

## Personal Notes

1280 Missal: Twenty-third Sunday in Ordinary Time A Catholic Bible Study (120909)

© 2015

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

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

Ignoring the nonsensical gibberish in the illiterate Roman Missal, the Papacy is complaining that the Sisters are not including Masses as part of their major celebrations.<sup>2</sup> The Papacy would profit from paying more attention to the comments made here, week after week. Theologically, the situation is as follows.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 might find that want to include that Appendix as they read. Regular readers might look in the Appendix to refresh their memories.

<sup>2</sup> Many references from the weeks of May 29 through June 16, 2012 support this fact. The following references include the unattributed comments associated therewith.

Joshua J. McElwee, May 29, 2012, "Former LCWR leader gives take on Vatican order," at <http://ncronline.org/print/news/women-religious/former-lcwr-head-gives-take-vatican-order> (accessed May 29, 2012).

John L. Allen, Jr., May 30, 2012, "Vatican academy mulls how pro-life is pro-life enough," at <http://ncronline.org/print/news/vatican/vatican-academy-mulls-how-pro-life-pro-life-enough> (accessed May 30, 2012).

Tom Roberts, May 31, 2012, "Priest heading controversial Cleveland community threatened with suspension," <http://ncronline.org/print/news/accountability/amid-doubts-cleveland-bishop%E2%80%99s-leadership-he-suspends-priest> (accessed June 4, 2012).

Marie Rohde, May 31, 2012, "Meeting minutes: Dolan's Milwaukee archdiocese paid accused priests to leave," at <http://ncronline.org/print/news/accountability/dolan%E2%80%99s-milwaukee-archdiocese-paid-accused-priests-leave> (accessed May 31, 2012).

Joshua J. McElwee, June 1, 2012, "U.S. sisters: Vatican order has caused `scandal and pain,'" at <http://ncronline.org/print/news/women-religious/us-sisters-vatican-order-has-caused-%E2%80%98scandal-and-pain%E2%80%99> (accessed June 4, 2012).

Joshua J. McElwee, June 1, 2012, "LCWR president speaks of pain and process," at <http://ncronline.org/print/news/women-religious/lcwr-president-speaks-pain-and-process> (accessed June 4, 2012).

## **Personal Notes**

1280 Missal: Twenty-third Sunday in Ordinary Time A Catholic Bible Study (120909)

© 2015

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

---

Jerry Filteau, June 4, 2012, "Vatican criticizes US theologian's book on sexual ethics," <http://ncronline.org/print/news/vatican/vatican-criticizes-us-theologians-book-sexual-ethics> (accessed June 4, 2012).

Thomas C. Fox, June 5, 2012, "Bishops' move against women religious a hard sell, indeed," at <http://ncronline.org/print/news/women-religious/bishops-move-against-women-religious-hard-sell-indeed> at (accessed June 5, 2012).

Fr. Charles E. Curran, Jun 6, 2012, "Condemnation of 'Just Love' not a surprise in this day and age," at <http://ncronline.org/print/news/condemnation-just-love-not-surprise-day-and-age> (accessed June 6, 2012).

Joshua J. McElwee, June 7, 2012, "Theological society backs Vatican-criticized nun," at <http://ncronline.org/print/news/faith-parish/theological-society-backs-vatican-criticized-nun> (accessed June 8, 2012).

Editorial, "Sisters' discussions reflect healthy questioning," National Catholic Reporter: The Independent News Source, Vol. 48, No. 17 (June 8—21, 2012), page 24, below the fold.

Joe Orso, June 8, 2012, "Essay: Power of the dying hierarchy is an illusion," at <http://ncronline.org/print/news/women-religious/essay-power-dying-hierarchy-illusion> (accessed June 9, 2012).

Joshua J. McElwee, June 10, 2012, "Vatican-criticized nun addresses fellow theologians," at <http://ncronline.org/print/news/spirituality/vatican-criticized-nun-addresses-fellow-theologians> (accessed June 10, 2012).

John L. Allen, Jr., June 12, 2012, "Vatican official warns of 'dialogue of the deaf' with LCWR," at <http://ncronline.org/print/blogs/ncr-today/vatican-official-warns-dialogue-deaf-lcwr> (accessed June 13, 2012).

Various comments at <http://www.praytellig.com/index.php/2012/06/13/systems-thinking-the-congregation-for-the-doctrine-of-the-faith-and-the-lcwr/> (accessed June 13, 2012).

John L. Allen, Jr., June 13, 2012, "Sartain: LCWR dialogue a 'work in progress,'" at <http://ncronline.org/print/blogs/ncr-today/sartain-lcwr-dialogue-work-progress> (accessed June 13, 2012).

## Personal Notes

1280 Missal: Twenty-third Sunday in Ordinary Time A Catholic Bible Study (120909)

© 2015

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

Catholics think that the Mass operates *ex opere operato*, that is, by virtue of the person of the Presider. That means priests do not have to prepare for Mass to be valid and the Eucharist present. Which, in turn, means that Mass can be devoid of any emotional impact, as it often is.

