

California may be less “religious” than the rest of the nation. But are they more tolerant?

Religion in the USA Has a New Anthem.

No longer Give Me That Old Time Religion, Now It's Don't Fence Me In.

By Cathy Lynn Grossman

USA TODAY

June 23, 2008

Newly released data from a major survey finds that most U.S. adults range far from knowing or caring about the distinctive teachings of their professed faith.

They believe overwhelmingly (92%) in God and 58% say they pray at least once a day. But when it comes to specific religions — the teachings of the Southern Baptist Convention, the Roman Catholic Church or scores of other denominations — they're all over the map, finds the latest data from the Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life.

Pew's U.S. Religious Landscape Survey questioned 35,000 Americans, nearly three in 10 of whom profess no religious identity, but sometimes go to church. Most evangelicals, whose denominations teach that Jesus is the sole route to salvation, instead say people who have 'led good lives' go to heaven. Only one in three Catholics say their church should preserve its traditional beliefs rather than change with the times or adopt modern practices.

Pew released demographic data in February from the survey, which was conducted in May through August 2007. This new installment focuses on the questions asked about Americans' religious beliefs and practices, spiritual experiences, and views on society and politics.

This analysis, based on a questionnaire that never mentions Jesus, portrays a nation of 'free-flowing spirituality,' says Pew Forum director Luis Lugo, who finds the declining adherence to dogma 'stunning.'

'You no longer have an alignment of affiliation, belief and behavior. Instead we find complexity, and diversity not only between religious communities but within them, as well. We find a high level of comfort with this diversity,' says political scientist John Green, a senior fellow with the Pew Forum. ...

Some key findings:

- 78% overall say there are 'absolute standards of right and wrong,' but only 29% rely on their religion to delineate these standards. The majority (52%) turn to 'practical experience and common sense,' with 9% relying on philosophy and reason, and 5% on scientific information.
- 74% say 'there is a heaven, where people who have led good lives are eternally rewarded,' but far fewer (59%) say there's a 'hell, where people who have led bad lives and die without being sorry are eternally punished.' Only evangelicals and Muslims are as likely to believe almost to the same degree in both.
- 70%, including a majority of all major Christian and non-Christian religious groups except Mormons, agree that 'many religions can lead to eternal life.'
- 68% say 'there's more than one true way to interpret the teachings of my religion.'

•54% say being devoutly religious isn't a challenge in modern society. Another 42% say they 'often feel that my values are threatened by Hollywood and the entertainment industry.' • 45% of adults say they seldom or never read their religion's holy texts. This includes 49% of members of mainline Protestant churches, 57% of Catholics and 70% of Jews. Among groups that emphasize reading scripture, the numbers are sharply higher. Those who read scripture at least weekly include: evangelicals (60%); historically black churches (60%); Mormons (76%); Jehovah's Witnesses (83%); and Muslims (43%)

•44% want to preserve their religion's traditional beliefs and practices. But most Catholics (67%), Jews (65%), mainline Christians (56%) and Muslims (51%) say their religion should either 'adjust to new circumstances' or 'adopt modern beliefs and practices.'

•50% say 'homosexuality is a way of life that should be accepted by society,' but the most consistently traditional religious groups say society should discourage it — 76% of Jehovah's Witnesses, 68% of Mormons, 61% of Muslims and 64% of evangelicals.

•14% overall, including 28% of evangelicals, say religion is the 'main influence in their political thinking.' ...

By measures of 'religiosity' — people who attend church at least weekly, pray at least daily and have an absolute belief in a personal God — the survey finds overall that Democrats and Republicans hit the same levels.

The difference is in their behavior, however, says Green. 'Those who lean Republican and attend church are likely to vote at a high rate while religious Democrats don't turn out to vote at the same levels.'

If the candidacy of Barack Obama, the first black major-party nominee for the presidency, brings religious Democrats to the polls, that could all change, Green says. ...

'Americans are deeply suspicious of institutional religion,' says Green. Some see 'religion as about money, rules and power and that is not a positive connotation for everyone.'

Adults under 30 are further from strict religious adherence than their parents and even though other studies show they cycle back to religion at key moments such as marriage or rearing children, those spirals are smaller and smaller, says Tom Smith, director of the Center for the Study of Politics and Society. It is part of the University of Chicago's National Opinion Research Center, which has measured religion and society for decades through the General Social Survey.

'We may see that unlike the past, people are not going to return to the church they left or to any one at all,' says Green.

Indeed, Pew found fewer people starting out in any church.

Among couples (married or living together) with children, 63% say they read the Bible or pray with their children and 60% say they send them for religious education.

But those numbers drop significantly for religiously mixed couples with children — 37% of those surveyed. In mixed marriages, only 48% say they pray or read Scripture with their children and 44% say they send their children for religious education, says Greg Smith, a Pew research fellow.

'Every religious group has a major challenge on its hands from all directions,' Lugo says. 'It is extremely difficult to maintain the integrity of the tradition and the strength of a community, given all these findings.'

The full article is available at: http://www.usatoday.com/news/religion/2008-06-23-pew-religions_N.htm?loc=interstitialskip

Survey Shows U.S. Religious Tolerance

By NEELA BANERJEE

June 24, 2008

Although a majority of Americans say religion is very important to them, nearly three-quarters of them say they believe that many faiths besides their own can lead to salvation, according to a survey by the Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life.

