

Personal Notes

1100 Missal: Seventeenth Sunday in Ordinary Time A Catholic Bible Study (120729)

© 2015

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

Roman Missal¹

I. Introduction

The current Papacy likes to subordinate humans to itself, without itself being subordinate to any humans. For example, the L'Osservatore Romano centerfold for July 11 is devoted to the so-called Fortnight for Freedom in the United States. William E. Lori, current Archbishop of Baltimore, shares space with Charles Chaput, current Archbishop of Philadelphia. Lori uses the words “common good,” at least ten times. Lori does not define common good, thereby implicitly reserving for himself and the Papacy the right to determine what may be the common good for the United States of America.²

Offering segue to Chaput, Lori remarks, “Of course, all [sic] this has been falsely portrayed . . . as part of a war on women.” Chaput contributes to that portrait, rather than referring to God and leaving it at that, he gratuitously adds, himself, God himself. In his Fortnight homily, Chaput uses the word “all” at least nine times, implicitly making the point that it is he and the Papacy to determine if anyone has any ecclesial right to dissent from their political views.

The Papacy demands freedom for itself without granting freedom to dissent for anyone else, Faithful or not. The Papacy has demanded freedom from the good sense of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) to domineer standard American English to nonsense in the prayers of the illiterate 2011 Missal.³ Vatican II was about making the Church less domineering. The problem centers on whether truth or Church politics determines the prayer life of the Church as first seen temporarily in

¹ For regular readers of these 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.

² William E. Lori, “Archbishop of Baltimore explains the fight for religious liberty in the United States: A beacon of hope amid religious persecution around the world,” and Charles Chaput, “Archbishop of Philadelphia’s homily closing the Fortnight for Freedom: True freedom fears neither the state nor death itself,” L'Osservatore Romano: Weekly Edition in English, Vol. 55, No. 28, Vatican City Wednesday, 11 July, 2012 pages 6-9. Lori refers to the war on women in column 1 on page 8. Chaput refers to “God himself” in column $\frac{3}{4}$ in the paragraph below the fold on page 7.

³ Grammarians explain the subordinating style of writing. Such subordination is abusive and a sign of a lack of love. Chapter 5 in How to Write a Sentence and How to Read One is on “The Subordinating Style.”³ The other approach, besides subordinating, is additive, more eye-to-eye, more democratic than regal.

Personal Notes

1100 Missal: Seventeenth Sunday in Ordinary Time A Catholic Bible Study (120729)

© 2015

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

the Fortnight for Freedom and then, more permanently, in the Missal. The Missal is the prayer book Catholics use at Sunday and weekday Masses.

Language matters. Language exists to enable the rulers to command the ruled. When rulers want to be arbitrary, they speak gibberish. That is political. Rulers lose authority and diminish in dissent. The ultimate ruler, God, is not always clear, thereby enabling humans to be free. God wants to rule humans through love, rather than terror. Over the short term, seen in the sinful way of humanity, even God loses authority and diminishes in dissent.

Language also exists to enable everyone to think. When thinkers want to be understood, they speak clearly. That is truth. Thinkers win authority and flourish in dissent, as one mind rubs against another. The ultimate thinker, God, is forever rubbing his mind with humans, especially with living prophets. Even God wins authority and flourishes in dissent as thinkers ultimately argue that God is in charge.

Ultimately, the search for God is a search for truth. Thoughtfully clear prayer helps. Gibberish, imposed by the Teaching Magisterium on the illiterate 2011 Missal, imprisons the faithful and may help explain the lack of vocations to the institutional Church, secularism in Europe, and rising secularism in the United States of America.

The Papacy errs when it promotes faith in the Papacy rather than Faith in God. Faith in God ultimately wins out. When we put "In God we trust" on our money in the United States, we mean we are trusting in our legislators. Western Civilization is about Faith in God as evidenced by faith in truth, rather than politics. When the Papacy imprisons the faithful in tension between faith in the Papacy and faith in truth, the Papacy loses.