Another, more non-Catholic view, is that religious services operate *ex opere operantis*, that is, by virtue of all participants. A more non-Catholic view is that emotional impact measures the validity of religious services. What this means is that a celebration, even if a Mass, devoid of emotional impact, is no celebration. When a male tries to lead female religious in their celebrations, he may be in an impossible situation. That is why Cardinal William Levada has to keep denying the charge that the Papacy is waging a war on women.

Papal arrogance is specifically present in the General Instruction of the Roman Missal, continued from last Sunday, below.

“. . . on special occasion (for example, . . . when civic leaders are present), the Priest may offer the Sign of Peace to a small number of the faithful near the sanctuary.”<sup>3</sup> *Civic* but not *religious* leaders is a secularization of the Missal.

---

Jerry Filteau, June 14, 2012, “Bishops told religious liberty is in growing `global crisis,” at <http://ncronline.org/print/news/global/bishops-told-religious-liberty-growing-global-crisis> (accessed June 14, 2012).

John L. Allen, Jr., June 14, 2012, “Rome Notebook: Lefebvrites, Vatican Bank, and is the hierarchy abusive?” at <http://ncronline.org/print/blogs/ncr-today/rome-notebook-lefebvrites-vatican-bank-and-hierarchy-abusive> (accessed June 14, 2012).

John L. Allen, Jr., June 15, 2012, “Exclusive interview: Levada talks LCWR, criticism in the States,” at <http://ncronline.org/print/blogs/all-things-catholic/exclusive-interview-levada-talks-lcwr-criticism-states> (accessed June 15, 2012).

<sup>3</sup> 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 49 Section #154 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: 49, #154.

## Personal Notes

1280 Missal: Twenty-third Sunday in Ordinary Time A Catholic Bible Study (120909)

© 2015

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

“It is not permitted for the faithful [sic] to take the consecrated Bread and the sacred chalice by themselves and, still less, to hand them on from one to another among themselves,”<sup>4</sup> except that this is exactly what happens at Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church, in Newport News, Virginia, for what is not consumed by communicants at Sunday Mass.

“. . . whatever may remain of the Blood of Christ is consumed [at the altar](#) by the Priest or the deacon or the duly instituted acolyte who ministered the chalice.”<sup>5</sup> That would make quite an unseemly show were that to happen at Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church at the Sunday Masses.

“Any of the faithful who wish to receive Holy Communion under the species of bread alone should be given Communion in this form,” is silent about those able to receive Holy Communion from the gluten-free chalice, but not from wheat bread.<sup>6</sup> Receiving only from the chalice looks like a pastoral response to the obduracy of the Papacy insisting that only gluten bearing bread be consecrated.

I have never seen the following directive carried out at Sunday Masses.<sup>7</sup>

“When the distribution of Communion is over, the Priest himself immediately and completely consumes at the altar any consecrated wine what happens to remain; as for any consecrated hosts that are left, he either consumes them at the altar or carries them to the place designated for the reservation of the Eucharist.

“Upon returning to the altar, the Priest collects the fragments, should any remain, and he stands at the altar or at the credence table and purifies the paten or ciborium over the chalice, and after this purifies the chalice, saying quietly for formula (*Quod ore sumpsimus, Domine (What has passed our lips)*), and dries the chalice with a purificator. If the vessels are purified at the altar, they are carried to the credence table by a minister. Nevertheless, it is also permitted to leave vessels needing to be purified, especially if there are several, on a corporal, suitably covered, either on the altar or on the credence table, and to purify them immediately after Mass, after the Dismissal [sic]

---

<sup>4</sup> 50, #160.

<sup>5</sup> 65, #284.

<sup>6</sup> 66, 284.

<sup>7</sup> 50-51, #163.

## Personal Notes

1280 Missal: Twenty-third Sunday in Ordinary Time A Catholic Bible Study (120909)

© 2015

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

of the people.” *Suitably covered . . .*” during pre-Vatican II, that would have been called a *burse*.

“A sacred silence . . .”<sup>8</sup> oh, for a sacred silence. Some of the faithful arrive for Mass a half hour early and get centered, while others chatter away before the show begins.

“*Let us offer each other the sign of peace.*”<sup>9</sup> whatever that means. What is the difference between *the* and *a* sign of peace? Why not *one another* rather than *each other*? *Each other* implies two, but there are usually more than two Faithful at Mass.

“ . . . the Deacon says, *Bow down for the blessing.*”<sup>10</sup> How else does one *bow*, other than *down*. This directive pushing the Faithful toward the ground is another instance of the remaining legacy of the imperial habits of Constantine in the Papacy.

### I. Introduction

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

A. Missal: **O** God, by whom we are redeemed and receive adoption, look graciously upon your beloved sons and **daughters**, that those who believe in Christ may receive true freedom and an everlasting inheritance. **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.

