

WHAT KIND OF ECCLESIOLOGY?

The imposition of the new-but-old-sounding translation of the *Roman Missal* has been accomplished. U.S. Catholics are trying to remember “and with your spirit” and “*holy* Church,” as well as struggling with the Creed and the Glory to God. Priests are, to varying degrees, struggling and stumbling as they try to pray texts which at times give the impression of having been translated by graduates of ESL programs or specialists in Victorian English literature—or which simply sound silly. Both people and priest are bothered by Latinate constructions—rambling sentences, clumsy relative clauses, a scarcity of periods and semi-colons—and multi-syllabled Latin look-a-likes that have replaced simple and direct words rooted in our language’s Anglo-Saxon foundations.

Nevertheless, contrary to expectations on both sides, the heavens did not roll up like a scroll nor did the Second Coming take place when the new translation was introduced. Vatican II was not annulled nor did the world end. But neither did sonorous obscurity heighten reverence and a sense of mystery. At best, the new translation has made us give more thought to what we’re saying and listening to. More likely, it’s been irritating. At worst, it’s making prayer more difficult or even impossible.

Only when frustration eventually gives way to familiarity will we be able to fully assess the changes that have been imposed on English-speaking Catholics. In the meantime we must approach and use the translation carefully and critically for the sake of the Church at worship.

Guidelines for implementation have stressed the need for ongoing catechesis. That has been good: we always need to deepen our

What Kind of Ecclesiology?

understanding of what we are saying and doing in worship and appreciate it as the Church's spirituality. Unfortunately, catechesis is also needed to explain that what we sometimes hear at worship is not what we really mean. Unfamiliar words can be misleading. Grammar and style intended more for the eye than ear can be misheard or misunderstood or ignored.

Even more dangerously, language communicates attitudes and outlooks at a level deeper than the surface meaning of words. Language scholars have pointed out since the early nineteenth century that language affects our thinking. Some have gone so far as to say that it directs our vision and shapes what we see and that, repeated often enough, it determines reality for the speakers of a particular language.

That extreme statement of the so-called Sapir-Whorf hypothesis may be too strong. But, at the very least, the language we use indicates what is conventional and acceptable and taken for granted. For speakers of American English "time is money" and the distinctions between past and present and future are clear. (The fluidity of tenses in Hebrew and Aramaic is basic to the concept of *zikaron*, translated into Greek as *anamnesis* and into English as "memorial.") Similarly, the gender-perspective of English is evident in hysteria, sob-sister, sissy, manslaughter, man overboard, and opposite sex. Debates are differently framed when the topic is "undocumented aliens" or "illegal aliens," "right to choose" or "right to life."

The new translation (and the hype surrounding it) presents views on Church, tradition, unity, Eucharist, priesthood, laity, liturgical assembly, symbol, and liturgical participation. Sometimes these are unclear or conflicting or at odds with Vatican Council II perspectives. Because they are not stated explicitly, their effect may go unnoticed. But they will have a formative effect. We will see examples as we proceed.

What Kind of Ecclesiology?

Developing a healthy liturgical spirituality requires special attention to the sense of Church experienced in Eucharist. Sunday Eucharist is where we most intensely experience our identity as Catholic Christians and our responsibility for the Church's mission. My focus here, then, will be on the ecclesiology of the new translation, the understanding of Church it conveys. I will indicate ways in which I see it subtly communicating a view of Church, the Counter-Reformation institutional model, that threatens the ecclesiology of communion that is central to both the letter and the spirit of Vatican Council II.

As described by Avery Dulles in his classic, *Models of the Church*,¹ the analogy of the Church as institution is from secular and political society. The model focuses on the external shape and organizational features of Church and practically ignores its inner life. The organization, not its purpose, is the focus, in particular its governmental structure. "Church" is effectively identified with the officials responsible for the functions of teaching, sanctifying, and governing. The outcome is an ecclesiology that is clerical, juridical, and triumphalistic. Authority is highly centralized and exercised from the top down. An elite class is in control. Patriarchy and clericalism are central values. A narrow and restricted vision ignores other churches and religions and identifies unity with uniformity.

Dulles argues convincingly that any of several models of Church can be primary—except the institutional. Any can be primary, but the others must be integrated so that their priorities are included. Since the institutional priority is structure, organization, and self-preservation, however, it can include other priorities only as

¹Garden City, NY: Doubleday. The original edition was published in 1974, an expanded edition in 1987 added a concluding chapter on the Church as community of disciples, and the 2002 edition includes an appendix on the ecclesiology of Pope John Paul II.

What Kind of Ecclesiology?

secondary and incidental. On the other hand, the other models need what structure and organization offer for effectiveness and survival. Communion is more fundamental than structure, for example, but there can be no communion without structure.

The recovery of communion ecclesiology began in the late nineteenth century as a movement away from a preoccupation with the merely juridical and institutional aspects of Church. Though there was tension, scriptural and patristic images of the Church as Body of Christ and People of God became increasingly popular in the first half of the twentieth century. The communion ecclesiology these images represent is basic to the letter and the spirit of Vatican Council II. This is evident in the council as an event and in its documents, as well as in subsequent events and documents.

Though the Council primarily saw the Church as communion, it also used other models: the Church as sacrament of salvation, herald of the Gospel, and servant of humanity. The institutional element was not denied or rejected, but it was recognized as existing, not for its own sake, but for the sake of the Church's nature and mission. Institutional priorities could not be primary.

At its heart communion ecclesiology moves beyond institutional features—without denying them—to highlight the mystery of sharing the divine life: the Church reflects the communion that is the Trinity, it is the icon of the Trinity. In its scriptural roots, in its development in the first centuries of Christian history, and in its contemporary revival, communion ecclesiology emphasizes the mystical, sacramental, and historical dimensions of the Church and focuses on the web of interwoven relationships that makes the Church—Trinity, humans and God, Church and world, within the Church, among the local churches and with the universal Church, among the bishops, and in parishes, with other churches

What Kind of Ecclesiology?

and religions, and ultimately with all humanity.²

At least part of the postconciliar crisis in Catholicism has been the consequence of the Council subordinating the institutional model, the most familiar, to other models. People recognized the inadequacies of a hierarchical ecclesiology. Their dissatisfaction intensified. Divisions and polarization increased. Attempts to make that model once more primary can only intensify the crisis.

The new translation is one instance of the tension between institutional and communion models of Church. The tension was evident during the Council itself, particularly in the relationship between pastoral bishops and curial officials. During the long pontificate of John Paul II and the current pontificate of Benedict XI the tension has surfaced from time to time in various areas and the tendency has been for the tension to be resolved by the Vatican in favor of the institutional model.