Such is the danger with the illiterate 2011 Missal. Gibberish forces the Faithful seeking God by seeking truth, to look elsewhere. The Protestant Revolt makes the point. As John Calvin (1490-1564) explained five hundred years ago, even the politics associated with conferring the sacraments ultimately yields to the truth of Faith. The Missal is part of the politics associated with conferring the sacraments, particularly Holy Communion.

Calvin said ". . . that the sacraments are effective through faith."⁴ I would add that Faith also becomes more effective through the sacraments. When the Papacy encrusts Holy Communion in gibberish, rather than standard American English, however, faith can become difficult and impossible.

Since Chaput takes up important space in L'Osservatore Romano, which represents Papal views, extending an examination into the Lectionary is in order. To begin, Chaput uses Volume IV to say his Fourth of July Mass, a volume rarely used

⁴ John Calvin, "Commentary on Ezekiel," CTS 23:311-12 (CO 18:492) in Reformation Commentary on Scripture: Old Testament XII: Ezekiel, Daniel, (ed.) Carl L. Beckwith (Downers Grove, Illinois: IVP Academic, An Imprint of InterVarsity Press, 2012) 114.

Personal Notes

1100 Missal: Seventeenth Sunday in Ordinary Time A Catholic Bible Study (120729)

© 2015

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

outside of funeral Masses.⁵ The exact title of the Mass, which Chaput does not identify by name, is “II. FOR PUBLIC NEEDS: 13. FOR THE COUNTRY OR A CITY OR FOR THOSE WHO SERVE IN PUBLIC OFFICE OR FOR THE CONGRESS OR FOR THE PRESIDENT OR FOR THE PROGRESS OF PEOPLES.” The First Reading includes ten choices. Chaput mentions elements of choices #1 (Genesis 1:23—2:3) and #10 (Ezekiel 3:17-21), but uses #10 at Mass.

Chaput does not accurately quote the Lectionary. For but one example, Chaput uses *sentinel*, where the Lectionary uses *watchman*.

At *watchman*, my 2010 Word Spell Checker suggests:

Gender-Specific Language

Although the marked word or phrase may be acceptable in some situations, consider the suggestion that includes both men and women.

- Instead of: They designed the cooking class for *housewives*.
- Consider: They designed the cooking class for homemakers.
- Instead of: Have you seen the *stewardess*?
- Consider: Have you seen the flight attendant?
- Or consider: Have you seen the steward?

That change Chaput makes from *watchman* to *sentinel* may not change the meaning, but the meaning is changed in the Gospel, where Chaput uses *render unto* three times where the Lectionary only uses *repay*, “Then **repay** to Caesar what belongs to Caesar and to God what belongs to God.” Whatever may be in his homily, Chaput is not free to change what is in the Lectionary. Chaput illustrates lack of respect for the truth by the powerful. What the Faithful heard or should have heard is not what Chaput said they heard.

Who, but me, who has no political standing, will publically challenge the right of the Papally anointed Archbishop blithely to change what is read, in the spirit of Petruccio, mentioned below who said it was the moon or the sun, or whatever else he said it was. This is another instance of political Papal power determining what is true,

⁵ United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, The Roman Missal Restored by Decree of the Second Ecumenical Council of the Vatican and Promulgated by Authority of Pope Paul VI: Lectionary for Mass: For Use in the Dioceses of the United States of America: Second Typical Edition: Volume IV: Common of Saints: Ritual Masses, Masses for various Needs and Occasions, Votive Masses, and Masses for the Dead (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 2002) 786-813.

Personal Notes

1100 Missal: Seventeenth Sunday in Ordinary Time A Catholic Bible Study (120729)

© 2015

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

rather than devotion to truth determining what Papal power holds. That is why vocations are declining and the Faithful are leaving the Church in Europe and throughout the Americas.