The report, titled U.S. Religious Landscape Survey, reveals a broad trend toward tolerance and an ability among many Americans to hold beliefs that might contradict the doctrines of their professed faiths.

For example, 70 percent of Americans affiliated with a religion or denomination said they agreed that “many religions can lead to eternal life,” including majorities among Protestants and Catholics. Among evangelical Christians, 57 percent agreed with the statement, and among Catholics, 79 percent did.

Among minority faiths, more than 80 percent of Jews, Hindus and Buddhists agreed with the statement, and more than half of Muslims did.

The findings seem to undercut the conventional wisdom that the more religiously committed people are, the more intolerant they are, scholars who reviewed the survey said.

“It’s not that Americans don’t believe in anything,” said Michael Lindsay, assistant director of the Center on Race, Religion and Urban Life at Rice University. “It’s that we believe in everything. We aren’t religious purists or dogmatists.”

The survey confirms findings from previous studies that the most religiously and politically conservative Americans are those who attend worship services most frequently, and that for them, the battles against abortion and gay rights remain touchstone issues.

“At least at the time of the surveys in 2007, cultural issues played a role in political affiliation,” and economic issues less so, said John C. Green, an author of the report and a senior fellow on religion and American politics at Pew. “It suggests that the efforts of Democrats to peel away Republican and conservative voters based on economic issues face a real limit because of the role these cultural issues play.”

The survey, which is based on telephone interviews with more than 35,000 Americans from May 8 to Aug. 13, 2007, is the second installment of a broad assessment Pew has undertaken of trends and characteristics of the country’s religious life. The first part of the report, published in February, depicted a fluid and diverse national religious life marked by people moving among denominations and faiths.

According to that report, more than a quarter of adult Americans have left the faith of their childhood to join another religion or no religion. Every denomination and religion lost and gained members, but the survey indicated that the group that had the greatest net gain was the unaffiliated. Sixteen percent of American adults say they are not part of any organized faith, which makes the unaffiliated the country's fourth-largest "religious group."

The new report sheds light on the beliefs of the unaffiliated. Like the overwhelming majority of Americans, 70 percent of the unaffiliated said they believed in God, including one of every five people who identified themselves as atheist and more than half of those who identified as agnostic.

"What does atheist mean? It may mean they don't believe in God, or it could be that they are hostile to organized religion," Mr. Green said. "A lot of these unaffiliated people, by some measures, are fairly religious, and then there are those who are affiliated with a religion but don't believe in God and identify instead with history or holidays or communities."

The most significant contradictory belief the survey reveals has to do with salvation. Previous surveys have shown that Americans think a majority of their countrymen and women will go to heaven, and that the circle is wide, embracing minorities like Jews, Muslims and atheists. But the Pew survey goes further, showing that such views are held by those within major branches of Christianity and minority faiths, too.

Scholars said such tolerance could stem in part from the greater diversity of American society: that there are more people of minority faiths or no faith and that "it is hard to hold a strongly sectarian view when you work together and your kids play soccer together," Mr. Lindsay said. But such a view of salvation may also grow out of doctrinal ignorance, scholars said.

"It could be that people are not very well educated and they are not expressing mature theological points of view," said Todd Johnson, director of the Center for the Study of Global Christianity at Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary. "It could also be a form of bland secularism. The real challenge to religious leaders is not to become more entrenched in their views, but to navigate the idea of what their religion is all about and how it relates to others."

The survey tried to determine how people's religious affiliation and practice shaped their views of culture and politics.

As past surveys have shown, this report found that Americans who prayed more frequently and attended worship services more often tended to be more conservative and "somewhat more Republican" than other people. Majorities of Mormons and evangelicals say they are conservative, compared with 37 percent of Americans over all. (Twenty percent say they are liberal, and 36 percent say moderate.)

Respondents were evenly split about whether churches should express their views about politics, with evangelicals and black Protestants favoring such activities far more than people of other faiths.

Nearly two-thirds of respondents favored more government help for the poor, even if it meant going deeper into debt. Sixty-one percent of respondents also said "stricter environmental laws and regulations are worth the cost."

A majority said the United States should pay more attention to problems at home than those abroad, but in the area of foreign policy, 6 out of 10 respondents said that diplomacy, not military strength, was the best way to ensure peace.

Neela Banerjee writes regularly for the New York Times. However, I am not sure where this article appeared, since it was forwarded to me.

The next three articles clearly indicate that the Church is regressing liturgically. Wouldn't it be remarkable if the Church made the same effort to reach out to the progressives who have left that it is making to appease the traditionalists?

THE TABLET
JUNE 21, 2008

Ring in the old

Elena Curti

A Pontifical High Mass in the Tridentine Rite was said in Westminster Cathedral last weekend for the first time in four decades. Its celebrant, a close ally of the Pope and an ambassador for the old liturgy, promised that further changes will be afoot

Imagine for a moment a vibrant and confident Catholic church, the pews filled every Sunday with parishioners of all ages, eager to celebrate a distinctive liturgy that will impart a sense of reverence and awe and the mystery of Christ's redeeming sacrifice.