Liturgy has been an especially sensitive area. Curial liturgical decisions have often favored Counter-Reformation perspectives and been too readily accepted by bishops. The conciliar principle of full, conscious, and active participation as an assembled community has not been done away with, but it has been restricted in a variety of ways by curial instructions and papal statements. "Interior" participation has been stressed, rightly, but in a way that often overlooks and undermines communal celebration. The role of the laity and lay ministers has been limited. The reestablishment of the "extraordinary" form of the Roman liturgy is a clear example, particularly when bishops are bypassed to make its use a matter of the priest's choice. This decision weakened ecclesial communion and episcopal collegiality, reinforced clericalism, and disregarded the rights of nonclerical

²For a survey of contemporary ecclesiologies of communion, see Dennis M. Doyle, *Communion Ecclesiology* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2000).

What Kind of Ecclesiology?

members of the liturgical assembly.

The translation of the third edition of the *Roman Missal* is another example of the restoration of the institutional model of Church. Both the translation and the process for producing it are more consistent with the Counter-Reformation outlook and its institutional model of Church than with the communion ecclesiology of Vatican Council II. That is what I try to establish in this paper.

I want to be clear that both the third edition of the *Roman Missal* and the new translation include positive elements and improvements. However, I leave a balanced assessment to others and to the future.³ I am focusing on negative aspects, particularly ecclesiological, because they are being ignored. Each point criticized can perhaps be explained or defended by itself as of no great consequence, but, taken together, they diminish a communion ecclesiology and give renewed prominence to the institutional model of Church.

Statements and catechesis from official sources have been singing the praises of the *Missal* and the English translation. They often use specious arguments—superficially plausible but unfounded or wrong. They admit that the translation is not perfect but ignore

³The best presently available provide commentary on the 2002 *General Instruction of the Roman Missal* and the 2010 Order of Mass. See *A Commentary on the General Instruction of the Roman Missal* (Edward Foley et al., eds; developed under the auspices of the Catholic Academy of Liturgy and cosponsored by the Federation of Diocesan Liturgical Commissions; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2007) and *A Commentary on the Order of Mass of The Roman Missal: A New English Translation* (Edward Foley et al., eds; developed under the auspices of the Catholic Academy of Liturgy; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2011). The latter is especially good for its history and theology of the Latin text, its careful and cautious comments on translations, and its valuable remarks on the mystagogy and spirituality of the parts of the Mass and the translation.

What Kind of Ecclesiology?

specific weaknesses or try to explain them away. This choral response is to be expected when the institutional model of Church is dominant. People who are part of the establishment or close to it are afraid to speak their minds. Dissonant voices are largely ignored or ridiculed, even those of bishops. Critics are silenced or advised to speak anonymously.

I will begin with the process that led to the new translation. I will then look at the translation in terms of language issues, patriarchy and clericalism, ecumenical and interreligious issues, ideological restrictions, unity understood as uniformity, and some more subtle theological issues. I will conclude with some suggestions on what can be done.

The Translation Process and Ecclesial Communion

The manner in which the 2010 translation was made and imposed violated ecclesial communion as curial authority overruled and substituted for episcopal authority. This is the strongest and clearest indication that in it the Counter-Reformation institutional model of Church is being restored to primacy.

A quick historical review provides some context on the papacy's gradual eclipse of the college of bishops. For centuries the Petrine ministry functioned to maintain communion among the bishops, then it came to be viewed as a papal monarchy. This began in the Gregorian reformation of the eleventh century. A strong papacy, allied with the monasteries, gained for bishops freedom from outside control but some dependence on the pope. Boniface VIII and Innocent III worked to establish papal supremacy and conciliarists (mostly academics and bishops) countered with a broader view of bishops' rights and of shared responsibility in the Church. In the crisis of the Reformation it seemed that the Church could reform and revive only with a strong papacy, but during this era of Counter-Reformation bishops came increasingly to be

What Kind of Ecclesiology?

regarded as papal delegates. The definitions of papal primacy and infallibility at Vatican Council I made the pope not only monarch but an *absolute* monarch, in line with current royalist views.

Vatican Council I ended because of war that ended the Papal States and unified Italy. It ended, perhaps fortunately, before it got to the topic of the bishops in its discussion of the Church. Though the historical research of the late nineteenth century often led to scholars being charged with modernism, it also led to recognition of pope and bishops' roles in the Church of the first millennium and the essential role of communion in ecclesiology.

Collegiality of bishops was the Council's primary structural focus. This stated that the college of bishops, with the pope as their head, governs the Church, and that in extraordinary circumstances the pope may exercise that authority of governance independently. This provided necessary context for what Vatican I said of the pope and attempted to balance papal and episcopal roles in Church governance. The bishops bend over backwards to avoid even the semblance of questioning papal authority, but they do move toward proper context and balance.

An ever-expanding sense of conciliarity and co-responsibility has been a central part of the postconciliar development of communion ecclesiology. Collegial and collaborative structures on the parish, diocesan, regional, national, international, ecumenical, and interreligious levels developed following the Council.

The development and imposition of the new translation on the English-speaking world failed to respect these structures. In what can be seen as an abuse of power and a violation of ecclesial communion, Roman officials have curtailed the authority of bishops and bishops' conferences and rejected their decisions.

Roman curial culture never fully forgave the bishops for rejecting

What Kind of Ecclesiology?

the drafts curial officials had prepared and for taking the Council in a different direction. Conciliar documents intentionally decentralized authority, giving regional, national, and international bodies of bishops greater scope and broader responsibility, including over the liturgy. Retrenchment has been evident in the pontificates of John Paul II and Benedict XVI. Curial officials (e.g., Cardinal Medina, Archbishop Ranjith) have claimed that the Council's liturgical vision has been distorted, that elements not envisioned by the Council have been introduced (e.g., the priest facing the people, communion in the hand, an exaggerated role for the laity, full use of the vernacular), and that the liturgical reform must itself be reformed. The latter, of course, is code for retrenchment and restoring the status quo.

In particular, the process whereby the new translation has been imposed involved significant violations of ecclesial communion. What was originally a collegial responsibility of bishops has, in a rather heavy-handed fashion, become again the prerogative of curial officials. Despite curial efforts to have bishops' conferences only "propose" texts and translations, the Constitution on the Liturgy (36) acknowledged the bishops' authority to enact them (*statuere*). Later documents changed Roman approval and confirmation into a review (*recognitio*). That is now regarded as the significant exercise of the power of governance (*Liturgiam authenticam* [LA] 82); i.e., authorization by ultimate authority. The Vatican may, in fact, prepare translations and require their use, though the fiction of episcopal approval and subsequent Roman review is maintained (LA 104).

