

What I want to first focus on is the problem: **the need for translations and why translations are so problematic**, so much so that no matter what would be produced, there would be critics. That's because it's very complex; in a sense it's unwinnable, but we have to try our best.

The first issue is: **Can the gospel of Jesus Christ be expressed in the words of what we call ordinary language?** Ordinary language means what ordinary people speak on the street, in their homes, and so on. **Probably not**—probably the gospel of Jesus Christ cannot really be expressed in ordinary language, the language we learn outside of the Church, just in culture in general.

Now culture itself can be influenced by religion, so you could have a religious culture, but we don't happen to live within one. **We live in a very secular culture.** Prior to the growth of secularism our culture actually was very Protestant. We have to keep that in mind also. So as Catholics doing liturgy, transferring the Catholic Faith, **we have always had a problem in this country** in a way that perhaps people did not have in Italy. So that's another layer of complexity that we have to keep in mind.

Furthermore, **if we are going to understand anything about the Scriptures, we have to have some kind of spirituality.** I have met innumerable people and I have read innumerable witnesses of people who after having entered into the study of Yoga, all of a sudden something clicks and they say, "Oh, this is what Christianity was about, which I have left." And then they may return to Christianity now able to understand it because of their practice of Yoga. Why? Well, Yoga offers a certain set of concepts, a certain set of ideas that are spiritual in nature. The same is true of even Buddhism. I have known Buddhists who have returned to Catholicism because once they started practicing some spirituality, all of a sudden they realize what they left, but didn't realize it before. So this is **the idea of providing a conceptual framework to think about what is not really visible in our culture;** because it's materialistic, everything is about what is visible. So we have to **provide a way of talking that is different from ordinary language in our culture.**

Even then we run into all kinds of problems, especially with **the mysteries**, that is, the truths of our faith that can't really be expressed easily in words or actually cannot really ever be completely expressed in any kind of word, in any kind of expression, in any kind of concept. They **always go beyond words and beyond concepts.**

Now St. Thomas says there are two of these primarily. First it is **the teaching on the divine Trinity.** Aquinas calls this the "necessary mystery." Why? Well, because God is triune and that's necessarily so. God must be. **God is the only necessary being.** So people say, "Well, where did God come from?" Well, God didn't come from anywhere because God must be. This is not something that is very logical. It's something that goes beyond logic. That's why we can't keep going back farther and farther back behind the Big Bang. No, you can't go behind the Big Bang. The Big Bang is the end of time or the

beginning of time, however you want to look at it. God is outside of that. This is so beautifully put in the Prologue of John's Gospel. "In the beginning was the Word, the Word was with God, the Word was God. Nothing came to be apart from the Word." That is our faith. St. Paul says, "We live and move and have our being in God." **Without God there is nothing. This God is triune.**

Now according to the definition of the Council of Trent: **one God subsists in three divine persons, *personas* in Latin.** We translate *personas* as "person." That really is not a good translation; in fact, it's a poor translation. Why? Because the word "person" has a meaning in English and it isn't the same meaning as *persona* in Latin. It's what the language scholars call a "false friend." A false friend in language means a word that looks like, but isn't the same. When I was in Austria recently with my sister, we ran into what was called *der Moor*, the moor. There was no moor in a Scottish sense. It was a marsh. The German word *Moor* means "bog" or "marsh"; it doesn't mean moor. There are a lot of words like this. *Persona* is one of them.

Now when the word *persona* was used to define God, translating the Greek word, *hypostasis*, it didn't mean the modern word a "person." That wasn't in use at the time. ***Persona* meant "mask."** In the Greek dramas the actors wore a mask. In fact, you could have the same actor play two or three different roles; they just had two or three different masks. In Greek drama the point wasn't that the actor was a really good actor. **The actor disappeared behind the mask and projected through it, and that's the original idea of *persona* in the idea of God.**

Now modern people say, "Oh that doctrine of the Trinity"—my dad used to say this; he would say, "I don't know why you keep talking about that Trinity; it doesn't make any sense. How can you have three persons in one God?" Well, **the problem is he is thinking of person in the modern sense of some one with a will, an identity, a mind.** Well, the three persons in God don't all have their own identities, their wills and their minds. There is only one will in God. There is one mind in God. **There is one divine identity, not three.** So the word is inappropriate, but we are stuck with it, more or less. I haven't heard anyone decide to change it. But that's the problem with translating. Now if someone did change it, a hullabaloo would break loose. People would say, "You are changing the doctrine of the Church." Well, actually people don't even know what the doctrine of the Church is because they can't understand it. **So the idea of *persona* is then that God, one divine being, speaks through different masks. And then we try to understand how this all happens in unity because there is only one God.** So that's one example.

Another example—Chaucer. During the Middle English period Geoffrey Chaucer wrote a hymn to the Blessed Mother. It began: "O holy Wench." Well, today you would never use the word "wench" for the Blessed Mother or for any decent woman. It just isn't the way it is. **Words change. And because words change we have to change translations.**

Third example—from Greek. In biblical Greek, which is called "koine," and koine Greek just means common Greek, Jesus' words are expressed this way. One of his

fundamental messages is a message for change. And the word used in Greek for change is *metanoia*. You have probably heard that. It doesn't quite translate at all into English—***metanoia*: change of heart, change of mind, change of viewpoint.** But what people don't realize is it doesn't translate into Greek either, not **Modern Greek**. The word still exists pronounced "*metanya*." But it doesn't mean change. It doesn't mean conversion. It doesn't mean repentance. **It means "prostration."** Now in the Greek Church the koine Greek of the New Testament is still proclaimed. That's what they use. But they pronounce it modern Greek; they don't use ancient pronunciations; they use modern—but a modern Greek person listening to the word now for prostration could never understand, unless somebody explained this, what Jesus is talking about. "Prostrate yourself and believe." What do you mean, prostrate yourself and believe? It doesn't make any sense. **Words change. This is the problem.**

The solution to this is this new missal, which in many ways is successful, but not necessarily in all ways.