The word *daughters* only appears here and at Reading 116 for the Nineteenth Sunday in Ordinary Time, this past August 12, 2012. The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) also used the word *daughters* during the Prayer for Religious Liberty, added at Masses April 22, 2012. The Latin, *filios*, appears here and at Reading 98 for the Thirteenth Sunday in Ordinary Time, July 1, 2012, where the Missal translates it *children*.

---

<sup>8</sup> 51, #164. Also see 38, #84 and the whole paragraph on Silence at 32, #56, written up at 1070 Missal 16th Sunday in Ordinary Time\_A Catholic Bible Study 120722.

<sup>9</sup> 53, #181.

<sup>10</sup> 53, #185.

## Personal Notes

1280 Missal: Twenty-third Sunday in Ordinary Time A Catholic Bible Study (120909)

© 2015

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

B. Italian Latin:<sup>11</sup> Deus, per quem nobis et redemptio venit et praestatur adoptio, **filios** dilectionis tuae benignus intende, ut in Christo credentibus et vera tribuatur libertas, et hereditas aeterna. Per Dominum.

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 8/29), week after week, after identifying more and more repetitious nonsense.

C. Revised: **God, you have redeemed and adopted us as your sons and daughters. So that we might enjoy everlasting happiness with you, free us from sin. We ask this through our Lord, Jesus Christ, your Son, who lives and reigns with you in the unity of the Holy Spirit, one God, forever.**

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

### III. Prayer after Communion

A. Missal: **Grant** that your **faithful**, **O** Lord, whom you nourish and endow with life through the food of your **Word** and heavenly **Sacrament**, **may** so benefit from your beloved Son's great gifts that **we may** merit an eternal share in his life. Who lives and reigns for [sic] ever and ever.

B. Italian Latin:<sup>12</sup> **Da** fidelibus tuis, Domine, quos et **verbi** tui et caelestis **sacramenti pabulo** nutris et vivificas, ita dilecti Filii tui tantis muneribus proficere, ut eius vitae semper consortes effici mereamur. Qui vivit et regnat in saecula saeculorum.

---

<sup>11</sup> See pagina 473 at <http://www.clerus.org/bibliaclerusonline/en/> The Holy See, Congregation for the Clergy runs this website. (accessed June 13, 2012).

<sup>12</sup> See pagina 473 at <http://www.clerus.org/bibliaclerusonline/en/> The Holy See, Congregation for the Clergy runs this website. (accessed June 13, 2012).

## Personal Notes

1280 Missal: Twenty-third Sunday in Ordinary Time A Catholic Bible Study (120909)

© 2015

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

C. Revised: **Lord, your Holy Words in combination with Holy Communion both nourish and enliven your faithful people. Let this holy food enable us to benefit from the wondrous works of your Son. Through your love, we hope to merit a share in his life forever.**

### V. ICEL

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

ICEL:<sup>13</sup> God of unfailing mercy, who redeemed us and adopted us as your children, look upon us with tender love, that we who believe in Christ may enjoy true freedom and enter our promised inheritance.

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:<sup>14</sup> Lord, at the table of your word and sacrament you nourish your faithful and give them life. Grant that through these gifts of your

---

<sup>13</sup> 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 910 (233/362), downloaded from [https://rs895dt.rapidshare.com/#!download|895|35|387089704|ICEL\\_Sacramentary\\_1998\\_.zip|6767|R~00A3D4012C6FE19956DB84F71E5405F6|0|0](https://rs895dt.rapidshare.com/#!download|895|35|387089704|ICEL_Sacramentary_1998_.zip|6767|R~00A3D4012C6FE19956DB84F71E5405F6|0|0) at [http://misguidedmissal.com/wp/?page\\_id=23](http://misguidedmissal.com/wp/?page_id=23) (accessed December 8, 2011).

<sup>14</sup> 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 911 (234/362), downloaded from [https://rs895dt.rapidshare.com/#!download|895|35|387089704|ICEL\\_Sacramentary\\_1998\\_.zip|6767|R~00A3D4012C6FE19956DB84F71E5405F6|0|0](https://rs895dt.rapidshare.com/#!download|895|35|387089704|ICEL_Sacramentary_1998_.zip|6767|R~00A3D4012C6FE19956DB84F71E5405F6|0|0) at [http://misguidedmissal.com/wp/?page\\_id=23](http://misguidedmissal.com/wp/?page_id=23) (accessed December 8, 2011).

**Personal Notes**

1280 Missal: Twenty-third Sunday in Ordinary Time A Catholic Bible Study (120909)

© 2015

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

Son we may advance in holiness and be worthy to share his life for  
[sic] ever.

We ask this through Jesus Christ our Lord.

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

These Appendices enable the preoccupied reader to skip repetitious and boring parts. Some of the details become dense and distracting, except for anyone with the time and devotion to work through more than 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 primarily for first-time readers, especially first-time readers associated with the Papacy. The secondary reason is to improve the presentation.