That is the vision of the Church presented last weekend by a senior member of the Curia, Cardinal Darío Castrillón Hoyos. And the means of achieving it, he claims, is the revival of the Tridentine Rite.

It was last July when Pope Benedict issued an instruction, or *motu proprio*, encouraging the rite's much wider celebration if a "stable group" requests it from a parish priest. He designated the Tridentine Mass the "extraordinary form" and the new the "ordinary form" of the one Roman rite. But, Cardinal Castrillón, who is close to the Pope, has now gone much further, suggesting it should be made a far more frequent liturgical experience.

The cardinal, who in his present role as president of the Pontifical Commission, *Ecclesia Dei*, has responsibility for ensuring that traditionalists have access to the old Mass as set out in Pope John XXIII's 1962 missal, was in London last weekend where he celebrated a Pontifical High Mass in the old rite at Westminster Cathedral - the first celebrated by a cardinal in England for nearly 40 years. Before the Mass, he gave a group interview to four journalists arranged by the Latin Mass Society at a hotel in Westminster. And during it, he made clear his vision, saying that it was his hope that eventually Catholics in every parish in England and Wales would have the opportunity to attend Sunday Mass in the Tridentine Rite.

Those unfamiliar with the pre-Conciliar Mass will be offered catechesis to help them understand and appreciate it. Men training for the priesthood will be taught not just Latin but the complex ritual and gestures they must learn in order to equip them to meet the expected demand for the old Mass. At the moment, bishops are required to facilitate Masses using the rite if appropriately trained priests are available.

Celebration of the Tridentine Rite was discouraged after the introduction of Paul VI's missal in 1970 following the Second Vatican Council. From that time Mass was to be celebrated in a new rite with the priest facing the congregation. The new rite led to the widespread introduction of lay readers and Extraordinary Ministers of the Eucharist. For the first time women were permitted on to the sanctuary to fulfil these new roles and girls were also allowed to be altar servers. The biggest change in the new rite was that Mass was celebrated in the vernacular for the first time although Latin was still permitted.

Small numbers of traditionalists continued to celebrate Mass in the old rite down the years with some encouragement in the later part of Pope John Paul II's pontificate. But it is under Pope Benedict that the old Mass has acquired new prominence following the *motu proprio*. There have been loud complaints from traditionalists that some bishops in England and Wales have been uncooperative in implementing the *motu proprio* but Cardinal Castrillón declared that he and the Pope felt the bishops' response had been good, given the time needed to prepare for the change.

Cardinal Castrillón, now 79, has spent a lifetime as a curial cardinal. He is a former prefect of the Congregation of the Clergy and currently heads negotiations to bring the ultra-traditionalist Society of St Pius X with its four excommunicated bishops back into the Catholic fold.

He was eager to explain why he considered the revival of the old rite - which he called the Gregorian Rite - so important. He had a forthright response to those who complain that its reintroduction violates the teaching of the Second Vatican Council, calling such a view "absolute ignorance". Pope Benedict, he added, was a theologian with deep understanding of Vatican II and was acting exactly in accordance with "the way of the council" that the freedom of different kinds of celebration is to be offered. Similarly, he judged complaints about the priest in the old rite celebrating Mass with his back to the congregation to be "ridiculous". The priest represented the person of Christ and in facing east - that is, towards God - he was reviving the sacrifice of the Son to the Father.

Asked whether he hoped to see provision for the Tridentine Rite made in "many" parishes in England and Wales, the cardinal said he wanted "all" parishes to experience this "treasure". As for men training for the priesthood, he disclosed that the Vatican is writing to all seminaries, asking them to ensure they will be taught Latin not just for liturgical purposes but also to prepare them for their studies in theology and philosophy.

But what of the confusion felt by many Catholics who had seen the transition from the Tridentine to the new rite in 1970 and had welcomed it, seeing it as real progress? I suggested that for some this new emphasis on old rite might feel like a step backwards.

"Progress is important, but what does it mean?" said the cardinal. "Today, for me, progress is discovering the meaning of contemplation. This is progress. A person who has no time for silence is a poor person. A person who has no time for contemplation is poor also. The holy Mass is sacrifice. We have to look at Golgotha, at Calvary, the Cross of Christ. When we have sacrifice in Christ we feel free from sin, we are redeemed, then we are happy and when we celebrate the Resurrection of Christ we are happy to gather together and to celebrate, but first the sacrifice, second the community aspect of the meal."

Is it not possible to express all this in the new rite?

"Yes, but the experience of these 40 years is not always so good," said Cardinal Castrillón. "Many people abandon the sense of adoration of God. Yes, we are brothers but we are not saved

as brothers. We are saved by the sacrifice. We need to be in front of the mystery. We sing because we are brothers. We sing because we are celebrating, but we keep silent because we are in front of the mystery. The new rite can express it but there have been brought out so many abuses all over the Church that many people abandon it [sic]. Many children do not know how to be in the presence of God, how they have to be adoring."

To a conservative journalist who insisted vehemently that some bishops in England were denying permission for the old Mass to be celebrated in their dioceses, the cardinal said such cases were few and he did not want to make the Eucharist a cause of confrontation for priests, lay people, bishops and the Holy See. He explained that the new rite was a response to a new era of world communication and conceded that it too contained riches. The Pope had decided that the time had come to celebrate the new rite alongside the old.