Now the principle of translating that is now at the fore is expressed in the document called *Liturgiam Authenticam*, and I will just read you three paragraphs.

"The Latin liturgical text of the Roman Rite, while drawing on the centuries of ecclesial experience in transmitting the faith of the Church received from the Fathers, are themselves the fruit of the liturgical renewal, just recently brought forth. In order that so great a patrimony of riches may be persevered and passed on through the centuries, it is to be kept in mind from the beginning that the translation of the liturgical texts of the Roman Liturgy is not so much a work of creative innovation as it is of rendering the original texts faithfully and accurately into the vernacular language. While it is permissible to arrange the wording, the syntax and the style in such a way as to prepare a flowing vernacular text suitable to the rhythm of popular prayer, **the original text, insofar as possible, must be translated integrally and in the most exact manner, without omissions or additions in terms of their content,**"—in terms of their content—"and without paraphrases or glosses. Any adaptation to the characteristics or the nature of the various vernacular languages is to be sober and discreet." **So this translation is sober and discrete.**¹

Now of course there are adaptations. When we begin the greeting of the priest: *Dominus vobiscum*, in the Latin there is no verb. Well, in English you can't have a sentence without a verb; in Latin you can. So, of course, the verb "be" was supplied, plus the article "the." "The Lord be with you," not just Lord with you, but that's the Latin. So there were obviously additions, **but not to the content theologically speaking.** Okay, that's what that meant.

Now if you really want to read something, I recommend this: *The Magnificat Roman Missal Companion*. This is little. It's good. It's concise. It has a lot of good points, so I recommend it.

I believe that someone gave you a card. So I would like to go over the actual parts—not all of them—but I would like to go over some of the parts which we will be using.

Now, first of all, as I mentioned, “The Lord be with you,” now the response is “And with your spirit.” Now that’s literally what it says. *Et cum spiritu tuo*. Now the translation of the last forty years, “And also with you” is not wrong. It means the same thing. There is no change in meaning. However, what people pointed out was English was the only language that translated it that way; everyone else said, “And with your spirit.” And so in the idea of being more or less in harmony with other languages, the translation goes back to the original.

Now I don’t think that it is too necessary to go through the beginning of the Mass, the so-called “**Penitential Acts**.” But I will point out this: if people believe that this translation is a great victory for traditionalists and conservatives, that’s not true. **The traditionalists wanted to eliminate all options.** That was their wish, so that when you start the Mass there was only one act of penance, and when you have prayers, there is only one choice for that day; and when you come to Eucharistic Prayer, there is only one Eucharistic Prayer. Well, now there are ten. **So it is not a victory for traditionalism.** But some people may think in some regard it is.

But if you turn now to the **Gloria**, you see “Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace to people of good will.” This is a more accurate translation and it might be a great improvement. What did it say before? The expression was “God’s people.” Yep, “God’s people on earth.” But the problem with “God’s people,” who are God’s people? What does Vatican II say “God’s people” are? Who are the people of God? The baptized believers—the baptized believers are the people of God. Everyone is invited to become the people of God, but they are not a people until they have accepted Baptism. That’s what we say. That’s our belief. So the Gloria in the old translation, by “old” I mean the one we have been using, was “Peace to all God’s people,” Peace to all the baptized faithful. But this says, no, **peace to all people of good will. It’s much more general**, and it corresponds to—what? Where does this come from? It comes from **Luke**. It comes from the story of Christmas, **the birth of Christ**, the angels’ address, **the angels’ proclamation**. In this we will find that **the new translation tries to copy more exactly allusions to Scripture**. Recently someone came running to me and said, “Did you know that that prayer, “Lord I am not worthy,” that comes from the story of the centurion? I said, yeah, I knew that.

Now furthermore, as you come down you see that there is a restoration of the original idea of a litany; it’s **a litany of praise**. So “We praise you, we bless you, we adore you, we glorify you, we give you thanks for your great glory.” **So that’s a restoration**. In the other one it said, “Lord God, heavenly king, almighty God and Father, we worship you, we give you thanks, we praise you for your glory” all in one sentence. So it’s a stylistic thing. Does anyone want to ask any questions about the Gloria?

Question: assuming there are changes being made in every language across the world?

Eventually, that’s true—assuming there’s a change in all languages. Well, **all missals are to be translated**. How many are finished, I don’t know.

Question: if there is a change in the Gloria when sung?

Yes, but when it is sung, you won't even notice the difference, at least I didn't. We have already used it. I don't know if you noticed. **We have been using the new Gloria.**

Question: if blessing people of good will, we are not blessing the people who have bad will—shouldn't we be praying for our enemies? Why shouldn't we be praying for peace for everybody?

That's a very good idea, but this is reflecting the angels' clarion call at the birth of Christ, that **God is sending peace to all people of good will.** What to do about enemies: **are we supposed to pray for our enemies? Yes.** Can those who are hostile to God have peace? No, they really can't have peace until they convert. And this is not just an idea of our enemies, but it's God's friends or God's enemies. And so our own personal relationships are a little bit secondary. Your thought is right. **We have to pray for our enemies. But can they have peace? No, not until they accept God. God is the only true source of peace.** Now it may seem they have peace; in their own minds they may not be disturbed because they are so used to what they are doing, but that's not true peace. **Shalom is a gift from God,** and it only goes to those who accept it as a gift. It does not go to those who are set on their own way, on their own will, and their own purpose in life.

