

Personal Notes

1130 Missal: Eighteenth Sunday in Ordinary Time A Catholic Bible Study (120805)

© 2015

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

[Missal] language
Usually/often
With the new Missal. . .
Discombobulation

Roman Missal¹

I. Introduction

The papacy ordering the Faithful to misuse standard American English, to pray with Ancient and Medieval grammar and syntax (and, perhaps, a little Italian), is worth a good laugh. Ascribing Divinity to human language, namely the gibberish in the Roman Missal is so hilarious that it does not rise to the level of heresy. In any event, Personal Notes opens up the intellectual problems needed to worship God in standard American English. The main effort is to pray well.

The first 136 pages of the Missal are about how to use the Missal. While the first thing I did upon receiving the Missal was to study those pages, I postponed sharing the results, until now. The main interest between now and September 30² is in the difference between directions in the Missal and practice in the pew.

According to the illiterate 2011 Missal, in 1969, Pope Paul VI refers to the “Latin Rite.” In 2011, unnamed Papal bureaucrats refer to the “Roman Rite” in “The General Instruction of the Roman Missal [GIRM].”³ The difference between *Latin* and *Roman* is

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 September 30 is the Twenty-sixth Sunday in Ordinary Time. Anyone wanting a full set of the GIRM comments, please let me know, because I have them in the following file in my computer: “120718 GIRM for Fr. Ramsey Reading 1138 August 5 to Reading 1310 September 16 2012.”

³ 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, United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2011) pages 13, 17, 19, and Section #1. Subsequent references are to the numbered sections, which run

Personal Notes

1130 Missal: Eighteenth Sunday in Ordinary Time A Catholic Bible Study (120805)

© 2015

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

a concession to using the vernacular in the liturgy. The change is subtle. In this case, *Latin* refers to language alone and *Roman* to language as spoken in a particular area.

The Missal substitutes *praise* for *adoration* in its rundown of the various purposes of prayer: praise, thanksgiving, propitiation, and satisfaction.⁴ That notwithstanding, the “Gloria” still uses *adore*.⁵

The Missal comes right out and proclaims “the more prominent place and function given to the Priest [sic].”⁶ *The less prominent place*, evidently, was part of Vatican II. The Missal offers a grudging concession to the people, “though holy in its origin.”⁷

From the arrogant way the Missal proceeds, “the people” excludes priests, but includes everyone else, including nuns and sisters in ministerial congregations.⁸ More arrogance is present, where the Missal proclaims, that “the Eucharistic Sacrifice is in the first place the action of Christ himself, whose inherent efficacy is therefore unaffected by the manner in which the faithful participate in it.”⁹ Through the gibberish, the meaning is that the Papacy does not care if the Faithful understand the Eucharistic Sacrifice. Rather, lest the Missal be misunderstood, the purpose of the Eucharistic Sacrifice is that the Faithful participate.

from #1 on page 19 to #399 on page 87. These references will first provide the page number in my missal, followed by the section number, as follows: 19, #1.

⁴ 19, #3.

⁵ 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, United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2011) 521-522.

⁶ 20, #4.

⁷ 20, #5.

⁸ For language, see Sharon Abercrombie, “From Oregon to Ohio, a swell of support for catholic sisters,” National Catholic Reporter at <http://ncronline.org/print/news/women-religious/oregon-ohio-swell-support-catholic-sisters> (accessed May 4, 2012).

⁹ 21, #11.

Personal Notes

1130 Missal: Eighteenth Sunday in Ordinary Time A Catholic Bible Study (120805)

© 2015

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

The Missal refers to “the People of God arrayed hierarchically” as if that were the only Christian Catholic way to arrange the People of God.¹⁰ Monarchy is one way of running a government; but democracy also works, especially in the United States. The Missal contends, “the Priest will remember that he is the servant of the Sacred Liturgy and that he himself is not permitted, on his own initiative, to add, to remove, or to change anything in the celebration of Mass,”¹¹ as if the rest of the Faithful have nothing to do with it, except pay, pray, and obey.

The Missal refers to the Homily, when it means the Sermon. A homily allows for more feedback than a sermon.¹² The Missal goes on, referring to “the Priest who presides over the assembly in the person of Christ, in the name of the entire holy people and of all present. Hence [sic] they are rightly called the ‘presidential prayers,’”¹³ as if (presidential) democracy had anything to do with it.

Forgetting that the Mass is about communion between the Faithful and God, the Missal rambles on about “communion between Priest and people.”¹⁴

Practice in the pews at Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church (OLMC) in Newport News has yet to catch up with the directive that “the main place should be given, all things being equal, to Gregorian chant, as being proper to the Roman Liturgy. . . . Since the faithful from different countries come together ever more frequently, it is desirable that they know how to sing together at least some parts of the Ordinary of the Mass in Latin, especially the Profession of Faith and the Lord’s Prayer, according to the simpler settings.”¹⁵ Prioritizing Gregorian Chant seems like a good idea, though OLMC does not do it. I do not know any parish Church in the United States that does prioritize Gregorian Chant. Again, “those who do not kneel ought to make a profound bow when

¹⁰ 24, #16.

