, Jill Barnett, Geralyn Dawson, Pam Binder, and Patricia Cabot, A Season in the Highlands (New York: Pocket Books, 2000); Christina Dodd, Stephanie Laurens, Julia Quinn, and Karen Ranney, Scottish Brides (New York: Avon Books, 1999).

<sup>35</sup> Geneva Smitherman, Word from the Mother: Language and African Americans (New York: Routledge, 2006) 3.

<sup>36</sup> <http://www.commonwealmagazine.org/it-doesn%E2%80%99t-sing> (February 26, 2012).

## Appendix II

Specific Comments for this Sunday

© 2012

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

In the **Collect**, *your Son* is in apposition to *Jesus Christ* and standard American English would set it off with commas. The Little, Brown Handbook has a "using appositives" subsection.

An appositive is usually a noun that renames another noun nearby [in this case *your Son*], most often the noun just before the appositive. (the word *appositive* derives from a Latin word that means "placed near to" or "applied to.") An appositive phrase includes modifiers as well . . . . All appositives can replace the words they refer to: [*Jesus Christ/your Son*] . . . Appositives are economical alternatives to adjective clauses containing a form of *be* . . . [*Jesus Christ* [who is] *your Son*. . . ] you can usually connect the appositive to the main clause containing the word referred to . . . An appositive is *not* set off with punctuation when it is essential to the meaning of the word it refers to [in the United States of America, which has no secular lords, *our Lord* is not essential to *Jesus Christ*] . . . When an appositive is not essential to the meaning of the word it refers to, it *is* set off with punctuation, usually a comma or commas [as is the case here, *our Lord, Jesus Christ,*] . . .

H. Ramsey Fowler and Jane E. Aaron, Eleventh Edition: The Little, Brown Handbook (New York: Longman, 2010) 254-255.

*Through* . . . is a sentence fragment the Missal uses throughout the book. See The Little, Brown Handbook explains,

A prepositional phrase is a modifier consisting of a preposition (such as *in*, *on*, *to*, or *with* [including *through*]) together with its object and any modifiers (see pp. 242-43). A prepositional phrase cannot stand alone as a complete sentence . . .

At the end of the **Collect**, *the unity* is confusing. A dictionary definition for the word *the*: "1 c:-- used as a function word to indicate that a following noun or noun equivalent refers to someone or something that is unique or is thought of as unique or exists as only one at a time <*the* Lord><*the* Messiah> . . . ." <sup>1</sup> *Unity* is a noun meaning "1a: the quality of state of being or consisting of one." <sup>1</sup> Does *the unity* mean that the Holy Spirit belongs to a union, like a labor union? Does *unity* in the **Collect** mean that the Holy Spirit, unlike Jesus, has only one nature, Divine? Does *unity* mean the trinitarian unity? In the same vein, does *unity* mean that it is the Holy Spirit, which is the relationship between the Father and Son, thereby causing a triune unity? The last is how the revision would resolve the matter, substituting *Divine Trinitarian nature* for *unity*. Because the Faithful have not challenged *the unity* since Vatican II, the now traditional silly phraseology remains.

## **Appendix II**

Specific Comments for this Sunday

© 2012

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

See Part 4, “Clear Sentences,” Chapter 17 c, “Sentence Fragments: Verbal or prepositional phrase,” H. Ramsey Fowler and Jane E. Aaron, Eleventh Edition: The Little, Brown Handbook (New York: Longman, 2010) 335. <http://unabridged.merriam-webster.com/cgi-bin/unabridged?va=the&x=0&y=0> (accessed December 4, 2011). <http://unabridged.merriam-webster.com/cgi-bin/unabridged?va=unity&x=0&y=0> (assessed December 4, 2011).

By placing the verb, *having consumed*, first, the Missal does not follow either Latin (subject-object-verb)<sup>37</sup> or standard American English (subject-verb-object) word order. Word order in Vatican Italian may not provide the subject before the verb. The Little Brown Handbook explains standard American English. “Word order in English sentences may not correspond to word order in the sentences of your native language. English, for instance, strongly prefers subject first, then verb, then any other words, whereas some other languages prefer the verb first.” That is what is happening in this prayer. The verb, *Grant*, is first.<sup>38</sup>

Misuse of interjections, such as *O Lord*, contributes to the conglomeration of meaninglessness and is very confusing to listeners. The Little, Brown Handbook gives some examples, *hey, oh, darn, wow*. An interjection is “A word standing by itself or inserted in a construction to exclaim or command attention.” A forceful interjection is set off with an exclamation point, a mild interjection with a comma. The Missal only uses mild interjections and that is a cause of discombobulation.<sup>39</sup>