"It is not a matter of confrontation but of dialogue, fraternal dialogue, and making efforts to understand the precious things contained in the new and in the old rite," he said.

But what exactly were the abuses he had alluded to earlier that had crept in with the advent of the new rite? The answer was surprising.

He explained that he had received letters complaining that a priest had celebrated Mass made up as a clown: "The parish priest with the lips painted and the wig and mirrors here," he said, pointing to his temples. "A travesty." Other examples including that of a priest who had allegedly presided at Sunday Mass dressed in a miniskirt, and a priest who had invited his Protestant "brother" to celebrate the Eucharist. Yet another had introduced his wife and sons before celebrating Mass.

(Interruption!!! Was it a miniskirt or a surplice? Was the priest who introduced his family a former Anglican who left the Anglican Church because of his contempt for women priests? Was the priest who invited his Protestant "brother" to concelebrate any less orthodox than Pope John Paul the Second who gave communion to the non-Catholic head of the Taize community? Was the clown makeup applied tastefully? These are some questions which inquiring minds need answered. Now, back to the article.)

"There is an atmosphere that makes possible those abuses and that atmosphere must be changed, and in my poor opinion the new presence of the Gregorian Rite will help us to take seriously the identity of our faith, respecting all the other ways of thinking but keeping strongly our identity with Christ, with Christ in Calvary, with Christ in Golgotha, with Christ offering his blood for our salvation."

With that the cardinal was off to change into his red robes in readiness for his address to the Latin Mass Society's annual general meeting, followed by a private session with Cardinal Cormac Murphy-O'Connor. According to a statement issued by Archbishop's House, Cardinal Castrillón expressed his gratitude to his fellow cardinal for the generous way which the bishops of England and Wales had responded to an indult from Pope Paul VI allowing traditionalists to celebrate the old rite and for their reception of Pope Benedict's *motu proprio*

A gathering of a family around the supper table is a moment when the bonds that are shared are reinforced, the love its members have for one another is enhanced and the very experience of coming together can strengthen them as they go out into the world. But it is also a place where old jealousies can resurface, where squabbling can break out and enmities occur. That, sadly, is also true of those called to the Lord's table. The divisions in the Church between traditionalists and progressives seem nowhere so marked as they are over the form of the Mass. No wonder Cardinal Darío Castrillón Hoyos felt the need during his recent visit to London to warn both liberal and conservative Catholics against making the Eucharist a cause of confrontation.

While confrontation should certainly be avoided, there is a growing danger that Catholics will be confused as to the intentions of the Vatican regarding the new rite, introduced after the Second Vatican Council. Last year, Pope Benedict issued his *motu proprio* enabling Catholics to attend a Mass in the Tridentine Rite should a stable group request it from a parish priest. The Tridentine Rite, he said, was the extraordinary form, while the new rite was the ordinary form. Now Cardinal Castrillón, president of the Pontifical Commission, *Ecclesia Dei*, has gone further, suggesting that the old rite should be celebrated in every parish in England and Wales. Some see this as a sign that the old rite is being restored step by step. Others go further, warning that if both rites become widely available the Mass could become a sign of division rather than a place of communion.

Those made anxious can take comfort from Cardinal Castrillón's exhortation to fraternal dialogue. But while dialogue is vital, and there is a need to understand the way in which Catholics of good will who loved the old rite have felt estranged from the Church for so many years, there is nevertheless a need to recognise and uphold the good that was done by the post-Vatican II liturgical renewal. It restored the liturgy to the people of God and taught that the Eucharist involves the entire gathered assembly under the leadership of the priest with the help of various lay ministers. To suggest Balkanisation of the Catholic Church is to go too far, but a situation akin to that of the Anglicans, divided along high-church and low-church lines, may not be far off if the old rite becomes widespread.

There are other significant issues which affect worship and which the Church needs to address, particularly in the West. The laity has become more mobile, more educated, and less passive about their faith. They no longer define the transcendent as distant or remote but as accessible and intimate. God is no longer away in heaven or the stars. As well as in the Eucharist, God is found in prayer, loving others, in service of the poor, in study and reflection, in psychological and scientific phenomena, in discussion. As a consequence many want liturgical celebration not only to be dignified but accessible too - and of course to be beautiful.

For bad liturgy certainly exists, sometimes in a mumbled old rite, sometimes in banalities surrounding the new. But those who seek God will find him in worship infused with poetry and beauty.

Vatican presses traditionalists with reconciliation expiration date

By John Thavis
Catholic News Service

VATICAN CITY (CNS) -- The Vatican has pressed the traditionalist Society of St. Pius X to accept five conditions, including respect for the pope and his authority, as part of a reconciliation offer.

The conditions were communicated by letter to the head of the society, Bishop Bernard Fellay, by

Cardinal Dario Castrillon Hoyos, who has conducted an on-again, off-again dialogue with the traditionalists for several years.

One of the conditions set forth in Cardinal Castrillon's letter was that the society respond favorably by the end of June. Vatican sources said the deadline indicated some Vatican impatience with the dialogue that began in 2000 and has yet to yield results.

The Vatican offer was first reported by the Italian newspaper, Il Giornale, and followed a meeting June 4 between Cardinal Castrillon and Bishop Fellay.