¹¹ 25, #24.

¹² <http://unabridged.merriam-webster.com/cgi-bin/unabridged?va=homily&x=0&y=0> (accessed April 29, 2012). <http://unabridged.merriam-webster.com/cgi-bin/unabridged> (accessed April 29, 2012).

¹³ 27, #30.

¹⁴ 27, #34.

¹⁵ 28, #41.

Personal Notes

1130 Missal: Eighteenth Sunday in Ordinary Time A Catholic Bible Study (120805)

© 2015

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

the Priest genuflects after the Consecration.”¹⁶ This also seems reasonable, but is not done.

The most serious concern is with the eight-line section: Silence.¹⁷ In practice, there is no silence lasting as long as five minutes either before, during, or after Mass. According to the Missal,

Even before the celebration itself, it is a praiseworthy practice for silence to be observed in the church, in the sacristy, in the vesting room, and in adjacent areas, so that all may dispose themselves to carry out the sacred celebration in a devout and fitting manner.

OLMC does not observe this spirit of silence.

II. Prayer before reading Sacred Scripture (Collect)

A. Missal: Draw near to your **Servants**, O Lord, and answer their prayers with unceasing kindness, that, for those who glory in you as their **Creator** and guide, you **may** restore what you have created and keep safe what you have restored. **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: Adésto, Dómine, **fámulis** tuis, et perpétuam benignitátem largíre poscéntibus, ut his, qui te **auctórem** et gubernatórem gloriántur habére, et creáta restáures, et restauráta consérves. Per Dóminum.

To make the Paraphrased Prayers easier to find, Personal Notes repeats them on the last page (just before the Endnotes on the James River Journal). Only the heartiest souls will want to plow through the preceding Appendix (see the heading on page 7/40), week after week, after identifying more and more repetitious nonsense.

C. Paraphrased: **Almighty God, you create and guide the Faithful. You stand them up, when they fall. Keep them close and in your**

¹⁶ 29, #43.

¹⁷ 29, #45.

Personal Notes

1130 Missal: Eighteenth Sunday in Ordinary Time A Catholic Bible Study (120805)

© 2015

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

safe embrace. Respond to their prayers with your kindness.

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.

III. Prayer after Communion

A. Missal: Accompany with constant protection, O Lord, those you renew with these heavenly gifts and, in your never-failing care for them, make them worthy of eternal redemption. Through Christ our Lord.

B. Italian Latin: Quos caelésti récreas múnere, perpétuo, Dómine, comitáre praesídio, et, quos fovére non désinis, dignos fíeri sempitérna redemptióne concéde. Per Christum.

C. Paraphrased: **Heavenly Father, protect those receiving your Son in Holy Communion with your Holy Spirit. Make them worthy of eternal life with you, through Christ, our Lord.**

V. ICEL

Prayer before reading Sacred Scripture (Collect)

ICEL: Lord, be present to your servants who call upon you, and bless us with your unfailing kindness. Since we glory to have you as our maker and ruler, restore in us the beauty of your creation and keep intact the gifts you have restored.

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

Personal Notes

1130 Missal: Eighteenth Sunday in Ordinary Time A Catholic Bible Study (120805)

© 2015

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

ICEL: Lord, surround with your constant protection the people you renew by this eucharist [sic], and in your never-failing care for us make us worthy of eternal redemption.

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, Personal Notes sets 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.¹⁸ This Appendix I applies an overview to the whole Missal. Appendix II concentrates on specific comments for this Sunday.

Whenever the faithful begin Mass with the prayer, “I confess to almighty God . . .” “that I **have** greatly sinned,” it happens that 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.”¹⁹ The Papacy is placing American Catholics in the United States into that mess.

The Reverend Michael G. Ryan begins to explain, “To read these prayers is difficult; to call them prayerful is to redefine the word; to pray them is almost impossible.”²⁰ Despite that, 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.”²¹ The revised prayers are a paraphrase of the babble in the

¹⁸ <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).

¹⁹ H. Ramsey Fowler and Jane E. Aaron, Eleventh Edition: The Little, Brown Handbook (New York: Longman, 2010) 274.

²⁰ 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).

²¹ 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).

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

Missal into standard American English as heard in such venues as EWTN (Eternal Word Television Network), the Weather Channel, and the evening news.

