

# 2013 Survey of U.S. Priests on the New Roman Missal

The Godfrey Diekmann, OSB Center for Patristics and Liturgical Studies, Collegeville, MN  
May 21, 2013

## ALL COMMENTS

Comments appear unedited, except minor editing [indicated by brackets] to preserve confidentiality.

I do think that the new translations are more formal...and I'm okay and even like most of the new translations, but I also think that the old translations were also prayerful and reverend. In reality, don't reverence and prayerfulness come more from the one who prays than from the words or sentence structure that is used. Thank you.

---

1 How can God's people answer "Amen" to liturgical/theological verbiage which is awkward and many times incomprehensible esp when Vatican II calls for our prayers to be clear and understandable? 2) W all the insistence on following the new "rubrics" will any Liturgist or bishop please explain what paragraph 11 from Sc might possibly mean? 3) how can we use the new Roman Missal w masses for children--we need a missal designed in their language, . 4) the previous sacramentary was more poetic and I remember [Bishop] saying that God also inspires poetry as well as prayer. 5) how the new roman missal will lead our people to that full, conscious and active participation envisioned by the Council is beyond me when the prayers are so arcane and obtuse. 5) it's a disgrace and insult to the priests who labored so long and hard implementing the sacramentary after Vatican II that Our opinions and wisdom were not requested. A wealth of knowledge was lost. 6) anyone who is fluent in a foreign language knows that one language cannot be literaaly and exactly translated into another language. 7) if the word 'chalice' was so important to change in the words of institution, why was it not carried through into the memorial acclamations? I consider the way the roman missal was conceived and revised was flawed from the get go and the best thing to do is to admit it's flaws and consign it to the archives of history and return to the sacramentary and start over--from the grassroots--and not the top down. This a shame that the wisdom of Bishop Donald Trautman was not more well received and respected by his fellow bishops. He knew what he was talking about, [Name]

---

I thank all those who worked on this translation and the Vatican for the courage to make it happen.

---

The Propers are very awkward. Some of the wording is terrible and the use of words most people have never heard of or understand its meaning is a distraction from the ligurgy. Eliminate the 6th century words and rephrase some of the prayers. The priests and the people are only accepting it because there is no where else to turn. It is like being stuck in the latin Mass for 400 years. Also get Rome to suppress the Latin Mass. It was forbidden after Vatican II and now it is back. Nothing like having a schism in the Roman Church by have two rites in the Western Church.

---

\*When I look at the very real pastoral needs our dear church has to attend to, I could not justify the energy, time, finance that has gone into preparing for and implementing the new translation. \*While i do like some of the new texts in some Eucharistic Prayers, etc, the few changes in the Confiteor, Gloria, Credo, Sanctus ....could not possibly warrent the unsettling revision of the missal. As long as the previous English version adhered to the original meaning of the text, its flow of the English language was more important to me than to have now the exact literal translation from the Latin. \*I do not believe that the new tranlation draws people closer to God, helps them pray better. \*I have seen priests struggle through the mass with the new translation, and feel esp. for the older priests who strain to read and pray the new version. \*Because of a few words that have been changed or added, I no longer can pray the Gloria and Crede by heart. \*I think this new focus on the correct, literal translation from the Latin reminds JESUS of his struggle with the Pharisees of his time on earth, when they put so much emphasis on the letter of the Law and observance, while neglecting the widows and orphans. \*I am also very disappointed that this new revision does not reflect a thoughtful use of inclusive

language, that recognizes the presence of women. To “cover” women in the common term of “men” is no longer good enough. \*Maybe it is simpler to have put much concentration and narrow focus on a text in the missal, so the church leadership does not need to open their eyes and face the crying needs of the majority of its people. We focus on a text and neglect the people’s real needs. \* After all I have said, I want to also state that I have cooperated in praying the new texts and in finding meaning in them, and have not been a divisive stirrer-up person sharing my views in the parish community.

---

I agree with Fr. Martin Pable, O.F.M. Cap. who said: “I am suggesting that we may need some new linguistic approaches in order to reach the post- modern, post-Christian people of our time. I do not want us to deny, water down, or cheapen any of the truths from SS, tradition, or the Ch’s Magisterium.”

---

I like the the New Missal and the translation.

---

Is the motive of the new Mass to make people more submissive and repentant.

---

is too stilted. The grammar of some sentences is just wrong. The People of God deserve to have prayers proclaimed by the priest which they join in by hearing and assenting; these prayers have to be understandable as they are communicated by speech, if the people are to assent to them. Some of the theological words like ‘consubstantial’, ‘prevenient grace’ etc are totally not understood by the congregation. They have to be put into understandable, theologically correct, English language.

---

Too bad some of the prayers are as difficult to read for a priest as to understand for the congregation.

---

. The Eucharist is the most intimate experience we have with the Lord. This new translation distances both the presider and the participants further from that intimacy with the Lord. I strongly suggest that we go back to the drawing board. It is not an aid to evangelizing or re-evangelizing Catholic. I think it is a disaster.

---

.....TOO BAD YOU DIDN’T ASK BEFORE IT WAS MADE THE REQUIRED FORM FOR WORSHIP.