Question: about before it read "take away the sin of the world," but now they have pluralized it. Why?

Well, first of all, in the Latin it is plural, *peccata*; so now is that better or which is better? I remember my mother saying she liked it better in the singular. The problem is some might say, "Well, the sin of the world, what is that? Some sort of vague abstraction. Whereas the sins of the world means everything, **all sins against God: personal, public, everything. This refers to all sin, not just original sin.**

Question: about the English translation and if other languages were to be translated throughout the world?

One criticism was that there was only one for all the English speaking world. English is not spoken the same everywhere. According to Microsoft, they have eighteen different English softwares for English depending upon where you come from. But that adaptation, if it ever does come, and it may, but it won't come until after this one. I think they wanted one objective framework, and then **if they make adaptations**—and I will bet you the first adaptations will be permitted in Ireland because Ireland is basically a Christian country; it's a Catholic culture. So I think Rome would be much more trusting in letting the Irish make adaptations than they would the Americans or the Indians or anyone else.

Question: about acceptance by bishops in Ireland?

Our bishop in Joliet voted against this; until the bitter end he voted against this because he thought it was too sober, too formal. He thought it should be more informal. But now he is saying **we have it; we are going to go with it and do our best; we adapt, see, we adapt.**

Now we go on to the **Creed**. You notice the first thing is we have been saying, “We believe,” and now it’s “I believe.” Well, technically *Credo* means “I.” So is there a difference in meaning? Not really because **it is a communal faith**. In fact, that’s a distinguishing characteristic of Catholicism, that Catholicism is pre-modern, that is, with a focus on the community. Protestantism is not. Protestantism is modern. The modern era begins with the Reformation and the Enlightenment with the emphasis on the individual. **In extreme Protestantism**, by which I mean what they call the Free Church—that’s if you want to say extreme left, but not left in a political sense; it means extreme individual—**there are no creeds**. In fundamentalism there are no creeds. They are not possible because according to fundamentalism, the Bible explains itself and no creed is necessary.

Well, the Catholic Church doesn’t believe that. It does not believe that the words of the Bible explain themselves nor do the words of the Mass explain themselves. They have to be mediated—that’s what the Church is for. **The community mediates, not only this community here and now but through time the same Church. There is only one Church. And that’s what we call “Tradition.”** Tradition is **the Church through time, moving through time**. That’s why I mentioned **the Fathers. They are the beginning of the reflection on: what is the meaning of the gospel; how do we put it into language?** And to maintain that and to transmit it through time, that’s what we call “Tradition.”

Now the Protestants say we don’t need tradition because the words explain themselves. The most extreme form of this is the fundamentalists who condemn the idea of a creed. Now the traditional Protestants like Lutherans and Calvinists, they didn’t think a creed was really needed, but it wasn’t bad either, so they could take to or leave it. Calvin said, well, you could either have the whole Church have a creed, you could do that, and he didn’t mind the *Chalcedonian Creed*, the *Nicene Creed*; he accepted it. Or he said you could just have a certain group formulate a creed, and that group eventually became to be called the Presbyterians. The first group was called Episcopalian, that is, they have bishops and they gather together and they decide. The other group where you have connections among other churches but more or less lay leadership were called Presbyterians. Or he said you could have just an individual community, and they were called Congregationalists, and they could have a creed. But the fundamentalists said, no, you can’t have any creed—not a Congregational creed, not a Presbyterian creed, not an Episcopal creed, no creed. Why? Because the word of God cannot be added to at all and it explains itself, so it’s an extreme point of view. And the Baptists, although they are more ancient than the fundamentalists, basically agree, too, that the individual is the authority on what faith is about.

That is not our belief. **Our belief is the community has the authority to determine what the belief is about, what faith is about.** And the idea was that the *katholika* were those **communities that early on communicated with each other and developed a singular belief**, a unique belief, which then they called the “Catholic Faith.” It is the same faith in the Greek Orthodox Church, the Russian Orthodox Church—it’s the same faith. That’s why if you have a Greek Orthodox or Russian Orthodox person that said they want to join the Church, well, there is actually nothing to join because they are

already part of the Church; their faith is the same. **There are no rites to bring in the Orthodox. They are one in faith already.**

Now with Protestants many of them do follow the Creed; however, they interpret it very differently, so then **they have to renounce any alternate, false, or contrary interpretations and accept the one of the community through tradition, through time.** So that's the origin of the Creed. That's why we have it and why we say it.

Now the Creed is not really a product of Western thought. **The Creed is a product of Eastern thought** because in the early Church it was the Greeks that were really interested in thinking. It's hard to believe this, but I mean it's true. The westerners didn't care about thinking. They didn't care about thought or philosophy. The easterners, they **wanted to talk about the gospel in such a way the philosophers would be attracted** and know that there was something here that was on the level of philosophy that was worthy of their reflection. That's how **the eastern Fathers originally developed ideas. But then that created all kinds of controversies, which the councils were an answer to.**

Now mind you, most of the councils met not because the bishops thought they should meet in a council, but because the emperor forced them to meet. Why? Because **the emperor tried to use the Church to solidify the unity of his empire**—unfortunately. This has caused a lot of mischief in the history of the Church. And it really probably created many of the heresies. **People wanted to say something in a way contrary to the Greeks** because they didn't like the Greeks. So we have the Arian heresy in Egypt just to be contrary, just so the Greeks would not have the last word. And then we have the Monophysite heresy. Why? Well, they didn't like the Greeks. That was the fundamental motivation. It was only John Paul II who eventually said, oh, you know, a lot of this isn't really heresy at all; it's a misunderstanding. Now no pope had ever said that before! But then the popes really didn't care too much about the content of these, but more about the form. They accepted the form of the Creed and said, yeah, that goes along with what we believe.