Dallen explains,<sup>40</sup>

---

37

[http://www.google.com/search?q=Does+the+verb+come+last+in+Latin+word+oorder%3F&ie=utf-8&oe=utf-8&aq=t&rls=org.mozilla:en-US:official&client=firefox-a#hl=en&client=firefox-a&hs=IXc&rls=org.mozilla:en-US:official&sa=X&ei=iKzVTqRPKLx0gHWxdDrAQ&ved=0CBkQvwUoAQ&q=Does+the+verb+come+last+in+Latin+word+order%3F&spell=1&bav=on.2,or.r\\_gc.r\\_pw.,cf.osb&fp=c5f9ab36cd8b91fa&biw=1472&bih=754](http://www.google.com/search?q=Does+the+verb+come+last+in+Latin+word+oorder%3F&ie=utf-8&oe=utf-8&aq=t&rls=org.mozilla:en-US:official&client=firefox-a#hl=en&client=firefox-a&hs=IXc&rls=org.mozilla:en-US:official&sa=X&ei=iKzVTqRPKLx0gHWxdDrAQ&ved=0CBkQvwUoAQ&q=Does+the+verb+come+last+in+Latin+word+order%3F&spell=1&bav=on.2,or.r_gc.r_pw.,cf.osb&fp=c5f9ab36cd8b91fa&biw=1472&bih=754) (accessed November 30, 2011)

<sup>38</sup> H. Ramsey Fowler and Jane E. Aaron, Eleventh Edition: The Little, Brown Handbook (New York: Longman, 2010) 236.

<sup>39</sup> H. Ramsey Fowler and Jane E. Aaron, Eleventh Edition: The Little, Brown Handbook (New York: Longman, 2010) 233, 431, 893.

**Appendix II**  
Specific Comments for this Sunday  
© 2012  
Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

The [Missal] language is elitist . . . Self-deprecating and deferential language entered the liturgy in the fourth through sixth centuries. To a great extent this copied the language of the imperial court, where petitioners and even officials groveled at the emperor's feet and were expected to kiss his foot. Much of this was translated in a more straightforward manner in the old ICEL translation. The new one restores it—"be pleased to," "listen graciously to," and "we pray, O Lord, that you bid"—to avoid seeming to tell God what to do. The Lord's Prayer should presumably be rewritten to avoid such direct language as "give us this day," "forgive," "lead us not," and "deliver us."

Whether to include or exclude the 1998 ICEL translation is difficult. The reason to include ICEL is: this is the best the American bishops could do, before the Vatican rejected the translation. The ICEL translation also deals with some of the vocabulary and grammatical problems with which the revisions deal. The reason to exclude ICEL is: the ICEL translation is not significantly better than the Missal.

For the **Collect** see, International Commission on English in the Liturgy: A Joint Commission of Catholics Bishops' Conferences (ICEL), The Sacramentary: Volume One—Sundays and Feasts (Washington, D.C.: International Commission on English in the Liturgy, 1998), page 893 (216/362) , downloaded from [https://rs895dt.rapidshare.com/#!/download|895|35|387089704|ICEL\\_Sacramentary\\_1998.zip|6767|R~00A3D4012C6FE19956DB84F71E5405F6|0|0](https://rs895dt.rapidshare.com/#!/download|895|35|387089704|ICEL_Sacramentary_1998.zip|6767|R~00A3D4012C6FE19956DB84F71E5405F6|0|0) at [http://misguidedmissal.com/wp/?page\\_id=23](http://misguidedmissal.com/wp/?page_id=23) (accessed December 8, 2011).

For **Prayer after Communion** see, International Commission on English in the Liturgy: A Joint Commission of Catholics Bishops' Conferences (ICEL), The Sacramentary: Volume One—Sundays and Feasts (Washington, D.C.: International Commission on English in the Liturgy, 1998), page 895 (218/362), downloaded from [https://rs895dt.rapidshare.com/#!/download|895|35|387089704|ICEL\\_Sacramentary\\_1998.zip|6767|R~00A3D4012C6FE19956DB84F71E5405F6|0|0](https://rs895dt.rapidshare.com/#!/download|895|35|387089704|ICEL_Sacramentary_1998.zip|6767|R~00A3D4012C6FE19956DB84F71E5405F6|0|0) at [http://misguidedmissal.com/wp/?page\\_id=23](http://misguidedmissal.com/wp/?page_id=23) (accessed December 8, 2011).