The principles of *Liturgiam authenticam* establish the basic contours of the new translation and favor regression to the sacral cult of the institutional model of Church. However, at points the 2010 ICEL translation goes beyond or changes what LA requires, supporting and extending that model.

What Kind of Ecclesiology?

Following the Council's authorization of vernacular languages in the liturgy and in accordance with its directives, eleven bishops' conferences established the International Commission on English in the Liturgy (ICEL) to prepare the English translation which was then to be confirmed by Rome. The basic guideline Rome gave translators in the 1969 document *Comme le prévoit* was the principle of dynamic equivalence. The translation was to be "faithful, but not literal." The unit of meaning was the whole passage, not individual words. The local worshiping community was to be able to find and express itself in worship rather than repeating verbatim formulas from other times and places. That last meant, for example, preparing new texts as options, particularly in the collect of the opening prayer as a form of inculturation beyond mere translation.

Requiring Roman confirmation restricted bishops' liturgical responsibility and authority, but there were, in fact, few changes made in the translation prepared under the auspices of the bishops and enacted in 1973. It had its weaknesses—sometimes repetitious and too prosaic, a lack of sensitivity regarding inclusive language—but it was generally well accepted.

In 1981 the bishops and ICEL began a process of revising the translation. This process was completed in the late 1990s. The eleven English-speaking bishops' conferences approved the translation and submitted it to the Vatican for confirmation in 1998.

Overall, both the process and the translation reflected the communion ecclesiology of Vatican Council II, including its theology of the local Church (i.e., inculturation).⁴ The process

⁴For a thorough study—superseded because the CDW rejected the translation—see *Liturgy for the New Millennium: A Commentary on the Revised Sacramentary* (Mark R. Francis and Keith F. Pecklers, eds.;

What Kind of Ecclesiology?

throughout was collegial and collaborative, with wide consultation among experts and decisive input from the bishops' conferences.

ICEL had been assured that the principles stated in *Comme le prévoit* remained valid and would be used to evaluate the translation. The translators followed those principles, especially that of dynamic equivalence. However, they focused on how the translation would sound, not just how it would read. They paid particular attention to the patterns of English formal public speech and proclamation, especially stress, cadence, and rhythm. When appropriate, inclusive language was used, especially for "horizontal" references, those for human beings. The translators paid close attention to translating the Latin faithfully and bringing out biblical allusions. They used a careful analysis of words and phrases in the Latin and looked at the major current translations. The final text included original compositions.

The bishops and advisors of eleven episcopal conferences examined the translation and approved it part by part. The translation was well received. With the assumption that it would be approved, work began on implementation.

However, political shifts in the Vatican began in the 1980s that reasserted curial competence and control. Subsequent heads of the Congregation of Divine Worship (CDW)—Mayer, Martinez Somalo, Javierre Ortas, Medina, Arinze, and Llovera—were less sympathetic toward the Council's vision of Church and worship, especially a vernacular liturgy controlled by bishops' conferences. They were especially critical of ICEL, probably because English had become the primary international language and because the Vatican was increasingly dependent on English-speaking countries, especially the U.S., for financial support. Curiously,

Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2000). The 1998 translation is available on the web at www.misguidedmissal.com. We cannot analyze its ecclesiology here.

What Kind of Ecclesiology?

none of these CDW officials were native English-speakers or even fluent in English and only a few were liturgical specialists. Pope John Paul II's deteriorating health gave curial officials an increasingly free rein.

Matters came to a head when Cardinal Medina, a close associate of the Chilean dictator Pinochet, became prefect of the CDW in 1996 and set himself to the task of reforming the reform. An especially important element of this was establishing new principles and regulations for preparing vernacular translations. *Liturgiam authenticam* was issued in 2001 with the requirement, not recommendation, that translations be so literal as to copy Latin syntax, rhythm, punctuation, and capitalization. The Latin text, not the praying community, is to be the central focus. LA specifically warns against inclusive language and dependence on modern forms of expression such as "psychologizing language" (whatever that is) and regards archaic forms as sometimes appropriate.⁵

Thus a project guided by the English-speaking bishops' conferences for twenty years was derailed by changing the rules after the work had been done. On that basis Medina in 2002 rejected the ICEL translation which the bishops' conferences had approved in 1998.

Medina also required that ICEL personnel be replaced by CDW-approved staff and translators and that the CDW, not the bishops' conferences, control its work. A CDW-appointed committee, Vox Clara, was established and loaded with carefully selected cardinals and bishops unsympathetic toward ICEL's previous efforts. Its stated purpose was to advise the CDW on English texts. In effect,

⁵Peter Jeffery has provided a solid critique in his *Translating Tradition: A Chant Historian Reads Liturgiam Authenticam* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2005).

What Kind of Ecclesiology?

it replaced the English-speaking bishops as the body responsible for worship in the English language.

LA had, in fact, explicitly restated that “the Holy See reserves to itself the right to prepare translations in any language, and to approve them for liturgical use” (104). Despite the expressed intentions of the Council, the final state of affairs was little different from that which had existed since the Congregation of Rites was established in 1588: everything pertaining to divine worship was ultimately under the firm control of the Vatican. The bishops could oversee the preliminary work and finance it, but they were otherwise given as little actual authority as possible.

ICEL had previously operated collaboratively and consulted widely. The new ICEL regime began to operate more secretively. It gave primacy to patristic scholarship rather than consulting poets and social scientists. It sent completed translations to the bishops’ conferences but paid little attention to the bishops’ criticisms, corrections, and proposed amendments.

In this whole process bishops have generally acted more as papal delegates than bishops. Knowing who was in control, they resigned themselves to the new translation. Some said that if they didn’t approve it Rome would impose it. Others stated that this was the price of belonging to a universal Church, effectively identifying the Roman church and the universal Church. Some, of course, were sincere in their acceptance. Since it has been introduced, almost all of them have defended it. They refer to it as the fruit of forty years of experience and scholarship. They are complicit by saying “we’ve learned” and “we want.” Only a few have dared to publicly challenge the process and the translation.

The process whereby the new translation was prepared and imposed seems designed to show who is in control—the curia, not the bishops. This goes against the ecclesiology of communion of

What Kind of Ecclesiology?

Vatican Council II. It minimizes the responsibility and authority of bishops. Most significantly, it gives almost no attention to pastoral concerns. Loyalty to the Latin text takes precedence over people's prayer. Though the process and the translation have violated ecclesial communion, bishops publicly acquiesce and praise the translation. Nevertheless, this was another among many regressive moves that favored the institutional model of Church over the communion model. So far as liturgical authority is concerned, it is practically a return to the Counter-Reformation situation.

