

Personal Notes

1160 Missal: Nineteenth Sunday in Ordinary Time A Catholic Bible Study (120812)

© 2015

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

Roman Missal¹

I. Introduction

The Papacy proclaims a layperson may not deliver a homily. The Missal directs that “The Homily [sic] should . . . be given by the Priest Celebrant [sic] himself. . . but never to a lay person,”² such as a cloistered nun or Sister in a ministerial congregation.³

A news item:⁴

NCR [National Catholic Reporter] has learned that during a meeting of Vatican personnel in early 2012 to discuss the LCWR [Leadership Conference of Women Religious] assessment, a senior Vatican diplomat warned that launching a crackdown now might be a bad idea in light of domestic American politics, especially an increasingly nasty campaign season featuring rhetoric about a “war on women.”

According to sources with knowledge of that meeting, officials of the Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith [headed by Cardinal William J.

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 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) page 30 Section #48. Subsequent references are to the numbered sections, which run to #399 on page 87. These references will first provide the page number in my missal, followed by the section number, as follows: 34, #66.

³ 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).

⁴ John L. Allen, Jr., “LCWR crackdown more complicated than ‘Rove vs. America,’” National Catholic Reporter at <http://ncronline.org/print/news/women-religious/lcwr-crackdown-more-complicated-rome-vs-america> (accessed May 3, 2012).

Personal Notes

1160 Missal: Nineteenth Sunday in Ordinary Time A Catholic Bible Study (120812)

© 2015

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

Levada] replied [to the Congregation for Religious] that such concerns were “exaggerated.”

Thomas C. Fox, publisher of the National Catholic Reporter, relates the Papal abuse of Sisters in ministerial congregations to abuse of the Faithful in the illiterate 2011 Missal.⁵ Fox writes,

The bishops [of the United States] need to speak out against this ill-conceived and ill executed but very hurtful behavior. They need to speak out on behalf of the sisters whom they well know to be faithful servants of the church—no matter what the orthodox police might allege.

But so far the bishops are largely silent.

This is the same silence we found after the U.S. bishops' doctrine committee offered its devastating critique of theologian Sister of St. Joseph Elizabeth Johnson's book, *Quest for the Living God*. The critique found every fault possible, but the worst part of that sad story was that during the one year the committee studied the Johnson text, it never once contacted her for comment or defense, nor did it take the time to enter into respectful dialogue with her after the fact.

This is the same silence that occurred after Vatican officials disregarded our bishops' efforts to represent the prayer lives of U.S. Catholics in the sacred words of the Mass, after our bishops passed a suitable translation.

It would have been so soul-lifting and empowering if our communities had a number of bishops step forward to publicly represent local Catholic sentiments in these most personal and communal matters. But that never happened.

The behavior of the bishops is passive/aggressive, extremely effective enforcing an agenda on a group, while pretending to be compassionate. The bishops may not be speaking out, but Personal Notes does, week-after-week. Someone seems to be paying attention. Googling for *Jirran* May 5, 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.

⁵ Thomas C. Fox, “Sisters Under Scrutiny: Commentary,” National Catholic Reporter at <http://ncronline.org/blogs/sisters-under-scrutiny/abusive-ecclesial-authority-puts-our-bishops-spot> (accessed May 6, 2012).

Personal Notes

1160 Missal: Nineteenth Sunday in Ordinary Time A Catholic Bible Study (120812)

© 2015

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

Back to the Missal: 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. My main interest is in the difference between directions in the Missal and practice in the pew. Last week, the Eighteenth Sunday in Ordinary Time, I worked my way through page 29. Here, I continue.

The Missal directs,⁶ “If there is no singing at the Entrance, the antiphon given in the Missal is recited either by the faithful, or by some of them, or by a reader; otherwise it is recited by the Priest himself, who may even adapt it as an introductory explanation . . .” Mass usually begins with a hymn at the Masses I attend on the Virginia Peninsula; but never with the antiphon.

The Missal proclaims,⁷ “The people, joining in this petition [the **Collect**], make the prayer their own by means of the acclamation [sic] **Amen**.” The arrogant authors of the Missal announce that the people can make something their own they do not understand. I suppose.

“The Alleluia or the Verse before the Gospel, if not sung, may be omitted.”⁸ Since I do not sing, when I read I have not sung that verse. The Faithful have encouraged me to sing anyway, and let them pick it up, as I do.