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.

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*). Privileging standard American English in Personal Notes over Papal Italian 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.

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 Reverend Michael G. Ryan refers to “virtually unintelligible translations.”<sup>15</sup> 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.

---

<sup>15</sup> 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](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.

The full name of the Missal is, n.a., The Roman Missal: Renewed by Decree of the Most Holy Second Ecumenical Council of the Vatican, Promulgated by Authority of Pope Paul VI and Revised at the Direction of Pope John Paul II: English Translation According to the Third Typical Edition: For Use in the Dioceses of the United States of America: Approved by the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops and Confirmed by the Apostolic See (Washington, DC [sic]: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2011). The **Collect** and **Prayer after Communion** for this Sunday are on page 483.

James Dallen, a retired diocesan priest<sup>16</sup> and emeritus professor of religious studies at Gonzaga University in Spokane, Washington, has written an article that sheds light on the 2011 Missal. Dallen observes that the higher clergy is using a model that prioritizes preserving the Church institution, rather than the Gospel, for which the Church exists. Personal Notes draws attention to exclamation marks of Dallen with bold red print! Dallen asks the question, “What Kind of Ecclesiology?”<sup>17</sup> His answer is that higher clergy, with an untenable and dysfunctional model of the Church as an institution, imposed the 2011 Missal on the United States and elsewhere.

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

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

---

<sup>16</sup> <http://salinadiocese.org/priests/231-priests/980-dallen-rev-james> (accessed March 11, 2012).

<sup>17</sup> <http://misguidedmissal.com/wp/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/Translation-Ecclesiology-Jim-Dallen-3-6-2012.pdf> (accessed March 11, 2012).

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

*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*.<sup>18</sup>

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

---

<sup>18</sup> 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.

course, the passion for uniformity regarded little as trivial. Someone once tried to calculate the stupendous number of mortal sins that a priest could commit praying the breviary! Despite that unfortunate precedent, generally mortal sin presumes grievous matter and violating the bonds of communion in liturgy presumes a substantial change of the expected texts.

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

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

The confusion in the hierarchy is evident in at least two places: first in the highly publicized sexual abuse coverup; second in the less publicized 2011 Roman Missal. First, is the sexual 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,<sup>19</sup> is an irresponsible derelict of duty, power play.

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

Such imperial Roman behavior only makes things worse. Lest there be any misunderstanding of the criminal seriousness of the sexual abuse coverup, Bishop Robert W. Finn of Kansas City-Saint Joseph, Missouri has not been able to escape. He is currently going to trial for not reporting sexual abuse.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> By Rome, I mean global Church governance emanating from Rome, in which the Vatican City State is found. Sometimes *Rome* is used to mean the *Holy See* or the *Apostolic See*. *Holy See* is not quite right, because all dioceses are *Holy*. *Apostolic See* is arrogant and is how Rome prefers to refer to itself.

<sup>20</sup> Joshua J. McElwee, "Judge orders Kansas City bishop to stand trial in abuse case," National Catholic Reporter at <http://ncronline.org/news/accountability/judge-orders-kansas-city-bishop-stand-trial-abuse-case> (accessed April 5, 2012).

## Appendix I

### An overview of the Missal

© 2012

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

The second hierarchic confusion is in the 2011 Missal. Care of souls is the first responsibility of the hierarchy.<sup>21</sup> Lack of due diligence and leadership for the care of souls results in authority producing an anti-intellectual, anti-Vatican II, dysfunctional, illiterate 2011 Missal. As Martin Luther (1483-1546) reminded the faithful, “. . . the Jews are no longer Israel, for all things are to be new, and Israel too must become new.”<sup>22</sup> In other words, the Faithful need to be open to the vagaries of the New Covenant.

As the Reverend John David Ramsey, my pastor of Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church in Newport News, Virginia 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.”<sup>23</sup>

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

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

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*

---

<sup>21</sup> Already evident in the [1545-1563] Trent] Council’s teaching is that the celebration of Mass is of undoubted validity in any language but that the *cura animarum*, or care of souls, which is at stake in the participation of the faithful in the Liturgy, is the first responsibility of the Bishops, no matter what language may be used for the Liturgy. n.a., *Ratio Translationis for the English Language* (Vatican City: Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, 2007) as found at <http://www.bible-researcher.com/ratio.translationis1.pdf> for page 13 (accessed March 31, 2012).

<sup>22</sup> 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.

<sup>23</sup> 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.

*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:”<sup>24</sup>

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

---

24

[http://www.opensourceshakespeare.org/views/plays/play\\_view.php?WorkID=tamingshrw&Act=4&Scene=5&Scope=scene&displaytype=print](http://www.opensourceshakespeare.org/views/plays/play_view.php?WorkID=tamingshrw&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).** 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. Only time will tell what the Papacy will do next.

