

Personal Notes

1340 Missal: Twenty-fifth Sunday in Ordinary Time A Catholic Bible Study (120923)

© 2015

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

Roman Missal¹

I. Introduction

Sunday services are the highlight of the weekly prayer life for Christians. The 2011 Roman Missal provides words for Roman Catholics. Generally, these words are an unmitigated mess. Analysis of the proffered prayers is required to get out of the mess and into communion with God. Personal Notes offers such analysis.

Personal Notes continues from last Sunday, analyzing the General Instruction of the Roman Missal (GIRM), which gives instructions for praying during Mass. On the one hand, Personal Notes is mainly about analysis designed to enable the Faithful to get over the non-essentials of a life of prayer in order to contemplate God intuitively in life as lived. On the other hand, brandishing intuition as a counter to, rather than a result of, analysis harms a life of prayer.² The Faithful do better to let intuition and analysis feed into one another. Analysis takes work and opens up new vistas in which to pray, that is, commune with God.

GIRM instructs about “Sacred pastors . . . ”³ what might that mean? Is there such an office as non-sacred pastor, for example local ordinaries who criminally cover over up sexual abuse by their priests?

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

³ Personal Notes begins the examination of “The General Instruction of the Roman Missal” at Reading 1130 Missal 18th Sunday in Ordinary Time_A Catholic Bible Study 120805, that is August 5, 2012. The Missal, referenced for this Twenty-fourth Sunday in Ordinary Time, 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, United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2011) page 49 Section #154 Subsequent references are to the numbered sections, which run

Personal Notes

1340 Missal: Twenty-fifth Sunday in Ordinary Time A Catholic Bible Study (120923)

© 2015

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

“Any of the faithful who wish to receive Holy Communion under the species of bread alone should be given Communion in this form.”⁴ Before Sunday Mass at Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church in Newport New, Virginia, a Reader announces that a gluten-free Chalice will be available for a few minutes after the distribution of Holy Communion begins. GIRM is strangely silent here. I wonder whether making the Chalice available is a pastoral response to the Papacy refusing to consecrate other than bread containing gluten.

“The People of God [sic] which is gathered . . . ”⁵ is evidence of a writer unfamiliar with standard American English. Standard American English would be The People of God, who are gathered . . . ”⁶

“For only what is required for the celebration of the Mass may be placed on the altar table . . . ”⁷ omits any mention of the crucifix, which is usually on the altar, in sight of the Presider.

“Places for the faithful . . . ”⁸ does not recognize special needs of the handicapped, needs to which United States custom applies.

“. . . the Saints, she [the Church] hopes one day to have some share and fellowship with them.” In standard American English, *them* refers twelve words back to *Saints*, which is awkward at best and wrong at worst.⁹ Later, in the same place, “[I]n

to #399 on page 87. These references will first provide the page number in my missal, followed by the section number, as follows: 65, #282.

⁴ 66, #284.

⁵ 68, #294.

⁶ H. Ramsey Fowler and Jane E. Aaron, Eleventh Edition: The Little, Brown Handbook (New York: Longman, 2010) 350-351.

⁷ 69, #306.

⁸ 71, #311.

⁹ H. Ramsey Fowler and Jane E. Aaron, Eleventh Edition: The Little, Brown Handbook (New York: Longman, 2010) 346.

Personal Notes

1340 Missal: Twenty-fifth Sunday in Ordinary Time A Catholic Bible Study (120923)

© 2015

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

sacred buildings images . . . themselves . . . *Themselves* refers back four lines and eighty words.¹⁰

“In the Dioceses of the United States of America, sacred vessels may also be made from . . . ebony . . .”¹¹ As a Black American, I await the happy day to see that.

GIRM does not distinguish between a homily and a sermon.¹² A sermon receives no feedback from the faithful, whereas a homily does. What Presiders customarily deliver is sermons, not homilies.¹³ As Villanova University puts it, “a sermon is more about ‘doing’ than ‘thinking about.’” It seems to me that priests are afraid to analyze, as evidenced by the fact they do not read, and that the Sisters are incurring the wrath of the Papacy for daring to analyze.