The Reverend John David Ramsey asserts, “The church’s *faithful* [italics in original] way of being is—to return to musical terms—neither a monotone nor *cacophony* . . . ”²² *Cacophony*, however, is what the illiterate 2011 Missal imposes on the Faithful in the United States. It seems likely, however, that Father Ramsey is too young to be member of the newly-founded Association of United States Catholic Priests (AUSCP).

The AUSCP passed the following resolution at its first full meeting June 11-14 in Tampa Florida.²³ Except to change the grammar from “the Association . . . urge . . . ” to “the Association . . . urges,” Personal Notes seconds the resolution. The Priests were making their resolution at the same time the Cardinals were expressing their angst.

The New Roman Missal

- Whereas Canon 278§1 asserts: “Secular clerics have the right to associate with others to pursue purposes in keeping with the clerical state”; and
- Whereas Canon 298§1 includes clerics among the Christian faithful; and
- Whereas Canon 212§3 states: “According to the knowledge, competence and prestige which they possess, they [the Christian faithful] have the right and even at times the duty to manifest to the sacred pastors their opinion on matters which pertain to the good of the Church and to make their opinion known to the rest of the Christian faithful, without prejudice to the integrity of faith and morals, with reverence toward their pastors, and attentive to common advantage and the dignity of persons”; and
- Whereas Canon 215 declares: “The Christian faithful are at liberty freely to found and direct associations for purposes of charity or

²² John David Ramsey, A Precarious Faith: The Tri-une Dynamic of the Christian Life (Ph.D. Dissertation, Duke University, 2002) 98.

²³ <http://www.praytelligblog.com/index.php/2012/07/14/association-of-us-catholic-priests-calls-for-reexamination-of-liturgical-translation/> (accessed July 15, 2012 @ 2:47 p.m.). I feel obligated to leave unchanged the non-standard noun/verb agreement in the final resolution, because of the nature of the message. <http://www.uscatholicpriests.us/> (accessed July 29, 2012).

Appendix I

An overview of the Missal

© 2012

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

piety or for the promotion of the Christian vocation in the world and to hold meetings for the common pursuit of these purposes”; and

- Whereas Canon 218 affirms: “Those engaged in the sacred disciplines have a just freedom of inquiry and of expressing their opinion prudently on those matters in which they possess expertise, while observing the submission due to the magisterium of the Church”; and
- Whereas Bishops are guaranteed collegial powers and responsibilities documented in the Vatican II Decree, *Christus Dominus*, [especially in ¶s 2 through 6], thereby preserving the integrity of their Apostolic Office. A reference from ¶2 points out: “Bishops, therefore, have been made true and authentic teachers of the faith, pontiffs, and pastors through the Holy Spirit, who has been given to them”; and
- Whereas the *Missale Romanum, Editio Typica Tertia* [herein, New Roman Missal] has caused disharmony, disruption and discord among many, for both laity [including religious non-clerical men and women], and for clerics, in our Church, frustrating rather than inspiring the Eucharistic prayer experience of the Christian faithful, thus leading to less piety and to less “full, active and conscious participation” in the Mass, [cf. Canons 898 and 899 §s 2 and 3 and Vatican II Constitution, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, ¶¶11 and 14]; and
- Whereas the New Roman Missal, as we have experienced it in our day to day celebrations of the Eucharist with the faithful, has created pastoral problems, in particular because of its cumbersome style, arcane vocabulary, grammatical anomalies, and confusing syntax;
Be it resolved that the Association of United States Catholic Priests urge [sic]²⁴ our Bishops, who are also our Pastors, to exercise their collegial powers and responsibilities by addressing in a collegial way, with the appropriate Vatican authorities, the problematic prescriptions of *Liturgiam authenticam* which brought about the New Roman Missal.

James Dallen, a retired diocesan priest²⁵ 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.²⁶

²⁴ <http://www.uscatholicpriests.org/our-work/> (accessed June 28, 2015).

²⁵ <http://salinadiocese.org/priests/231-priests/980-dallen-rev-james> (accessed March 11, 2012).

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

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.

Non-American English, such as Scottish, British, or Australian, can appear illiterate to Americans in the United States.²⁷ 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),²⁸ or Spanglish,²⁹ 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.³⁰ Pastoral care requires

²⁶ 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.

²⁷ 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).

²⁸ Geneva Smitherman, *Word from the Mother: Language and African Americans* (New York: Routledge, 2006) 3.

²⁹ <http://unabridged.merriam-webster.com/cgi-bin/unabridged?va=Spanglish&x=0&y=0> which uses the lower case (accessed April 22, 2012). My Word 2010 spellchecker uses the upper case, which I am using.

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

standard American English. Otherwise, the Faithful are subject to two debilitating conclusions about the readings.