The Faithful deserve readability, integrity, scholarship, "language which is easily understandable' to the faithful."<sup>25</sup> ". . . *Liturgiam authenticam* calls for the development and consistency of a distinctive translation style with these principal characteristics . . . (2) easy intelligibility . . ." <sup>26</sup> that *easy intelligibility* is the reason for Personal Notes. That is why Personal Notes pays attention to the Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level

---

<sup>25</sup> ". . . It is important to note that vernacular renderings of a Latin text must be made in a 'kind of language which is easily understandable' to the faithful . . ." n.a., *Ratio Translationis for the English Language* (Vatican City: Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, 2007) as found at <http://www.bible-researcher.com/ratio.translationis1.pdf> for page 10 (accessed March 31, 2012) #9.

<sup>26</sup> n.a., *Ratio Translationis for the English Language* (Vatican City: Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, 2007) as found at <http://www.bible-researcher.com/ratio.translationis3.pdf> for page 78 (accessed March 31, 2012); <http://www.bible-researcher.com/ratio.translationis4.pdf> for pages 100-130 (accessed March 31, 2012) #114 .

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

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 [the technical term is hypotaxis]<sup>27</sup> remains comprehensible to the speaker and hearer of English, and therefore should be used to the extent that is necessary in order to translate accurately the prayers of the Roman Rite.<sup>28</sup>

Personal Notes strongly disagrees with the grammar of the above abusive run-on sentence. Personal Notes paraphrases the substance, which *ratio translationis* legitimates in another place.<sup>29</sup> Personal Notes, then, *paraphrases*, rather than *translates*, the illiterate 2011 Missal into standard American English.

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

---

<sup>27</sup> Stanley Fish, How to Write a Sentence and How to Read One (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2011) 51.

<sup>28</sup> n.a., Ratio Translationis for the English Language (Vatican City: Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, 2007) as found at <http://www.bible-researcher.com/ratio.translationis2.pdf> for pages 40 (accessed March 31, 2012).

<sup>29</sup> . . . Translations may not be made from a translation of the editio typica . . . Paraphrase, as a method of restating a perceived meaning in terms other than those found in the original Latin, is not to be equated with translation. Paraphrase aims to convey meaning directly and quickly in a given language . . . n.a., Ratio Translationis for the English Language (Vatican City: Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, 2007) as found at <http://www.bible-researcher.com/ratio.translationis2.pdf> for pages 34-36 (accessed March 31, 2012) 41, 42.

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

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.”<sup>30</sup> 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. When *LORD* means the untranslatable name for God, translators are to capitalize all letters.<sup>31</sup> So far, there has been no occasion for that in any of the prayers paraphrased here, from the 2011 Missal. Allowing for exceptions from what is capitalized in Latin is new (as of July 1, 2012) to Personal Notes. *Ratio translationis* lists Terms for Capitalization,<sup>32</sup> a list unavailable until April 1, 2012, mainly because of my unwillingness to start research until the text for the 2011 Missal became fully available, just in time for Advent 2011. On April 1, I was developing material for July 1.

In other cases, translators are to follow, with some exceptions, Latin capitalization.<sup>33</sup> Flowerday comments,<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> When it may be deemed appropriate by the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, a text will be prepared after consultation with Bishops, called a “*ratio translationis*”, to be set forth by the authority of the same Dicastery, in which the principles of translation found in this Instruction will be applied in closer detail to a given language. This document may be composed of various elements as the situation may require, such as, for example, a list of vernacular words to be equated with their Latin counterparts, the setting forth of principles applicable specifically to a given language, and so forth.  
<http://catholicsensibility.wordpress.com/2011/07/24/> (accessed April 1, 2012) 9.

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

<sup>32</sup> n.a., *Ratio Translationis for the English Language* (Vatican City: Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, 2007) as found at <http://www.bible-researcher.com/ratio.translationis4.pdf> for pages 117-122 (accessed March 31, 2012).

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

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 [sic] Moroney [James P. Moroney, Executive Secretary to the Vox Clara Committee]<sup>35</sup> don't seem to have read up on their 2007 *ratio translationis*. It all seems rather arbitrary—which strikes me as counter to this church document, not to mention the whole thrust of post-conciliar liturgy.

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**.<sup>36</sup>

---

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

<sup>34</sup> <http://catholicsensibility.wordpress.com/2011/08/20/liturgiam-authenticam-32-33/> (accessed March 31, 2012).

<sup>35</sup> <http://www.blogger.com/profile/17013903890674545477> (accessed March 31, 2012).

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

The Papacy mocks the venerable Chicago Manual of Style.<sup>37</sup> The problem is that the 2007 *Ratio* is citing a 1982 Chicago Manual. 1982 is the Twelfth Edition. By 2007, the Chicago Manual was in the 2003 Fifteenth Edition.<sup>38</sup> 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.<sup>39</sup>

“However, the use of ‘sense lines’ or colometry (‘the measuring of the length of phrases’) has now been introduced into liturgical books . . .”<sup>40</sup> except the Italian Latin. Personal Notes, therefore, is not able to compare English with Latin colometry.

