

EXECUTIVE SESSION "A"

Report on Ordination Rites

Archbishop Jerome G. Hanus, OSB

**Executive Session
November 11, 1997
Washington, D.C.**

Prot. 760/96/L
761/96/L

20 September 1997

Your Excellency.

I write in response to your letter of 2 April 1996 in which you requested the approval or confirmation of the Holy See *ad interim* for an English-language translation of the *editio typica altera* (1989-1990) of that part of the *Pontificale Romanum* now entitled *De Ordinatione Episcopi, Presbyterorum et Diaconorum*.

The material submitted has been examined in detail and at length by this Congregation and also, according to its specific competence, by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, which gave its reply in a letter dated 12 May 1997 (prot. 216/73-04256). The conclusion of this examination is that the text cannot be approved or confirmed by the Holy See for liturgical use, not only by reason of its failure to adhere faithfully to the Latin *editio typica altera* and to convey accurately in English its contents, but also because the translation is not without doctrinal problems.

Your Excellency in fact wrote two letters to the Congregation on the same date, 2 April 1996, presenting on the one hand the ICEL translation as such and on the other a project in which certain adaptations were proposed for the dioceses of the United States of America. It has seemed to this Congregation more practical for the moment to comment specifically upon the translation that lies at the base of both of the submissions made by the Conference of Bishops of the United States of America rather than on the project incorporating proposed local adaptations. Your Excellency will, I hope, appreciate that in trying to coordinate a response to the different Conferences of Bishops which use the English language in the liturgy, this is the most practical course of action for the Congregation at this time.

At numerous points both in the liturgical texts themselves, in the rubrics, in the *praenotanda*, and in the various pontifical documents authorizing the rites, the translation is seriously deficient. Particularly problematic are the texts that form part of the Eucharistic Prayer - the embolisms and Preface - and the Prayers of Ordination, at least those of the Bishop and of priests, but the difficulties are widespread.

(with enclosure)

His Excellency
The Most Reverend Anthony M. Pilla, Bishop of Cleveland
President, National Conference of Catholic Bishops
3211 Fourth Street NE
Washington DC 20017-1194
United States of America

Prominent among the problems is the decision of the translators to break with common Catholic usage and translate the Latin "presbyteri" into English not with "priests" but with "presbyters". This cannot meet with the Holy See's consent since it risks being misunderstood by the people and represents an unacceptable theological tendency. In particular it constitutes a retreat from a term that carries a sense of sacrality, that carries with it the history of the development of the faith in favour of a term which does not.

As to the rest of the translation, the competent organisms of the Holy See are of one accord in considering that it fails to transmit faithfully important doctrinal aspects of the Latin original. It appears, indeed, consciously or unconsciously to promote a view of sacramental and ecclesiological theology that contrasts with the intentions of the Holy See.

These matters are of grave concern to this Congregation at a time when by mandate of the Holy Father it is working for improved norms to govern liturgical translations.

It is also a cause for concern that the translators have felt free to introduce changes at will, to "improve" the order of the text, the rubrics, and the numbering. The Holy See, after a very considerable labor of study and wide consultation has fixed these matters, and only recently. I would point in particular, Your Excellency, to the title. This was changed in the Latin after serious study and reflection by the Holy See and is in harmony with one of the significant features of the revision that lead from the first to the second typical edition, namely the reordering of the material to begin with the rites for the Ordination of the Bishop. This change was designed among other things to enhance and clarify the unique role of the Bishop in his diocese and hence has a precise and weighty ecclesiological significance. In this translation the translators, with no permission from the Holy See, have changed it in a way that is not acceptable.

After a suitable period of experience the Holy See would certainly be willing in principle to consider suggestions for genuine improvement of the different elements of this liturgical book, as put forward by the Conferences of Bishops. However, in the meantime these things cannot be subject to arbitrary change by translators.

To the above-mentioned translation have been added new compositions. These have been found to be in disharmony with the conventions of the Roman Liturgy, confused, largely unsuited to the circumstances in which they would be used, and at best theologically impoverished. They are therefore unacceptable to the Holy See. Together with the changes and the element of paraphrase tacitly introduced by the translators in the course of their work, these texts arouse the concern of this Congregation for the substantial unity of the Roman Rite which the Council determined to preserve.

Any variant upon the text and the provisions of the *editiones typicae* issued in the Latin language that goes beyond what is specified in the final part of the different *praenotanda generalia* is to be considered more properly a matter of inculturation governed by the recent Instruction *Varietates legitimae* of 1994. By their nature, such proposed variations should reflect specific, localized cultural conditions, whether they are undertaken on the basis of the *praenotanda generalia* or of the Instruction *Varietates legitimae*. They are the sphere of action of the Bishops of a local Conference, not of translators.

Your Excellency, the policy of this Congregation has always been to adopt an approach to relations with the local Bishops which is marked by profound respect and a spirit of willing dialogue. Regular practice has also been to list the small points of detail which

appeared to present some difficulty in material submitted and to request the Conference of Bishops to propose solutions.

In this present case, Your Excellency, the shortcomings are so diffused that minor isolated corrections will not suffice. This situation will be evident from the enclosed set of detailed Observations. Their purpose is merely to illustrate a certain number of difficulties which have led the Holy See to its present decision and hence they cannot be considered in any way exhaustive. Indeed, they cover only part of the texts submitted.