The first untoward 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.³¹ They need their local ordinaries (bishops) to insist they keep improving their use of standard American English. In my personal experience, Latino priests mispronounce the sounds accents, and rhythm of standard American English to the point where what they vocalize is sometimes meaningless. Bishops and anyone can listen for the full pronunciation of words: “Lor” for Lord; “hee” for his, “specially” for especially. 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 illiterate 2011 Missal seems oblivious.³²

. . . 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.

³⁰ 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.

³¹ <http://www.commonwealmagazine.org/it-doesn%E2%80%99t-sing> (February 26, 2012).

³² H. Ramsey Fowler and Jane E. Aaron, Eleventh Edition: The Little, Brown Handbook (New York: Longman, 2010) 856.

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

Language is the tool humans use to think. All languages have some thoughts that other languages cannot express. Language operates the osmosis of the soul to reality. Because language matters, the illiterate 2011 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 468 at <http://www.clerus.org/bibliaclerusonline/en/> The Holy See, Congregation for the Clergy runs this website. (accessed April 29, 2012). There is a problem where the Missal asserts, "However, the use of `sense lines' or colometry (`the measuring of the length of phrases') has now been introduced into liturgical books . . ." ³³ The problem is whether the Italian Latin is in liturgical books. Personal Notes, therefore, is not willing to compare English with Latin colometry.

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 yearlong 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 will remain on the Missal, until the end of the liturgical year, December 1, 2012. At that time, the intention is to return to the Lectionary.

These Appendices enable the busy 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. The secondary reason is to improve the presentation.

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.net/> A second revision takes place after the particular Mass in question. These latter two

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.

Appendix I

An overview of the Missal

© 2012

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

revisions are uploaded to <http://www.western-civilization.com/CBQ/Personal%20Notes/Personal%20Notes.htm> as they occur.

Someone seems to be paying attention. Googling for *Jirran* May 5, 2012 found about 84,600 results; *Raymond Jirran* found about 49,100 results; *Raymond J. Jirran* found about 72,600 results from all around the globe. Anticipating pushback from this volume is scary, though, so far, not happening, except for one comment from Vince Locascio, Saturday, July 21, 2017 at <http://www.jamesriverjournal.net/index.php/bloggers/dr-raymond-jirran/110-the-catholic-church-republican-bishops-and-oh-those-women>.

Archbishop Gregory M. Aymond tried to follow Papal directives to approve a translation that does not follow other directives the Papacy 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*). Care for an abusive institutional church and care for souls compromise the archbishop. Using standard American English focuses 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.

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 in such venues as EWTN (Eternal Word Television Network), the Weather Channel, and the evening news.

The pertinent Missal passages for this Sunday are at 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) 478. Scholars are critiquing that 2011 Missal.

James Dallen, a retired diocesan priest³⁴ and emeritus professor of religious studies at Gonzaga University in Spokane, Washington, has written an article that

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

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?”³⁵ 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 points. The reason is an academic preference for scholarship, rather than emotion. Daisy Grewal has an article, “How Critical Thinkers Lose Their [sic] Faith in God: Faith and intuition are intimately related.”³⁶ Grewal reports that critical thinking takes time that faith and intuition do not require. Critical thinkers, therefore, tend to lose their faith.

To counter this trend, Personal Notes takes an analytical, critical thinking approach to the prayers of the Missal. This approach is time-consuming and often painful. For Personal Notes, this approach begins with an interest in the Black Apostolate for which Faith combined with intuition combine to perpetuate racism, to say nothing of the other irrational prejudices that uncovering racism reveals.

When an analytical 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 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

³⁴ <http://salinadiocese.org/priests/231-priests/980-dallen-rev-james> (accessed March 11, 2012.)

³⁵ <http://misguidedmissal.com/wp/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/Translation-Ecclesiology-Jim-Dallen-3-6-2012.pdf> (accessed March 11, 2012)

³⁶ Daisy Grewal, “Advances: Psychology: How Critical Thinkers Lose Their [sic] Faith in God: Faith and intuition are intimately related,” Scientific American, Vol. 307, No. 1 (July 2012) 26.

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

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 Papacy is insistent, on April 14 ordering German Catholics to stop postponing the change from *for all* to *many*.³⁷

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 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.

³⁷ Jonathan Luxmoore, “Pope orders German Catholics to make the ‘for many’ change,” National Catholic Reporter at <http://ncronline.org/print/news/global/pope-orders-german-catholics-make-many-change> (accessed May 4, 2012).

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

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. This hurts. Personal Notes brings concerns and emotions similar to Dallen to the illiterate 2011 Missal.

Dallen continues,³⁸

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."

Dallen points out that none of the heads of the Congregation for Divine Worship (CDW) were fluent in English.³⁹ 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. At the time, Mayer was a past head of the CDW. Admittedly, the first language for Mayer was German.

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 17/36.

³⁹ 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.