II. Prayer before reading Sacred Scripture (Collect)

A. Missal: **O God**, who founded all the commands of your sacred **Law** upon love of you and of our neighbor, grant that, by keeping your precepts, we may merit to attain eternal life. **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:¹⁴ **Deus**, qui sacrae **legis** ómnia constitúta in tua et próximi dilectióne posuísti, da nobis, ut, tua praecépta servántes, ad vitam mereámur perveníre perpétuam. Per Dóminum.

To make the Paraphrased Prayers easier to find, Personal Notes repeats them on the last page. Only the heartiest souls will want to plow through the preceding

¹⁰ 72, #318.

¹¹ 74, 329.

¹² 78, #360.

¹³ <http://www83.homepage.villanova.edu/richard.jacobs/homilies/homily-sermon.htm> (accessed June 24, 2012).

¹⁴ The Missal translates the Latin Missale into English. I name the Missale *Italian Latin*, because of the accent marks, which do not appear elsewhere. See pagina 475 at <http://www.clerus.org/bibliaclerusonline/en/>. The Holy See, Congregation for the Clergy runs this website. (accessed June 24, 2012).

Personal Notes

1340 Missal: Twenty-fifth Sunday in Ordinary Time A Catholic Bible Study (120923)

© 2015

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

Appendix (see the heading on page 6/28), week after week, after identifying more and more repetitious nonsense.

C. Paraphrased: **God, to love you and to love all of our neighbors, accounts for the whole law. Help us now follow the Law. Using the Law, help us gain eternal life with you. 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: Graciously raise up, **O Lord**, those you renew with this Sacrament, that we may come to possess your redemption both in mystery and in the manner of our **life**. Through Christ our Lord.

B. Italian Latin:¹⁵ Quos tuis, Dómine, réficis **sacraméntis**, contínuis attólle benígnus auxiliis, ut redemptiónis efféctum et mystériis capiámus et **móribus**. Per Christum.

C. Paraphrased: **As we receive Holy Communion, raise us up and renew us, Lord. Help us to grasp and transform the mystery of your life into our lives, so that we may enjoy your holy redemption. We pray through Christ our Lord.**

V. International Commission on English in the Liturgy (ICEL)

Prayer before reading Sacred Scripture (Collect)

¹⁵ See pagina 475 at <http://www.clerus.org/bibliaclerusonline/en/> The Holy See, Congregation for the Clergy runs this website. (accessed June 24, 2012).

Personal Notes

1340 Missal: Twenty-fifth Sunday in Ordinary Time A Catholic Bible Study (120923)

© 2015

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

ICEL:¹⁶ Lord our God, upon the two commandments to love you and to love our neighbour [sic] you have founded all your holy law. Give us the grace to keep these commandments and so inherit eternal life.

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:¹⁷ Lord, support with your unfailing help those you nourish with this sacrament, that we may feel the power of your redemption in the celebration of the eucharist [sic] and in the conduct of our lives.

Grant this through Jesus Christ our Lord.

¹⁶ 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 914 (237/362) , downloaded from https://rs895dt.rapidshare.com/#!download|895|35|387089704|ICEL_Sacramentary_1998_.zip|6767|R~00A3D4012C6FE19956DB84F71E5405F6|0|0 at http://misguidedmissal.com/wp/?page_id=23 (accessed December 8, 2011).

¹⁷ 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 915 (238/362), downloaded from https://rs895dt.rapidshare.com/#!download|895|35|387089704|ICEL_Sacramentary_1998_.zip|6767|R~00A3D4012C6FE19956DB84F71E5405F6|0|0 at http://misguidedmissal.com/wp/?page_id=23 (accessed December 8, 2011).

Appendix I
An overview of the Missal
© 2015
Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

Skipping over these Appendices enables the busy and preoccupied reader to skip repetitious and boring parts. Some of the details become dense and distracting, except for anyone with the time and devotion to work through 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 (as Personal Notes does) 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.”¹⁸ 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. Standard American English is my first language.