*Liturgiam authenticam* directs,<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> James Dallen, "What Kind of Ecclesiology?" <http://misguidedmissal.com/wp/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/Translation-Ecclesiology-Jim-Dallen-3-6-2012.pdf> (accessed March 11, 2012), page 17/36.

<sup>41</sup> <http://catholicsensibility.wordpress.com/2011/08/20/liturgiam-authenticam-32-33/> (accessed March 31, 2012).

## **Appendix II**

Specific Comments for this Sunday

© 2012

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

33. The use of capitalization in the liturgical texts of the Latin editiones typicae as well as in the liturgical translation of the Sacred Scriptures, for honorific or otherwise theologically significant reasons, is to be retained in the vernacular language at least insofar as the structure of a given language permits.

Todd Flowerday comments,<sup>42</sup>

Capitalization is an interesting separate issue raised, especially in light of LA 32. First, liturgical texts are primarily an aural/oral tradition. I don't know how caps are communicated in speech. A slight pause, perhaps?

It might be seen that a plunge into capitalization is itself a political fad. If a vernacular language is moving away from it, what's the sense in introducing it? Do the clergy need reinforcement on the doctrine of upper case?

And finally, the various versions of the English MR3 [the 2011 Missal] have shown an uneven application of capital letters. ICEL, Vox Clara, or Msgr Moroney [James P. Moroney, Executive Secretary to the Vox Clara Committee]<sup>43</sup> don't seem to have read up on their 2007 *ratio translationis*. It all seems rather arbitrary—which strikes me as counter to this church document, not to mention the whole thrust of post-conciliar liturgy.

### **Rationale**

Clarity is not a prerequisite for prayer. The search for clarity can be a means to prayer. As part of catechesis, these Personal Notes set up what the Church needs to explain to enable the Faithful to pray with *faith seeking understanding*, as Saint Anselm of Canterbury (1033-1109) puts it.<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup> <http://catholicsensibility.wordpress.com/2011/08/20/liturgiam-authenticam-32-33/> (accessed March 31, 2012).

<sup>43</sup> <http://www.blogger.com/profile/17013903890674545477> (accessed March 31, 2012).

<sup>44</sup> <http://www.google.com/search?q=faith+seeking+understanding&ie=utf-8&oe=utf-8&aq=t&rls=org.mozilla:en-US:official&client=firefox-a> (accessed November 28, 2011) and <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/anselm/> (accessed November 28, 2011).

**Appendix II**  
Specific Comments for this Sunday  
© 2012  
Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

Dallen refers to an “omitted rubric” that makes one wonder how free presiders may be to use and adapt my translations of the current illiterate 2011 Missal.<sup>45</sup>

An omitted rubric also suggests a move toward greater uniformity. In several places the 1973 translation advised the priest that he could say something to the assembly “in these or similar words.” Whether paragraph 14 of *Eucharistiae participationem* (1973), which permitted this, has been repealed or not is unclear, but that option goes unmentioned in the new translation. In some cases, the Latin text (and English translation) does provide a few variations and the impression is that only these are allowed. Unity again required uniformity. Apart from the omission of this rubric, the very fact that the many nations divided by a common language . . . are required to use the same translation makes clear the relationship between unity and uniformity.

In an attempt to use the prayers the anti-intellectual, anti-Vatican-II, dysfunctional, illiterate Vatican, is now setting forth, these Personal Notes are taking on a new focus. This new focus began November 27, 2011, the First Sunday in Advent. From the First Sunday in Advent until just before the First Sunday of Lent, February 26, 2012, these Notes had a double focus, including both the Lectionary and the Missal. After that, the focus remains on the Missal, until the end of the liturgical year, December 1, 2012.

---

<sup>45</sup> James Dallen, “What Kind of Ecclesiology?” <http://misguidedmissal.com/wp/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/Translation-Ecclesiology-Jim-Dallen-3-6-2012.pdf> (accessed March 11, 2012), page 28-29/36.



**Stand-alone Prayers**

1040 Missal: Fifteenth Sunday in Ordinary Time A Catholic Bible Study (120715)

© 2012

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

**Heavenly Father, with truth, show your Church the way out of confusion.**

**Jesus Christ shows the way, along the straight and narrow path of honest virtue. Help the Faithful to follow him. We ask this through our Lord, Jesus Christ, your Son, who lives and reigns with you in the unity of the Holy Spirit, one God, forever.**

**By participating in this Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, we have participated in the love of the Holy Eucharist. Let its saving effects increase our love. We pray through Christ, our Lord.**