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

Ramsey comments on the relationship between ecclesiology and history.⁴⁰

The rise of the state as an abstract entity demanding the primary allegiance of its citizens in combination with Luther's undercutting of the church's authority assured that by the end of the seventeenth century the long-standing relationship between civil and ecclesial authority which defined Christendom had been transformed, such that the civil or nation-state had become the primary object of allegiance, with "religion" playing a supporting role as privately held belief which engenders loyalty to the State, whether that "religion" be Protestant, Catholic or anything else.

Personal Notes takes a different understanding of *ecclesial authority which defined Christendom*. The problem for both church and state is whether truth determines politics or politics truth. Ramsey accepts the secular notion that it is legitimate for politics to determine truth.

Personal Notes maintains that, with Christianity, in every age and under every circumstance, truth is to determine politics. This means that, in Christendom, both church and state derive their authority from truth, rather than from either one or the other. What happened in Modern Times was a realization of the truth that a monetary economy replaced the Medieval barter economy. The state realized this sooner than the church, which, for Roman Catholics still winds up deliberating just how long the Cardinal cappa magna (like a bridal train) may be. It used to be 14 meters, but, in 1952, before Vatican II, the Papacy reduced it to seven meters.⁴¹

Dallen comments,⁴²

⁴⁰ John David Ramsey, A Precarious Faith: The Tri-une Dynamic of the Christian Life (Ph.D. Dissertation, Duke University, 2002) 50.

⁴¹ #84 and # 86 Jeffrey Pinyan; #85 Bill deHaas; at <http://www.praytellig.com/index.php/2012/07/06/putting-back-whats-missing-in-the-new-mass/> (accessed July 9, 2012). Also, see <http://ncronline.org/blogs/ncr-today/understanding-cappa-magna> (accessed July 9, 2012); <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cope> (accessed July 9, 2012).

⁴² 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 I
An overview of the Missal
© 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. [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 participation. Sometimes these are unclear or conflicting or at odds with Vatican Council II perspectives.

The 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 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 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,⁴³ 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.

On July 1, 2012, Pope Benedict XVI announced that Bishop Gerhard Ludwig Müller of Regensburg, Germany would succeed Levada as Prefect of the CDF. Müller is a strong friend of the Peruvian Gustavo Gutiérrez, O.P., widely regarded as the father of Liberation theology. Müller, himself, however, is not known as a liberation theologian, but as a conservative, much in the mold of Pope Benedict XVI.⁴⁴ Personal Notes will

⁴³ 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.

⁴⁴ John L. Allen, Jr., "German friend of liberation theologian named Vatican doctrinal czar," <http://ncronline.org/print/blogs/ncr-today/german-friend-liberation-theologian->

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

watch to see if Levada dares to return to the United States to face possible prosecution for covering up sexual abuse of children.

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 been able to escape. He will go to trial September 24, for not reporting sexual abuse.⁴⁵ 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.⁴⁶

Furthermore, on June 22, 2012, in another place, a jury found Monsignor William Lynn guilty of child endangerment associated with the sexual abuse cover up by Cardinal Anthony J. Bevilacqua of Philadelphia. Bevilacqua died shortly before the Lynn trial.⁴⁷ A month later, on July 24, a judge sentenced Lynn to at least three years in prison before parole.⁴⁸ The Survivors Network of those Abused by Priests said, “Considering all the kids whose innocence was shattered (or, in some whose lives were lost to suicide), we believe that Msgr. Lynn deserved the harshest punishment. Still, this sentence sends a powerful message: cover-up child sex crimes and you’ll go to jail.”

[named-vatican-doctrinal-czar](#) and <http://ncronline.org/blogs/ncr-today/german-friend-liberation-theologian-named-vatican-doctrinal-czar> (accessed July 5, 2012).

⁴⁵ 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).

⁴⁶ 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.

⁴⁷ Brian Roewe, “Guilty verdict in Philadelphia a first in sex abuse cases,” <http://ncronline.org/print/news/people/guilty-verdict-philadelphia-first-sex-abuse-cases> (accessed June 23, 2012).

⁴⁸ Brian Roewe, “Philadelphia priest guilty of child endangerment to serve up to six years in prison,” <http://ncronline.org/print/news/lynn-serve-six-years-prison> (accessed July 24, 2012).

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

The second hierarchic confusion is in the 2011 Missal. Care for souls is the first responsibility of the hierarchy.⁴⁹ Lack of due diligence and leadership in the care for souls results in authority producing an anti-intellectual, anti-Vatican II, dysfunctional, illiterate 2011 Missal. As Martin Luther (1483-1546) reminded the faithful, “. . . the Jews [as with Pilgrim Christians] are no longer Israel, for all things are to be new, and Israel too must become new.”⁵⁰ In other words, the Faithful need to be open to the vagaries of the New Covenant.