¹⁸ 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

© 2015

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

Personal Notes begins the examination of “The General Instruction of the Roman Missal (GIRM)” at Reading 1130 Missal 18th Sunday in Ordinary Time_A Catholic Bible Study 120805, that is August 5, 2012. The Missal, referenced for this Twenty-fourth Sunday in Ordinary Time, 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 485.

James Dallen, a retired diocesan priest¹⁹ 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. He asks the question, “What Kind of Ecclesiology?”²⁰ 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 points. The reason is an academic preference for reason over emotion; for analysis over intuition. Daisy Grewal has an article, “How Critical Thinkers Lose Their [sic] Faith in God: Faith and intuition are intimately related.”²¹ Her research shows that people who analyze tend to love their Faith. Personal Notes reaches out to critical thinkers mainly by using critical thinkers, like Dallen, to demonstrate compatibility between analysis and intuition.

When an established scholar like Dallen gets emotional, 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*;

¹⁹ <http://salinadiocese.org/priests/231-priests/980-dallen-rev-james> (accessed March 11, 2012).

²⁰ <http://misguidedmissal.com/wp/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/Translation-Ecclesiology-Jim-Dallen-3-6-2012.pdf> (accessed March 11, 2012).

²¹ Daisy Grewal, “Advances: Psychology: How Critical Thinkers Lose Their [sic] Faith in God: Faith and intuition are intimately related,” Scientific American, Vol. 307, No. 1 (July 2012) 26.

Appendix I
An overview of the Missal
© 2015
Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

with priests receiving communion for and in place of the people; with the Vatican Holy See not following its own *Liturgiam authenticam* [LA] rules of “translation;” and with substituting uniformity for Christian unity.

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

Many promotes the institutional Church at the expense of the Gospel, *for all*. The Papacy is insistent, on April 14 ordering German Catholics to stop postponing the change from *for all* to *many*.²²

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

²² 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
© 2015
Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

Latin—curiously, the requirement of literal translation (“formal correspondence”) is not always observed!

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

The final exclamation point comes at page 34/36.

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

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

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

The confusion in the hierarchy is evident in at least two places: first in the highly publicized sexual abuse coverup; second in the less publicized 2011 Roman Missal. First, is the sexual coverup. Lacking a true care for souls, means that the sexual abuse coverup, including extricating Cardinal Bernard F. Law and Cardinal William J. Levada from the United States to Rome,²³ is an irresponsible derelict of duty, power play.

Rome promoted Law to a position helping choose bishops throughout the world. Rome promoted Levada to the position from which the Cardinal Conclave chose Pope Benedict XVI. Rome, therefore, reinforced and promoted a culture of confusion. On July 1 Pope Benedict XVI announced that Bishop Gerhard Ludwig Müller of Regensburg, Germany would succeed Levada as Prefect of the CDF. Müller is a strong

²³ 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.

Appendix I
An overview of the Missal
© 2015
Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

friend of the Peruvian Gustavo Gutiérrez, O.P., widely regarded as the father of Liberation theology. Müller, himself, however, is not known as a liberation theologian, but as a conservative much in the mold of Pope Benedict XVI.²⁴ Personal Notes will watch to see if Levada dares to return to the United States to face possible prosecution for covering up sexual abuse of children.

The imperial behavior of the Papacy, enabling Cardinals to evade courts in the United States, 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.²⁵

The second hierarchic confusion is in the 2011 Missal. Care of souls is the first responsibility of the hierarchy.²⁶ 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.”²⁷ In other words, the Faithful need to be open to the vagaries of the New Covenant.

²⁴ John L. Allen, Jr., “German friend of liberation theologian named Vatican doctrinal czar,” <http://ncronline.org/print/blogs/ncr-today/german-friend-liberation-theologian-named-vatican-doctrinal-czar> and <http://ncronline.org/blogs/ncr-today/german-friend-liberation-theologian-named-vatican-doctrinal-czar> (accessed July 5, 2012).

²⁵ 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).

²⁶ 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).