Commenting on Ezekiel 3:16-27, the Protestant Revolutionary, John Mayer (1583-1664) explained, even then,⁶

A watchman, a bishop, as such are called in the New Testament. But how must he acquit himself according to this office? By taking his words from God's mouth, and so speaking to the people and not bringing forth any of his own as Paul did (1 Thess 2:13, Acts 20). But the Pharisees did not do this, or the papists at this day. Therefore although they have the title of bishops, they are indeed nothing less by reason of their ignorance, which keeps them from seeing, and of the traditions of the people and legends, which they teach, and not the words coming from God's mouth only. Neither can ignorant preachers among us, or such as preach themselves, venting their spleen against particulars . . . better acquit themselves for such watchmen.

Regardless of what the Papacy may dictate from the altar, the Word of God lives in the Faithful. The Reverend John David Ramsey, pastor of Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church in Newport News, Virginia, moves from the Word of Sacred Scripture to its presence in the Faithful. Ramsey writes, "The intimate, physical quality of the relationship between God and his people is made plain when at the end of Deuteronomy [Deut 30:14] Moses reminds the people that ` . . . the word is very near to you; it is in your mouth and in your heart for you to observe.'"⁷ The Word does not depend on human politics but the Word lives in the Faithful for its human existence. Humanity makes the presence of the Word possible.

That is to say, Faith helps the sacraments function in prayer and contemplation. The sacraments, in turn, help Faith to function. This is neither a matter of political subordination nor of monarchy nor of democracy. It is a matter of trusting in truth determining politics, not only in the long term, but (especially) in the short term. Prayers

⁶ John Mayer, "Ezekiel I," CTS 22:167-168 (CO 18:1102-103) in Reformation Commentary on Scripture: Old Testament XII: Ezekiel, Daniel, (ed.) Carl L. Beckwith (Downers Grove, Illinois: IVP Academic, An Imprint of InterVarsity Press, 2012) 29.

⁷ John David Ramsey, A Precarious Faith: The Tri-une Dynamic of the Christian Life (Ph.D. Dissertation, Duke University, 2002) 25.

Personal Notes

1100 Missal: Seventeenth Sunday in Ordinary Time A Catholic Bible Study (120729)

© 2015

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

in the 2011 illiterate Missal are best limited to the short term. Faith and the sacraments help to use prayers in the Missal, despite their secular and academic nonsense.

II. Prayer before reading Sacred Scripture (Collect)

A. Missal: **O God**, protector of those who hope in you, without whom nothing has **firm foundation**, nothing is holy, bestow in abundance your mercy upon us and grant that, with you as our ruler and guide, we **may** use the good things that pass in such a way as to hold fast even now to those that ever endure. **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: Protéctor in te sperántium, Deus, sine quo nihil est válidum, nihil sanctum, múltiplica super nos misericórdiam tuam, ut, te rectóre, te duce, sic bonis transeúntibus nunc utámur, ut iam possímus inhaerére mansúris. Per Dóminum.

To make the Paraphrased 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 7/27), week after week, after identifying more and more repetitious nonsense.

C. Paraphrased: **Heavenly Father protect us who have hope in your salvation. Hold us firm to your Sacred Heart as our foundation. Be merciful to us. As our Savior, enable us to love you and one another. Help us use Faith, Hope, and Charity, so that we will be with you in the next life. 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: Bold print in the single-spaced material highlights problems developed throughout this essay.

Personal Notes

1100 Missal: Seventeenth Sunday in Ordinary Time A Catholic Bible Study (120729)

© 2015

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

III. Prayer after Communion

A. Missal: We have consumed, **O Lord**, this divine **Sacrament**, the perpetual memorial of the **Passion** of your Son; grant, **we pray**, that this gift, which he himself gave us with love beyond all telling, **may** profit us for salvation. Through Christ our Lord.

B. Italian Latin: Súmpsimus, Dómine, divínium **sacraméntum**, **passiónis** Filii tui memoriále perpétuum; tribue, quaesumus, ut ad nostram salútem hoc munus proficiat, quod ineffábili nobis caritáte ipse donávit. Qui vivit.