---

“A camel is a horse invented by a committee.” While committees are valuable, too many cross-cultural committees want to insert meanings, theological perspectives, and choice of words that do not make sense for the majority of people. Prayers are meant to be clear, simple, and direct and not catechetical enterprises. Parishioners ask what all these words mean and why they are used. If you need to explain it, is it prayer? Each country has its own mode of speaking. As has been quipped, “England and America are two countries divided by a common language. Why not provide translations accordingly?

---

“et ne nos inducas in tentationem” does NOT translate into “lead us not into temptation”, but into “let us not be leaded into temptation”...

---

“The new translation is more prayerful and reverent – we need a special language with which to address God.” I found this statement confusing. I strongly agree with the first part, but strongly disagree with the second part. Overall, I really love the new translation, especially the more obvious Scriptural allusions, and the rich theological imagery; it think the beauty of the Latin Rite is more clearly expressed in this translation. However, some of the new collects can occasionally be combersome and awkward in English. I also look forward to new translations of the Liturgy of the Hours and other rites. Hopefully it won’t take another ten years.

---

“Views of priests” is inconsequential since the Church is not, nor has she ever been, a democracy.

---

\* The new Missal translations’ meaning is closer to the Bible Text, this experience we have had from the translation from Latin to Vietnamese. For Example: “I am not worthy that you should come to my house . . . my soul shall be healed” . . .

---

1. The first question about anticipating the new translations offers a very poor range of options. my answer is simply the least inaccurate. I would say I felt neither eagerness nor apprehension beforehand and that I like the new translations very much. 2. The statement “The new translation is more prayerful and reverent - we need a special language with which to address God” is also poorly presented. My answer corresponds to the first part. The second part is an entirely different matter and should not be confused with the first part. 3. I strongly disagreed with the statment “I think the new translation urgently needs to be revised” because this translation is indeed far superior to its predecessor. However, that does not mean there are not lamentable errors retained in it. For example, in the dialogue of the Eucharistic Prayer prefaces, “Habemus ad Dominum” is still rendered the banal “We lift them up to the Lord”; whereas, a literal translation would capture the dynamism contained in the dialogue, something that features in patristic preaching. Likewise, the introduction to the Lord’s Prayer continues in the vein of “dynamic equivalence” - the Latin “praeceptis salutaribus moniti et divina institutione formati” is quite different from the new English version. Last, in the priest’s private prayer before Communion, it’s very unfortunate to see the flat English when something much more powerful is contained in “et fac me semper inhaerere mandatis tuis.” 4. I’m not sure what value there is in predicting hwo

the views of priests may or may not be considered in future translation exercises. What is the point behind this? 5. Last, of course I approve of the Holy See's leadership. What is this item assuming? That there was dubious role played by the Holy See which all of us would have sufficient knowledge about so as to be qualified to critique? That you propose a substitute authority for shaping the Roman Rite in the vernacular than the Holy See? It is the Roman Rite after all, and we are not the Anglican Communion.

---

1. In a way, its not a matter of whether I like it but whether I believe it works in the actual pastoral/liturgical setting. It does not work well at all. I was disappointed. While I was apprehensive, I still had my hopes up that once we got used to it, it would be fine. After a year, it's clearly not going to be fine in many points of the text. 2. I like some of the chant settings; its hard to judge how they would work if the translation were better. I think there should be some options with the preface chants; it would be nice to have some simpler versions. But again, some of the problem may very well be the text itself. 3. There are some elements of the translation that are certainly better than what we had before--certain phrases etc. I like the richness that is contained in the Latin text. I like the clearer allusions to scriptural texts. But the most of it is too formal, with some outrageously awkward, even impossible sentence structures. It is not oral language. Its not even good English as far as I'm concerned. The Roman Canon (EUCH PRAYER I) is a disaster. Of all the Eucharistic prayers, I find it the most poorly translated. I always liked to us this prayer for high feast days etc. but it is almost impossible to pray as it is given to us in the text. Some of the sentences simply do not make sense. It is choppy, unelegant, and clumsy. The others are at least usable. Still, many expressions were better put and far more elegant in the former Sacramentary. While many of the collects do offer a greater richness than the former Sacramentary, the grammatical constructions and sentence flow are often clumsy and poorly rendered. They could have done a better job of expressing the richness present in the original Latin text and still compose smooth sentences with interesting relative clauses that are still comprehensible in oral proclamation. The removal of permission for introductions to be done "in these or similar words" is very unfortunate. It was a way to bridge the formal, ritual text with more local language and immediate expression. The removal of permission for additional Christological titles in the Lamb of God is also unfortunate; the opportunity to use varied and multiple titles added richness to the *fractio* rite. 4. We do need a liturgical language that is not simply street slang; but this is not it. What we have in this new translation beyond formal; it is affectatious! FINAL NOTE I was surprised that with such a strong insistence on a "literal" translation that one word in several of the Eucharistic prayers (1, 2, and all the prayers for Various Needs and Occations) was not translated: the "qui" at the beginning of the institution narrative. Without the "qui," the instituion narrative drops into these prayers out of nowhere. With that word, the institution narrative flows as an extension of the epiclesis and a in dynamic relationship to it because in a way, it gives the reason or basis for what the church asks for in the epiclesis. Yet this word is omitted in the translation. I find this the one word I would have wanted to have restored by a more careful translation.