²⁷ 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,

Appendix I
An overview of the Missal
© 2015
Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

As the Reverend John David Ramsey, incoming 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.”²⁸

Lack of standard American English prevents the Faithful from clear, critical thinking about God. The Apostolic See is exercising an unadulterated power play, closed to cultures in the United States. 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 cum originali* (*agrees with the original*), on page 4, in the Missal. 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:”²⁹

- **Petruchio (Papacy).** Come on, a [sic] God's name; once more toward our father's. Good Lord, how bright and goodly shines the moon!

(ed.) Carl L. Beckwith (Downers Grove, Illinois: IVP Academic, An Imprint of InterVarsity Press, 2012) 116.

²⁸ John David Ramsey, A Precarious Faith: The Tri-une Dynamic of the Christian Life (Ph.D. Dissertation, Duke University, 2002) 37.

²⁹

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

© 2015

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

- **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.
- **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.

Appendix I
An overview of the Missal
© 2015
Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

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.

The Faithful deserve readability, integrity, scholarship, “‘language which is easily understandable’ to the faithful.”³⁰ “. . . *Liturgiam authenticam* calls for the development and consistency of a distinctive translation style with these principal characteristics . . . (2) easy intelligibility . . . ”³¹ 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 intuitively 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]³² 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.³³

³⁰ “. . . .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.

³¹ 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 .

³² Stanley Fish, *How to Write a Sentence and How to Read One* (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2011) 51.

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

Appendix I
An overview of the Missal
© 2015
Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

Personal Notes strongly disagrees with the above abusive run-on sentence grammar but agrees with the substance and offers paraphrasing, which *ratio translationis* legitimates in another place.³⁴ 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.

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.”³⁵ 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

<http://www.bible-researcher.com/ratio.translationis2.pdf> for pages 40 (accessed March 31, 2012).

³⁴ . . . 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.

³⁵ When it may be deemed appropriate by the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, a text will be prepared after consultation with Bishops, called a “*ratio translationis*”, to be set forth by the authority of the same Dicastery, in which the principles of translation found in this Instruction will be applied in closer detail to a given language. This document may be composed of various elements as the situation may require, such as, for example, a list of vernacular words to be equated with their Latin counterparts, the setting forth of principles applicable specifically to a given language, and so forth. <http://catholicsensibility.wordpress.com/2011/07/24/> (accessed April 1, 2012) 9.

Appendix I
An overview of the Missal
© 2015
Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

exceptions from what is capitalized in Latin is new (as of July 1, 2012) to Personal Notes. *Ratio translationis* lists Terms for Capitalization,³⁶ 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.³⁷ Flowerday comments,³⁸

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

³⁶ 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).

³⁷ 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.

³⁸ <http://catholicsensibility.wordpress.com/2011/08/20/liturgiam-authenticam-32-33/> (accessed March 31, 2012).

Appendix I
An overview of the Missal
© 2015
Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

Committee]³⁹ 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**.⁴⁰

The Papacy mocks the venerable Chicago Manual of Style.⁴¹ 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.⁴² 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.⁴³

³⁹ <http://www.blogger.com/profile/17013903890674545477> (accessed March 31, 2012).

⁴⁰ <http://www.clerus.org/bibliaclerusonline/en/> (accessed April 1, 2012). Go to pagina 461 #56 .

⁴¹ 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. .

⁴² <http://www.worldcat.org/title/chicago-manual-of-style/oclc/51553085/editions?editionsView=true&referer=br> (accessed April 1, 2012).

Appendix I
An overview of the Missal
© 2015
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 . . . ”⁴⁴ except the Italian Latin. Personal Notes, therefore, is not able to compare English with Latin colometry.

The illiterate 2011 Missal is a model for lack of academic integrity. Personal Notes only examines **Collects**, **Prayers after Communion**, and the 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 a week before Personal Notes are presented to <http://www.jamesriverjournal.net/>. That ended about 2013. 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.

⁴³ 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).

⁴⁴ 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
© 2015
Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

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

Misuse of interjections, such as **O**, 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.⁴⁵ One priest has found a solution.

Father Jim Blue writes, “I find that all the ‘**O**’s’ can be dropped easily, as well as all the instances of ‘*we pray*’ But those are merely cosmetic improvements that can’t conceal the ugliness of the whole.”⁴⁶ 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,⁴⁷

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

⁴⁵ H. Ramsey Fowler and Jane E. Aaron, Eleventh Edition: The Little, Brown Handbook (New York: Longman, 2010) 233, 431, 893.