Language and Elitism

A point of conflict in the liturgy wars has been the issue of "elevated language" sufficiently different from ordinary language to call attention to sacred meaning and the presence of mystery. This is also referred to as "heightened style" and "noble tone" and "sacral language" (LA 47, 50c).

The debate's not new. Hilary of Poitiers, for example, argued for elevated language and Augustine of Hippo argued for accessible language. No one, however, until recent years tried to make a case for sacral language or obsolete usage. Sacral language was an available and obvious option when the liturgy went from Greek to Latin, since Roman pagan worship used an archaic Latin that sounded sacred and mystical and was otherwise unused. No evidence suggests that it was ever considered appropriate for Christian worship. Yet LA 27 and 43 explicitly recommends language that might otherwise sound odd and obsolete.

At many points the new translation has an attractive elegance that points to the beauty of holiness. But there are serious weaknesses, points where unusual images and expressions, literally translated, give a counterfeit to the heightened language that is poetry. All of these, especially taken together, are more

What Kind of Ecclesiology?

likely to create mystique than serve as pointers to mystery, especially as they artificially separate liturgy from life.

“Precious chalice” in Eucharistic Prayer I is an example. “Chalice” entered the English language six or seven centuries ago as a loan-word rendering the Latin *calix*, meaning “cup.” Its use long ago came to be confined to ecclesiastical circles for the goblet used at Mass. Using a word otherwise unused makes it unusual, perhaps, in a twisted sort of way, even mystical. Yet, curiously, the second acclamation, like the lectionary and most, if not all, scripture translations, refers to “cup” rather than “chalice.”

The new translation is less accessible due to unfamiliar words, strange images, convoluted constructions (especially long periodic sentences with relative clauses), and a tendency to archaism. Its proponents argue that it is a more “sacral” language and more reverent, precisely because it is different from everyday “secular” language. The presumption and consequence is a sacral cultic language that compartmentalizes, artificially separating liturgy from life. For the most part, this language consists of polysyllabic words with Latin rather than Anglo-Saxon roots. Though they’re really more meant to be read than heard, their unusual sound gives an “elevated” tone which sets the rites apart from the everyday—sacred cult reserved to sacred figures. As in academic prose, language numbs rather than energizes.

The 1973 ICEL translation was the first literary liturgy in the West that was not, to some extent, elitist. Critics of the forty-year-old ICEL translation have called its language common and plebeian, a dumbing-down that disrespected the congregation. Even its supporters admitted that it was at times prosaic and insufficiently poetic and allusive. Yet, despite its weaknesses, it was accessible. That could not be said of the language that had been used for more than a millennium.

What Kind of Ecclesiology?

The *koine* Greek that was used in the early liturgy was the *lingua franca* of its time, an everyday language that lacked the polish of the educated upperclass. Churches moved from Greek to Latin in the third and fourth centuries as Latin became the more common language, first in north Africa, then in Rome.⁶ (We know little about other areas in the West.) Formal upperclass Latin was used, not the everyday language of the lower classes or the archaic sacral Latin of Roman religions. As the various Romance languages developed from rustic or vulgar Latin, their distinction from formal Latin became more apparent. "Mistakes" in early medieval manuscripts, for example, often reflect developments in everyday folk Latin and the pastoral efforts of monks and priests to make the liturgy a little more accessible.

The ninth-century Carolingian reformation established a "correct" Latin that functioned as a sign of the sacred much like icons in the Byzantine East. The liturgy became sacral and clerical, increasingly inaccessible to the common people. Its "mystery" was even more evident when the priest began to say his Mass so quietly that the common people could not even hear the "blessed murmur of the Mass." The twentieth-century vernacularization of the liturgy helped to diminish this elitist character, in part because a goal of reform was that texts and rites be easily understood (SC 21). This rejected mystique, not mystery, and made the mystery both more apparent and more accessible to all members of the assembly.

The new translation confuses mystique with mystery. Using arcane and archaic language, its composers suppose, will confront people with mystery and lead to greater reverence. It is more

⁶Catechesis in one diocese makes the strange statement that Christian communities worshiped in their vernacular with texts composed in their own language for the first millennium, with Latin phrases beginning to come in during the eleventh century and then becoming dominant.

What Kind of Ecclesiology?

likely to make liturgy seem the preserve of a favored few and irrelevant to everyday life. Applying readability criteria indicates that the number of years of formal education required for understanding the Eucharistic Prayers on first *reading* has increased from 10.75 to 17.21.⁷

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

Piling up adjectives, a characteristic of Roman rhetoric, sounds artificial in a language with Anglo-Saxon and Norman foundations. Some of the unusual language is the consequence of seeking conceptual precision by using technical theological vocabulary; e.g., "consubstantial" and "prevenient." This too is likely to turn off hearers and leave the impression that the liturgy is intended for a favored few.

Overall, doctrine has priority over prayer in *LA* and in the new translation. This reverses the traditional *lex orandi, lex credendi* (the norm of prayer is the norm of belief). Tellingly, *LA* also reverses the meaning when it refers to the saying (80). We will, however, see some places in the new translation which hint at

⁷<http://www.praytellig.com/index.php/2011/02/18/readability-tests-on-the-eucharistic-prayers/>

What Kind of Ecclesiology?

semi-Pelagianism or Jansenism.

There are instances where catechesis will be needed because the translators used English words but seem unfamiliar with English, at least as it has been used in the last century or so. "Victim" in Eucharistic Prayer III, for example, is a reasonable translation of *hostia* (sacrificial offering), but in contemporary English it generally refers to someone who has been treated unfairly or is the object of violence. At the very least, "sacrificial victim" would have been clearer, with or without capitalization. The use of "oblation" and "confirm" in Eucharistic Prayer III and of "charity" (in Eucharistic Prayer II and elsewhere) are similarly problematic because of their usage in contemporary American English. Likewise, "minister to you" (Eucharistic Prayer II) normally has the connotation (if not meaning) of caring for someone who is helpless or providing for someone's needs.

In the Nicene Creed "consubstantial" replaces "one in Being." This certainly sounds more like the *consubstantialem* of the Latin, but it will have less meaning for most people. In addition, "substance" has a materialistic meaning for most English speakers, including even philosophers and theologians in their less-metaphysical moments. In the Apostles' Creed—for the first time in history an option for use at Mass—the archaic "he descended into hell" reappears, making extensive catechesis necessary to counter the clearly stated verbal meaning. In both cases the translators seem out of touch with contemporary English.