But the Roman Church's attitude was we don't really need councils because, after all, Peter and Paul died here. We know what they taught. We know what we believe, so go have your council. **Western bishops didn't go to them.** They are called "ecumenical councils"—Western bishops didn't go there! A few emissaries from Rome went to those councils. It wasn't considered important in the West. So in the West a more traditional Creed was used: we call the *Apostles' Creed*. And in the new rite that is permitted all the time. Now our bishops didn't really like that, so back in the 70's they said only use that for children. But now it says in the text **it may be used all the time for everybody. Why? It's the preference of the Roman Church for a baptismal creed.**

Now there was a little problem that happened because **in Spain there was a provincial council that added a word to the Nicene Creed.** "I believe in the Holy Spirit who proceeds from the Father," and they added "**and the Son,**" *Filioque in Latin*. And that's not in the original, and the Greeks to this day are angry about that. And when John Paul would say the *Creed* in the presence of Easterners he would drop *Filioque*. But for

some odd reason it's still in there. It doesn't matter theologically. Everyone agrees theologically it's correct; it's in the gospel. **But the Greeks' attitude is, but we didn't authorize this in our council.**

Question: if there are other changes in the Bible?

No changes from the Bible, change only in this liturgy. That's what we are talking about. The Church has issued a new *Vulgate*, you know, a revised *Latin Vulgate*, which is the, quote, "the official" Bible of the Western Church. But in every country the bishops have their own Bibles. In this country it's called *The New American Bible*. In Canada it's *The New Revised Standard Version*, and so on. **There is more than one Bible translation.**

Question: about the Creeds?

The *Apostles' Creed* is older, yes. **The Nicene answers certain controversies**, which we will go through right now, if you want to. Shall we go through the Creed now?

"I believe in one God, the Father almighty, maker of heaven and earth, of all things visible and invisible." What did we used to say? "Seen and unseen"—now you might say, well, there is hardly any difference. I would admit there is not too much difference. Visible and invisible, of course, are more Latin—they sound more Latin; they are from Latin. Seen and unseen is not, but then someone pointed out that **unseen is not exactly the same as invisible** because the members of your family who are not here are unseen, but they are not invisible. So **this wanted to affirm that God is the creator of everything.** That was a controversy. Who? The Gnostics—the Gnostics said that God, the Father of Jesus, was the creator of all spiritual being but not material being. The material being was created by an evil demiurge and that therefore there is no unity in creation. So this was meant to contradict the Gnostic idea. So you have to kind of know why they said it in the first place. **They are answering some controversy.**

"I believe in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Only Begotten Son of God," and we used to say the only Son of God." Well, "Only Begotten"—what does it mean to beget? This is entering into the mystery of the Trinity. It's hard to say, but if you think about yourself and thinking about something, understanding something, you beget an understanding. That is the idea of the Logos, the Word. **The Word of God is God's understanding of God begotten and expressed.** To say "only Son of God," no, the whole idea is we are all called to be children of God. **We are all God's children and sons and daughters.** So "only Son of God," well, not really—"Only Begotten"—yes, when the word "begotten" means that God begets an understanding of himself, and Jesus as the incarnate Word of God is the only one who is really divine in that way.

It says "born of the Father before all ages"—"born of the Father before all ages." The word in Greek *yingethen* could mean "born" or "begotten," so this could be translated "begotten," but here it's "born." When Jesus says to Nicodemus, "Unless you be born again," you could translate that "begotten again" or "born from above" or "begotten from above," *another*—it's a play on words. *Another* means both "from above" and "again."

And “born,” *yingethen*, is both “born” and “begotten.” “. . . of the Father before all ages. God from God, Light from Light, true God from true God, begotten, not made, consubstantial with the Father.”

Now that’s the question you brought up. Before it said, “one in being with the Father.” Well, one in being is not wrong if you understand “being” in a metaphysical sense, but people don’t. Being, if you go back to John’s Gospel, the Prologue: “nothing came to be apart from God.” But God is in the beginning; only God is in the beginning; only God is necessarily and eternally and ever shall be. Everything else comes into being through participating in God. So really, as any mystic will tell you, everything is one in being with God—everything. **The entire universe is one in being.** So to say “one in being” is not wrong; it’s just not enough. **“Consubstantial” says that it’s the same being. Jesus, the Word, is the same being as is God, the same identity as God.**

Now is that a good word? No, but we could blame the English for that. The British wanted this word. Is there another way of saying it? Same in being with the Father, co-eternal with the Father. There are other ways of saying it, but they said, no way, we are keeping this, and so the Americans said, oh well, we are not going to fight over that.

“. . . through him all things were made. For us men and for our salvation he came down from heaven,”—we would rather not see “men” there—“and by the Holy Spirit was incarnate of the Virgin Mary.” Before it was “born of the Virgin Mary.” Now it’s “incarnate.” Well, to say that Mary was the mother of Jesus is not an article of faith; it’s simply a fact of history. **Every person born is born by some mother**, so that’s not a real article of faith. **What the article of faith is, is that within her womb the Word of God became incarnate.** That’s the article of faith. And in this **we have to distinguish between the virginity of Mary and the Incarnation of Christ.**

First of all, when you take any child, the child receives the physical part from the parents. We see this. We see they look like the parents. They act like the parents. There are all kinds of characteristics. We call the pattern “DNA.” But the soul is not from the parents. **No individual soul is from the parents.** How does this take place? No one knows. But as Pope John Paul pointed out we can believe in evolution as long as we believe **somehow God intervenes in the creation of human life, so that the human life is really the image of God and not simply a product of chance.** How is it done? We don’t know how it’s done, but that’s our belief.