⁴⁶ 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).

⁴⁷ 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
© 2015
Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

presumably be rewritten to avoid such direct language as “give us this day,” “forgive,” “lead us not,” and “deliver us.”

The problem is whether Church politics determines truth or truth determines Church politics. Ramsey offers insight.⁴⁸

. . . Modernity, so thoroughly characterized by the rise of the nation-state and the privatization and marginalization of “religion,” can be identified as the decadent form of Christendom, rather than its replacement: for the post-Constantinian church, Modernity is the logical outcome of the failure of the church to remain singularly faithful to the God who saves them, the result of the church’s tense devotion to two powers [the empire of Constantine and the nation-states of Modern Times].

Faithfulness to God means Faithfulness to truth, rather than politics, in particular the politics of prioritizing (1) the welfare of the institutional Church over the welfare of the victims of clerical sexual abuse and (2) the Latin language of the institutional Church over standard American English in the United States.

In a word, Faithfulness means devotion to truth rather than politics. The Protestant Revolt tracked the problem to Ezekiel (deported to Babylon in 598 BC).⁴⁹ Protestants concluded, “It was principally their hatred of the truth that evoked the wrath of God,” sending Juda into captivity and exile.⁵⁰ Obfuscating the truth with incomprehensible language is one sign of hating truth in this Twenty-first Century.

Dallen points out that none of the heads of the Congregation of Divine Worship (CDW) were fluent in English.⁵¹ I am not sure what Dallen means by *fluent*. When I

⁴⁸ John David Ramsey, [A Precarious Faith: The Tri-une Dynamic of the Christian Life](#) (Ph.D. Dissertation, Duke University, 2002) 50-51.

⁴⁹ <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/05737b.htm> (accessed June 26, 2012).

⁵⁰ n.a., “Overview,” for Ezekiel 25:1—27:36 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) 138.

⁵¹ James Dallen, “What Kind of Ecclesiology?” <http://misguidedmissal.com/wp/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/Translation-Ecclesiology-Jim-Dallen-3-6-2012.pdf> (accessed March 11, 2012), page 11-12/36.

Appendix II
Specific Comments for this Sunday
© 2015
Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

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;⁵² *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.”⁵³

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.”

The Latin does not capitalize *legis* in the Collect and *sacraméntis*, but the Missal does follow the rules and capitalize *Law* and *Sacrament*.⁵⁴ Since the Faithful will not hear the difference between an upper and lower case word, there is no reason to make up inconsistent rules, 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.

In the Collect, there is a problem with *manner of our life* that translates the Latin *móribus*. The sense is *customs*.⁵⁵ The Latin is plural; the English singular, *our life* versus *our lives*. *Lives*, rather than *life* would be standard American English.

Dallen comments,⁵⁶

⁵² <http://unabridged.merriam-webster.com/cgi-bin/unabridged?va=might&x=15&y=10> (accessed January 29, 2011).

⁵³ H. Ramsey Fowler and Jane E. Aaron, Eleventh Edition: The Little, Brown Handbook (New York: Longman, 2010) 274.

⁵⁴ 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 June 24, 2012).

⁵⁵ D. P. Simpson, M.A., Cassell's Latin Dictionary: Latin-English English-Latin, (Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Publishing, Inc., (fifth edition) 1968) 380.

Appendix II
Specific Comments for this Sunday
© 2015
Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

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

The Little, Brown Handbook has some pertinent advice, for the illiterate 2011 Roman Missal.⁵⁷

. . . 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.

Readability

The first sentence of the **Collect** contains thirty-four words, in a 13.0 College Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level Readability. The Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level Readability

⁵⁶ 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.

⁵⁷ H. Ramsey Fowler and Jane E. Aaron, Eleventh Edition: The Little, Brown Handbook (New York: Longman, 2010) 856.