Ramsey writes, “Thus the church became increasingly open to the cultures which surrounded it, and often saw the hand of God at work through people outside the church, for the benefit of the church.”⁵¹

United States culture differs from Papal culture. Lack of standard American English inhibits the Faithful from clear, critical thinking, contemplating 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, rather than the spiritual welfare of the Faithful.

Many years ago, in the Sixteenth Century, Luther spelled out the danger.⁵²

⁴⁹ 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).

⁵⁰ Martin Luther, “Preface to the Prophet Ezekiel,” Lenker, 6, 307-308* (WADB 11,1:400 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) 116.

⁵¹ John David Ramsey, *A Precarious Faith: The Tri-une Dynamic of the Christian Life* (Ph.D. Dissertation, Duke University, 2002) 37.

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

Here you see that Christ's kingdom is to be concerned about the weak, the sick, the broken, that he may help them. That is, indeed, a comforting declaration. The only trouble is that we do not realize our needs and infirmities. If we realize them, we would soon flee to him. But how did those shepherds act? They ruled with rigor, and applied God's Law with great severity; and, moreover, they added their own commandments, as they still do, and when these were not fulfilled, they raved and condemned, so that they were driving and driving and exhorting and exacting, continually. That is no proper way to tend and keep souls, says Christ. He is no such shepherd as that; for no one is benefited, but is rather wholly undone, by such a course, as we shall presently hear.

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 Papacy has publically broken the will of Archbishop Aymond to agree with whatever nonsense the Papacy proclaims.

From "The Taming of the Shrew:"⁵³

- **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.

⁵² Martin Luther, "Sermon on John," CSML 2.1, 21-22 (WA 12:131-532) 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) 166.

⁵³

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.

- **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.
- **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 audience watching poor Katherina trying 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

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

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. Time will tell what the Papacy will do next.

The Papacy admits that the Faithful deserve readability, integrity, scholarship, “language which is easily understandable’ to the faithful.”⁵⁴ “. . . *Liturgiam authenticam* calls for the development and consistency of a distinctive translation style with these principal characteristics . . . (2) easy intelligibility . . . ”⁵⁵ 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 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.⁵⁶

⁵⁴ “. . . 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.

⁵⁵ 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 .

⁵⁶ 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).

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

Personal Notes strongly disagrees with the abusive run-on sentence genre, but agrees with and offers paraphrasing of the substance, which *ratio translationis* legitimates in another place.⁵⁷ 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 all the craziness from the Apostolic See, Personal Notes relegates some of 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.”⁵⁸ The Papacy is secretive and, because secretive, also arbitrary.

Notice in the following that the Bishops do not mention *ratio translationis*, keeping up the façade that it does not exist. Bishops, nevertheless, may be getting some traction. The problem is that the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) wants to have a Bible suitable for the liturgy and for study. The USCCB is

⁵⁷ . . . 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.

⁵⁸ 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.

recognizing *Liturgiam authenticam* as part of the problem, but not *ratio translationis*.⁵⁹ Finally.

Cardinals are expressing an expectation that the new Bible will only be ready over their dead bodies, or at least the dead body of Cardinal Donald W. Wuerl. At least the Cardinals made their dismay public at their summer meeting in Atlanta Georgia June 14. The Cardinals are very genteel, as the pertinent part of the transcript shows.

Cardinal Daniel DiNardo: (Galveston-Houston) Cardinal Wuerl, first my condolences that you anticipate your demise before the completion of the project. Flowers and prayers are on the way! (laughter)

The second thing I wanted to mention is exactly in light of that. I'm very favorable that there be one translation. It's something devoutly to be hoped for. The question I raise—someone already answered about the grail Psalter—but *Liturgiam authenticam* also asked that we do translations—I presume this is from the Greek, when it comes to the New Testament. And yet, apparently, according to *Liturgiam authenticam*, some eye has to be held toward the *New Vulgate* as well. Is that going to be part and parcel—and that's what's going to cause the complexity that goes on, in a translation that is both personal study, catechetical and also liturgical?

Cardinal Wuerl: Your Eminence, you highlighted exactly part of the problem why it will take so long. Also you highlighted why we do need a communications person. I was really referring to not being *here*. I hope still on the planet! (laughter)

Cardinal Dolan: Bishop Rosazza, and then we gotta go to regional meetings. Bishop Rosazza, you were going to bring that (same question) up? Cardinal Wuerl, Archbishop Aymond, good work. Thank you. And you'll keep us posted right?
.....

The following is an addendum after the transcript.

⁵⁹ Helen Hull Hitchcock and Susan Benofy, "USCCB June 2012 Meeting Report: Bishops Discuss Key Social Issues—and Scripture Translation," The Adoremus Bulletin, Vol. XVIII, No. 5 Easter, (August 2012) pages 3 and 8. The transcript is from the Adoremus Bulletin recordings as transcribed by Susan Benofy. The quotation is from page 8.