In the Holy, despite the recommendation that Hebrew and Greek words not translated into Latin retain the original form (LA 23), *Sabaoth* is rendered as "hosts." YHWH is once more a warrior or war god rather than the "God of power and might" that regarded the Hebrew as metaphorical. Perhaps we should be grateful that the archaic leanings of the translators led them to choose "hosts" rather than "armies"! However, most English-speakers are still

What Kind of Ecclesiology?

more likely to associate the term with hospitality or wafers than the Almighty.

In the response to the invitation to communion, “enter under my roof” is certainly a more literal translation of the centurion’s words in Lk 7:6-7. That is not, however, particularly helpful if it is taken anatomically—especially if it is erroneously understood as a localized presence of the Lord under the roof of one’s mouth. Nor is it a poetic image, as it has been described—it uses the text in an accommodated sense.

No one, of course, argues for colloquialisms or street English. The formal setting and the nature of ritual require that there be a different tone to worship, one that has the unimaginable effect of confronting the ordinariness of life with the awesome presence of God. That presence is already in the ordinary, of course. One purpose of liturgical language is to make us aware of that presence. That is more likely to be accomplished by simple words and rites that do not require extensive catechesis (*Constitution on the Liturgy*, 34). Poetry is more likely to do it than theological concepts and can be just as orthodox

The Counter-Reformation institutional model of Church was inclined to elitism, with some groups within the Church privileged and all Catholics regarded as privileged in comparison with other Christians and all non-Christians. Such elitism was characteristic of the institutional model of Church and the new translation moves back in that direction with its use of so-called “elevated language.”

Patriarchy and Clericalism

Patriarchy and clericalism are significant dimensions of the institutional model of Church and its elitist views. Both are evident in the new translation. Inclusive language has no place.

What Kind of Ecclesiology?

The distinction between ordained and lay is repeatedly underlined with little attempt at integration, to the detriment of full participation.

The language that we use can either reinforce patriarchy and clericalism or counter them. Using language that regards the male as normative reinforces them; e.g., the masculine as synonymous with human or as presumed unless explicitly stated otherwise. Using inclusive language counters them; e.g., words that regard masculine and feminine as equal or which refer to both men and women.

As far back as 1976, ICEL began to study the issue of inclusive and exclusive language. The Vatican has apparently never understood what is at issue, perhaps seeing gender-neutral language as a subtle way of advancing the ordination of women. The translation of the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* used inclusive language and was rejected by Rome. The ICEL translation of the psalms used inclusive language and was rejected by Rome. The 1998 ICEL translation of the Roman Missal generally used "horizontal" inclusive language (references to human beings) but retained patriarchal language for God. It was rejected.

The rejection of inclusive language is now a matter of principle. LA is, of course, in favor of "the dignity and equality of all *men*" (29; emphasis added). However, it claims a knowledge and wisdom superior to linguists and language scholars. It can state authoritatively that favoring inclusive language is not necessarily an authentic development in a language (30) and that academic style manuals cannot provide standards for liturgical translators (32). ("Classics," on the other hand, can, presumably because their language is less up-to-date.) LA insists that the Church makes its own decisions on language without reference to external norms (30). In this, one of its least coherent paragraphs, LA

What Kind of Ecclesiology?

insists on the use of the masculine for translating words from Hebrew (*adam*), Greek (*anthropos*), and Latin (*homo*), words which are clearly inclusive in the original and distinguished from words that refer to males (*ish*, *aner*, and *vir*, respectively).

The disregard for academic style manuals shows itself in other ways. English is no longer a gendered language. Many languages, including German and the Romance languages, attribute a grammatical gender to nouns: "pen" (*plume*) is feminine in French, "police" (*Polizei*) is feminine in German, "little girl" (*Mädchen*) is neuter in German. Despite its presence in the language's Anglo-Saxon and Norman roots, English has generally abandoned the use of gendered language. LA nevertheless insists that "church," for example, is always to be treated as feminine (32d), presumably to maintain the spousal relationship between Christ and Church as heterosexual.

The new translation does depart from LA in several instances and at least one of these reveals the clerical mindset of the translators. LA directs that capitalization in the Latin original is to be followed in translations (33). The new translation, however, uses uppercase for "Priest" and "Deacon." Lowercase is, of course, used for reference to other "ministers." The Latin text makes no distinction. The frequent and uncalled for use of the upper case is contrary to English usage but presumably intended to be more "sacral," perhaps even to indicate superiority. This also supports the notion that the new translation is more meant to be read than heard.

The translation of the priest's invitation to the assembly to pray for God's acceptance of the sacrifice is more literal than the previous—"my sacrifice and yours" rather than "our sacrifice. It also subtly reinforces the clerical notion that priest and assembly offer the sacrifice in very different ways. That was, of course, the understanding when this dialogue developed in Carolingian times

What Kind of Ecclesiology?

and later entered the Roman Mass. The dialogue, in fact, took place not between priest and people but among the clergy. The people were not regarded as having any active role.

What is probably the clearest expression of clericalism is the new translation's perpetuation of an error in the Latin original required by LA 56. Clericalism here is not so much in the translation as in the justification given for it.

"And with your spirit" is the literal translation of the Latin *et cum spiritu tuo*, itself a literal (but mistaken) translation of the scriptural original. In the Hellenistic anthropology used by Paul "spirit" refers to the human person at its best or to the inmost self. (Body/flesh, soul, and spirit are not parts of the person for Paul but rather, from his Jewish background, the person seen from different perspectives.) Thus, when the priest (Priest?) greets and blesses the assembly ("The Lord be with you"), the assembly responds by returning the greeting and blessing. "And also with you" expressed the Hebraism clearly.

The defense of the new translation explains the anthropology of "and with your spirit" as the priest's special configuration to Christ because of the Holy Spirit received at ordination. Some variation of this seems to be the standard explanation given in catechesis despite the general lack of scholarly support. The people's response is explained as recognition of the Spirit given the priest in ordination and thus acknowledgment that the Risen Lord presides. Or it is the people's assurance to the priest that he has the Spirit's assistance to use the charismatic gifts of ordination to fulfill his prophetic function in the Church.

This is interpretation, not explanation, much like the commentary

What Kind of Ecclesiology?

on “the Lord be with you.”⁸ And there is some support in late patristic allegorical interpretations.⁹ But what happens in fact is that the priest blesses the assembly and the assembly blesses the priest. If the interpretation is followed and the words taken literally, then the assembly’s response is the wish that the Lord be with the Holy Spirit. More simply and accurately, the incoherence of the explanation reveals the attempt to maintain clericalism: how *could* the assembly bless the priest? Once again, catechesis divorces liturgy and life.