Appendix II

Specific Comments for this Sunday

© 2015

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

indicates the number of formal school years it takes to understand the material. The first sentence of the **Collect** is a fused sentence.⁵⁸

My version of Microsoft Word 2010 Spelling & Grammar checker provides the Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level Readability.⁵⁹ 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,"⁶⁰ from sophomore high school to graduate school college.

According to the U.S. Department of Education, in 2009, thirty-three percent of Fourth graders read below basic achievement levels; twenty-five percent of Eighth Graders fall below. In 2013, it was thirty-two percent for Fourth Graders, twenty-two percent for Eighth Graders.⁶¹ Little change.

The Department of Education breaks down the statistics by dividing 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.⁶²

⁵⁸ 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.

⁵⁹ For a description of readability levels, go to http://www.online-utility.org/english/readability_test_and_improve.jsp (accessed March 11, 2012).

⁶⁰ 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.

⁶¹ 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).

⁶² 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

Appendix II

Specific Comments for this Sunday

© 2015

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

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

The first sentence of this **Prayer after Communion** contains thirty-one words, in a 13.2 College Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level Readability. It is a fused sentence. The revised **Prayer after Communion** has a 5.6 Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level Readability.

The second sentence of the **Collect** has twenty-seven words with a 9.7 Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level Readability. That is reading at the sophomore high school level. The Little, Brown Handbook has a section, "Writing Concisely" that is helpful for the wordiness here.⁶³

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 four, rather than two, sentences. The revised **Collect** has a 4.2 Flesch-Kincaid Elementary Grade Level Readability.

Non-American English, such as Scottish or British, can appear illiterate to Americans in the United States.⁶⁴ That is why oral prayers in anything other than

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.

⁶³ 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.

⁶⁴ 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

Appendix II
Specific Comments for this Sunday
© 2015
Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

standard American English are irrelevant, in the United States. An exception to this may be African American Language (AAL),⁶⁵ 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.⁶⁶ 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. The second conclusion is that the Church is actively sabotaging any attempt to learn standard American English, just as it is sabotaging Vatican II.

The respective ICEL **Collect** and **Prayer after Communion** have 8.3, and 9.2 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.⁶⁷

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.⁶⁸

the Highlands (New York: Pocket Books, 2000); Christina Dodd, Stephanie Laurens, Julia Quinn, and Karen Ranney, Scottish Brides (New York: Avon Books, 1999).

⁶⁵ Geneva Smitherman, Word from the Mother: Language and African Americans (New York: Routledge, 2006) 3.

⁶⁶ <http://www.commonwealmagazine.org/it-doesn%E2%80%99t-sing> (February 26, 2012).

⁶⁷ 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.

Appendix II

Specific Comments for this Sunday

© 2015

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

An appositive is usually a noun that renames another noun nearby [in this case *Jesus Christ*], most often the noun just before the appositive. (the word *appositive* derives from a Latin word that means “placed near to” or “applied to.”) [sic] 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,⁶⁹

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>” *Unity* is a noun meaning “1a: the quality of stage of being or consisting of one.” Does *the unity* mean that the

⁶⁸ H. Ramsey Fowler and Jane E. Aaron, Eleventh Edition: The Little, Brown Handbook (New York: Longman, 2010) 254-255.

⁶⁹ 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).

Appendix II

Specific Comments for this Sunday

© 2015

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

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.

Liturgiam authenticam directs,⁷⁰

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.

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.⁷¹

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.”⁷²

⁷⁰ <http://catholicsensibility.wordpress.com/2011/08/20/liturgiam-authenticam-32-33/> (accessed March 31, 2012).

⁷¹ <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).

⁷² 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 II
Specific Comments for this Sunday
© 2015
Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

Dallen 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.⁷³

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.

⁷³ 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

1340 Missal: Twenty-fifth Sunday in Ordinary Time A Catholic Bible Study (120923)

© 2012

Raymond J. Jirran, Ph.D.

God, to love you and to love all of our neighbors, accounts for the whole law. Help us now follow the Law. Using the Law, help us gain eternal life with you. 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.

As we receive Holy Communion, raise us up and renew us, Lord. Help us to grasp and transform the mystery of your life into our lives, so that we may enjoy your holy redemption. We pray through Christ our Lord.