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

The Catholic Biblical Association (CBA) did the various translations of the New American Bible.

A letter from the CBA board to the bishops, dated August 13, 2001, strongly objected to *Liturgiam authenticam*, and argues that “there are insurmountable problems” with ascribing authority to the Nova Vulgata The CBA letter is online at bible-researcher.com/Liturgiam-authenticam2.html [sic] [I found the letter at <http://www.bible-researcher.com/liturgiam-authenticam2.html>]

And see the Response to the CBA from the Congregation for Divine Worship: Notitiae Vol. 7, Nov-Dec. 2001 (Adoremus.org/0502NovaVulgata.html.)

Regular readers will note that capitalization in English does not follow capitalization in Latin. *Liturgiam authenticam* offers some special rules. When *LORD* means the untranslatable name for God, translators are to capitalize all letters.⁶⁰ 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,⁶¹ a list unavailable until April 1, 2012, mainly because of 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. Material following I. Introduction develops slowly, from Sunday to Sunday. As of May 5, 2012, I do not intend to rework earlier presentations the next time through the liturgical cycle. After this cycle is finished, I intend to return to my focus on academic Biblical research.

Liturgiam authenticam directs,⁶²

⁶⁰ 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).

⁶¹ 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).

Appendix I
An overview of the Missal
© 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.

With some exceptions, the Papacy orders translators to follow Latin capitalization.⁶³ Flowerday comments,⁶⁴

Capitalization is an interesting separate issue raised, especially in light of LA 32 [Liturgiam authenticam, paragraph 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 [the committee the Apostolic See used to hijack the translation], or Msgr Moroney [James P. Moroney, Executive Secretary to the Vox Clara Committee]⁶⁵ don't seem to have read up on their 2007 *ratio translationis*.

⁶² <http://catholicsensibility.wordpress.com/2011/08/20/liturgiam-authenticam-32-33/> (accessed March 31, 2012).

⁶³ 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.

⁶⁴ <http://catholicsensibility.wordpress.com/2011/08/20/liturgiam-authenticam-32-33/> (accessed March 31, 2012).

⁶⁵ <http://www.blogger.com/profile/17013903890674545477> (accessed March 31, 2012).

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

It all seems rather arbitrary—which strikes me as counter to this church document, not to mention the whole thrust of post-conciliar liturgy.

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**.⁶⁶

The Papacy attacks the venerable Chicago Manual of Style.⁶⁷ 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.⁶⁸ Like Petruccio, the Papacy is making it up as it goes along.

By its use of the word *noble* twice and *nobility* once, the Papacy continues to regard itself as part of Medieval nobility, rather than modern democracy.⁶⁹

⁶⁶ <http://www.clerus.org/bibliaclerusonline/en/> (accessed April 1, 2012). Go to pagina 461 #56 .

⁶⁷ 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. .

⁶⁸ <http://www.worldcat.org/title/chicago-manual-of-style/oclc/51553085/editions?editionsView=true&referer=br> (accessed April 1, 2012).

⁶⁹ 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

© 2012

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

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.

<http://www.bible-researcher.com/ratio.translationis3.pdf> for page 78, (accessed March 31, 2012).

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*, 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.⁷⁰ One priest has found a solution.

Father Jim Blue writes, “I find that all the ‘O’s’ can be dropped easily, as well as all the instances of ‘we pray.’ But those are merely cosmetic improvements that can’t conceal the ugliness of the whole.”⁷¹ The O’s are not in the originating Latin, so editing the O’s seems to suit Papal rules for translation. There is more on the O’s below.

Might versus *may* in the Missal: *might* connotes ability, wish, or desire;⁷² *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. Asking permission (*may*) suits approaching an elitist monarch, like Constantine or the Pope. Expressing an ability, wish or desire (*might*) suits approaching a friend. Again, 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.”⁷³

⁷⁰ H. Ramsey Fowler and Jane E. Aaron, Eleventh Edition: The Little, Brown Handbook (New York: Longman, 2010) 233, 431, 893.

⁷¹ Fr. Jim Blue on May 17, 2012—1:54 p.m., comment on America magazine at <http://www.praytellig.com/index.php/2012/05/17/america-on-the-new-translation/> (accessed May 24, 2012).

⁷² <http://unabridged.merriam-webster.com/cgi-bin/unabridged?va=might&x=15&y=10> (accessed January 29, 2011).

⁷³ H. Ramsey Fowler and Jane E. Aaron, Eleventh Edition: The Little, Brown Handbook (New York: Longman, 2010) 274.