In this regard, I should like to recall here one last fact which appears significant. A number of re-translations concerning parts of the Eucharistic Prayer proposed in 1981 failed to secure the consent of the Sacred Congregation for Sacraments and Divine Worship on account of a negative judgement by the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (prot. n. 216/73, 22 January 1983). Among the proposed translations then rejected was that of the wording of the intercession in the Second Eucharistic Prayer which in Latin runs "una cum Papa nostro N. et Episcopo nostro N. et universo clero" by the English "together with N. our Pope, N. our bishop, and all the ministers of your Gospel". This was found unacceptable by the Bishops' Conference of the United States of America and by the Holy See. It could reasonably have been expected that the translators would thereafter take note that translations of that kind were not acceptable. This did not in fact happen, however. In n. 59 of this proposed translation we find "universo clero" now rendered by "all who are called to your service", an even wider expression. In both these cases the translation had been prepared by the Mixed Commission known as the International Commission on English in the Liturgy.

Your Excellency, the Bishops retain all their rightful freedom of action to adopt the remedy they consider most appropriate regarding the English translation of this liturgical book. At the same time this Congregation considers it may be helpful to recommend that there be a complete change of translators on this project and that a new, independent and definitive English version be made afresh from the Latin texts.

Should the Bishops consider it appropriate and useful, the Congregation is at their disposal within the limits of its competence and its resources to give whatever assistance it can, including an approach to the Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith for similar assistance.

Your Excellency, the good relations and the active and efficacious cooperation between the Conference of Bishops of the United States of America and itself in recent times have been a source of great satisfaction and encouragement to this Congregation. I have every confidence that it will be possible to work quietly together for the good of the Church to arrive at a definitive English language translation of the rites of Sacred Ordination that is of high quality and suitable for use in United States of America.

With all cordial good wishes in Christ the Lord,

Sincerely yours,


+ Jorge Medina Estévez
Archbishop Pro-Prefect

OBSERVATIONS
ON SOME DETAILS OF THE ICEL TRANSLATION OF THE BOOK
DE ORDINATIONE EPISCOPI, PRESBYTERORUM ET DIACONORUM
(editio typica altera)

IN GENERAL

Titles and Pontifical Documents

1. The translation into English of the overall title of the parts of the Pontifical is not accurate. It should read, rather, something like:

The Roman Pontifical, as renewed by Decree of the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, published by Authority of Pope Paul VI, and further revised by Pope John Paul II

2. The English translation of the title of this book must also follow more strictly the Latin:

The Rites of Ordination of a Bishop, of Priests and of Deacons

In the recent revision of this part of the Pontifical a deliberate choice was made in this respect. There is no justification for its being tacitly changed by the translators.

3. The documents published by the Holy See must be translated as such, following faithfully the paragraph divisions and indentation of the Latin and in so far as is compatible with English-language usage the capitalization of words. In particular, care must be taken to convey a sense of respect for terms such as the names of the Sacraments. The technical juridical terms must be translated with exactness. The whole of the translation of each document should be without changes, without any additions or omissions, even in the footnotes. These are historical documents whose footnote references cannot be updated. The layout should follow that of the Latin. The passages of the Apostolic Constitution which specify the sacramental form would perhaps most appropriately be given in Latin, as their sense requires. Otherwise the impression given is that Pope Paul VI was imposing the present English translation as such. The citations from other pontifical and conciliar documents require careful correction. The translation here has been changed with respect to the previous edition in English, but by no means always for the better.

Terminology

4. Just as the Latin term "presbyter" should be translated into English throughout and always by "priest", the usual translation of "presbyteratus" should be "priesthood" unless in rare cases some special and serious reason intervenes.
5. A large number of adjectives present in the Latin have been omitted in English translation. When the Latin speaks of the "Holy Spirit" rather than the "Spirit", "Saint Peter" or "Blessed

Peter" rather than "Peter", "sacred vestments" rather than "vestments", "holy celibacy" rather than "celibacy", and so on, these expressions should be translated exactly into English. Some of these cases are pointed out in these present Observations, but not all. The effect of such omissions is a secularization of the tone of the liturgical book and it constitutes a departure from tradition.

6. A particularly serious case is the omission of terms of imploration or beseeching such as "suppliciter" and "quaesumus" or of concession, granting, such as the parts of "dignor". This alters expression given in the liturgical texts of the relative positions of God and his people. It may be true that in everyday English discourse in an egalitarian society these terms are no longer in common use but they are traditional in orthodox Christian prayer, have been retained in the Latin, and must be translated into English. The ICEL translation is, moreover, designed for use by peoples in very different social and cultural circumstances in different parts of the world and needs to take a broader view of cultural issues.
7. In other respects traditional vocabulary is to be maintained as part of the heritage of the Church and innovations or importations of terminology are not to be made without serious need. Hence terms such as "leader" should not be used, nor should "overseer", nor "role", nor "model", as being too secular in tone. In many places throughout this translation "caritas" is replaced by "love", which is not the same thing. Preference should be given to the term "charity", especially since this is employed in the free compositions devised by ICEL.
8. Traditional technical terms such as "paten", "chalice", "gremial" or "sacristy" should be given precedence over more generic terms, descriptions or paraphrases. The reduction of these leads in general to a secularization of the liturgical books. Every sphere of life has its technical terminology and there is no reason that the Church of Roman Rite should abandon the body of terms it has acquired in the course of history.
9. The Book of Gospels should be referred to by that term.
10. An alternative translation to "song" should be found for the Latin "cantus", "song" being too secular and too imprecise.
11. The term "interpolations" should not be used for the proper texts to be inserted into the Eucharistic Prayer but rather some expression such as "embolisms" or "proper texts". The term "interpolations" has the connotation at least on occasion of unwarranted insertions or insertions contrary to the intentions of author of the original text.