---

<sup>36</sup> <http://www.clerus.org/bibliaclerusonline/en/> (accessed April 1, 2012). Go to pagina 461 #56 .

<sup>37</sup> In sum, no style sheet can be used to “restrict the full sense of the original text within narrower limits” than is intended by the Liturgy itself. The *Chicago Manual of Style* (University of Chicago Press, 1982), p., 208, for example, instructs its readers that the names of rites other than the Eucharist “are not capitalized in run [sic] of the text,” including all the Sacraments, whereas clearly in English-language liturgical books it has been a long-standing and well-founded practice to capitalize the words such as “Confirmation” as the proper name of a particular sacrament. n.a., *Ratio Translationis for the English Language* (Vatican City: Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, 2007) as found at <http://www.bible-researcher.com/ratio.translationis2.pdf> for pages 52 (accessed March 31, 2012) 79.

<sup>38</sup> <http://www.worldcat.org/title/chicago-manual-of-style/oclc/51553085/editions?editionsView=true&referer=br> (accessed April 1, 2012).

<sup>39</sup> n.a., *Ratio Translationis for the English Language* (Vatican City: Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, 2007) as found at <http://www.bible-researcher.com/ratio.translationis3.pdf> for page 78, (accessed March 31, 2012).

<sup>40</sup> n.a., *Ratio Translationis for the English Language* (Vatican City: Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, 2007) as found at <http://www.bible-researcher.com/ratio.translationis4.pdf> for page 126 (accessed March 31, 2012) #6.

## **Appendix I**

An overview of the Missal

© 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.

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 when Personal Notes is presented to <http://www.jamesriverjournal.net/>, generally the Monday before the Sunday. A second revision often 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.

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

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

By placing the verb, *grant*, first, in the **Prayer after Communion**, the Missal does not follow either Latin (subject-object-verb)<sup>41</sup> or standard American English (subject-verb-object) word order. Word order in Vatican Italian may not provide the subject before the verb. The Little Brown Handbook explains standard American English. “Word order in English sentences may not correspond to word order in the sentences of your native language. English, for instance, strongly prefers subject first, then verb, then any other words, whereas some other languages prefer the verb first.” That is what is happening in this prayer. The verb, *Grant*, is first.<sup>42</sup>

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.”<sup>43</sup> 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.

Dallen explains,<sup>44</sup>

---

41

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

<sup>42</sup> H. Ramsey Fowler and Jane E. Aaron, Eleventh Edition: The Little, Brown Handbook (New York: Longman, 2010) 236.

<sup>43</sup> 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).

<sup>44</sup> James Dallen, “What Kind of Ecclesiology?” <http://misguidedmissal.com/wp/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/Translation-Ecclesiology-Jim-Dallen-3-6-2012.pdf> (accessed March 11, 2012), page 17/36.

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

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

Dallen points out that none of the heads of the Congregation of Divine Worship (CDW) were fluent in English.<sup>45</sup> I am not sure what Dallen means by *fluent*. When I spoke with Cardinal Paul Augustin Mayer, O.S.B. in 2000 we seemed to have no trouble communicating in English. At the time, Mayer was a past head of the CDW. Admittedly, the first language for Mayer was German.

*Might* versus *may* in the Missal: *might* connotes ability, wish, or desire;<sup>46</sup> *may* connotes permission. According to the Dictionary, *may* is used in auxiliary function to express a wish or desire especially in prayer, imprecation, or benediction <*may* he reign in health> <*may* they all be damned> <*may* the best man win>. I think *might* sounds better, because the faithful are expressing a desire, rather than asking for permission. The Little, Brown Handbook explains, "the helping verbs of standard American English may be problematic if you are used to speaking another language or dialect."<sup>47</sup>

Someone like Mayer may have had such a difficulty, which I would have overlooked, as I reached out to him. For example, I overlook the street sign that warns, "Caution: Bridge *may* freeze," rather than ". . . *might* freeze."

---

<sup>45</sup> James Dallen, "What Kind of Ecclesiology?" <http://misguidedmissal.com/wp/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/Translation-Ecclesiology-Jim-Dallen-3-6-2012.pdf> (accessed March 11, 2012), page 11-12/36.

<sup>46</sup> <http://unabridged.merriam-webster.com/cgi-bin/unabridged?va=might&x=15&y=10> (accessed January 29, 2011).

<sup>47</sup> 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.

*Heirs to an eternal inheritance* in the **Collect** is redundant. See The Little, Brown Handbook for “redundant phrases.”<sup>48</sup>

The Latin does not capitalize *verbi* and *sacraménti*, but the Missal does capitalize *Word* and *Sacrament*. Neither *word* nor *sacrament* is on the list of words capitalized, regardless of the Latin.<sup>49</sup> *Word* is capitalized when *Word* refers to the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, but the *food of your Word* in the context of the Prayer after Communion refers to Sacred Scripture, rather than a person. *Sacraments* is capitalized, but not *sacrament*. Since the Faithful will not hear the difference between an upper and lower case word, there is no reason to stray from the Latin, except, perhaps, to show the arrogance of the translator in the face of anyone objecting to the illiterate 2011 Missal. The revision takes into account the hearing of the faithful.