“The intentions announced should be . . . in few words.”⁹ The Faithful might profit did someone call this to the attention of my long-winded friend at Daily Mass.

“Even money or other gifts for the poor or for the Church, brought by the faithful or collected in the church, are acceptable; given their purpose, they are to be put in a suitable place away from the Eucharistic table.”¹⁰ To the contrary, what usually happens on Sundays is that the Faithful place the offertory collection next to the altar or “Eucharistic table.” The Faithful only remove the collection after Mass.

⁶ 30, #48.

⁷ 31, #54.

⁸ 33, #63.

⁹ 35, #71.

¹⁰ 35, #73.

Personal Notes

1160 Missal: Nineteenth Sunday in Ordinary Time A Catholic Bible Study (120812)

© 2015

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

“In the Lord’s Prayer a petition is made for daily bread, which for Christians means principally the Eucharistic Bread . . . ”¹¹ That is not what the Disciples meant immediately after Jesus taught them how to pray. Here is another example of the Papacy making it up as it goes along.

“ . . . offer a sign of peace only to those who are nearest.”¹² *Nearest* is superlative, *near*, *nearer*, *nearest*. What does that whole phrase mean: physically nearest? Spiritually nearest? Politically nearest? Religiously nearest? Genetically nearest?

“This [*Agnus Dei* (*Lamb of God*)] invocation accompanies the fraction [breaking] of the bread [*sic*] and, for this reason may be repeated as many times as necessary until the rite has been completed.”¹³ Though the Faithful sing the *Agnus Dei* in Latin at Daily Mass and in English at Sunday Mass at Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church, it is not timed to the breaking of the bread. The *Agnus Dei* always ends after three rounds, no matter the progress in breaking the bread turned Eucharist.

“To the Concluding Rites belong the following: a) brief announcements, should they be necessary . . . ”¹⁴ In other words, such announcements are a formal part of the Holy Mass prayer. We would not want to omit announcements such as the bake sale from our prayers. Nuts.

To be continued . . .

II. Prayer before reading Sacred Scripture (Collect)

A. Missal:¹⁵ Almighty ever-living God, whom, taught by the Holy Spirit, we dare to call **our Father**, bring, **we pray**, to perfection in our hearts the

¹¹ 37, #81.

¹² 37, #82.

¹³ 38, #83.

¹⁴ 39, #90.

¹⁵ 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 902(224/362) , downloaded from

Personal Notes

1160 Missal: Nineteenth Sunday in Ordinary Time A Catholic Bible Study (120812)

© 2015

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

spirit of adoption as your **sons and daughters**, that we **may** merit to enter into the inheritance which you have promised. **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:¹⁶ Omnípotens sempitérne Deus, quem, docénte Spírítu Sancto, **patérno** nómine invocáre praesúmimus, pérfice in córdibus nostris spírítum adoptiónis **filiórum**, ut promíssam hereditátem íngredi mereámur. Per Dóminum.

To make the Revised Prayers easier to find, Personal Notes repeats them on the last page. Only the heartiest souls will want to plow through the preceding Appendix (see the heading on page 7/31), week after week, after identifying more and more repetitious nonsense.

C. Revised: **Heavenly Father, the Holy Spirit and your Son taught us to call you Father. We praise you for creating us. Perfect our hearts with your love. Enable us to be with you forever in paradise. We ask this through our Lord, Jesus Christ, your Son, who lives and reigns with you in the unity of the Holy Spirit, one God, forever.**

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

III. Prayer after Communion

A. Missal:¹⁷ May the communion in your **Sacrament** that we have consumed, save us, **O Lord**, and confirm us in the light of your truth. Through Christ our Lord.

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).

¹⁶ See pagina 469 at <http://www.clerus.org/bibliaclerusonline/en/> The Holy See, Congregation for the Clergy runs this website (accessed May 6, 2012).

Personal Notes

1160 Missal: Nineteenth Sunday in Ordinary Time A Catholic Bible Study (120812)

© 2015

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

B. Italian Latin:¹⁸ **Sacramentórum** tuórum, Dómine, commúnio sumpta nos salvet, et in tuae veritátis luce confirmet. Per Christum.

C. Revised: **Praise God for the Sacraments. Now that we have consumed the Holy Eucharist, Heavenly Father, strengthen us and enable us to see the truth of your love, through Christ our Lord.**

V. ICEL

Prayer before reading Sacred Scripture (Collect)

ICEL: Almighty and eternal God, whom we dare to call Father, impart to us more fully the spirit of adoption, that we may one day gain the inheritance you have promised.