Ecumenism and Interreligious Dialogue

Characteristic of the institutional model of Church was its rejection of ecumenism, interreligious dialogue, and religious liberty. The “one true church” had no need of dialogue with heretics and unbelievers. Before the official recognition of “invincible ignorance” in the mid-nineteenth century their salvation was considered very unlikely. Prior to Vatican Council II, the official Catholic position was to seek religious liberty while Catholics were in a minority, then to deny it to “heretics” when Catholics were in a majority. That position was enshrined in concordats; e.g., that with Italy in the early twentieth century.

⁸According to the USCCB website, “the priest expresses his desire that the dynamic activity of God’s spirit be given to the people of God, enabling them to do the work of transforming the world that God has entrusted to them.” (http://old.usccb.org/romanmissal/translating_notes.shtml)

⁹Allegorical interpretations are spiritually enriching but theologically fanciful and historically unreliable attempts at understanding elements of scripture and liturgy by attaching meaning from outside. A classic example in regarding the details of the Mass as representing the life of Jesus, especially his passion: the priest washing his hands reminds us of Pilate washing his hands. A similar example in recent catechesis on the new translation: “through my fault, through my fault, through my most grievous fault” reminds us of Peter’s three denials of Jesus.

What Kind of Ecclesiology?

Issues of religious liberty and conscience were among the most bitterly contested at the Council because of their status in the Counter-Reformation Church. Ecumenism was a matter of controversy for the same reason: change seemed to be a repudiation of the past and a rupture of continuity. Yet within a short time the latecomer to the ecumenical movement was in the forefront. National and international dialogues revealed how much the separated churches and ecclesial communities had in common.

Among the areas of cooperation were the production of common liturgical texts and work on a common lectionary. ICEL was one of the conveners of the International Consultation on English Texts and its successor, the English Language Liturgical Consultation. However, in 2001 ICEL was ordered to withdraw from any ecumenical endeavors. Though LA pays lip service to the value of ecumenical texts (91), it makes clear that texts must avoid wording or style akin to those of other churches or religions lest the faithful be confused or discomforted (LA 40). They obviously have nothing to offer.

Some departures from the wording of the common texts that had been in use are among the oddities of the new translation. Why the changes were made is unclear. There are hints that at least some may have been made to maintain Catholic uniqueness against ecumenical and academic consensus.

In the Glory to God, for example, translators produced a phrase with a hint of semi-Pelagianism: "on earth peace to people of good will." While the ambiguous Latin genitive (*bonae voluntatis*) is open to that translation, biblical exegetes are in general agreement that the scriptural meaning is that peace is a reward for those on whom God's favor rests, not payment to those who manage to achieve good will. "Peace to his people on earth," the previous ICEL translation, was somewhat deficient but at least not

What Kind of Ecclesiology?

misleading.¹⁰

Another hint of semi-Pelagianism is in the Penitential Act. (It was already in the Penitential Rite of the previous translation.) *Ut apti simus* is translated as “prepare ourselves” rather than “be ready.” The difference may seem inconsequential, but if doctrine is supposed to determine the translation it might be better for God’s grace to prepare us rather than thinking we do it ourselves by acknowledging our sins. Or is justification by grace too Protestant?

The requirement that hymns and liturgical texts not use the sacred tetragrammaton YHWH—usually rendered in English as Yahweh—was an important change to show respect for Jewish sensibilities. It is to be translated as “Lord,” like the Hebrew *adonai* that replaced YHWH in public reading. However, references to “your Christ” in scripture readings and collects—rather than Messiah or Anointed One—seem designed, like the Douay-Rheims translation of the Bible, to diminish recognition of Christianity’s roots in Judaism.

The institutional model of Church had no place for ecumenism and interreligious dialogue. Contact with heretics and pagans that treated them as in any way equal or having anything to offer could only be dangerous to Catholic believers. While we have not returned to the condemnations issued by Leo XIII and other popes, in liturgy as in other areas of Church life we have regressed from the position and spirit of Vatican Council II.

Restricted Vision

¹⁰A curious catechetical explanation in one diocese—totally without foundation—is that the change was made to avoid sexist language! Changing “his” to “God’s,” as many people had already done on their own, would have solved that problem. Catechetical comments generally ignore “for us men” and “man” in the Creed.

What Kind of Ecclesiology?

As we have seen, a narrow and restricted self-centered view was characteristic of the Counter-Reformation model of Church. Its closed-mindedness rejected non-Catholic contributions and modern scholarship. In the U.S. it gave rise to a ghetto culture and siege mentality that isolated itself and regarded itself as under attack.

One aspect of this restricted vision was the perpetuation of medieval individualism. Aspects of this have returned in a de-emphasis on external communal participation and in some oddities in the new translation. The restricted vision also shows itself in seemingly narrowing the scope of Christ's saving death and resurrection. Ideology also sometimes triumphs over literalism.

One of the errors in the Latin translation of the Nicene Creed was to begin with *credo*, I believe, rather than the plural, we believe. The Council of Nicaea (325), followed by the Council of Constantinople (381), expressed the faith of the assembled bishops and the Church using the plural. The error came because, when the Nicene Creed was introduced into Spanish liturgy in the late sixth century, it was "revised" to match the baptismal creed where individuals professed their personal faith. (The Nicene Creed was based on a local baptismal creed but put in the plural.) After four or five centuries of resistance the emperor finally forced the pope to incorporate it into the Roman liturgy in the eleventh century. By then Rome was too weak to resist, if it even recognized the mistake.

The earlier ICEL translation returned to the accurate conciliar plural where the individual identifies with the community of faith. In perpetuating the errors of the Latin text the new translation returns to medieval individualism and, in an affront to other churches, particularly of the East, it unilaterally revises a conciliar text.

What Kind of Ecclesiology?

An especially disconcerting error in the new translation is the restrictive rendering of *pro multis* in the Last Supper narrative. "For many" is a literal translation of the Latin and of Mt 26:28 and Mk 14:24. So far as English meaning rather than English words is concerned, however, it is exceptionally misleading. It hints at the Jansenist and Counter-Reformation view that salvation for those outside the Catholic Church is extremely unlikely.

Though "many" and "all" contrast in meaning in English, linguists and exegetes say that is not the case in Aramaic or Hebrew. Roman authorities say otherwise and make explaining that "for many" really means "for all" the task of catechesis.¹¹ Surely it would have been better if that had been reversed! It will be more difficult to convince people that what they hear means something entirely different. Liturgy and life are once more divorced.