Vatican sources confirmed that the reconciliation proposal included the possibility of establishing a "personal prelature" or a similar canonical structure for the society, which would allow the society a certain autonomy.

Last year, Pope Benedict XVI widened the possibility for use of the Tridentine rite, the form of Mass used before the Second Vatican Council. That was a long-standing request of the society.

But Bishop Fellay has continued to criticize the Vatican on other matters, and has expressed his society's continued opposition to several teachings of Vatican II.

In April Bishop Fellay said the time was not right for reconciliation with the Vatican, because church leaders have not taken steps to reverse the "crisis" introduced by Vatican II.

One source said the new Vatican offer signaled that the Vatican was not willing to continue dialogue with the traditionalist society indefinitely. There was some hope, but not much optimism, that the society would accept the proposal, he said.

The conditions laid out by the Vatican were:

- A commitment to a response that is proportionate to the generosity of the pope.
- A commitment to avoid any public intervention that does not respect the person of the pope and that could "be negative for ecclesial charity."
- A commitment to avoid "the pretext of a magisterium superior to the Holy Father" and to not present the society in opposition to the church.
- A commitment to demonstrate the will to act honestly in full ecclesial communion and in respect of the pope's authority.
- A commitment to respect the date, fixed for the end of June, to respond positively. This deadline is described as a "necessary condition" for the preparation for a reconciliation.

The society broke with the Vatican in 1988 when its founder, the late French Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, ordained four bishops against papal instructions; Bishop Fellay was one of those ordained.

At that time, the Vatican said those involved in the ordinations were excommunicated. Bishop Fellay has asked the pope to repeal the decree of excommunication as one major step in the reconciliation process.

Pope returns to old way of distributing Communion

Published: 6/25/08, 1:06 PM EDT

VATICAN CITY (AP) - A papal aide says Pope Benedict XVI intends to return to the old way of distributing Communion at Masses.

Benedict's master of liturgical ceremonies said in an interview Wednesday in the Vatican newspaper L'Osservatore Romano that the pontiff will place the Communion host in the mouths of the faithful who kneel before him.

That's how Roman Catholics received Communion in the years before the modernizing reforms of the Second Vatican Council in the 1960s. The reforms made it possible for faithful to take the host in their hands while standing.

Benedict gave Communion to kneeling faithful during his trip this month to southern Italy.

The aide, Monsignor Guido Marini, says that distributing Communion the old way helps faithful be devout.

New Roman Missal

What to expect from a new translation of liturgical texts

Paul Turner

MAY 26, 2008

AMERICA

Catholics expect some changes to the words in the liturgy from time to time. But they will soon be using the first Mass texts since the Second Vatican Council that have been created according to a different theory of translation. The revision will have a noticeable effect on the style and sound of the texts of the Mass. Some Catholics are looking forward to these changes with hungry anticipation; others are hoping that the laborious process of translation and approval will drag on and never produce a result. Still others, including many priests, are blithely unaware of the changes to come.

The current Sacramentary is an English translation of the second Latin edition of a book entitled *Missale Romanum*. The third Latin edition was promulgated in 2002; its translation into vernacular languages is in progress. Many of the changes made will slip beneath the radar: new vigil Masses for the Epiphany and the Ascension, some new votive Masses, a rearrangement of the Masses for various needs and occasions, and the addition of several saints' days on the universal calendar, to name but a few. The most notable changes are a consequence of the Vatican's decision to apply a different theory of translation in preparing the text. So even though the Latin words have not much changed from the second to the third edition, the English words have. It will sound like a very different book, starting with the title: instead of calling it the Sacramentary, we will be praying from the Roman Missal.

Some Catholics are wary of the new translation because other recent changes to the Mass have been controversial, from the restriction of duties for extraordinary ministers of holy Communion to the revised translation of the lectionary. Those who worked on the first English translation of the Sacramentary 40 years ago now find their contributions criticized, often unfairly.

The new translation will affect the people in the nave, not just the ministers in the sanctuary. Everyone will notice alterations to the texts they say and hear. A church that has been praying the same English words for four decades may rightly wonder whether the revisions will improve its common prayer. Surely that is the intent of the new translation. ...

While this article quotes several draft texts of the revised missal, none of these has reached its final form, although a revised *Glory to God* and *Holy Holy* have been approved for limited use at World Youth Day this summer in Sydney, Australia. All the proposed texts are subject to final approval from the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Sacraments. That approval will probably come at the end of the entire project - not piecemeal - so that the missal may be reviewed as a complete unit.

Catholics will immediately notice changes to some of the most common texts of the Mass. What people hear - not just what they say - will also change. New translations have been proposed for all the presidential prayers, including the eucharistic prayers. The grammar will be more complex, the word order more varied and the vocabulary more expansive.

The draft of the opening prayer, or collect, for the First Sunday of Advent, for example, reads:

Grant, we pray, almighty God, that your faithful may resolve to run forth with righteous deeds, to meet your Christ who is coming, so that gathered at his right hand they may be worthy to possess the heavenly kingdom. The sentence is longer than we are accustomed to hearing in English, but it is the same length as the one currently in use for this prayer in French, Italian and Spanish.