God could have become incarnate in a child born in a natural manner with a mother and a father. That is not beyond God’s power. Also God could supernaturally cause a child to be born of a virgin where that child would not necessarily be divine. So they are not all equivalent. So when you say in the old way, “by the power of the Holy Spirit he was born of the Virgin Mary,” that puts the emphasis on the virginity of Mary. **This puts the emphasis on the Incarnation, the Holy Spirit’s incarnating the Word in the womb of the Virgin Mary.**

“. . . and became man. For our sake he was crucified under Pontius Pilate, he suffered death.” In the old translation, “he suffered, died, and was buried.” Here “he suffered

death and was buried.” Not perhaps a big difference, but the idea is primarily what Jesus suffered was death. And you see **death in the Scripture is punishment for Adam’s sin** for not trusting God, for rebelling against God, for not wanting to live with God—that leads to death. “The wages of sin is death.” But **Jesus suffered that death willingly**, and we will see also later on in the consecration prayer it is a willing thing. So it isn’t just he suffered and died, but he suffered death.

Question: about in the *Apostles’ Creed* it says he descended into hell; why is that not said here?

Well, because it wasn’t being disputed. This Creed answered disputes, specific disputes. Descended into hell refers to the idea **when Jesus died he went to what was called the limbo *patrum*, not the limbo *puerorum***, which was a theological fiction of Augustine where infants who were not baptized went. Limbo, the original idea of limbo is *Sheol* in Hebrew. It means the “pit” literally. “Limbo” literally means “vestibule.” But it comes from Hebrew, the pit. The idea is that everyone descended into the shades, into the pit of the earth, when they died. Heaven was not available. There was no life in heaven except with God. **Jesus made life in heaven with God possible**. And he not only made it possible for the people who were living at that time and after him, but even for those before. So that’s why *Lumen Gentium* says God has willed the salvation of all people and has provided for it since the time of Adam. Well, how did he save all the people before the time of Adam? He descended into *Hades*, he descended into *Sheol*, and he brought them up.

Question: about he also suffered the consequences of hell?

I think partially that’s true insofar as **he suffered even despair**, if you want to call it that. “My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?” But the trouble with “hell” is in terms of—*Sheol* is not just hell; it’s everything; **it’s all the dead**. Even in hell don’t you remember the story of Lazarus, I mean the beggar. He went to the bosom of Abraham, but then that rich man did not. That rich man was suffering torment. Why? Well, because of the way he lived. Remember the word: he said, “There is a chasm separating us from you. We cannot enter. We cannot cross over. You cannot cross over.” So that’s the idea. **Did Jesus suffer the torment of hell?** I don’t know because according to most theologians—and I know where that is coming from. But **most theologians think that the real hell is this utter hatred of God, and I can’t believe Jesus experienced hatred of God**. It doesn’t make sense to me. **But in terms of all the other possible forms of suffering, loss of hope, and all that, yes.**

“. . . and rose again of the third day in accordance with the Scriptures. He ascended into heaven and is seated at the right hand of the Father.”—no change there. We come down below then and it says, “I confess one Baptism,” instead of “We acknowledge one Baptism.” Well, confessing is more forceful. **When I confess something I am saying I believe it; acknowledging is more passive, so “confessing” is a more active word.** “. . . and I look forward to the resurrection of the dead,” not simply “look for,” but “look forward to.” So the idea is that **Christians are really called on to anticipate joyfully the resurrection from the dead**. Any questions on this?

Question on the last line: “and the life of the world to come,” why do we say world?

The world to come? Because world is the universe. **The idea of the resurrection is that God is creating a new world, a new heaven and a new earth.**

We will finish the prayers where you are involved, and then go to the Eucharistic Prayer itself. Let’s go to the **Preface**, the Eucharistic Prayer of the Preface.

Priest: The Lord be with you.

People: And with your spirit.

Priest: Lift up your hearts.

People: We lift them up to the Lord.

Priest: Let us give thanks to the Lord our God.

People: It is right and just.

So this you can see is essentially equivalent, slightly different words. I think this is a little cleaner myself.

Now when we get to the **Sanctus**: “Holy, Holy, holy Lord God of hosts.” Now this is again the **reclaiming of biblical imagery**. In the Bible there are concrete images. Some people don’t like that. Some people, modern people, have been critical of the Bible saying the Bible is caught up in the mythological imagination, and that is really not something we should be proud of. But on the other hand, there is something to the human mind that wants concrete images. What does “Lord God of hosts” mean? The image is God surrounded by an army of angels, and so the idea is that we are not alone in our battle on earth. Yes, life is a battle; yes, there are all kinds of problems. But **we are not alone because God has got this whole army to fight with us and for us**. So that’s the image.

Now what the old one said was, “God of power and might.” Well, that’s abstract, not wrong. It was an abstract idea: power, might, and it’s ascribed to God. But here it’s the God who has all these helpers. So it’s a different image; it comes **from Isaiah**, if you remember. This is another allusion to Scripture. If you said, “Holy, holy, holy Lord, God of power and might,” you might miss the reference to Isaiah, but this clearly is from the image of Isaiah. “Heaven and earth are full of your glory.” Some would prefer “filled with your glory,” but that’s “full”—we are keeping. “Hosanna in the highest. Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord.” That’s the same.

Now we move to the Consecration. Now, you know, in Latin there are words that are ordinarily not translated. If this translation had been submitted to my professors, it would have gotten no better than a B! The reason is that **it translates words that are not supposed to be translated, like *enim* or *nam* or *igitur*. Those are just throw away words because Latin had no punctuation**. So in the Consecration Prayer that we have been using: “Take this all of you and eat it:”—colon—the colon was the word *enim* in Latin. But now they said, oh, no, you have to put it in; you have to put *enim* in there, account for it with something more than a punctuation. So now it’s “Take this all of you, and eat of it,” instead of “eat it,” “for this is my body.” So this is how it goes for the

bread. “Take this all of you, and eat of it”—this is all right—“for this is my body which will be given up of you.” That’s okay.