Accurate Translation of the Original

12. The numbering of the Rites and rubrical passages must remain the same as in the *editio typica altera*. The only additions permissible are those required by the culture of the people, and they must be made in accordance with what is laid down in the final section of the *Praenotanda* and in the Instruction *Varietates legitimae*.
13. The *Praenotanda* should be translated with verbal fidelity, without any additions or omissions, even in the footnotes. The layout should follow that of the Latin.

IN PARTICULAR

14. In n. 5, and throughout the translation the use of "college of presbyters" for "presbyterium" appears contrived. The usage that seems to have established itself in English in various nations is "presbyterate", by analogy with "episcopate" in the sense of the corporate body of Bishops. It would seem preferable to employ this term for the body of priests in the diocese.
15. In n. 11, and throughout, the translation of "recognoscere" and cognates needs revision. Here, the Apostolic See does not "review" but "confirms" or "grants its *recognitio*".
16. In n. 11 d, "the resolve to accept commitment to the obligation of celibacy" would perhaps be better rendered: "his resolve to assume the obligation of celibacy".
17. In n. 11 e, "to approve certain (hymn and antiphons?) to be used instead of those given in this book".
18. In n. 11 f, "adaptations to the rites". Not "will be introduced" but "may be introduced". "However," instead of "But".
19. In n. 12, the Latin "capite atque membris" is not translated properly by "the head". It should be noted that this text is an implicit quotation from *Lumen Gentium* n. 22. The relation between the explicit quotation from the same Constitution and the surrounding text of the *Praenotanda* is here confused. There is no reason to replace the "cf." of the Constitution with "see". The translation of the Constitution itself needs revision: "homines universi", for example, does not mean "all peoples".
20. In n. 14, not "heralds of faith" but "heralds of the faith". Here and throughout, the translation of the Latin "munus" also needs to be carefully reconsidered. The preaching of the Gospel is intrinsic to the episcopate, it is not simply one "duty" among others.
21. Likewise in n. 14, "moribus applicandam" is poorly translated by "put into practice", "regunt" by "oversee", "ministri originarii" by "primary ministers", "dispensatores sacrorum Ordinum" by "stewards of sacred orders", while the Latin "moderator" is not unambiguously rendered here by "moderator" in English. "Insigniti" is weakly translated by "marked".
22. In n. 15, "precibus Vesperarum" is rather generically rendered by "intercessions of evening prayer", and "constituatur" inadequately translated here and throughout by "appointed".
23. In n. 16, "Iuxta sibi adiungat" is not accurately translated by "By custom associates". There is no reason to change the internal order of sentences when the Latin, with its deliberate emphases, is easily translated as such into English: as, for example, reversing the order of "collegial nature" and "ordination of every bishop" in the second paragraph. "Significatur" is not future tense. It is also not the prayer that blesses God and invokes the Holy Spirit, as here (cf. the translation of n. 6).
24. In n. 18 and throughout "proclaimed" is an unsuitable term to translate "profertur" and the like. The word of God is proclaimed, but a prayer is recited, sung, etc.
25. In n. 20 "some suitable way" seems reductive or minimizing compared with "apto modo".

26. In n. 22. and in other places where this rubric is repeated, the translation half follows the Latin but has confused the expressions. The Latin excludes the whole of Holy Week from the list of days when the Ordination may take place, the English excludes the Ordination taking up the whole of Holy Week: "on any day in Holy Week", but better simply translate the Latin as it stands.
27. In n. 24 "Apostoli" is not translated.
28. In n. 26 and throughout the term "osculum" is not best rendered by "kiss of peace". Nor is "regendi" translated accurately here by "shepherding".
29. In n. 28 b) "libelli" is not properly translated by "copies" and in f) there is no need to reduce expression to a telegraphic style: "a ring, a pastoral staff, and a miter ...".
30. In n. 29 and throughout the term "bishop's cathedra" could more appropriately be used in English to render the Latin "cathedra", without the recourse to brackets. To have a "complete view" seems exaggerated as an expression.
31. In n. 30 "sacras" (sacras vestes) is omitted.
32. The order of the texts of nn. 32 and 33 should be the same as in the Latin, without addition or omission.
33. The number 32 of this translation speaks of "assent" of the people. This is an interpolation unjustified by the Latin original here. The Conference of Bishops should also decide here on any alternative form of acclamation or eliminate the possibility of an alternative. It is not acceptable to leave the matter undecided and dependent on the devising of person or persons unspecified. This applies in general to all the matters listed in the final section of the *Praenotanda generalia*.
34. In n. 35 the hymn for use in the Rite must be specified, or the possibility of an alternative eliminated. At the very least an English translation of the hymn "Veni, Creator Spiritus" must be provided here in the first Appendix, preferably with musical notation. It is appropriate that the Latin text be likewise given, together with the plainchant musical notation.
35. The text of n. 38 is not accurately translated: "service as bishop" does not translate "ad onus Episcopatus". "Then" is not present in the Latin and should be omitted. The response of the people is also to be set out exactly as in the Latin edition. The Conference of Bishops must decide on the exact form of an alternative response or eliminate the possibility of an alternative.
36. In n. 39 there are numerous problems of translation such as to necessitate a complete retranslation: "provehendus" is not accurately translated by "ordained", nor is "sanctificarent et gubernarent" best rendered by "guided and governed in the way of holiness". "Service" is not a translation of "munus". The term "Gospel" should be printed with a capital letter, as should others such as "Apostles", according to the indications of the Latin text. "Omnes gentes" is most naturally translated "all peoples". While the Latin does not entirely have it so, the natural expression in English to render "Ordinis sacramenti" would be "of the Sacrament of Holy Orders". While the Latin phrase is difficult to translate, "the powers conferred in the beginning" seems free and inadvisable as a translation. "perseveret" is not best translated by "lives".