---

1. The new translation at best needs explanation and is not useful to the occasional attendee, and thus works against New Evangelization, etc. 2. The new translation was not needed and the money spent on new missals, explanations, and so on could have been put to real use in "Come Home" ads and so on. 3. I can't think of a single bishop anywhere in the English-speaking world who sought the advise of his priests about this New Translation. Why bother to ask us now? Are the bishops serious about consultation and collaboration?

---

1)My attitude toward some is positive and negative toward others. E.g. Like the wording of the Eucharistic Prayers but have difficulty with many of the Propers. 2)I learn music by repetition and have difficulty with some of the settings. 3)Re the new translation being revised, I keep hoping that with study and use the parts I have difficulty with will become easier. 4)Re continuing with new translates for the other rites, yes continue, but carefully, with the exception of the Liturgy of the Hours. 5)Re views of priests being considered, I just hope that the wording of the final products are not so "bookish" (for lack of a better word),that they fail to communicate the message. I appreciate being asked my opinion and hope that my observations will be helpful to you in your work and study.

---

1)The comment about needing a "special language with which to address God" I agree with. But a "hieratic" language needs to be intelligible as well. 2) While a great many of the words and phrases borrowed from Scripture, Scholastic Philosophy and Church Fathers are clunky and hard to understand, I think a rethinking of their placement and context would help immensely. 3)Let's get rid of the "one size fits all" Latin syntax and sentence structure. What's wrong with well thought out English? 4) Remember, it's "unity in diversity" not merely lock-step conformity. That's North Korea or some dead religion. Not the Faith in which I believe.

---

A great deal of the text is not English. It is a Latin text using English words. This is not the way we talk, think

nor pray. So many archaic usages, e.g. beseech. This was not done well and it does not serve the Church in the English speaking world well.

---

A number of the questions contain value judgments that in themselves somewhat control an answer: i.e. in answering the question, one is agreeing with a premise contained in the question

---

A reverent language for worship is most appropriate, but at times in this current translation, I think that incomprehensible is confused with reverent. A more poetic phrasing and shorter complete sentences would improve the listening comprehension of the gathered assembly. Translations that respect the listener (not someone who is reading along) would be an important consideration. Thank You.

---

A translation was necessary, yes more close to the latin text, but with a more flexibility and respect for the English language It is a too literally translation from latin and you don't feel the spirit of the prayer.

---

After a year and a half, I'm getting used to the new translation, but as a [subject] teacher, I'm amazed at some of the ridiculous structures -- in the name of reverence, I suppose. Frankly, I think this project was hijacked by ideologues. The wedding rite is particularly disappointing. It so distances us from the people of God and even keeps God remote. I applaud any effort for a revision that I would hope to describe as healthy. I certainly understand the reality of some past translation problems and the break from universality, but attempting to translate Latin (or any other language) literally makes for bad English. Blessings, thanks and peace to you, [Name]

---

After demanding that English, which has different syntax than Latin, march goosestep with the Latin, then letting Yoda do the translating, has resulted in a wordy, pompous mess that defies any attempts to speak the words in a reverent, prayerful and meaningful way.

---

Agree with the translation but some words are tough. I know I need to prepare before but for people some words are really tough. Don't get the meaning. Overall it's good.

---

All consultation regarding this translation was completely ignored. Vox Clara was a joke. Use of this translation has been a liturgical nightmare hindering the assembly's prayerful participation. The actual translation from the latin is poorly done. This was pointed out by latin scholars before the translation was adopted. Most of us are making our own adaptations of this fiasco or returning to the the precious version of the Roman Missal. I have not spent [number] years adhering to the liturgical directives following Vat II and attempting a pastoral concern for the spirituality of the people I serve to do the about-face the use of this translation requires.

---

All in all the Missal prays well. The suggestion that another translation be encouraged is not a good idea...too expensive. I look forward to having other ritual books with the newly translated missal prayers.

---

Although some of my answers seem rather vague, I must be honest and say that much of the new translation is cumbersome and non-relevant to the laity. Some of the language has not been used in over 50 years and is not the accepted way of speaking today. To be relevant for our people I believe that we must use a language that is inviting and stop playing to the minority that would like to turn the clock backward 50 years. To a degree I think clericalism has some part in this, but I can assure you, being more formal is not going to repair the institution of the church, only hard work and speaking our liturgies in language that is completely understood by all and is inviting to the listener will help the process of healing.