Now the cup is a little different. For one thing, they went with the word “**chalice.**” I’m not too happy about this. The word “chalice” means the same thing as cup, but it’s a fancy word. I don’t think we really need to be fancy. **The original was probably a glass cup, a Kiddush cup;** this was presumably a *Seder*. And so what they used at that time was something taller than this but made of glass, not this kind of clear plastic glass, but the other kind of glass which would have bubbles in it—you have seen bubble glass—about this tall but much more narrow. That’s what they used. They have found thousands of them in digs. So it was a cup.

Now what does the word “chalice” mean? *Calix* in Latin means “cup,” so why use the word “chalice”? Because it’s rooted in Latin. Now when we were translating in the seminary if we used a Latin word to translate a Latin word, you lost points. Our teachers said, “Use Anglo-Saxon words.” So, as I said, this would not get an A from my professors. This is how it reads.

And there is another change—this will maybe cause people problems. It says, “Take this, all of you, and drink from it, for this is the chalice of my blood, the blood of the new and eternal covenant.” It used to say “everlasting covenant.” Now that is not a bad change because “**eternal**” means “**of God.**” Only God is eternal. “**Everlasting**” means “**on and on and on and on.**” So eternal is better that way. “. . . which will be poured out,” as opposed to “shed.” “. . . which will be poured out”—well, “poured out” is the new translation, *effundetur*, but the old was “shed.” But “It will be shed”—the problem with “It will be shed” in the passive voice—“shed” is a transitive verb. I can shed my blood or I can shed your blood, but in the passive it doesn’t say. So it is “It will be shed,” well. “. . . which will be poured out” means **I am voluntarily giving it up.** So I think this is much better. Although I don’t like “chalice,” as I said.

“. . . for you and for many.” Now this people object to, but this is actually an **Aramaicism.** Presumably Jesus spoke Aramaic. In Aramaic you have a word for “one,” for “two, both,” like in English if you say “both,” you can only say that correctly if you are talking about two. You can’t say “both” of three—only “both” of two. Well, there is a word for “all,” but it’s only for “three.” So the other word is “many.” So it’s the Aramaic, and the Greek followed it—the Greek followed the Aramaic and the Latin followed the Greek. So now they say, well, we will follow it in English too. The only trouble is, of course, it may lead people to think that Jesus didn’t die for everybody, but that’s not what the Church teaches. **It’s just the idiom of this particular statement.** So that may be a problem.

Then it goes on to say, “for the forgiveness of sins,” where it used to say, “so that sins may be forgiven.” Now it says, “for the forgiveness of sins.” Okay. “Do this in memory of me.” Now that’s the same. Now what does that mean: “Do this is memory of me”? It means do this so that I will be remembered, so that people will remember and know me, which is the very idea of celebrating: make known. Celebration when it comes to liturgy does not mean have a party. It means to make celebrated, as you talk about a celebrity,

someone who is well-known. **Make known the mystery of faith; that's the idea of celebration.**

Now you do have the Proclamations there. So the first one: "We proclaim your Death, O Lord, and profess your Resurrection until you come again." Okay, that's the first one. **Again the emphasis is on what the community is agreeing to do in response to this great celebration**, this great covenant offered. So "We proclaim" and we "profess." The other one said, "Dying you destroyed our death, rising you restored our life"—more fact. Now this is our agreement; **our side of the covenant is to profess and proclaim.**

Now the next one is very similar to what it was before. "When we eat this Bread and drink this Cup, we proclaim your Death, O Lord, until you come again." Now they use the word "cup." Before they used the word "chalice."

Then the third one: "Save us, Savior of the world, for by your Cross and Resurrection, you have set us free." The other one said, "Lord, by your cross and resurrection you have set us free." So it puts it into the past; now it's **"Save us, Savior of the world." So I think it's a little better, more present.**

You notice "Christ has died" is gone. It was never in the missal in the first place. The American bishops added it. They were allowed to do that, but now they have been asked to take it out. Anyway, that was just a statement anyway.

Now we go to the Communion time. The Communion times goes: "Behold the Lamb of God, behold him who takes away the sins of the world. Blessed are those called to the supper of the Lamb," instead of "Happy are those called to his supper." No real change in meaning, just change in style. But now the next part is "Lord, I am not worthy that you should enter under my roof, but only say the word and my soul shall be healed." Again, this is obviously taken from the story of the centurion when he says, "Lord, I am not worthy to have you enter under my roof, but say the word and my servant will be healed." Here is my soul shall be healed. What is the idea of roof? It's really abode, my abode, and in a sense our bodies are our abodes; we live in our bodies. So we are saying, well, I am not worthy to have to come into my body, but it's saying it in a sort of metaphorical manner because we do take God into our bodies in the Eucharist. No, it's not a stretch. **We are actually taking in the body and blood of Christ.**

Comment that "under my roof" is literally from the Latin Mass.

And it is from the story in the Bible. "To receive you," you mean. It could have been "to receive you in my body," but then that's kind of clumsy. I mean, that is the idea, but, yeah, **it's going back to the biblical text to keep the allusions clear**, but it is rather awkward sounding. I don't see it as an improvement. It's like "chalice"; I don't see that as an improvement. I don't see it helping us understand something better.

Question: about how they make the transition from servant to soul because God can heal all of us.?