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: Merciful God, let our sharing in this sacrament deliver us from evil and make us stand firm in the light of your truth.

We ask this through Jesus Christ our Lord.

¹⁷ 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 903 (226/362), downloaded from https://rs895dt.rapidshare.com/#!download|895135|387089704|ICEL_Sacramentary_1998_.zip|6767|R~00A3D4012C6FE19956DB84F71E5405F6|0|0 at http://misguidedmissal.com/wp/?page_id=23 (accessed December 8, 2011).

¹⁸ See pagina 469 at <http://www.clerus.org/bibliaclerusonline/en/> The Holy See, Congregation for the Clergy runs this website (accessed May 6, 2012).

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.¹⁹ This Appendix I (pages 7-25/31) 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 (have) from the main verb (sinned), imprisons the meaning in 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.”²⁰ The Papacy forces American Catholics in the United States every Sunday into that mess. There are more examples below.

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.”²¹ 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.”²² The revised prayers are a paraphrase of the babble in the

¹⁹ <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).

²⁰ H. Ramsey Fowler and Jane E. Aaron, Eleventh Edition: The Little, Brown Handbook (New York: Longman, 2010) 274.

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).

²² 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, my pastor at Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church in Newport News, Virginia, asserts, “The church’s *faithful* [italics in original] way of being is—to return to musical terms—neither a monotone nor **cacophony** . . . ”²³ **Cacophony**, however, is what the illiterate 2011 Missal imposes on the Faithful in the United States. It seems likely, however, that Father John David is too young to be member of the newly-founded Association of United States Catholic Priests (AUSCP).

Though not using the word **cacophony**, the AUSCP passed the following resolution at its first full meeting in June in Tampa Florida.²⁴ Except to change the grammar from “the Association . . . urge [sic] . . . ” to “the Association . . . urges,” Personal Notes seconds the resolution. The Priests were making their resolution at the same time United States Cardinals were expressing 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

²³ John David Ramsey, A Precarious Faith: The Tri-une Dynamic of the Christian Life (Ph.D. Dissertation, Duke University, 2002) 98.

²⁴ <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] 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

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

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.

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 required uniformity. Apart from the omission of this rubric, the very fact that the many nations divided by a common language . . . are required to use the same translation makes clear the relationship between unity and uniformity.

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.

Standard 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

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.

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.

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

requires standard American English. Otherwise, the Faithful are subject to at least 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.

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.

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.

The Missal translates the written Latin Missale into written English. I name the Missale *Italian Latin*, because of the accent marks, which do not appear elsewhere. 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 details**. Some of the details become dense and distracting, except for anyone with the time and devotion to work through more than twenty pages of material in order to understand two relatively minor prayers, the **Collect** and **Prayer after Communion**. The main reason to keep repeating the material, Sunday after Sunday, is for first-time readers, especially first-time readers associated with the Papacy. The other reason is to keep improving 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 far 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 when Personal Notes is presented to <http://www.jamesriverjournal.net/> 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 the Papacy sets out in *Liturgiam authenticam* or *ratio translationis*. As mentioned below, on page 4 of the Missal,

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.

Aymond grants his *Concordat cum originali* (*agrees with the original*). Privileging standard American English over Papal Latin focuses on the care of souls, rather than preservation of the institutional Church. That is why, when I upload these ruminations to my web site at <http://www.western-civilization.com/CBQ/Personal%20Notes/Personal%20Notes.htm>, I always send a copy to the Archbishop. So far, he remains unresponsive to me. The institutional Church passes down the Gospels from generation to generation.

The pertinent Missal passages for this Nineteenth Sunday in Ordinary Time, August 12, 2012, 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) 479.

James Dallen, a retired diocesan priest³⁴ 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?"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 observed that Personal Notes rarely uses exclamation marks. The reason is an academic preference for scholarship, rather than emotion; for analysis over intuition. On the one hand, a conflict between analysis and intuition may help account for lack of pushback and retort. Those who might not find Personal Notes fruitful are contemplative and intuitive and not given to the analysis needed for pushback and retort. On the other hand, those who do find Personal Notes fruitful are analytical as a preparation for contemplation and intuition and have no need to pushback or retort.