---

Although the old translation certainly had its faults, they were minor in comparison with this new one, which I consider to have been foisted on the English-speaking churches around the world pretty much in violation of the directives of Vatican II and as well as being insult delivered in the face of a decade of careful work by the ICEL in preparing a new translation that met the approval of English-speaking Bishops' councils around the world. I'm praying that Pope Francis will rescind the mandate that imposed this thing we've been saddled with and leave each national conference free to choose whatever translation works best in their own part of the world. I was particularly elated to hear that the bishops of, I think it is Austria, have recently decided to go back to the "for all" translation of "pro multis" the in the consecration of the wine. In fact, even Pope Benedict on one occasion said that the "pro multis" should be understood as meaning "for all". Unfortunately the Vatican Congregation for Worship apparently wasn't paying attention to what the Pope said or the Pope wasn't paying attention to what the Congregation for Worship was doing in his name! Sincerely, [Name]

---

Although, as I marked, some of the language is awkward, especially where the english translation attempts to even keep the latin's word order (word order makes very little difference in Latin, whereas it makes a big difference in english!), or insists on keeping the latin's tendency to make one massive sentence where several smaller sentences in english would be more idiomatic, even with these problems, THE NEW TRANSLATION IS INFINITELY SUPERIOR TO THE OLD!!!! (emphasis intended) While it could use some revision in favor of respecting native english cadence and word pattern, there is no urgency to this task at all. Also, far too many

of the preparation sessions were done in the absence of an actual new text, so it was endless hours of talking about the arrival of a new translation rather than actually working \*with\* a new translation. I could go on, but that's enough for now.

---

amen.

---

An incredible use of time and resources without much to show for it. And words like "imbued" are fine for novels but absurd in prayers...

---

Any future revisions must be undertaken by people who understand the English language and are able to put the prayers in language which is simple and able to be proclaimed. Many dependent clauses do not make it.

---

Any revisions of the new translation should make it more accurate in places where accuracy gave way to nameless concerns. For example, the Institution Narrative of the Roman Canon still omits a translation of the initial "Qui". Also, in the Second Eucharistic Prayer, "astare coram te et tibi ministrare" refers to the priestly posture of standing; to translate "astare" as "to be" seems inaccurate.

---

As a former [degree] student in [subject], and [degree] in [subject], I am dismayed by the heavy-handed approach toward an artificial goal of achieving 'consistency' with Latin texts. It is neither linguistically, aesthetically, or liturgically fruitful. In addition, the maxim has been inconsistently applied in the texts themselves. Prayer and ritual are not defined or refined by rubrical impositions. Vatican II attempted to point the Church in the direction of addressing the lived needs and experiences of the faithful. Artificiality, of whatever stripe, does not serve that effort.

---

As a missionary in [Country], I found that the previous translation was much easier to be translated with dynamic equivalency into the local language than the new one. "....for many" in the consecration, is not as theologically and scripturally sound as "....for all."

---

As a onetime [profession], I appreciate clear, straightforward English prose. The previous translation had a colloquial style, not burdened with adverbs and participles. As someone pointed out, how can you diagram many of the compound, complex sentences?

---

As a priest in my [age], I studied [subject], minor in college. This work would have been given a D - D-, by my teacher!

---

[Sentence removed] I only had a couple of years to work with the Sacramentary; I thoroughly enjoy the new Roman Missal translation. I believe the formal translation is most appropriate.

---

AS far as I know, this new translations was imposed on us priests without any input. The new translation is not English.

---

As for the second to the last statement, I am very happy that you sought my input as a priest with more than [number] years of experience but I don't think it will make a bit of difference. This translation was done for "political" reasons, not liturgical or linguistic.

---

as if a survey will make any difference

---

As indicated above, I think the translation is awkward. I appreciate some of the theological nuance expressed in using the word "eternal" in the place of "everlasting," as well as other words. I am ok with "chalice" instead of "cup" and "for the many" rather than "all." However, the sentence structure, especially in the "Collect" is horrible.

---

As liturgy is a public, community-based worship, I recognize the role of a more formal language, but its purpose is the same: to connect, to uplift us to the Divine. I have several suggestions: (1) formal AND poetic expressions; an element of beauty (2) Inclusive language (3) I am VERY CONCERNED about the seemingly pelagian belief that underlies quite a few prayers: some examples: (a) "O God . . . we may also MERIT to face him confidently when he comes again as our Judge" (Christmas Vigil Mass Collect) (b) "May the mysteries we have received, O Lord, prepare us, we pray, for the eternal joys that, as a faithful steward, blessed N. CAME TO DESERVE (Common of Pastors);

---

As priests, we have taken a promise of obedience to our bishop and his successors. In doing so, we pledge our obedience to the Church and we trust that she has the authority to do what is best, including in the areas of liturgy. The liturgy is not about something that we tailor to be the most appealing to ourselves, but rather it is about giving praise to God according to His plan. Throughout the Old Testament, God told the people how they were to worship Him and He continues to do this through the Holy Spirit working through the Church, who has been given this authority by Christ Himself. The bishops, as successors to the Apostles carry this responsibility forth and we as priests must be supportive of them. We do the Church and our people no favors by complaining about the bishops and their work of translating the texts of the liturgy. Doing so only fosters

division within the Church which is contrary to her very nature and must be avoided at all costs. In the end, I trust that the bishops who are the ones with the authority in such matters, not us, have done what is right. If the language is a little confusing at times, that is not the Church's fault, but rather shows that I must be open to being flexible in my responsibility of remaining obedient to the Church I love and who has conferred the great Sacrament of Holy Orders on me.

---

At least St. Paul's long sentences in the Epistles made sense. The long sentences in the New Sacramentary are not smooth and uncomfortable to pray or recite....I would like to return to the former...thanks for asking  
[Name]

---

AWFUL ... INCORRECT GRAMMAR ... INCOMPLETE SENTENCES .... AND WORDS THAT NO ONE UNDERSTANDS .... PRAYER ???