We believe that Eucharist is the source of all healing: body, mind, soul. It's true, it's not the best, but it is what the Latin said all along. See, that's the problem. They go back to that. That's how I started with that idea: don't take away from what it originally said. See, the whole idea is that some of the more conservative people, they look to the modern world and they say, "Oh, it's falling apart. Thank God we have the Latin language because it doesn't change because no one speaks it." And so in that way it is a faithful witness, where you can't trust even Greek. Now Greek has changed. So that's part of it, see. Unfortunately I think it is motivated by fear, and I don't think that's totally appropriate. You know, I sometimes wonder if some of the people who worry so much believe in the Holy Spirit. You know what I mean? On the other hand, I don't want to say that their worries aren't justified. Looking around, it would seem many people are losing out on the essence of the gospel.

Question: that isn't it the most important thing that our soul should be healed?

Well, **the soul is the principle of identity so that when you have a new body and a new mind it will be fine if your soul has been healed.** So that's probably why it got there. But it is right in saying we don't want to only stress that. When I was in seminary we had Salesians, and I remember having a discussion with one of the Salesians about that very idea of a soul. Cardinal Cardijn, who had been rather influential, I believe Dutch or Belgian cardinal, talking about preaching to the poor, he said he didn't like the idea of saving souls because he never saw one. That was his idea. But each one is correct; it's not like one is right and one is wrong.

Question: about what if the priest said "cup" instead of "chalice"?

Well, I don't want to say; I don't know. But I think this will be revised too, minor, not big, big. But I think there will be minor revisions and I think that could be one of them.

Question: about teaching these changes to children?

Well, all as I can say is there will be occasions to teach them. The children won't have different words there. The children's differences in the children's liturgy are associated with the readings and the Eucharistic Prayers, but not these prayers.

Question: if there will be a talk like this for teens?

I am perfectly willing to do one if they want it.

Question: about the elimination of the cup in some places?

I do know that at the Vatican Council one of the things the bishops all agreed on was to restore the cup, and they said because Christ said, "Take and drink of it." So if he says that, then you have to let them do that, and to eliminate it seems to be wrong. But then Joachim Jeremias says that in the early Church they hardly ever had wine because it was too expensive.

Question: about a bishop eliminating the cup from the congregation?

I am not sure whether the bishop actually has the right to do that. I mean, it's in the rite; it's permitted, so I don't know if the bishop could change that. I would think that if a priest totally avoided that or ignored that he would be justified. This is my understanding.

Before we are finished then I would like to proceed to the Eucharistic Prayers. Now **the Eucharistic Prayers are very different. There are ten of them, and they are all very different in style.** So the **First Eucharistic Prayer** is called the "Roman Canon." Now in Latin it is a very elegant sort of document. When Vatican II was meeting and they were discussing translating the Mass, there were many liturgists that said let's not even use this one because it's too Latin. But they did translate it, and they did it very beautifully. I always liked the translation we have been using. But this, **which is more accurate to the Latin, becomes rather difficult to read**, to be honest. So I don't imagine I will be reading it too often. Luckily we never have to use it. It's never required. But I will just point out to you a few things.

So when you begin it says, "To you, therefore." Well, that *igitur*, that is just a comma. I think it should have been dropped. "To you, therefore, most merciful Father, we make humble prayer." Now there are lots of humble prayers in this translation. ". . . and petition to Jesus Christ, your Son, our Lord: that you accept and bless these gifts, these offerings, these holy and unblemished sacrifices, which we offer you firstly." Well, the trouble with putting "firstly" in there, there's no "secondly." And then proceed—I am not going to read the whole thing to you.

There are often adjectives added, so when he takes the bread, he takes it in his "holy and venerable" hands, not just takes it, but he takes it in his "holy and venerable" hands. There is a lot of that what you call flowery language. So we see that.

Now at the end we always said, "Through him, with him, in him." Now this is "Through him, and with him, and in him." Why the *ands* are added, I have no idea. It seems like too much.

Now on the other hand, **the Second Eucharistic Prayer is in its original very simple**, so therefore it doesn't have flowery language because it wasn't there in the first place. **So the translation is simple because the original is simple.** Now the Second Eucharistic Prayer is really older than the First. It goes back to the time of Hippolytus, third century, before the time of Constantine. It wasn't considered good enough once the emperor became a Catholic. But it's easy; you hear it all the time. And you won't notice as many changes in that one because it is already in the beginning more simple. **So in some ways it's an improvement.** "At the time he was betrayed and entered willingly into his passion." I think that's a nice way to put it and it is what it actually says. So in some respects I think there are some nice improvements in the Second one.

This was criticized by some, but I don't think it's wrong. "Remember, Lord, your Church spread throughout the world, and bring her." **Now the Church is referred to as "her" in all these translations, which the Latin did.** And Cardinal George said, well, **the Church is a communion and a community and therefore personal and "it" sounds like it's an organization.** So it's always "her." ". . . and bring her to the fullness

of charity.” Now “charity” in Latin is *caritas*; it’s also in Greek *agape*. It means God’s unconditioned love, which we share with others through generosity and alms and so on. But some people say, well, people think charity is just what you give to the poor. But that’s not the meaning of it. So this is another opportunity to express what we really believe. So, “Remember, Lord, your Church, spread throughout the world, and bring her to the fullness of charity, together with Benedict our pope and Daniel our bishop” and so on.

Now in the Third Eucharistic Prayer, I do think it was a big improvement here. You know, in Malachi the prophet says there was a time coming when there will be a sacrifice offered to God from the rising of the sun to the setting of the sun. Now what does that mean, “rising of the sun to the setting of the sun”? All day long—all day long. Well, in the Eucharistic Prayer we have been reading it’s from the east to the west Well, it’s true the sun rises in the east and sets in the west, but that’s not the meaning. So **from the rising of the sun to the setting of the sun** means all day long, and because the earth is turning there is always day somewhere. So **it means all day long and forever and always.** So I think that’s an improvement.