Appendix II

Specific Comments for this Sunday

© 2012

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

The Latin does not capitalize *fámulis* and *auctórem*, but the Missal does capitalize *Servants* and *Creator*. *Servant* is but *Servants* not on the list of words capitalized, regardless of the Latin, which is not included in the list.⁷⁴ 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 paraphrase takes into account the hearing of the faithful.

The Latin for *Servants* is *fámulis*. *Servus* is the more familiar Latin word for *Servant*. The translation seems to be needlessly groveling. ICEL also uses *servants*.

Readability

The first sentence of the **Collect** contains forty-two words, in a 15.9 upper level college 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.⁷⁵ Dallen explains, "Applying readability criteria indicates that the number of years of formal education required for understanding the Eucharistic Prayers on first reading has increased from 10.75 to 17.21,"⁷⁶ from sophomore high school to graduate school college.

According to the U.S. Department of Education, in 2009, thirty-three percent of Fourth Graders read below basic achievement levels; twenty-five percent of Eighth Graders fall below. The Department of Education divides students in four categories of

⁷⁴ 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, 119 (accessed April 29, 2012).

⁷⁵ For a description of readability levels, go to http://www.online-utility.org/english/readability_test_and_improve.jsp (accessed March 11, 2012).

⁷⁶ 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.praytellig.com/index.php/2011/02/18/readability-tests-on-the-eucharistic-prayers/> that I accessed March 11, 2012.

Appendix II

Specific Comments for this Sunday

© 2012

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

those eligible for free or reduced price lunch: 0-25 percent; 26-50 percent; 51-75 percent; 76-100 percent. I am taking that last category as 100 percent eligible for free or reduced price lunch.⁷⁷

Only sixty-eight percent of Twelfth Grade Students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch graduated with a diploma during 2006-2007 (where statistics are available). Only twenty-eight per cent of that group attended a four-year college the following year. In 2008, five percent of children ages 5-17 spoke a language other than English at home and spoke English with difficulty. Those children would be disproportionately Hispanic. I see no recognition of these problems in the illiterate 2011 Missal.

The first sentence of this **Prayer after Communion** contains forty-two words, in a 15.9 upper level college Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level Readability. It is a fused sentence. The revised **Prayer after Communion** has an 8.7 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.⁷⁸

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.

⁷⁷ Susan Aud, William Hussar, Michael Planty, Thomas Snyder: National Center for Education Statistics; Kevin Blanco, Mary An Fox, Lauren Frohlich, Jana Kemp: American Institutes for Research; Lauren Drake: MacroSys, LLC; Katie Ferguson, Production Manager: MacroSys, LLC; Thomas Nachazel, Senior Editor; Gretchen Hanne, Editor,: American Institutes for Research, The Condition of Education 2010: May 2010 (NCES 2010-028: U.S. Department of Education: ies: National Center for Education Statistics: Institute of Education Sciences). The condition of Education is available in two forms, print and web at <http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe>. See pages xiii, 17, 33, and 45 in the print edition.

⁷⁸ 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.

. . . 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 seven, rather than two, sentences. The revised **Collect** has a 3.3 Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level Readability.

Non-American English, such as Scottish or British, can appear illiterate to Americans in the United States.⁷⁹ 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),⁸⁰ 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.⁸¹ They need their local ordinaries (bishops) to insist they keep improving their use of standard American English.

The **Missal Collect** begins with an **O Lord**, referring to God the Father. Five lines, two sentences, five commas, and thirty-four words later, **Our Lord** refers to God the Son. Expecting the faithful listening in the pews to understand the duality is arrogant and dismissive of standard American English grammar.

⁷⁹ 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).

⁸⁰ Geneva Smitherman, *Word from the Mother: Language and African Americans* (New York: Routledge, 2006) 3.

⁸¹ <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.

The respective ICEL **Collect** and **Prayer after Communion** have 9.3, and 9.1 Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level Readabilities.

The Latin omits the **O** in the Missal **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.

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.

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 proposition (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

Appendix II

Specific Comments for this Sunday

© 2012

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

exists as only one at a time <the Lord><the Messiah>”¹ *Unity* is a noun meaning “1a: the quality of stage 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-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 900 (222/362) , 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 901 (222/362), 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).

In an attempt to use the prayers the anti-intellectual, anti-Vatican-II, dysfunctional, illiterate Papacy, 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.

Appendix II

Specific Comments for this Sunday

© 2012

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

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.

Stand-alone Prayers

1130 Missal: Eighteenth Sunday in Ordinary Time A Catholic Bible Study (120805)

© 2012

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

Almighty God, you create and guide the Faithful. You stand them up, when

they fall. Keep them close and in your safe embrace.

Respond to their prayers with your kindness. 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.

Heavenly Father, protect those receiving your Son in Holy Communion with

your Holy Spirit. Make them worthy of eternal life with you,

through Christ, our Lord.