---

AWKWARD does not begin to describe some of the stilted phrases in this new translation. Dynamic was much better for prayer than this literal!

---

awkward....no flow....and incorrect English structure I've used Eucharist Prayer I about three times and will never use it again I am so angry that this was imposed on us.

---

BAD ENGLISH DOES NOT MAKE LITURGICAL LANGUAGE BETTER.

---

Beautiful proper prayers were submitted but rejected by the Vatican.

---

Before it was introduced I was supportive, even enthusiastic as the previous translation was poor, but the revised language is clumsy and awkward. I much preferred the old Exultet. I'm tired of singing about bees and honey. The Gloria is choppy. After a year and a half I still have to read everything.

---

Being more 'prayerful and reverent' has more to do with delivery than with sentence structures that are foreign to the way we normally hear and understand. Putting long clauses or phrases before the subject and not getting to the verb may be a flowery way of speaking, but it is not easy to follow and makes understanding less complete. The older piety prayers although beautiful in their own way utilize a language that is not easily heard and understood in our day. Words like 'vouchsafe', 'entreat', or 'oblation' don't make a prayer or liturgy more reverent. Although our diocese did a thorough implementation process with workshops and homilies and materials, it seemed the explaining of the changes was quite arbitrary. To speak of the changes in the language of the new missal as making more sense than the less literally accurate previous missal was insulting to the process of translation that was implemented in the previous missal. The previous missal's language was just easier to understand and dar I say proclaim and pray.

---

[Sentence removed] The current translation has been easy for me to learn. It was a little getting used to.

---

Besides grammatical errors and very poor English the text often suggests a spirituality that is Jansenistic or Pelagian. The frequent use of "merit" could lead people into serious error.

---

Blech!

---

Book is too bulky, servers can't handle it, not plain english, people don't talk like that. I transpose the text so it sounds like common sense english. Because the wording is so clumsy it is unproclaimable. Try again.

---

Both the language and theology of the translation is pathetic, stilted, out of touch, ignorant.

---

Both theologically and linguistically it is an abysmal failure and the process of its "approval" was flawed.

---

Certainly, it is our first duty to obey whatever the Holy See asks us to do. If there is space for personal opinion, I am a foreign priest, and there is no doubt that the prior translation was much simpler and understandable for me; in it prayers and prefaces (also easier to pronounce). This is from a very subjective point of view. I do like the richness of language, however, it is fundamental at the same time to enrich language, instead of impoverishing it. I think, in the end, it is matter of priorities. We will do, nonetheless, whatever we have to do.  
Thanks

---

Clearly, I feel the language is burdensome and obfuscates some of the things we'd like to say and pray about. I find myself frequently hunting for a verb in these run-on sentences.

---

Collects are stilted and non-grammatical in English.

---

Considering the mis-translation of your St. John's Bible, I am suspicious of your motives with this survey.

---

Creed: consider again the inclusion of "by the power of the Holy Spirit"; consider replacing the word "imbued".  
[email address]

---

Dear Brothers in Christ... Bless you for your Diocesan [Diocese Name] Liturgy Survey offered by Collegeville Seminary. I have always heard of the excellence the Benedictine community brings to the Liturgy, what we are called to bring – the best by way of celebrating, proclamation ... giving our Lord the best in Adoration, Praise, Thanksgiving, Atonement for Sin, and while we've got God on the line, Petition. Thank you for asking for

comments to the above questions, [number] blessed years in Christ's Holy Priesthood, humbly so, [number] years young ... I believe our dear folks in the pews, largely, don't have a sense of derivation of words, the root meaning from Greek, Latin, etc., so the new choice of words I believe goes over their heads. Yes, [comment removed] Cardinal George of Chicago, is a wordsmith, was on the grand liturgy committee from the beginning, "Dewfall" I suspect was his, well-explained in the liturgical guides! Yes, I relish the words & love to allow the folks in the pews to 'taste' the new, fresh liturgical language. I can appreciate the years the esteemed international English-speaking prelates, etc. put into this 'new' liturgy, but is it worth all the stewardship of time, travel, many meetings, talents, etc. to even try again. Bottom line, it is all up to the celebrants/proclaimers, to make any liturgical readings come alive, engender faith ... as some said, they need to put "fire in the belly." Afraid it is all too easy to be nonchalant. Grateful for all your labors of love...

---

Despite my general dissatisfaction there are a few (not many) collects which are quite well done. Unfortunately these are off-set by the many, many stilted and almost unintelligible prayers.

---

Despite the desire for collegiality as espoused at Vatican II, there was none in this translation of the Missal. Irrespective of whether the Missal is good or bad, I understand that the issue of collaboration has not been in evidence. As there is so much wisdom and variation in customs from continent to continent, even the appearance of collaboration would be a good move.

---

Did anyone bother to allow professors of the English language look at the texts before they were promulgated? I am not sure any English speaking nation is happy with this awkward and odd syntax that is used in the Roman Missal.

---

Did anyone one with a degree in English proof this text?

---

Do not make English sound like Latin. Both languages are unique in themselves. Literally translating makes it hard to read. We are all not poets. Mass is not a place of poems reciting place. It is a place of simple language communicating to God. People say new translation is for the glory of God. Do not make compilation Glory of God.