37. The term "action" does not appear to be good English in this context to translate "munus".
38. The phrase "ministratio Spiritus et iustitiae" is not properly translated by "a spirit of justice and holiness".
39. In the middle of n. 39 the translation introduces an unwarranted rubric not found in the Latin. The sense of "ex hominibus esse assumptum et pro hominibus constitutum", reflecting Hebrews 5: 1, is lost here by using first "people" and then "men and women". The idea is not that the Bishop is chosen from the mass of the people as a sociological group but that in Christ he is chosen to serve mankind being a man himself. The word "operis" could perhaps better be translated here as "task" or "duty" rather than "function". The translation of "prodesse ... praeesse" is difficult but the translation's idea that the Gospel does not permit the Bishop to rule is not warranted by the text. Some such translation needs to be devised as: "strive to be of profit to others than to seek preeminence". The translation of "praeceptum" is not "counsel". The word "leader" should not be used in this context, nor should "overseer", as being too secular in tone. The phrase "de plenitudine sanctitatis Christi" is not properly translated by "from the overflowing holiness of Christ". Indeed the final phrase of the paragraph needs revision in the translation.
40. The term "caritas" is here replaced by "love", which is not the same thing. The word "Imprimis" is missing from the final paragraph and the sense of the original has been changed. The expression "te ponit regere Ecclesiam Dei" is not accurately translated by "appoints you an overseer of the Church of God". "Role" is not an adequate translation of "munus".
41. In n. 40 "Antiqua sanctorum Patrum institutio" is not properly translated by "An age-old custom of the Fathers". There is no justification for translating "usque ad mortem" by "to the end of your life". The phrase "which we now pass on" is not an adequate translation, since the act does not immediately follow. The question "Vis Corpus ..." needs to be translated more exactly. The word "beati" (beati Petri) is not translated here nor is "sanctam" (plebem Dei sanctam). The expression "cum comministris tuis presbyteris et diaconis" is not properly translated by "in cooperation with the presbyters and deacons who share your ministry", which alters the sense.
42. In n. 41, "largitatem" is untranslated.
43. In n. 42 one of the St James has been omitted. "Omnes Sancti et Sanctae Dei" is not properly translated by "All holy men and women", nor "libera nos, Domine" by "Lord, save your people", nor "Per mortem et resurrectionem tuam" by "By your death and rising to new life", nor "effusionem" by "gift", nor "regere" by "guide", nor "hunc electum" by "the one you have chosen", nor "consecrare" by "consecrate him for his sacred duties", nor "pacem et veram concordiam" by "in trust and in peace", while "nosmetipsos" and "sancto" (sancto servitio) are omitted in the translation, and "Christe exaudi nos" is not properly translated by "Lord Jesus, hear our prayer". In general the whole litany has lost in translation a good deal of the literary variety of the Latin original.
44. In n. 43 (the numbering has been changed unnecessarily) the concluding oration drops the biblical imagery without justification. There is no title "Concluding prayer" in the Latin. Omit the title here.
45. N. 43 also refers to "one deacon" not "the" deacon.