Dallen comments,<sup>50</sup>

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

The Little, Brown Handbook has some more advice, of which the illiterate 2011 Roman Missal seems entirely oblivious.<sup>51</sup>

---

<sup>48</sup> H. Ramsey Fowler and Jane E. Aaron, Eleventh Edition: The Little, Brown Handbook (New York: Longman, 2010) 527-528.

<sup>49</sup> n.a., Ratio Translationis for the English Language (Vatican City: Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, 2007) as found at <http://www.bible-researcher.com/ratio.translationis4.pdf> for pages 119-121 (accessed March 31, 2012).

<sup>50</sup> James Dallen, “What Kind of Ecclesiology?” <http://misguidedmissal.com/wp/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/Translation-Ecclesiology-Jim-Dallen-3-6-2012.pdf> (accessed March 11, 2012), page 2/36.

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

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

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

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

The first sentence of the **Collect** contains thirty-four words, in a 16.0 Flesch-Kincaid Senior College Grade Level Readability. The Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level Readability indicates the number of formal school years it takes to understand the material. The first sentence of the **Collect** is a fused sentence.<sup>52</sup>

My version of Microsoft Word 2010 Spelling & Grammar checker provides the Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level Readability.<sup>53</sup> Dallen explains, "Applying readability criteria indicates that the number of years of formal education required for understanding Eucharistic Prayers on first reading has increased from 10.75 to 17.21,"<sup>54</sup> from sophomore high school to graduate school college.

---

<sup>51</sup> H. Ramsey Fowler and Jane E. Aaron, Eleventh Edition: The Little, Brown Handbook (New York: Longman, 2010) 856.

<sup>52</sup> 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.

<sup>53</sup> For a description of readability levels, go to [http://www.online-utility.org/english/readability\\_test\\_and\\_improve.jsp](http://www.online-utility.org/english/readability_test_and_improve.jsp) (accessed March 11, 2012).

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

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. In 2013, it was thirty-two percent for Fourth Graders, twenty-two percent for Eighth Graders.<sup>55</sup> Little change. The Department of Education divides students in four categories of 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.<sup>56</sup>

Only sixty-eight percent of Twelfth Grade Students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch graduated with a diploma during 2006-2007 (where statistics were 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-three words, in a 16.8 Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level Readability. It is a fused sentence. The revised **Prayer after Communion** has a 10.5 Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level Readability.

---

<sup>54</sup> James Dallen, "What Kind of Ecclesiology?" <http://misguidedmissal.com/wp/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/Translation-Ecclesiology-Jim-Dallen-3-6-2012.pdf> (accessed March 11, 2012), page 17/36. Dallen cites <http://www.praytelligblog.com/index.php/2011/02/18/readability-tests-on-the-eucharistic-prayers/> that I accessed March 11, 2012.

<sup>55</sup>

[https://www.google.com/?gws\\_rd=ssl#q=U.S.+Department+of+Education%2C+percent+age+of+Fourth+graders+read+below+basic+achievement+levels%3B+Eighth+Graders.++](https://www.google.com/?gws_rd=ssl#q=U.S.+Department+of+Education%2C+percent+age+of+Fourth+graders+read+below+basic+achievement+levels%3B+Eighth+Graders.++) (accessed July 5, 2015).

<sup>56</sup> 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.

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

The second sentence of the **Collect** has twenty-seven words with a 9.7 Flesch-Kincaid Grade Graduate School Level Readability. That is reading at the sophomore high school level. The Little, Brown Handbook has a section, "Writing Concisely" that is helpful for the wordiness here.<sup>57</sup>

That is why the revised **Collect** has three, rather than two, sentences. The revised **Collect** has a 8.2 Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level Readability.

Non-American English, such as Scottish or British, can appear illiterate to Americans in the United States.<sup>58</sup> That is why oral prayers in anything other than standard American English are irrelevant, in the United States. An exception to this may be African American Language (AAL),<sup>59</sup> but no one is trying that.

Because American English is not the first language for many Catholics in the United States, pastoral care requires standard American English. Otherwise, the Faithful are subject to two contrary conclusions about the readings. The first conclusion for the Faithful is that the Church does not respect what the marginalized, particularly immigrants, are doing to learn standard American English. In addition to the laity, twenty-two percent of the active diocesan priests in the United States are from outside the country.<sup>60</sup> They need their local ordinaries (bishops) to insist they keep improving their use of standard American English. In my personal experience, Filipino priests mispronounce the sounds accents, and rhythm of standard American English to the point where what they vocalize is meaningless. Vietnamese priests are worse. The second conclusion

---

<sup>57</sup> 8. Effective Words, 39. Writing Concisely," H. Ramsey Fowler and Jane E. Aaron, Eleventh Edition: The Little, Brown Handbook (New York: Longman, 2010) 523-524.