Passion (of Christ) is on the list of words to be capitalized. *Sacrament(s)* is on the List of Titles of the Blessed Virgin Mary to be capitalized.⁸

C. Paraphrased: **O Lord, we have experienced your love in Holy Communion. Holy Communion is a perpetual memorial of the cross and resurrection of your Son, Jesus Christ. Let this encounter with your love be our eternal salvation. We ask for this through Christ, our Lord.**

V. ICEL

ICEL: **Prayer before reading Sacred Scripture (Collect)**
O God, protector of those who hope in you, without whom nothing is strong, nothing is holy, enfold us in your gracious care and mercy, that with you as our ruler and guide, we may use wisely the gifts of this passing world and fix our hearts even now on those which last for ever [sic].

⁸ 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 118, 121 (accessed April 22, 2012).

Personal Notes

1100 Missal: Seventeenth Sunday in Ordinary Time A Catholic Bible Study (120729)

© 2015

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

We ask this 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: We have shared, Lord, in the sacrament which is the lasting memorial of your Son's passion. Grant, we pray, that this gift of his surpassing love may bring us closer to our salvation.

We ask this through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Appendix I
An overview of the Missal
© 2012
Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

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.⁹

The Reverend Michael G. Ryan explains, “To read these prayers is difficult; to call them prayerful is to redefine the word; to pray them is almost impossible.”¹⁰ 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.” Ryan refers to “virtually unintelligible translations.”¹¹ The revised prayers are a paraphrase of the babble in the Missal into standard American English as heard in such venues as EWTN (Eternal Word Television Network), the Weather Channel, and the evening news.

Whenever the faithful begin Mass with the prayer, “I confess to almighty God . . . that I have greatly sinned,” separating the helping verb from the main verb, is non-standard American English. The Little Brown Handbook sets out, “The helping verbs of standard American English may be problematic if you are used to speaking another language or dialect.”¹² The Papacy is placing American Catholics in the United States every Sunday into that mess.

⁹ <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).

¹⁰ Michael G. Ryan, May 28, 2012, “What’s Next? A pastor reflects on the new Roman Missal,” at http://www.americamagazine.org/content/article.cfm?article_id=13441&s=2 (accessed May 24, 2012).

¹¹ Michael G. Ryan, May 28, 2012, “What’s Next? A pastor reflects on the new Roman Missal,” at http://www.americamagazine.org/content/article.cfm?article_id=13441&s=2 (accessed May 24, 2012).

¹² H. Ramsey Fowler and Jane E. Aaron, Eleventh Edition: The Little, Brown Handbook (New York: Longman, 2010) 274.

Appendix I
An overview of the Missal
© 2012
Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

James Dallen, a retired diocesan priest¹³ and emeritus professor of religious studies at Gonzaga University in Spokane, Washington, refers to an “omitted rubric” that makes one wonder how free presiders may be to use and adapt paraphrasing of the current illiterate 2011 Missal.¹⁴

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 requires 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 current Papacy is now setting forth, these Personal Notes have taken on a year-long 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.

These Appendices enable the busy and preoccupied reader to skip repetitious and boring parts. Some of the details become dense and distracting, except for anyone with the time and devotion to work through twenty pages of material in order to understand two relatively minor prayers, the **Collect** and **Prayer after Communion**. The reason to keep repeating the material, Sunday after Sunday, is for first-time readers, especially first-time readers associated with the Papacy.

¹³ <http://salinadiocese.org/priests/231-priests/980-dallen-rev-james> (accessed March 11, 2012).

¹⁴ 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.

Appendix I

An overview of the Missal

© 2012

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

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 the Sunday 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 Papal directives to approve a translation that does not follow other directives Rome sets out in *Liturgiam authenticam* and *ratio translationis*. As mentioned below, on page 4 of the Missal, Aymond grants his *Concordat cum originali* (*agrees with the original*). Standard American English would focus on the care of souls, rather than preservation of the institutional Church. That is why, when I first 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. So far, he remains unresponsive to me.

The Missal for this Sunday is 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) 477.

James Dallen, a retired diocesan priest¹⁵ 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?”¹⁶ His answer is that the Papacy, with an untenable and dysfunctional model of the Church as an institution, imposed the 2011 Missal on the United States and elsewhere.