46. In n. 46 there is no title "Book of the Gospels" in the Latin. Omit the title here.
47. In n. 47 "in excelsis" is not properly translated by "in heaven", which also weakens the literary image and the biblical allusion (cf. Ps 112: 5-6). The expression "verbum gratiae tuae" is not properly translated by "your gracious word", nor "in Ecclesia tua normas" by "the plan of your Church", nor "praedestinasti" by "chosen", nor is "genus iustorum ab Abraham" accurately translated. "Initio" is not accurately rendered by "creation", and "glorified in" would be more accurate than "glorified by". The phrase "in gloriam et laudem indeficientem" is not translated by "unceasing glory and praise". From "Da, cordium cognitor..." the translation rearranges the elements of the original text and disrupts the literary parallel "da ... da".
48. In the rubric after the first part of n. 47 and elsewhere there should not be alternative expressions in brackets. The matter could be resolved more elegantly by adopting a translation such as "All the ordaining Bishops join in the following part of the Prayer ..."
49. In n. 48 "aliique" is not translated.
50. In nn. 49-56 the titles have been modified in the English text.
51. In n. 49 "participem te effecit" is not properly translated by "has brought you to share", which makes the degree of participation sound weak. The logical connection between the first line of the text and the rest has been broken.
52. In n. 51 "intemerata fide ornatus illibate custodi" is not translated by "With faith and love protect", nor "sanctam Ecclesiam" by "his holy Church". A possible translation would be "Accept this ring, the seal of your fidelity: adorned with inviolate faith, preserve unblemished the bride of God, Holy Church".
53. In n. 52 "Beati Petri" is not properly translated by "Peter", nor "signum" by "symbol", nor "incitamentum" by "incentive". The translation of "tibi" has been omitted.
54. In n. 53 "splendor" is not properly translated by "light", nor "princeps pastorum" by "chief shepherd".
55. In nn. 50-54, the Latin "Accipe" should be translated in a uniform manner in the English, preferably as "receive". "Take" is not the most suitable translation.
56. In n. 54, the reference to Acts 20: 28 is not accurately translated, and is not in harmony with an earlier translation.
57. In n. 57 the antiphon is not accurately translated and the text of psalm 96 should be given in full, as in the Latin, and the rubrics translated exactly.
58. In n. 59 the rubric has a casual sound. Translate perhaps "In the Eucharistic Prayer mention is made of the newly ordained Bishop by means of the following formulas", or "In the Eucharistic Prayer the newly ordained Bishop is named by means of the following formulas".
59. In n. 59 the embolisms are not accurately translated. This is an especially serious matter. "Divinis effectibus" is not rendered correctly by "yield an abundant harvest", nor "universo clero" by "all who are called to your service", nor "episcopali Ordine et universo clero" by

"all bishops, presbyters and deacons", nor "imprimis famuli" by "your servant", nor "quem hodie ad servitium populi tui eligere dignatus es, et Episcoporum Ordinis universi, sed et totius cleri:" by "chosen today to serve your people: remember all bishops, presbyters and deacons, and other ministers of your Church". These are texts specifically intended for use on a particular occasion. To reduce the exact expressions used to a generic and distant paraphrase is not acceptable. It is also damaging to the people's perception of the hierarchical nature of the Church.

60. What it said here regarding n. 59 applies *mutatis mutandis* to nn. 140, 214, 242, etc.
61. In n. 61 any alternative hymn is to be defined by the Conference of Bishops or the reference to an alternative expunged. It is not acceptable to leave the matter undecided and dependent on the devising of unspecified persons. The translation in the appendix needs to be revised: "advocate and guide" does not translate "Paraclitum" for which an English term exists; the verses concerning the Incarnation are inaccurately translated: "in gloria Patris" is not properly translated by "in glory"; "pretioso" is omitted in translation; "usque in aeternum" is not accurately rendered by "now and always", nor "in saeculum et in saeculum saeculi" by "for ever", nor "dignare ... custodire" by "keep", nor "misericordia" by "love and mercy". The final verse in the Latin is in the singular and should be rendered as such in English.
62. In n. 63 the Latin speaks of a "more solemn" blessing; not just a blessing.
63. In the blessing of n. 63 "quibus tradidisti regimen disciplinae" is not properly translated by "to the bishops you have made teachers and pastors". The final phrase of the same passage has been detached from the rest in sense. There is no address "Lord" or "Lord God" in the original and the interpolation alters the solemn blessing to make of it three collects. The word "maiestatis" is untranslated, "the service we perform for you" is not a true translation of the Latin, and again the final phrase of the same passage has been detached from the rest in sense. "Dirige" is not properly translated by "unite", nor "obedientia" by "support", while "loving concern" does not translate "cura" and "umquam" is missing in the English. The final formula of blessing, of which only one text is justified by the Latin, is not rendered accurately. There is also intrusive titling not present in the Latin and out of harmony with the system of divisions.
64. In the second formula of n. 63 "super populum" is not properly translated by "for his people". The sentences are divided without justification in a way that obscures the logical link and atomizes the sense, making of a well-balanced text a series of staccato propositions. "Obsequentes" is not properly rendered by "assist", nor "presenti saeculo" by "this life". "Mereantur" is left untranslated. Again the final blessing is duplicated without justification. Neither of the formularies given is an exact translation of the Latin.
65. The rubric of n. 64 should read something like: "After the blessing and following the dismissal of the people by the deacon, the procession moves to the sacristy in the usual manner." The term "sacristy" is not to be replaced by the vague expression "vesting room" and the beginning of the rubric as given in this translation is unclear.
66. In n. 65 at more than one point the translation surprises by being slavishly attached to unimportant constructions in the Latin and consequently offering poor English. The opening phrase should read something like: "Whatever is laid down in nos. 15-27 of the Introduction likewise applies to the Rite of Ordination of several Bishops at the same time." Similarly in

- 65 d) the translation "those things necessary for the washing of hands" might better be translated "whatever is necessary..." or "requisites for ...", as in the title before n. 28.
67. In n. 65 b) the systematic reduction of capital letters to small case which is to be found in this translation has here falsified the sense of "Ecclesia", which is the equivalent of "diocese" and hence needs perforce to be placed in capitals.
68. In n. 65 e) the numbering of the translation has been changed without justification.