The proposed collect for the Fourth Sunday of Advent is similarly complex, but it already enjoys popularity as the concluding prayer of the Angelus: *Pour forth, we beseech you, O Lord, your grace into our hearts, that we to whom the incarnation of Christ your Son was made known by the message of an Angel may by his Passion and Cross be brought to the glory of the resurrection.*

The elevated style of these prayers will surely cause an adjustment in the way the priest speaks them and in the way the people hear them. Some fear that the prayers of the Mass that are already hard to comprehend will become even more remote. Others think that the richness of the vocabulary and style in the proposed translations will stand up to repetition, study and prayerful reflection.

The new translation strives throughout for texts that can be proclaimed in an understandable way. That is not always easy to accomplish. Some of the longer orations are being broken up into independent parts, and some words are being reworked to facilitate understanding. For example, an early draft of the collect for the Feast of the Visitation began this way: *Almighty, everlasting God, who inspired the Virgin Mary to visit Elizabeth while bearing your Son in her womb....* It was not clear here whose womb was carrying the Son of God. A later revision proposes: *Almighty, everlasting God, while the Blessed Virgin Mary was carrying your Son in her womb, you inspired her to visit Elizabeth....*

Many of the texts will be sung, so their cadence and rhythm have received extra attention. The conclusions to the prefaces, for example, are drafted in a way that draws the text to a strong close and signals the start of the Holy Holy. Two examples are *forever crying out to your glory,* and *we sing the hymn of your praise and acclaim without end.* Phrases such as these are designed to produce a good sound when sung.

The use or avoidance of inclusive language can have a serious effect on the ability of some worshippers to pray. It can be argued that the Sacramentary brought these issues to the fore; before the vernacular translations, inclusive language was not much debated. But once the Sacramentary was published, people began reacting to its choice of words. The 1974 version of the words of

consecration, for example, included the phrase *for you and for all men*. By 1985 the word *men* was dropped.

Almost all the current opening prayers address God as Father. Decades ago, this was thought to be a warmer word than *God*, which would have been a more literal choice for the Latin word *Deus* that begins these prayers. *Father* is more familial, but it also carries gender-specific freight. The new translation consistently uses *God* in these instances, a form of address that many worshipers will find more appealing. Almost universally throughout the draft of the missal, *brothers* now appears as *brothers and sisters*, and such words as *man* have been recast as *humanity*, *people* or *men and women*.

The pronouns referring to God remain masculine. And sometimes the draft leaves the word *man* in place, largely because it was difficult for the translators to find a different solution, even after having discussed several alternatives. Still, those concerned about inclusive language will discover many improvements designed to ease their entrance into the spirit of prayer.

Some significant changes will probably never be evident to worshipers. For example, an early draft of the collect for the Mass for persecuted Christians prayed to God for those *who suffer because of your name*. The word *persecution*, which appears clearly in Latin, was missing from the draft after the word *suffer*, making the prayer sound tepid. Since the persecution of Christians continues in many parts of the world today, religious persecution demands the prayerful attention of the church. The word *persecution* was restored to make the intent of the prayer more explicit. Probably no one will notice the refinement, but the very unobtrusiveness of the phrase signals its success as a translation.

Beyond the issues of translation, the third edition of the missal will include some editorial improvements that should make a difference in how the Mass sounds. The presider's texts will be divided with greater attention to sense lines and page turns. The Eucharistic Prayer for Masses for Various Needs and Occasions, currently available only in a volume separate from the Sacramentary, will appear between the same two covers as all the other eucharistic prayers. Such accessibility should increase its usage. Single-use prefaces will appear on the same page as other presidential prayers for the feast in question. These small editorial matters will enhance the smooth celebration of the Mass.

The date for the release of the missal is still unknown. Over the next few months the work will pass from the International Commission on English in the Liturgy to the various English-language episcopal conferences, who will vote on it section by section. The Congregation for Divine Worship and the Sacraments will give its approval, which it prepares in consultation with the *Vox Clara* commission. Pope Benedict will be involved, because the draft calls for changes to the formula of consecration: *Take this, all of you, and eat of it, for this is my Body, [and] the Blood of the new and eternal covenant; it will be poured out for you and for many*. The best guesses now put the publication date at 2010 or 2011.

The new translation will have a new style and will put different words into the mouths of both worshipers and ministers. The process of changing will be difficult for many Catholics. The hope is that it will be worth the effort. The missal will attempt to do better what no translation can do adequately: give us words to praise our God.

The Rev. Paul Turner is pastor of St. Munchin Catholic Church in Cameron, Mo. He holds a doctorate in sacred theology from Sant'Anselmo University in Rome, and assists the secretariat for the semiannual meetings of the International Commission on English in the Liturgy.

America is available by subscription in a weekly on-line edition.

Bishop Victor Galeone expressed his concerns regarding the ability to effectively proclaim the new translation of the Roman Missal, which the International Committee for English in the Liturgy (ICEL) is proposing. From *Whispers in the Loggia* (whispersintheloggia.blogspot.com), here is ICEL's response:

Bishop Victor Galeone has broken new ground in the public discussion of liturgical language, raising the debate to a higher intellectual level. Whereas critics of ICEL's recent drafts have mostly commented on individual vocabulary items, his contribution points to structural and semantic issues that are systemic throughout the *Missale*. His remarks merit a careful response.