<sup>58</sup> Bette Mae K. Jirran reads widely in fiction and cites the following as examples. Emily Brightwell, Mrs. Jeffries Forges Ahead, (New York: Berkley Prime Crime, 2011); Jude Deveraux, Jill Barnett, Geralyn Dawson, Pam Binder, and Patricia Cabot, A Season in the Highlands (New York: Pocket Books, 2000); Christina Dodd, Stephanie Laurens, Julia Quinn, and Karen Ranney, Scottish Brides (New York: Avon Books, 1999).

<sup>59</sup> Geneva Smitherman, Word from the Mother: Language and African Americans (New York: Routledge, 2006) 3.

<sup>60</sup> <http://www.commonwealmagazine.org/it-doesn%E2%80%99t-sing> (February 26, 2012).

## **Appendix II**

Specific Comments for this Sunday

© 2012

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

is that the Church is actively sabotaging any attempt to learn standard American English, just as it is sabotaging Vatican II.

The respective ICEL **Collect** and **Prayer after Communion** have 13.2 , and 5.4 Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level Readabilities.

The Latin omits the **O** in the Missal **O God** and **O Lord**. The argument that the English is to stay close to the Latin does not hold up. The English has **O Lord**. The Latin has only *Dómine*, without the **O**. **O** is a Latin word.<sup>61</sup>

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.<sup>62</sup>

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,*] . . .

*Through* . . . is a sentence fragment the Missal uses throughout the book. See The Little, Brown Handbook explains,<sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>61</sup> Cassell's Latin Dictionary: Latin-English and English-Latin, revised by J. R. V. Marchant, M.A. and Joseph F. Charles, B.A. (New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company, 1952) 371.

<sup>62</sup> H. Ramsey Fowler and Jane E. Aaron, Eleventh Edition: The Little, Brown Handbook (New York: Longman, 2010) 254-255.

<sup>63</sup> See Part 4, "Clear Sentences," Chapter 17 c, "Sentence Fragments: Verbal or prepositional phrase," H. Ramsey Fowler and Jane E. Aaron, Eleventh Edition: The

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

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 exists as only one at a time <*the* Lord><*the* Messiah> . . . .”<sup>1</sup> *Unity* is a noun meaning “1a: the quality of stage of being or consisting of one.”<sup>1</sup> Does *the unity* mean that the Holy Spirit belongs to a union, like a labor union? Does *unity* in the **Collect** mean that the Holy Spirit, unlike Jesus, has only one nature, Divine? Does *unity* mean the trinitarian unity? In the same vein, does *unity* mean that it is the Holy Spirit, which is the relationship between the Father and Son, thereby causing a triune unity? The last is how the revision would resolve the matter, substituting *Divine Trinitarian nature* for *unity*. Because the Faithful have not challenged *the unity* since Vatican II, the now traditional silly phraseology remains.

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.

**Rationale**

Clarity is not a prerequisite for prayer. The search for clarity can be a means to prayer. As part of catechesis, these Personal Notes set up what the Church needs to explain to enable the Faithful to pray with *faith seeking understanding*, as Saint Anselm of Canterbury (1033-1109) puts it.<sup>64</sup>

---

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).

<sup>64</sup> <http://www.google.com/search?q=faith+seeking+understanding&ie=utf-8&oe=utf-8&aq=t&rls=org.mozilla:en-US:official&client=firefox-a> (accessed November 28, 2011) and <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/anselm/> (accessed November 28, 2011).

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

Michael G. Ryan explains, “To read these prayers is difficult; to call them prayerful is to redefine the word; to pray them is almost impossible.”<sup>65</sup>

Dallen refers to an “omitted rubric” that makes one wonder how free presiders may be to use and adapt my paraphrasing of the current illiterate 2011 Missal.<sup>66</sup>

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

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

---

<sup>65</sup> 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](http://www.americamagazine.org/content/article.cfm?article_id=13441&s=2) (accessed May 24, 2012).

<sup>66</sup> James Dallen, “What Kind of Ecclesiology?” <http://misguidedmissal.com/wp/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/Translation-Ecclesiology-Jim-Dallen-3-6-2012.pdf> (accessed March 11, 2012), page 28-29/36.

**Stand-alone Prayers**

1280 Missal: Twenty-third Sunday in Ordinary Time A Catholic Bible Study (120909)

© 2012

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

**God, you have redeemed and adopted us as your sons and daughters. So that we might enjoy everlasting happiness with you, free us from sin. 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.**

**Lord, your Holy Words in combination with Holy Communion both nourish and enliven your faithful people. Let this holy food enable us to benefit from the wondrous works of your Son. Through your love, we hope to merit a share in his life forever.**