The Ordination of Priests and Deacons

69. Many of the points already made above apply to the rest of the text, *mutatis mutandis*. Because of its importance, these observations will consider here in detail one further example, the Prayer of Ordination of Priests, n. 131.
70. The word "distributor" is not translated properly by "giver", nor "gratiarum" by "every good gift". There is no mention in the Latin of "progress and stability of creation" and the whole sense of the original is lost in this paraphrase. The Latin "diversis ordinibus" is not in any way translated by "various forms of ministry". The term "Church" is not used in the Latin here.
71. The phrase "in priore Testament" is not accurately rendered by "your covenant with Israel", which is a simple paraphrase. The translation "stand with them and help them in their task" is hardly a translation of the Latin, and the sequence of ideas in the original is dislocated. The word "praefecisses" is not properly translated by "appointed". The sense of "sequentis ordinis" is of a lower rank, whereas "next to them" is ambiguous and suggests quasi-equality, especially when accompanied by "to stand with them".
72. The Latin text does not speak of "elders" but of "virosum prudentium". All mention of "tabernaculi" is here omitted from the translation. The phrase "the good things to come" is weak and banal in English and could refer to virtually anything, being further weakened by the verb "foreshadow" which has lost much force in contemporary English in comparison with the noun "shadow".
73. The word "sancte" is not properly translated by "most holy", and by moving the phrase "Pater sancte" to the beginning of the paragraph in this and other cases the text is broken up from a literary point of view. The Latin does not say exactly that the Father sent Jesus into the world. He sent the Son, who was Jesus "Apostolum et Pontificem confessionis nostrae".
74. The word "sanctificatos" is not translated exactly by "consecrated".
75. The phrase "in apostolico sacerdotio fungendo" is not properly translated by "to fulfill the apostolic priesthood", which in itself has little sense.
76. There might be some grounds for re-examining the translation of the sacramental formula on some points, including the rendering of "dignitas" by "dignity" here - and elsewhere. The term "presbyter" has been substituted in English for "priest" in the sacramental form. This change would clearly require particular procedural steps, apart from its being unacceptable, as explained above.

77. The term "probi" is not translated by "faithful". not is it acceptable that "Ordinis nostri" here and elsewhere be abandoned in favour of other locutions such as "the bishops". The clarity of the text and its emphases are lost in a translation that leaves much to be desired. There is no mention in the Latin of "taking root in human hearts" and the term "bear" as used in the translation is ambiguous and unsure in its sense: here it can only mean "carry" since in no sense has it to substitute "fructificent" for "perveniant" in the original phrase. In all this the impact of a terse and incisive original has been lost.
78. The word "dispensatores" is not best translated universally by "steward", which introduces a different range of ideas and images. The sense of the "ut" clause is abandoned for a series of simple juxtapositions which lose a good part of the thrust of the original. The term "lavacrum regenerationis" is inadequately rendered by "waters of baptism" and "renewed" is a relatively weak and incomplete rendering of the notion conveyed by "innovetur". The Latin does not say, either, "ad altare tuum" but "de altari tuo", nor that sinners may "be brought to reconciliation" but instead effectively and simply reconciled. "Subleventur" is not properly translated by "raise up".
79. "Sint nobis iuncti" does not mean "be one with us".
80. The phrase "in Regno tuo consummandum" is not properly translated by the weak "call to the fullness of your kingdom". Here as elsewhere in these translations recourse is had to the idea of "call" in a manner not justified by the Latin. The idea of an ontological and sacramental process wrought by the power and grace of God is thereby reduced to an appeal to a subjective sensibility.
81. In n. 207. the opening of the prayer loses in the translation the stylistic parallelism of the Latin, but more seriously there are a good number of omissions and unnecessary paraphrases. "the Church" for "Ecclesiam tuam", "every kind of grace" for "caelestium gratiarum varietate", "sacris muneribus" seems more likely here to be related to the sense of "sacred functions". "Threefold ministry" offers some ambiguity in comparison with "trinos gradus ministrorum". The Latin speaks of ranks and this should be maintained. We find also "preaching" for "praedicationi verbi". Also omitted are equivalents of the Latin terms "suppliciter", "quaesumus", "evangelicae", "spiritualis", "sanctae" (sanctae plebis), "mereantur". The phrase "innocentiae puritas" is not accurately translated by "holiness of life".

Some further texts

82. In Chapter V the headings, the general layout and the rubrics differ from the Latin text.
83. In n. 342 the translation of the opening rubric is deficient to the point of confusing the precise content of the original.
84. The first collect is poorly translated. "Vis ... praeficere" is not translated by "you call ... to oversee". The word "hodie" is omitted. One prayer has in effect been divided into three separate prayers, with damage to the original sense. The meaning of "gubernante" is not "guidance", and "dirigere" does not mean "lead".
85. The second collect also presents a series of problems. The Roman Rite does not address God directly in the first instance as "Eternal Shepherd" and the Latin does not do so in this case.