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).

Appendix I

An overview of the Missal

© 2012

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

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. These are the ones whose Faith Personal Notes wants to save.

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 (here in red), 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 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

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.

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.

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.

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

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

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

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.

For historical context, Ramsey notes,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.

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.

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

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

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 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 Politics is comfortable with deception and confusion.

Dallen comments,⁴²

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.

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.

The Papacy is confusing care of souls with care of the institution. The institutional Church does require 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.

Such imperious Roman behavior only makes things worse. Lest there be any misunderstanding of the criminal seriousness of the sexual abuse coverup, Bishop Robert W. Finn of Kansas City-Saint Joseph, Missouri has not been able to escape. He is currently going to trial for not reporting sexual abuse.⁴⁴

The second hierarchic confusion is in the 2011 Missal. Care of souls is the first responsibility of the hierarchy.⁴⁵ Lack of due diligence and leadership for the care of souls results in authority producing an anti-intellectual, anti-Vatican II, dysfunctional,

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 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).

⁴⁵ 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.

illiterate 2011 Missal. Lack of standard American English prevents the Faithful from clear, critical thinking about God. The Apostolic See is exercising an unadulterated power play. Follow along and witness how it plays games with reality.

Imperious 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.

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 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:”⁴⁶

- **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!

46

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.

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 with Katherina than the Papacy with the LCWR.

- **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 audiences watching poor Katherina try to cope with Petruchio’s nonsense, their hearts go out to her. Likewise, hearts go out to Archbishop Aymond.

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

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

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.”⁴⁷ “. . . *Liturgiam authenticam* calls for the development and consistency of a distinctive translation style with these principal characteristics . . . (2) easy intelligibility . . . ”⁴⁸ 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.⁴⁹

Personal Notes strongly disagrees with the genre of the above run-on sentence but agrees with the underlying substance and offers paraphrasing, which *ratio translationis* legitimates in another place.⁵⁰ Personal Notes, then, *paraphrases*, rather than *translates*, the illiterate 2011 Missal into standard American English.

⁴⁷ “. . . .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.

⁴⁸ 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 .

⁴⁹ 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.

Boring detail, at least here, is essential for making the case that the Apostolic See is vacillating and arbitrary, expecting others to follow directives, it, itself, ignores. Not to burden the ordinary reader, with the compound, complex, confusing sentences from the Apostolic See, Personal Notes relegates these sentences to these 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.”⁵¹ The Papacy is secretive and, because secretive, also arbitrary.

Regular readers will note that capitalization in English does not follow capitalization in Latin. *Liturgiam authenticam* offers some special rules. 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,⁵² a list unavailable until April 1,

⁵⁰ . . . 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.

⁵¹ 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.

⁵² 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.

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.

Translators are to follow, with some exceptions, Latin capitalization.⁵³ Flowerday comments,⁵⁴

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]⁵⁵ don't seem to have read up on their 2007 *ratio translationis*. It all seems rather arbitrary—which strikes me as counter to this church document, not to mention the whole thrust of post-conciliar liturgy.

⁵³ 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.

⁵⁴ <http://catholicsensibility.wordpress.com/2011/08/20/liturgiam-authenticam-32-33/> (accessed March 31, 2012).

⁵⁵ <http://www.blogger.com/profile/17013903890674545477> (accessed March 31, 2012).

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

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” imperious 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**.⁵⁶

The Papacy attacks the venerable Chicago Manual of Style.⁵⁷ 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.⁵⁸ 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.⁵⁹

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

⁵⁷ 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. .

⁵⁸ <http://www.worldcat.org/title/chicago-manual-of-style/oclc/51553085/editions?editionsView=true&referer=br> (accessed April 1, 2012).

⁵⁹ 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).

Appendix I

An overview of the Missal

© 2012

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

“However, the use of ‘sense lines’ or colometry (‘the measuring of the length of phrases’) has now been introduced into liturgical books . . . ”⁶⁰ 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 and the willful imposition of politics upon truth. 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.

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.

⁶⁰ 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 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.⁶¹

Might versus *may* in the Missal: *might* connotes ability, wish, or desire;⁶² *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 in the **Collect**, because the faithful are expressing a desire, rather than asking for permission. The Little, Brown Handbook explains, “the helping verbs of standard American English may be problematic if you are used to speaking another language or dialect.”⁶³

The Latin does not capitalize *patérno*, but the Missal does capitalize *Father*.⁶⁴ Since the Faithful will not hear the difference between an upper and lower case word, there is no reason to stray from the Latin, except, perhaps, to show the arrogance of the translator in the face of anyone objecting to the illiterate 2011 Missal. The revision takes into account the hearing of the faithful.