Official commentaries sometimes make the point that the translation is literal but not slavish. Two errors suggest that some departures from a literal translation may be for the sake of reinforcing ideology, not prayer. In Eucharistic Prayer II, for example, *astare coram te*, literally rendered, is "to stand before you." Since we can hardly refer to standing during the Eucharistic Prayer, the new translation gives us "to be in your presence." (In Eucharistic Prayer III *astare* is paraphrased, something supposedly prohibited: "whom you have summoned before you.") In the second Eucharistic Prayer for Reconciliation, *experiendo tamen cognovimus te animos flectere*, literally translated, is "by experience we have known you to change hearts." The official translation changes the meaning entirely in order to rule out experience as a source of religious knowledge: "we know that by

¹¹The defense of the translation sometimes explains that while Christ *wants* all to be saved, not all accept salvation. Reference is also made to Isa 53:12. However, in addition to what was said above about "many" and "all," Christians have generally understood fulfillment to go beyond prophecy.

What Kind of Ecclesiology?

testing us you change our hearts.” The notion of divine testing does not at all fit in context and is certainly not in the Latin text.

Unity and Uniformity

Arguably the most telling expression of the institutional model of Church in LA and the whole of the translation process lies in paragraph 80. Seeking *recognitio*—originally a review and confirmation but now, effectively, permission and authorization—is described as an expression of communion between Peter’s successor and his brother bishops. But, the document goes on to say, decisions of bishops’ conferences have no legal force without the “exercise of the power of governance” of the *recognitio*. Implied, it seems, is that only the central authority has real authority and other “authorities” have only what is delegated to them. As in other cases, “communion” provides a facade for the institutional model of Church.

LA 80 also says that the *recognitio* assures not only authenticity and orthodoxy but also unity. “Furthermore”—and here the paragraph concludes its argument—“each particular Church must be in accord with the universal Church not only as regards the doctrine of the Faith and the sacramental signs, but also as regards those practices universally received through Apostolic and continuous tradition.” The paragraph then states the corollary that the *recognitio* ensures that unity is not harmed. Since what is involved is not only doctrine and sacraments but also practices, unity seems to be identified with uniformity. No examples of such practices are given.

An omitted rubric also suggests a move toward greater uniformity. In several places the 1973 translation advised the priest that he could say something to the assembly “in these or similar words.” Whether paragraph 14 of *Eucharistiae participationem* (1973), which permitted this, has been repealed or not is unclear, but that

What Kind of Ecclesiology?

option goes unmentioned in the new translation. In some cases the Latin text (and English translation) do provide a few variations and the impression is that only these are allowed. Unity again requires uniformity. Apart from the omission of this rubric, the very fact that the many nations divided by a common language (to pirate a phrase) are required to use the same translation makes clear the relationship between unity and uniformity.

A closer look at the liturgy wars suggests they revolve as much around issues of authority and ideology as liturgy and theology. This distracts attention from the more basic questions of how narrowly "Roman" the Roman rite is and whether fidelity to the "Roman" heritage requires ongoing cultural development, since the Roman liturgy has never been exclusively Roman.

The Asian bishops have been vocal in raising these questions. U.S. bishops have paid little attention to inculturation beyond translation. ICEL's alternate collects for the opening prayer in the 1973 translation were a rare attempt to do more than simply copy the Roman texts and that has now been ruled out. The traditional American loyalty to Rome has meant compliance with its laws and regulations. Thus, the U.S. bishops have acquiesced to Roman demands and now sing the praises of the new translation as though it is what they had intended all along. Unity requires uniformity as it did in the days of the Counter-Reformation institutional ecclesiology.

Other Signs of Restorationism

The third edition of the *Roman Missal* shows some definite improvement over previous editions. Particularly when viewed with *LA*, however, there are also definite tensions. These are even more evident in the new English translation, as we have seen. Taken together they represent a return to the Counter-Reformation institutional model of Church.

What Kind of Ecclesiology?

Other signs of restorationism in the reform of the reform are more subtle and more theological. These are especially evident in the *General Instruction of the Roman Missal (GIRM)*. This is the introduction to the Roman Missal. It is primarily “pastoral, practical, and catechetical” and not merely rubrical, legal, and doctrinal. Its purpose is to achieve a celebration that is pastorally effective by promoting the people’s participation within the parameters of official liturgical regulations. Like the introductions to the other postconciliar ritual books, it indicates the theological underpinnings of the sacramental rite and offers guidance on celebration.

The theological foundations noted in *GIRM*—and changes from previous editions—clearly indicate regression toward the Counter-Reformation model of Church. To look at them in detail, however, would take us beyond our focus, the ecclesiology of the new translation.

A few points indicate its perspective. *GIRM* says little about the Eucharist in relation to ecclesial communion. It says little about the significance of sacramental communion. Its incomplete theology of eucharistic sacrifice centers almost solely on the priest. This Counter-Reformation clerical emphasis is central in *GIRM* and the new English translation reinforces it. This affects the theology of eucharistic and ecclesial communion and the role of the assembly, all of which are crucial to postconciliar reforms. It reminds us that we are not that far removed from the time when the priest “said” Mass alone and he received communion for and in place of the people!

Implications include the people’s role in offering, the significance of *their* sacramental communion, and the continuing process of adaptation and inculturation, all of which receive too little attention. The underlying sense, too often, is that people still participate in the priest’s Mass, a perspective at odds with the

What Kind of Ecclesiology?

Vatican II principles of pastorally effective celebration and a participation that is full, conscious, and active as a community. Problems generally arise from a shift away from postconciliar trends and back to a sense of Church and priesthood and a style of worship more associated with the late Middle Ages and the Counter-Reformation era.

The shift is in the name of continuity and reverence, both of which are key values. However, *GIRM* and the defenses of the new translation frequently show no awareness of differences between patristic and medieval liturgy and culture. There are historically questionable references, especially to Trent and Vatican II.¹² There is often a failure to distinguish between tradition and custom, evident too in intentional archaisms in the translation.

¹²This point takes us beyond our concerns here, although it is central to determining the meaning of both scripture and magisterial documents. An ahistorical approach looks to the final product and interprets the text as it is: the meaning of words, syntax, and so on. Such interpretation can more easily deny change and development and find the translator's concerns in the text. Its slogan has been *ressourcement*, back to the sources. It relies more on patristic exegesis than contemporary scholarly tools. This has, in many ways, been the preferred approach of curial offices and such theologians as Joseph Ratzinger.