It is not clear why it was not deemed possible to translate exactly what is given in the Latin on this point, especially since the interpolated text below, freely composed, has exactly what would be required. "Vis ... sociare" is not properly translated as here. It is not that God has chosen a candidate who is then admitted by men into the social group of bishops. Instead, it is God who on this precise day will make of this man a member of the College of Bishops. There is no mention of "always" in the Latin.

86. The translation of the two *super oblata* texts has in the first place the literary defect of insisting upon transferring "Lord" to the very beginning of the prayer, thereby guaranteeing a certain sameness and lack of variety.
87. The translation of the first *super oblata* text is clumsy and omits the term "propitius". The translation of the second has again recourse to "choose" to render another term, here "suscitasti". "Apostolicarum virtutum" is plural.
88. The translation as given here and elsewhere of the Preface of the Eucharistic Prayer *VD. Qui Unigenitum tuum Sancti Spiritus unctione* is not acceptable. Nor is the translation of the dialogue that precedes it.
89. As regards the dialogue, "Dignum et iustum est" must be translated accurately and as in the Latin the echo picked up in the opening protocol of the Preface itself. Some such translation as "It is right and fitting" is necessary, then, which requires the beginning of the Preface to run something like: "It is indeed right and fitting, ...".
90. A further point regarding the dialogue is that it would seem that the moment is long overdue to provide the English-speaking liturgy with an accurate translation for "Et cum spiritu tuo".
91. There is no reason to omit the translation of "Domine" from the protocol. "Qui Unigenitum tuum Sancti Spiritus unctione" is not in any way translated properly by "By your Holy Spirit you appointed your only Son". This translation is doubly deficient when it is considered that the text is used in direct relation to the conferring or the celebration of a commemoration of the conferring of Sacred Orders. The rest of the same Preface translation is in need of radical revision, being inaccurate.
92. The provenance of the translation of the introit and communion antiphons here and elsewhere needs to be clarified.
93. The translation of the two postcommunion texts has again the literary defect of beginning with "Lord".
94. The translation of the first postcommunion text is in great part a new composition. There is no mention of hearts, fire, love or learning in the Latin.
95. The translation of the second postcommunion text speaks almost as if the purpose of the prayer were the bestowal of gifts of grace as a new event. This is not appropriate in this text since the act of sacramental ordination has done the bestowing. The prayer, therefore, does not convey the sense of the Latin.
96. In n. 343 the collect is not an exact translation. The Latin does not limit God's government of his people to the ministry of priests. The terms "watch over and guide" do not translate "regendo". "Dignaris" is untranslated.

97. The translation of the *super oblata* text imports a reference to the plan of salvation not found in the Latin. The Latin speaks of priests ministering at the altar and ministering to the people, whereas the English conflates these two activities. The text is divided into two by use of two distinct sentences, to the detriment of the meaning. "Propitius" is not translated. "Servitium" is not "ministry".
98. In the translation of the postcommunion text "Domine", the third word of the text, has become "Lord God", placed once again at the very beginning. "Hostia" is not accurately translated as "gift". We also find here "caritas" translated as "love". However, the rest of the text is faithful to the Latin.
99. In n. 344 the collect substitutes "others" for "fratres". The text is then divided inappropriately into two sentences. "Dignaris" is not translated, nor "quaesumus". Once again "call" is employed, this time for "eligere". The term "mansuetudine" is translated by "compassion", which is not the same.
100. In the translation of the *super oblata* the text is divided inappropriately into two sentences. This text brings out in particular form the general problem in all the translations of prayer texts found here, namely the rendering into English of the relative clause habitual in the Latin. It is sometimes maintained that "You who" is ugly and undignified and that it is often difficult to sustain the sense of a relative clause in a way that can be easily understood by a listening congregation. In this particular case the relative clause is brief and begins with "cuius". There would seem to be no difficulty in translating "Holy Father, whose Son ...". "Voluit" is not translated, nor "quaesumus", while "nostrae munera servitutis" has become "these gifts". The phrase "a willingness to serve our neighbor" seems a little excessive as a rendering of "diligentiae".
101. The Preface in its variant form represents a further problem here and in n. 345. The phrase "ut multa ministeria in Ecclesia exercerentur", proper to this text, is not correctly translated by "that his one priesthood should continue in the Church". The translator has evidently not taken account of the difference between the versions of the text.
102. In the translation of the postcommunion once again "Lord" is moved to the beginning. "Caelesti cibo potuque" is curiously translated "the food and drink of heaven", perhaps to avoid the widespread banal sense of "heavenly". However, the Eucharist is not consumed in heaven, but only on earth. "Evangelii, sacramentorum caritatisque" is not correctly translated by "of word, of sacrament, and of loving service".

The Biblical Readings

103. It is not clear what translation of Scripture is being used and no incipits are given, though they are indispensable. The thematic indications must reflect the exact Scripture translation used in the actual readings themselves. Some of the translations, such as "in the line of Melchizedek" are doubtfully acceptable, even from a literary viewpoint.