¹⁵ <http://salinadiocese.org/priests/231-priests/980-dallen-rev-james> (accessed March 11, 2012.)

¹⁶ <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

© 2012

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

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. In what follows, Personal Notes places the exclamation points in context. Dallen uses his first exclamation point as follows.

Though ‘many’ and ‘all’ contrast in meaning in English, linguists and exegetes say that is not the case in Aramaic or Hebrew. Roman [Papal] 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 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

Appendix I
An overview of the Missal
© 2012
Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

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 paraphrased 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 concerns and emotions similar to Dallen to the illiterate 2011 Missal.

The current Papacy 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 Papacy functions so close to the institutional Church, its confusion is understandable, if not damnable.

The confusion in the Papacy is evident in at least two places: first in the highly publicized sexual abuse coverup; second in the less publicized 2011 Roman Missal, which is not yet generally recognized as a scandal. First, is the sexual cover up. Lacking a true care for souls, means that the sexual abuse coverup, including extricating Cardinal Bernard F. Law and Cardinal William J. Levada from the United States to Rome,¹⁷ is an irresponsible derelict of duty, power play.

The Papacy promoted Law to a position helping choose bishops throughout the world. The Papacy promoted Levada to the position from which the Cardinal Conclave

¹⁷ By Papacy, 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.

Appendix I
An overview of the Missal
© 2012
Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

chose Pope Benedict XVI. The Papacy, therefore, reinforced and promoted a culture of confusion.

Such imperial Papal 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 escaped. He is currently going to trial for not reporting sexual abuse.¹⁸ Additionally, on June 28, Jackson County, Kansas Judge John Torrence ordered Finn and his Kansas City-Saint Joseph diocese to grant prosecutors access to child pornography investigative files. Involvement with child pornography would be a separate trial.¹⁹

The second Papal confusion is in the 2011 Missal. Care of souls is the first responsibility of the hierarchy.²⁰ 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 Papacy is exercising an unadulterated power play. Follow along and witness how the Papacy plays games with reality.

The imperial Papacy 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.

¹⁸ 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).

¹⁹ Joshua J. McElwee, "Diocese ordered to turn over files," Kansas City, Missouri, National Catholic Reporter: The Independent News Source, Vol. 48, No. 20 (July 20—August 2, 2012), page 8, columns 1-3, below the fold.

²⁰ 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
© 2012
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 the Papacy 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:”²¹

- **Petruchio (Papacy).** 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 (Papacy).** I say it is the moon that shines so bright.
- **Katherina (Archbishop Aymond).** I know it is the sun that shines so bright.
- **Petruchio (Papacy).** 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!

That “list” comports with whatever clarity the Congregation for Divine Faith (CDF) had about how the Leadership Conference of Women Religious (LCWR) Sisters were to change. Petruchio was no more vague than the Papacy.

- **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.

21

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
© 2012
Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

- **Petruchio (Papacy).** I say it is the moon.
- **Katherina (Archbishop Aymond).** I know it is the moon.
- **Petruchio (Papacy).** 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.

Kathy Galleher is a psychologist who worked for eight years at a treatment center for abusive priests and religious. She regards the current Roman Catholic hierarchy as abusive toward women. She explains the behavior of the roman Catholic hierarchy. "If we [she means anyone] cannot recognize the pain and take responsibility for it, we get stuck in an aggressively defensive stance, lashing out and blaming others as a way to deflect attention from our actions, actions we find too painful to look at honestly."²² Personal Notes continues to work at the pain unavoidably present in the illiterate 2011 Missal.

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 insistence 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 Papal power. 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.

²² <http://ncronline.org/print/news/vatican/bishops-lashing-out-sisters-distraction> (accessed July 17, 2012).

Appendix I
An overview of the Missal
© 2012
Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

The Papacy admits that the Faithful deserve readability, integrity, scholarship, “‘language which is easily understandable’ to the faithful.”²³ “. . . *Liturgiam authenticam* calls for the development and consistency of a distinctive translation style with these principal characteristics . . . (2) easy intelligibility . . . ”²⁴ that *easy intelligibility* is the reason for Personal Notes. That is why Personal Notes pays attention to the Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level Readability. That nothing coming from the Papacy 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.²⁵

Personal Notes strongly disagrees with the above run-on sentence but agrees with and offers paraphrasing, which *ratio translationis* legitimates in another place.²⁶

²³ “. . . .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.