Commenting on ICEL's proposed translation of the Post-Communion for the Wednesday in Holy Week, he has pointed out that the final verb is preceded by two lines that modify it, whereas the more normal pattern in English is for modifiers to follow their verb. If this principle were followed in this case, the translation might read:

Fill our minds, almighty God,
with sure confidence
that you have given us perpetual life
through your Son's Death in time,
to which awesome mysteries bear witness.

However, ICEL's translators have been impressed by the fact that Latin orations, especially Post-Communions, tend to conclude strongly with a teleological or eschatological point. Because of this, they have often followed the Latin in placing the modifiers before the verb so that the English prayer also ends on a strong note. In doing so, they have hoped to avoid a defect that many have noticed in the current translations of these prayers, namely that they often end weakly. Consequently, ICEL's proposed rendering of this prayer reads:

Fill our minds, almighty God,
with sure confidence
that through your Son's Death in time,
to which awesome mysteries bear witness,
you have given us perpetual life.

It has not been possible to follow this procedure in every case, because sometimes too contorted a syntax results, but it has been followed frequently throughout the proposed translation of the Missal. The Commission hopes that this pattern, though unfamiliar at first, will soon become familiar, and allow the teleological thrust that marks so many of the Post-Communions to become more apparent to the people.

Bp Galeone also suggested that the addition of 'the' before 'sure' would make it clearer that 'that' introduces a clause of indirect statement, not one of purpose. This seems an excellent suggestion which, had it been made at the time of the consultation on the Green Book of these texts, might well have been adopted.

He also suggested that 'these' be added to the third line, so that it would read:
to which these awesome mysteries bear witness.

The recommendation to insert 'this' or 'these' where there is no Latin equivalent is made frequently, but the translators have often found themselves disinclined to adopt it, because it narrows the focus of the text. A familiar example is found in the words before Communion currently translated:

This is the Lamb of God . . .

These words draw the people's attention to the Host that the Priest holds in his hand, and invite them to recognise Christ present in the Sacrament. But the words were originally those of John the Baptist, spoken when he was at some distance from Jesus. The Commission's more recent translation, 'Behold the Lamb of God . . .', gives the text a greater polyvalence, inviting the people to remember also the Baptist's words and the context in which they were first uttered, as well as the eschatological appearance of the Lamb in heaven, which the Priest's subsequent quotation of Apoc 19:9 recalls.

Returning to the Post-Communion for Wednesday in Holy Week, we can see that Bp Galeone's proposal would make the prayer refer clearly to the Eucharist whose celebration is drawing to a close. But it should be noticed that since its earliest appearance (in the *Hadrianum* manuscript of the Gregorian Sacramentary, dated 811 - 812), this prayer has been assigned to the day before the beginning of the Easter Triduum. It retained that position in subsequent Sacramentaries, and in the 1570 Missal. This being so, we can see a richer significance in the words *mysteria veneranda*: they refer not only to the Mass just celebrated, but also to the mysteries of the Triduum that will be beginning next time the people gather. It would seem a pity to remove such a resonance from this ancient prayer by adding the word 'these'.

There remains the issue of 'gibbet', which Bishop Galeone and others criticize as too archaic for liturgical use. None of the critics of this word seems able to produce a workable alternative. It should not surprise us that an English translation for Latin *patibulum* is difficult to find, since that word denotes an instrument of torture no longer in use. It is made up of the root *pati-*, 'to suffer' and the suffix *-bulum*, which, to quote the Oxford Latin Dictionary, 'forms substantives from verbal bases denoting instruments'. As a *stabulum* is a structure devised to facilitate standing (from *stare*) and a *conciliabulum* is a structure devised to facilitate the holding of meetings, so a *patibulum* is a structure devised to facilitate suffering. 'Guillotine', 'electric chair' and 'syringe' share the purpose of *patibulum*, but not its shape. 'Gallows' denotes a device similar in shape and purpose to a *patibulum*, but in modern speech seems only be used for structures designed for hanging by a rope. 'Yoke' is a possible translation, but it has the weakness that it denotes the shape of the device but not its purpose, whereas the *pati-* element in *patibulum* draws attention to its purpose. A vivid modern translation might be 'death-machine', but this would be found unacceptable by those many commentators who prefer blandness in liturgical language.

In choosing 'gibbet' to translate *patibulum*, the Commission has been aware that the phrase 'the gibbet of the Cross' was used by Saint John Fisher.

[Please visit and support the Whispers in the Loggia blog.](#)

The writer, with a self-proclaimed "relatively conservative orientation," indicts clerical culture as the source of the lack of transparency within the Church. His antidote? Vatican II mandated structures and processes of consultation.

Accountability in the Church: 'Company man' challenges church secrecy

By TOM ROBERTS

NCR news director and editor at large

June 27, 2008

Secrecy within the church is a "stifling, deadening" force "that does immense injury to communion and community." Clericalism is "an elitist mindset" that takes for granted that the

ordained “are intrinsically superior to other members of the church” and was “at the heart of the sex abuse scandal.”

Those strong words could have come from any number of Catholic reform groups, or the bishopaccountability.org Web site, or even an *NCR* editorial.