---

Do not start on other translations till we fix the new one.

---

Dry, exhausting and down right wordy.

---

English is not my first language, but I find the new Missal's language too old fashion. The Second Vatican Council liturgical reform aim to an up to dated liturgy looking for a modern world expression.

---

English not being my native tongue does not have anything to do with the translation. The thing here is the mentality. Latin has another totally different mentality than English. It has to be translated according to today's mentality. There is not Venerable Antiquity here, this is about being closer to people and them having the possibility to understand better the way they worship.

---

English syntax was thrown out. The majority and average folk in the pew have no clue as to the meaning of many words. The translation is simply a direct translation from the Latin which when attempted to be put into English leaves the whole process wanting. -- We use it because we are forced to. The people accept it but many times have no clue what is being said. This translation is NOT the vernacular of the people. It is ill advised Vatican-ese.

---

enjoy saying mass using the new Missal. Only change would be to enhance the language for the four Eucharistic Prayer for Masses for Various Needs and Occasions. They lack the beauty, reverence and prayerfulness of the other Eucharistic Prayers

---

eucharistic Prayer 1 with the special inserts for the celebration of Christmas Easter etc. is very difficult in going back and forth it does not promote concelebration without a lot of cutting and pasting over. It would be nice to have a new children's eucharistic prayer

---

Even when I look over the prayers before Liturgy, I find myself mispronouncing words that are not, never have been and never will be in my vocabulary. I find parishioners commenting on the words also. They just shrug their shoulders and smile. It seems to be a gentle way of calling it a joke and not being irreverent.

---

Every "Collect" ends in a prepositional phrase--it's not even standard English. I used to teach [subject]. I would flunk a student if they wrote a sentence fragment in their final exam.

---

Every aspect of the new Missal speaks of a total about-face from the spirit of Sacrosanctum Concilium - bringing the liturgy into the "language of the people." It's not so subtly disguised attempt at restoring the "high church" pre-Vat. Liturgy, even the options, e.g. penitential rite as it was once and better named is hidden in the back of the Missal to invite the celebrant to use only the Confiteor. Changing "cup" to "chalice" only in the Eucharistic Prayer, while leaving it "cup" elsewhere else shows that those doing the final preparation see

only the words of institution as significant, rather than the Mass in its entirety as one prayer. Guess they last read a theology book during their seminary days! The way of addressing God in these prayers is unctious and with wording such that any person under 60 would not recognize it as a throw-back but only odd. The old Sacramentary needed to be refreshed and needed many more options in Mass prayers, including Eucharistic prayers, but what was push down our throats is, for public worship, rubbish. It isn't "for the people," it's for the self-proclaimed and erudite liturgists. Bomb it! And don't allow this gang of crossword puzzle enthusiasts near future renderings of the breviary, scripture texts or sacramental rituals. To put who I am in context for you, I've been a priest for [number] years and hold [degree type] degrees - right, a supposed stuffy [profession]. Wrong. I LOVE good liturgy and work at it. This Missal was dead from the start. Thank you for allowing me to express my sincere, if irreverent, thoughts.

---

Fidelity to the "original" Latin does not require a total disregard for the proper rules of English grammar and syntax.

---

First I want to thank you for seeking feedback on the new translation! While I am not opposed to change regarding the Liturgy, I find the new translation language to be very difficult and awkward. Sometimes I'm not sure what the Opening or Closing prayers are really communicating, not to mention the prayers of the Gifts, etc. Several of my parishioners have also been frustrated with the new translation. I do not see how the new translations has helped to enhance the Liturgy -- words do not flow, and are not part of the common language of the folks sitting in the pews. Any efforts to rethink this new translation would be greatly appreciated.

---

Flowing from Vatican II, the bishops of a country were charged with translating the liturgical texts. Liturgian Authenticam completely changed that making Rome responsible for translation. In addition, the new norm is more a transliteration of the Latin in stilted English, with run-on sentences. We'll lose our people if we keep this up.

---

Flows poorly, especially collect; some words awkward and not current usage; would like lead-in for consecration to be the same in all canons;

---

Follow the spirit of pope francis....simple and holy.

---

For anyone who is well catechized about the reason for the change of translation, especially following Liturgiam authenticam, should know that this new translation is a needed step forward in the continual implementation of the Second Vatican Council. I did find it rather strange answering a survey gathering my personal opinion when the liturgy ultimately has nothing to do with my personal preference, but rather is given to us by Christ through the leadership of the Church. I don't think personal subjective opinions should be a primary criterion for continued renewal of the Church but rather following the hermeneutic of reform in continuity following the guidance of our last several Holy Fathers.

---

For priests in multi-cultural parishes, for instance where there are many Spanish-speaking who go to the English Mass, it is so hard for them to grasp the meaning of the prayers. And for Americans as well!!

---

For someone accustomed to the older English version, I find many of the newer expressions (e.g., the increasingly bothersome "graciously" awkward and off-putting). I fear that this last example is the result of someone presuming to increase our "sense of the sacred" by decreasing our more familiar, even colloquial language. In my view, this was misguided. Not every change is an improvement. Thank you.