COMPOSITIONS NOT FOUND IN THE "EDITIO TYPICA ALTERA"

104. Prescinding from the question of whether ICEL should be dedicating resources to the making of new compositions, it may be noted that this is a new edition of the Rite, as yet completely untried in practice. To gain necessary experience of it will take local Churches some time given that these rites are used on a relatively rare basis, and seldom in the same location. The Holy See decided that the texts provided in the *editio typica altera* would be sufficient. It is not clear, then, on what experiential basis it might be thought necessary to modify this decision now. The proper procedure in any case would be that indicated by the Instruction *Varietates legitimæ*.
105. Furthermore, the texts in themselves present a considerable number of problems, beginning with the fact that their authors seem to have made a deliberate choice not to respect the style of the Roman liturgy. No sources are indicated, and no clear rationale for the texts nor their specific content is offered. The number and nature of the problems and the general quality of the texts suggests that they certainly cannot be approved by the Holy See and that it would be probably best simply to discard them en bloc.
106. In n. 342, the additional collect for the Ordination of a Bishop is a general text that makes no specific reference to the essential event of the day, to the episcopate, or the Bishop-Elect. There seems no particular reason why the wide panorama specified should be evoked here.
107. The additional *super oblata* text has an oblique reference to a Bishop, of whom at least four are necessarily present. It is not clear how it would be suitable in either of the two cases defined by the rubrics: a Eucharist presided by the newly ordained Bishop or one presided by the principal ordaining Bishop.
108. The additional postcommunion text is evidently inspired in some sense by the *Didache*. To speak simply of "bread blessed and broken" seems inadequate. For the rest, the text by its length and the amplitude of its conclusion is particularly at odds with the conventions of the Roman Rite. Finally, the text could not reasonably be chosen by the principal ordaining Bishop, which takes away any meaning from the heading "general".
109. In n. 343, the additional collect for the Ordination of priests curiously does not provide entirely new material, but uses the same allusion to Matthew 20: 28 as is already found in the collect for the Ordination of Deacons. The phrase "and to give his life as a sacrifice" is not true to the Gospel text and from a literary point of view it ends abruptly and inelegantly. The composition seems for the rest to aim at grandiloquent effect but is confused in content. The meaning of "whose glory is the cross" is unclear, as is its specific reference to priests. The Lord is usually referred to as the eternal High Priest, not simply priest. The affirmation that the Church is reborn in the image of Christ the High Priest is in any case obscure, if not quite simply incorrect. Like the act of salvation in Christ with which it is bound up, the foundation or birth of the Church took place once and for all.
110. The additional *super oblata* text has only an oblique reference to priests. The presentation of the nature of the priesthood is here disquieting. The priest is a "steward" -- but under the orders of God or of the people? The people is characterized as "priestly". It would seem, therefore, that the principal notion is that it is the people who offer the gifts and that the role of the priest is minimalized. The concluding phrases again at first sound reasonably well. However, on closer examination it is not clear in what sense the Church in heaven is

dispersed and in need of being further united. Rhetoric has gained the upper hand over content.

111. The additional postcommunion text first makes a reference to Holy Communion. Without an evident logical link it then becomes an independent prayer for wisdom for priests before returning to speak again of Communion. There appears to be no particular reason for the addition of this problematic and prolix text.
112. In n. 344, the additional collect for the Ordination of deacons is far from the style of the Roman liturgy. The ideas are problematic. The presumed biblical allusion of the opening (cf. Lk 22: 27) is used in a confused way. "Jesus" is never referred to in such blunt terms in the liturgy. The expression used and the baldness of the reference present the Christ almost as a "primus inter pares". If the allusion is to texts such as Mt 20: 26, this is also problematic since the Lord cannot be characterized as wishing to be the greatest. It is difficult to understand to what "these holy gifts" refer. The term is normally found in a postcommunion (as with the ICEL free composition in this Mass) or at most in a *super oblata*. Presumably here, against the tradition, the reference is to the word of God and the sacrament of the Eucharist. "Minister these gifts" is a very vague expression whose sense is far from evident. It is not clear how "Make those who minister ..." is linked to what follows. Is the idea that by seeing these exemplary ministers ("models") the Church will be spurred on to acts of charity? Or that by the fact of having efficacious ministers the Church may be more effective in works of charity?
113. The additional *super oblata* text has a number of curious expressions: "worship of your name", "the words we voice in praise" (what might they be?), "resound in works of service". In the final lines the images of sound and of action have been confused. It is not the people and the ministers (are we talking here about deacons to the exclusion of Bishops at a diaconal Ordination?) who place the gifts before God in that order and in the same way. It would seem, too, that we are speaking about the fruits of the collection or the offertory procession, since they are "for the service of the needy". This is not acceptable in a *super oblata*.
114. The additional postcommunion text, apart from being once again prolix and in the form of a collect rather than a postcommunion, has other problems, in particular the fact of offering a succession of ideas that are not clearly linked. The text begins by referring in identical terms to the word of God and the Holy Communion (this double reference seems a constant in these compositions). We then seem to speak of deacons, characterized as "those who minister the food of life", but with no clear literary link to the reference already just made to the Eucharist. The prayer is then that these persons may be "confirmed" "in service and charity". The exact meaning of "confirm" is unclear. The deacon was ordained only minutes before. The end of the text then takes a new departure, presumably no longer limiting its point of view to deacons. It seems to foresee the following itinerary: the recipients of Holy Communion will be led to feed the poor assiduously and hence reach their own salvation, characterized as "eternal mercy". The phrase "nourish the poor in their every need" does not in fact make a great deal of sense. If the poor need a house, feeding will not bring one.

20 September 1997