²⁴ 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); <http://www.bible-researcher.com/ratio.translationis4.pdf> for pages 100-130 (accessed March 31, 2012) #114 .

²⁵ 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).

²⁶ “. . . .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

Appendix I
An overview of the Missal
© 2012
Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

Personal Notes, then, *paraphrases*, rather than *translates*, the illiterate 2011 Missal into standard American English.

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 Papacy, Personal Notes relegates these sentences to the Appendices for the more curious readers.

Commentator Todd Flowerday uncovers some of the secrecy involved, hiding the Papal 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.”²⁷ The Papacy is secretive and, because secretive, also arbitrary.

Few care. For others the Papacy is irrelevant. Where secrecy matters to people, for example the United States Internal Revenue Service records of presidential candidate Willard Mitt Romney, many care. For example on July 19, goggling, on the one hand, for “Romney’s tax records” found about 55,500 results in 0.24 seconds. Goggling for “Papal rules of translation,” on the other hand, found no results.

Regular readers will note that capitalization in English does not follow capitalization in Latin. *Liturgiam authenticam* offers some special rules. Allowing for exceptions from what is capitalized in Latin is new (as of July 1, 2012) to Personal

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.

²⁷ 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
© 2012
Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

Notes. *Ratio translationis* lists Terms for Capitalization,²⁸ 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.

Those who have followed Personal Notes over the past ten years, know “sloppy scholarship” appears too often. Here is another case of “don’t care” sloppy scholarship, this time from *ratio translationis*.

“ . . . 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**.²⁹

The Papacy attacks the venerable Chicago Manual of Style.³⁰ 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.³¹ Like Petruccio, the Apostolic See is making it up as it goes along.

²⁸ 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).

²⁹ <http://www.clerus.org/bibliaclerusonline/en/> (accessed April 1, 2012). Go to pagina 461 #56 .

³⁰ 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. .

³¹ <http://www.worldcat.org/title/chicago-manual-of-style/oclc/51553085/editions?editionsView=true&referer=br> (accessed April 1, 2012).

Appendix I
An overview of the Missal
© 2012
Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

In a larger context, by its use of the word *noble* twice and *nobility* once, the Papacy continues to regard itself as part of Medieval regality, rather than modern democracy.³²

“However, the use of “sense lines” or colometry (‘the measuring of the length of phrases’) has now been introduced into liturgical books . . . ”³³ 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.

Dallen refers to an “omitted rubric” that makes one wonder how free presiders may be to use and adapt my paraphrasing of the current illiterate 2011 Missal.³⁴

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

³² 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).

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.translationis4.pdf> for page 126 (accessed March 31, 2012) #6.

³⁴ 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.

Appendix I

An overview of the Missal

© 2012

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

common language . . . are required to use the same translation makes clear the relationship between unity and uniformity.

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

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

Misuse of interjections, such as *O Lord* and *we pray* 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.³⁵

In the *Collect*, “. . . *has firm foundation*” would be more standard American English as “. . . *has a firm foundation*”. See The Little, Brown Handbook for “Articles, careless omission of.” The Little Brown Handbook warns, “If your native language or dialect is not standard American English, you may have difficulty knowing when to use the English articles *a*, *an*, and *the*.”³⁶

Dallen explains more,³⁷

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.”

³⁵ H. Ramsey Fowler and Jane E. Aaron, Eleventh Edition: The Little, Brown Handbook (New York: Longman, 2010) 233, 431, 893.

³⁶ H. Ramsey Fowler and Jane E. Aaron, Eleventh Edition: The Little, Brown Handbook (New York: Longman, 2010) 374-375.

³⁷ 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.