---

For the most part, I think the new translation is fine. However, there are some things, like the repetition of "we pray" all over the place, which are pretty silly. I did not bring force to answer the first question above because, while I was looking forward to the new work, for the most part it was all right, some things, like "from the rising of the sun..." were good, but others were cumbersome, like the "we pray" mentioned above. My forced answer is exactly that: forced!

---

Frankly, I think this surveys nothing of importance. We have the new Missal. By and large, people have adjusted. Yes, some phrases are cumbersome, but I like the idea of ONE translation for the English speaking world. I suspect there are priests who stubbornly adhere to old formularies, but such will always be the case.

---

Getting the rituals for baptism, marriage and anointing should be a priority. There should be some revision of the current translation. Particularly in my opinion the post communion prayers. They often seem to have little meaning.

---

Give task to a committee made up with the people in the pew since priest prays in their name.

---

Give the process time.

---

Give us back the original translation

---

go back to the 1970 Missal

---

Grateful to have been asked to do this. Pity more English Speaking Citizens, lay and clerical were not invited to the table when the New Roman Missal was worked on.

---

Had the 1998 ICEL Translation put in place there would not have been any need for the above translation survey. [Name]

---

Having celebrated the mass in the Latin, transition, Missal 1 translation and now the New Roman Missal, it takes some time to adjust to the flow of words. Mind still remembers the old translation.

---

HAVING EXPERIENCED FORMER CHANGES IN SPANISH, DESIGNED TO ASSIST THE PEOPLE OF GOD IN PRAYER, I FIND THE CLUMSY, AND OFTEN INACCURATE TRANSLATION IN ENGLISH TO BE UNDERSTANDABLE, DISTRACTING.

---

Having prayed the Paul VI missal for [number] years, I thought it was beautiful and flowed very nicely. I'm not opposed to revision, but I think the new missal was too drastic. It's not so much the changes in the responses of the people that bother me, but more the presidential prayers (AWKWARD!) I'm not sure that "noble simplicity" characterizes the new missal?

---

Hope result of survey is taken seriously. God bless Pope Francis.

---

How come the Anglicans can produce beautiful, prayerful language in everything they do, but we end up with this unintelligible mess which is no better than the disaster it replaced?

---

I am grateful for the opportunity to comment on the 3rd addition of the Roman Missal. I certainly hope that our comments will be taken to heart, but my gut tells me that these comments will be ignored. I have spoken to a number of priests in my diocese as well as a few from other dioceses and they all feel the way I do. The wording is clumsy, awkward, confusing at times, doesn't make any sense at other times, and uses words that are not part of everyday conversation. Even the Eucharistic Prayers are awkward and clumsy, and I am being kind. I will be a priest for [number] years soon. I used to love to say Mass, not anymore. I used to use the various chants during the Easter season and at funerals, not anymore. In fact, I just said today that if I could go back to the old missal, I would do it tomorrow. Enough of my complaining. I think you got the message on how I feel. Thanks for your time. [Name] [email address]

---

I BELIEVE THAT THE SENTENCES ARE TOO LONG FOR EACH PRAYER....

---

I find the prayers not prayerful, the eucharistic prayer distracting and feel the Missal was simply imposed on us.

---

I accept and can appreciate the changes in the new English Missal even though I think some of them are awkward and don't necessarily enrich meaning or understanding. As someone who speaks two languages, I prefer translations that capture the essence of what is being said rather than those that are literal. Nevertheless, I believe the other rites and liturgies should conform to the new English Missal for the sake of consistency. It appeared to me that the Holy See promulgated the changes in the new English Missal without much consultation with U.S. priests. While that is its right, the process seemed somewhat less than collegial.

---

I acknowledge there is a good intention trying to render a closer English rendering to the original (editio typica), but the new text is rather awkward and rather than helping the faithful's (& the priest's) fruitful & active participation, it hinders it. And I am afraid it will not get any better over time: without losing its proper literary style and propriety, liturgical language should be closer to the language of the people, the "vernacular" - that was the intention of Vatican Council II.

---

I adhere to the new translation for two reasons. First, I don't want the R.M. to be a sign of disunity, no matter what my personal feelings about its inadequacies are. There is already enough disunity in the Church. Second, I respect the Church's role in regulating the Sacred Liturgy for the sake of expressing the unity of the Church at prayer. I read the Mass prayers beforehand. Yet, I'm ashamed to say that sometimes I actually find myself leaving the altar at the end of Mass feeling anger instead of peace. The wording is, in general, (not in every instance, to be sure) torturous. It reads like someone who does not speak English as a first language translated the original Latin. I do not have any expectations that the R.M. translation will be reconsidered any time soon, if at all. The many voices that were raised against the new translation at the time that it was under consideration were futile. It passed because that was the will of those in Rome who wanted it passed. I have little hope that voices raised today will find any more of a hearing.

---

I agree that ritual language is helpful in our communal prayer and it should be special language. This translation failed to take advantage, for the most part, of the beauty and grace of English. Forcing English, a mongrel language that draws on strengths of several languages, into a Latin pattern has made the English text stultified and awkward. On top of that, several scriptural references miss the mark. The scripture we are supposed to reverence and from which our prayers flow was written in Hebrew and Greek, with a little Aramaic thrown in--

not Latin. Latin is a dead and deadly language adored and glorified only by our Church. Thanks for inviting me to sound off.