⁶¹ H. Ramsey Fowler and Jane E. Aaron, Eleventh Edition: The Little, Brown Handbook (New York: Longman, 2010) 233, 431, 893.

⁶² <http://unabridged.merriam-webster.com/cgi-bin/unabridged?va=might&x=15&y=10> (accessed January 29, 2011).

⁶³ H. Ramsey Fowler and Jane E. Aaron, Eleventh Edition: The Little, Brown Handbook (New York: Longman, 2010) 274.

⁶⁴ n.a., Ratio Translationis for the English Language (Vatican City: Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, 2007) as found at <http://www.bible-researcher.com/ratio.translationis4.pdf> for page 117 (accessed March 31, 2012).

Appendix II

Specific Comments for this Sunday

© 2012

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

The Missal translates *filiórum* in the **Collect** as *sons and daughters*, when the formal correspondence might be simply *sons*. The Missal translates *patérno* as *our Father*. In the Latin Missale, there is no Latin equivalent for *Our Father*. *Our Father* in the Lord's Prayer is *Pater noster*, not *patérno*. *Sacramentórum* is the first word of the Latin sentence. The problem is that *Sacramentórum* is plural, rather than singular. The Missal translates *Sacramentórum* in the singular, as *Sacrament*. The revision uses *sacraments*.

The Missal translates the Latin Missale into English. I name the Missale *Italian Latin*, because of the accent marks, which do not appear elsewhere.

The first sentence of the **Collect** contains 47 words, in a 20.0 Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level Readability. It is a fused sentence.⁶⁵

My version of Microsoft Word 2010 Spelling & Grammar checker provides the Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level Readability.⁶⁶ 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,"⁶⁷ 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 3.7 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.

⁶⁵ 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.

⁶⁶ For a description of readability levels, go to http://www.online-utility.org/english/readability_test_and_improve.jsp (accessed March 11, 2012).

⁶⁷ 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.

The Little, Brown Handbook has a section, "Writing Concisely" that is helpful for the wordiness here.⁶⁸

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 five, rather than two, sentences. The revised **Collect** has a 5.4 Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level Readability.

The respective ICEL **Collect** and **Prayer after Communion** have 12.2, and 6.1 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. **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.⁶⁹

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

⁶⁸ 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.

⁶⁹ H. Ramsey Fowler and Jane E. Aaron, Eleventh Edition: The Little, Brown Handbook (New York: Longman, 2010) 254-255.

Appendix II

Specific Comments for this Sunday

© 2012

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

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,*] . . .

Through . . . is a sentence fragment the Missal uses throughout the book. See The Little, Brown Handbook explains,⁷⁰

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>”⁷¹ *Unity* is a noun meaning “1a: the quality of state of being or consisting of one.”⁷¹ 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.

Capitalizing *Sacrament* is meaningless for the Faithful, who will only hear (rather than see and read) the **Prayer after Communion**. The Latin does capitalize *Sacramentórum*. *Ratio Translationis*, however, does not provide for capitalizing *sacrament* in the singular, though it does provide for capitalizing *Sacrament (the)* and *Sacrament of Penance (of Reconciliation)*.⁷¹ The argument that the English is to stay

⁷⁰ 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).

⁷¹ <http://www.bible-researcher.com/ratio.translationis4.pdf> (accessed May 6, 2012).

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

close to the Latin does not hold up. The revision takes into account the hearing of the faithful.

Liturgiam authenticam directs,⁷²

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.

⁷² <http://catholicsensibility.wordpress.com/2011/08/20/liturgiam-authenticam-32-33/>
(accessed March 31, 2012).

Stand-alone Prayers

1160 Missal: Nineteenth Sunday in Ordinary Time A Catholic Bible Study (120812)

© 2012

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

Heavenly Father, the Holy Spirit and your Son taught us to call you Father.

We praise you for creating us. Perfect our hearts with your love. Enable us to be with you forever in paradise. 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.

Praise God for the Sacraments. Now that we have consumed the Holy

Eucharist, Heavenly Father, strengthen us and enable us to see the truth of your love, through Christ our Lord.