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.³⁸ 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;³⁹ *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 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.”⁴⁰

Dallen comments,⁴¹

Unfortunately, catechesis is also needed to explain that what we hear at worship is not what we really mean. Unfamiliar words can be misleading. [Familiar words used in an unfamiliar way can also be misleading and make the Faithful distrustful.] 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

³⁸ 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.

³⁹ <http://unabridged.merriam-webster.com/cgi-bin/unabridged?va=might&x=15&y=10> (accessed January 29, 2011).

⁴⁰ H. Ramsey Fowler and Jane E. Aaron, Eleventh Edition: The Little, Brown Handbook (New York: Longman, 2010) 274.

⁴¹ 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.

participation. Sometimes these are unclear or conflicting or at odds with Vatican Council II perspectives.

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 461 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 forty-five words, in a 12.8 Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level Readability. It is a fused sentence. See Chapter 18, “Comma Splices, Fused Sentences,” H. Ramsey Fowler and Jane E. 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.⁴² 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,”⁴³ from sophomore high school to graduate school college.

The first sentence of this **Prayer after Communion** contains forty-five words, in a 12.8 Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level Readability. It is a fused sentence. The revised **Prayer after Communion** has a 5.8 Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level Readability.

The second sentence of the **Collect** has twenty-six words with a 9.5 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.⁴⁴

⁴² For a description of readability levels, go to http://www.online-utility.org/english/readability_test_and_improve.jsp (accessed March 11, 2012).

⁴³ 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.

⁴⁴ 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.

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.

That is why the revised **Collect** has six, rather than two, sentences. The revised **Collect** has a 5.4 Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level Readability.

Non-American English, such as Scottish, British, or Australian, can appear illiterate to Americans in the United States.⁴⁵ 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),⁴⁶ but no one is trying that.

American English is not the first language for many Catholics in the United States. According to the 2010 United States Census, one in five people, five years and older, speak a foreign language at home.⁴⁷ Pastoral care requires standard American English. Otherwise, the Faithful are subject to two contrary conclusions about the readings. 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

⁴⁵ 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).

⁴⁶ Geneva Smitherman, Word from the Mother: Language and African Americans (New York: Routledge, 2006) 3.

⁴⁷ Rachael Huggins and Sam Ward, USA TODAY snapshots®, "Speaking a foreign language at home," Source: Census Bureau, USA Today, Wednesday, July 18, 2012, page A, column 1, at the bottom.

Appendix II

Specific Comments for this Sunday

© 2012

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

American English. In addition to the laity, twenty-two percent of the active diocesan priests in the United States are from outside the country.⁴⁸ 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 Little, Brown Handbook has some advice, of which the 2011 illiterate Missal seems entirely oblivious.⁴⁹

. . . 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.

The respective ICEL **Collect** and **Prayer after Communion** have 15.9, and 5.6 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. **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.

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

⁴⁸ <http://www.commonwealmagazine.org/it-doesn%E2%80%99t-sing> (February 26, 2012).

⁴⁹ 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.

An appositive is usually a noun that renames another noun nearby [in this case *Jesus Christ*], 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: [*our Lord/Jesus Christ*] . . . Appositives are economical alternatives to adjective clauses containing a form of *be* . . . [*our Lord* [who is] *Jesus Christ*. . .] 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>”¹ *Unity* is a noun meaning “1a: the quality of state of being or consisting of one.”¹ 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.

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->

Appendix II

Specific Comments for this Sunday

© 2012

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

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).

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 898 (220/362) , downloaded from 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 (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 898 (220/362), downloaded from 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 (accessed December 8, 2011).

Stand-alone Prayers

1100 Missal: Seventeenth Sunday in Ordinary Time A Catholic Bible Study (120729)

© 2012

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

Heavenly Father protect us who have hope in your salvation. Hold us firm to your Sacred Heart as our foundation. Be merciful to us. As our Savior, enable us to love you and one another. Help us use Faith, Hope, and Charity, so that we will be with you in the next life. 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.

O Lord, we have experienced your love in Holy Communion. Holy Communion is a perpetual memorial of the cross and resurrection of your Son, Jesus Christ. Let this encounter with your love be our eternal salvation. We ask for this through Christ, our Lord.