Now, again, here is the turn of phrase; you will get used to it, but at first it sounds a little bit flowery. “Therefore, O Lord, we humbly implore you: by the same Spirit graciously make holy.” See, it’s a little bit more flowery.

On the next part they use the word: “oblation.” Now when we had the anniversary for Sister Madelyn, Father Jonathan used the *Preface for Religious*, and that used the word “oblation.” But ordinarily we didn’t use it. Now it’s back quite often actually. And do you know what it means? “Offering,” it means an offering. Let’s put it this way, if you were German, a German background, you have *oblata*, but they are really cookies. I don’t know if you ever have *Lebkuchen*? In *Lebkuchen* if you make the dough, you put it on something that looks like—well, it’s unleavened bread really. It’s a wafer. And they call those *oblata*s, which means, well, it means offerings, so I know the word, but it’s not used too often. Again, I don’t want to go over every little thing.

I really do think they did a nice job with the **Penitential Eucharistic Prayers. They made them more suitable for using throughout Lent.** Then they added four more, which I think are pretty nice. I would like to read one; I would like to conclude, if you don’t mind?

Just reading through this Eucharistic Prayer: it’s called *Jesus the Way to the Father*. Oh, incidentally there is also music for all the Eucharistic Prayers so the priest can sing them all. Do not hold your breath waiting for me.

Priest: The Lord be with you.

People: And with your spirit.

Priest: Lift up your hearts.

People: We lift them up to the Lord.

Priest: Let us give thanks to the Lord our God.

People: It is right and just.

It is truly right and just, our duty and our salvation, always and everywhere to give you thanks, holy Father, Lord of heaven and earth, through Christ our Lord. For by your Word you created the world and you govern all things in harmony. You gave us the same Word made flesh as Mediator, and he has spoken your words to us and called us to follow him. He is the way that leads us to you, the truth that sets us free, the life that fills us with gladness. Through your Son you gather men and women, whom you made for the glory of your name, into one family, redeemed by the Blood of his Cross and signed with the seal of the Spirit. Therefore now and for ages unending, with all the Angels, we proclaim your glory, as in joyful celebration we acclaim:

Holy, Holy, Holy Lord God of hosts. Heaven and earth are full of your glory. Hosanna in the highest. Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord. Hosanna in the highest. You are indeed Holy and to be glorified, O God, who love the human race and who always walk with us on the journey of life. Blessed indeed is your Son, present in our midst when we are gathered by his love and when, as once for the disciples, so now for us, he opens the Scriptures and breaks the bread. Therefore, Father most merciful, we ask that you send forth your Holy Spirit to sanctify these gifts of bread and wine, that they may become for us the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. On the day before he was to suffer, on the night of the Last Supper, he took bread and said the blessing, broke the bread and gave it to his disciples, saying:

TAKE THIS, ALL OF YOU, AND EAT OF IT,
FOR THIS IS MY BODY,
WHICH WILL BE GIVEN UP FOR YOU.

In a similar way, when supper was ended, he took the chalice, gave you thanks and gave the chalice to his disciples, saying:

TAKE THIS, ALL OF YOU, AND DRINK FROM IT,
FOR THIS IS THE CHALICE OF MY BLOOD,
THE BLOOD OF THE NEW AND ETERNAL COVENANT,
WHICH WILL BE Poured OUT FOR YOU AND FOR MANY
FOR THE FORGIVENESS OF SINS.
DO THIS IN MEMORY OF ME.

The mystery of faith.

We proclaim your Death, O Lord, and profess your Resurrection until you come again. Therefore, holy Father, as we celebrate the memorial of Christ your Son, our Savior, whom you led through his Passion and Death on the Cross to the glory of the Resurrection, and whom you have seated at your right hand, we proclaim the work of your love until he comes again and we offer you the Bread of life and the Chalice of blessing. Look with favor on the oblation of your Church, in which we show forth the paschal Sacrifice of Christ that has been handed on to us, and grant that, by the power of the Spirit of your love, we may be counted now and until the day of eternity among the members of your Son, in whose Body and Blood we have communion. By our partaking of this mystery, almighty Father, give us life through your Spirit, grant that we may be conformed to the image of your Son, and confirm us in the bond of communion, together with Benedict our Pope and Daniel our Bishop, with all other Bishops, with Priests and Deacons, and with your entire people. Grant that all the faithful of the Church, looking into the signs of the times by the light of faith, may constantly devote themselves to the

service of the Gospel. Keep us attentive to the needs of all that, sharing their grief and pain, their joy and hope, we may faithfully bring them the good news of salvation and go forward with them along the way of your Kingdom. Remember our brothers and sisters (N. and N.), who have fallen asleep in the peace of your Christ, and all the dead, whose faith you alone have known. Admit them to rejoice in the light of your face, and in the resurrection give them the fullness of life. Grant also to us, when our earthly pilgrimage is done, that we may come to an eternal dwelling place and live with you for ever; there, in communion with the Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God, with the Apostles and Martyrs, with Saint Margaret Mary and with all the Saints, we shall praise and exalt you through Jesus Christ, your Son.

Through him, and with him, and in him,

O God, almighty Father,
in the unity of the Holy Spirit,
all glory and honor is yours,
for ever and ever.

Amen.²

Endnotes

¹ Congregation for Divine Worship, "Liturgiam Authenticam." *Parish Liturgy*, XXXIV, Number 4 (October-December, 2011) 4.

² <http://old.usccb.org/romanmissal/order-of-mass.pdf>
pages 66-70