Quite to the contrary, however, they are the words of Russell Shaw, who describes himself as “the ultimate company man,” a member of Opus Dei and someone who has spent most of his adult life working either for the U.S. bishops or the Knights of Columbus.

Question Shaw’s loyalty at your own risk. He is a widely respected and thoughtful church observer who is deeply disturbed by the growing culture of secrecy that he perceives within the church. In his new book, *Nothing to Hide: Secrecy, Communication and Communion in the Catholic Church* (Ignatius Press, \$13.95, 174 pages), he calls secrecy a problem that “arises from and is inseparably linked to a special factor peculiar to churches ... clericalism.”

For years, Shaw was a fixture at the national meetings of the bishops’ conference, the consummate insider who tirelessly dispensed information, explanations and insights to members of the press corps. He served as spokesman for the U.S. bishops from 1969 until 1987, and then as spokesman for the Knights of Columbus until 1997. Since then he has been a freelance writer whose work appears regularly in *Our Sunday Visitor*.

The topics he deals with in *Nothing to Hide* are normal fare for critique by Catholics on the liberal side of the spectrum, so it is only fair to point out that Shaw, who describes himself as someone with “a relatively conservative orientation,” is unlikely to arrive at the same endpoint as liberal reformers. He would have little interest, for example, in changing church teaching on sexual ethics or arguing for women priests. However, he and liberals might well find common cause in his conviction that adult Catholics should have a say in forming diocesan policy on a host of issues or that they should expect transparency in church governance, and certainly when the church faces a crisis as it did in the sex abuse scandal.

Correcting the problem, he said, would require returning to the documents of the Second Vatican Council, the 1960s meeting of the world’s bishops, and that council’s “limited mandate for consultation and consultative processes and structures in the church.”

He acknowledges that other conservatives probably think that he’s spending his time on liberal issues and wonder “if you’re a good conservative, why are you worried about this stuff?” “To which my answer is, ‘I agree with people who think that way fundamentally, that orthodoxy and loyalty to the discipline of the church are more important than the secrecy and openness and accountability issues,’ ” he said in a phone interview. “But what people who think that way are missing is that openness and accountability are absolutely indispensable to keeping people honest.”

“It’s when things are done in secret, when decisions are made in secret, that all sorts of bad things that are deplored by conservatives and by liberals, can and do happen.”

People tend to think of secrecy and clericalism as liberal issues, he said, “and I’m not disposed to waste a lot of time arguing with people on that score. In my mind what we’re talking about here is not a liberal issue and it’s not a conservative issue, it’s a Catholic issue, and it should be a concern to all of us.”

What would he say, though, to the argument that the church is an institution different from others, that there is something inherently different about how ordained ministers do their work and how they make their decisions?

“I would say, ‘Baloney,’ ” he said. “I mean I believe it’s true, the church is different in some significant respects, but it’s also a human institution made up of human beings who err in the way that human beings do err.” And the sex abuse crisis, he added, is a good example of that.

It was that crisis and the secrecy with which it was handled, as well as the growing realization that the U.S. bishops were closing the doors on more and more of their twice-a-year meetings, that pushed Shaw to write the book. Shaw had been among those instrumental in the bishops’ adoption of an open-meeting policy back in the 1970s.

“Openness and candor would not have prevented the [clergy sex abuse] scandal,” he writes in the book, “but they would have made it a lot less traumatic than it turned out to be. We need to give openness and honesty a try lest something else equally as bad, or even worse, occur in the future.”

Shaw cites a number of conciliar and papal documents to back his position, but in one section makes particular note of Pope Paul VI’s encyclical *Ecclesium Suum* and its section titled “The Dialogue.”

In that section, Paul VI speaks of his “ardent desire that the dialogue within the church should take on new fervor, new themes and speakers, so that the holiness and vitality of the Mystical Body of Christ on earth may be increased.” Participants in the dialogue specifically mentioned are “schools, the press, the social apostolate ... and our well-loved laity.”

Commented Shaw: “If the Vatican II years produced a charter for openness, honesty and the avoidance of unnecessary secrecy in Catholic life, it was this.”

Shaw knows, of course, that Conciliar-era documents can inspire more disagreement than consensus and that Conciliar-era structures -- parish and diocesan councils, for example -- are more often than not ineffective, mere rubber stamps for a bishop’s or pastor’s wishes.

“That’s the point,” said Shaw. “You have to go back 40 years and start over again and make them worthwhile instead of worthless. Yes, they’ve become toothless and ineffective as organs of consultation and bodies representing the laity’s point of view.”

At the same time, he thinks starting anew, in small ways and with education that teaches the laypeople how, in some ways, they are as clerical as clerics, things could be different. He lists 10 suggestions at the conclusion of his book for changing the current system into “the church with nothing to hide.” Those suggestions include remaking diocesan and parish pastoral councils; giving qualified laypeople a consultative voice; liberating the diocesan press so it is more than a house organ; and adopting meaningful freedom-of-information policies at all levels of the church that would be in writing and publicly available.

Shaw has been insider enough to keep his expectations in check -- no book is going to bring about change overnight. His hope, however, is that this ultimate company man’s critique will find a place “firmly and irrevocably on the long-term agenda of the church.”

Please consider subscribing to the *National Catholic Reporter* online edition at ncronline.org.