An approach informed by historical consciousness is more complicated and intricate: in clarifying meaning it analyzes the formation of the document. It is thus more open to recognizing change and development. Its slogan has been *aggiornamento*, updating, and it uses contemporary historical-critical tools. The two approaches are complementary, though not necessarily so in a theologian's methodology.

In the case of some Vatican II documents, a particular word or text may be open to various interpretations when analyzed semantically or philosophically. The controversial *subsistit* of *Lumen gentium* 8 is a good example. The Council deliberately chose to say that "the Church of Christ subsists in the Catholic Church" rather than "the Church of Christ is the Catholic Church"; the discussions show that the two words are not simply synonymous. The ahistorical approach tends to regard that as irrelevant and does a grammatical analysis showing that "subsists" means "is."

What Kind of Ecclesiology?

Counter-Reformation customs that reinforced medieval regard for the Mass as sacrifice, the ministerial priesthood, and the real presence are emphasized to maintain continuity and restore reverence. A clerical perspective often overshadows the pastoral and the role of central authority is overemphasized. The consequence is to downplay the role of the assembled community and the local Church. The official English translation accentuates these attitudes beyond what is in the Latin—curiously, the requirement of literal translation (“formal correspondence”) is not always observed!

What Can We Do?

Without a doubt, we will be using the new translation for the foreseeable future. There may be minor revisions, but these are unlikely to involve anything controversial. The Vatican is unlikely to change direction. After the investment that has been made in new books and implementation, the Church in the U.S. will not push for further change. The exercise of power by Roman offices, the acquiescence of the U.S. bishops, and the energy that has been put into defending and implementing the changes are as much an investment as the financial one. They make major changes very unlikely. Loss of face would be even more significant than loss of money.

So we can expect to be using these translations twenty or thirty or even forty years from now. (Well, perhaps you can expect to—I’ll be leaving for the perfect liturgy before then.) But we don’t have to join the chorus praising the emperor’s new clothes. We must approach and use the translation carefully and critically for the sake of the Church at worship.

In particular, we have the responsibility to seek changes and to counter undesirable elements that are not changed. Priests in particular need to carefully prepare so that they can pray the

What Kind of Ecclesiology?

texts effectively and compensate, to the extent possible, for the problems in the texts. Preachers and catechists must acknowledge the problems and explain them honestly, not gloss over them or make them virtues.

What else can be done? In some respects, very little—at least within the parameters of the institutional model of Church. But there is more to Church than its institutional structure. That structure is necessary, but alone it is not enough.

Even within the institutional model theologians acknowledged (quietly and unobtrusively) that teachings, laws, and practices are ultimately recognized as of the Spirit when they are accepted by the faithful. Nonreception has led to revision and even reversal.

This doctrine of reception and nonreception is even more significant within communion ecclesiology. People must, therefore, make clear to their pastors and bishops that they do not accept or receive the new translation, even if they faced with the choice either to go along or to be silent bystanders at Mass or not attend. Ideally they should also indicate what they object to and why and what they will do to show their nonreception.

Will this accomplish much? Probably not. The institutional model has little regard for people's concerns and within that perspective bishops are generally selected for their readiness to conform and obey. But at least this much is needed to avoid *our* complicity. We do what we can or lose our right to object.

Some people have proposed withholding financial support for the curial bureaucracy. That would be difficult to do because of the system of "taxes" and "voluntary" contributions: part of what is given to parishes goes to the diocese, part of what dioceses receive goes to the national conference and to Rome. Bishops are able to exert financial pressure, but, of course, they will not.

What Kind of Ecclesiology?

Some priests are still using the 1973 translation. It is hard to see how this can be justified, except perhaps for a time in homes for the aged and similar situations. It is a significant violation of ecclesial communion.

Some priests have adopted the 1998 translation for their prayers, even if they have felt compelled to introduce the new translation for the people's parts. This too, in my opinion, is hard to justify as a general practice, though the pastoral value of the translation certainly recommends it.

Other priests, probably many of them, are making minor revisions on their own. Some say "for all" rather than "for many" in the Last Supper narrative. Some priests and people are saying in the Creed "we" rather than "I," "for us" rather than "for us men," and "human" rather than "man." Some priests are finding ways to break up long periodic sentences and substituting words to make the text more intelligible and accessible.

Such changes are more easily justified, even though they do not resolve all the problems. Certainly the parish, not just the priest, must be involved in the decision. The consequences of the ecclesial equivalent of civil disobedience must be considered.

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

What Kind of Ecclesiology?

Within the perspective of other models, especially the communion model, minor departures from the literary norm which do not violate the doctrinal norm or which express that norm more clearly can be justified on pastoral grounds. The traditional adage here says that *salus animarum suprema lex*: the good of souls is the ultimate law. People are more important than rubrics and rule books.

Whether officials inclined to the institutional model will accept that remains to be seen. Good bishops are generally selective in what they notice and cautious about battles they fight. Some bishops, of course, will insist on absolute uniformity and priests in those dioceses will have to make conscientious decisions. Allegedly, priests have already been punished.

Power and control are central to the institutional model of Church. When those in power are able to declare the truth, those who must search for it are at a disadvantage. But those in control are insecure because they are always at risk of losing control—they look over their shoulders at Rome and hear the rumblings around them. The institutional model fails as a primary model because it makes the Church's purpose and mission secondary to organization and structure.

It is unfortunate that bishops have abdicated their responsibility and too easily acquiesced. The arguments they use to defend the decisions are even more disheartening. They often appear unconvinced by their own comments. But that is the reality of a Church that is, at the same time, the Body of Christ and a Church of sinners.

We celebrate the Eucharist to know this identity and our purpose as Church. Only at Sunday Mass—itself increasingly unavailable because of our ordination discipline—do we hear the Gospel as a community and know its call to conversion. Only at Sunday Mass

What Kind of Ecclesiology?

do we know ourselves as already the Body of Christ. But an inaccessible liturgy which communicates an inadequate model of Church calls into question the Gospel and our identity.

Unfortunately, many people, especially young people, will take this as another indication that the Church is out of touch with the contemporary world and irrelevant to their everyday lives.

Liturgy remains the area where tensions between differing ecclesiologies are most deeply felt. How this latest challenge will play out over time remains to be seen. But the kind of ecclesiology the new translation presents is unacceptable.

James Dallen, a priest of the diocese of Salina, Kansas, has his doctorate in liturgical and sacramental theology from The Catholic University of America. He is emeritus professor of religious studies at Gonzaga University, Spokane, Washington, where he specialized in liturgy, sacraments, and ecclesiology. He may be reached at dallen@calvin.gonzaga.edu.