---

I agree the Holy See should play a role in the new Missal translation but also words no one knows or uses should not be used

---

I am [number] years ordained right now. I realize I'm stuck with this translation for the rest of my priesthood. It makes me grateful that I only have to stumble over this crappy translation of incomplete sentences, poor syntax, incorrect grammar, esoteric words the laity (and many priests) have no idea what they mean, and in places bad theology for [number] more years. Unless I change, I hope to have enough saved that I won't have to say another Mass (which I used to love) my entire retirement. I almost cry when I see how my church has destroyed this beautiful form of prayer.

---

I am a priest for [number] years. I love what I do. In all humility (or at least some) I DO celebrate well. The revision is such a shame. Ray Brown once said there ought to be a new translation of Scripture every 20 years, because that's how often language changes. If you want the Church to speak to every generation then you must speak its language. My thanks and prayers for finally having been asked what I thought. [Name, City, State]

---

I am a strong believer in the liturgical principle of Full, Conscious and Active participation of the Assembly in the Liturgy. The Revised Roman Missal does NOT enhance the Assembly's ability to do so. If anything, it further disenfranchises them from full participation. While I'm sure these new texts are an accurate, technical translation of the original, revised Latin, they most certainly do NOT represent the vernacular language of any English speaking nation on the planet.

---

I am an [subject] major, a degree in [subject] and a in [subject], a [degree type] in [subject]. The language is too stilted. It makes it not only difficult for the clergy nontrained in voice and oral communication to make the translation sensible, the phrases are too many, too long, and too complicated for hearers to follow effectively.

---

I am comfortable now and used to the different structures we see especially in the prayers (orations). Thanks for asking.

---

I am confident in time that the new translation will become confident and prayerful. I have to admit even after using it now through a full year and studying/teaching a great deal about it, i still regularly stumble on the words and concentrate more on saying it correctly than praying. I do believe this is the right direction and in the long run we will be better for it. Change is difficult and all this has shown me i'm not as flexible as i thought i was.

---

I am extremely angry about this translation. It totally disregards the attitude and direction of Vatican II. It is an insult to American English speaking people. The translation of the Eucharistic prayers for Reconciliation & Daily use are horrible and were unnecessary. I am disappointed and very frustrated and cannot wait to retire which will be in the near future. What happen to the three yr. cycle for the opening prayer? What happened that the American Bishops wre unwilling to listen to Bsp Donald Trautmann? This whole translation is an insult to the American Church. Why weren't the parish priest allow some input? This whole missal is extremely awkward.

---

I am extremely happy with the new Missal and Pope Benedict's leadership, both are instrumental in bringing a stronger sense of reverence back to Mass.

---

I am grateful for the opportunity to give some input. The new translation does not reflect how English is spoken and written in the USA. Therefore, it greatly detracts from the quality of our liturgy rather than enhancing it. We also put too much emphasis on having everyone use the exact same words. Having more than one approved translation would do us more good than harm. Keeping the current translation would respect those who find it helpful. Allowing for other alternatives would help us substantially to affirm that our unity in praying is something beyond words. Thank you again !

---

I am in my [number] year of ministry as a priest. I earned a [degree type] in [subject] from [Academic Institution] and have been a student of [subject] all my ordained life. This Roman Missal translation is extremely poor communication. Its language is clumsy and largely inaccessible to most folks. Really, it might as well be Latin. The sentences are too long. The word order is often incomprehensible. The name of God often does not appear for several lines, so that it is unclear to whom this prayer is addressed. There are multiple modifying clauses strung together, which could easily have been divided into separate sentences that would be comprehensible. I strive to pray these prayers with comprehension, but folks here tell me they often become lost. This desire for a more formal "elevated" language for liturgy is a thinly disguised attempt to elevate clerical status and remind folks that their comprehension if at best secondary. I am extremely disappointed.

---

I am indifferent about the first question, but I have notice a change. Both translations are beautiful in their

own way.

---

I am most happy to have an opportunity to express my great disappointment with this new translation. I read the account of Archbishop Maurice Taylor of Scotland concerning the manner in which this translation came about and I was angered by the Vatican politics.

---

I am not against change. But this change is disastrous. Borne and educated in America I thought that I was fluent in English, the new translation is a humbling experience.

---

I am old enough to remember a time when Mass was celebrated in Latin and the faithful read a missal with Latin on the left and an English translation on the right. It was awkward but as good a translation as the present translation. I could not translate Latin at the time but I could write better English as a seventh grader.

---

I am pleased with the 3rd translation so far; there seems to be more “jumping” around with the scrutinies but, I don’t view that as a major issue at this time (we’ve only experienced the first.

---

I am saddened that a long and widely collaborative effort by ICEL to prepare a new translation seems to have been ignored. Instead, we seem to have been given a stilted, Latinate translation with grammar and vocabulary which is awkward at best.

---

I am truly disappointed that the work of ICEL for over ten years was thrown out and a small unknown committee forced the translation changes on the English speaking churches. Very sad. It is so awkward praying the prayers, some of which, make no sense. We need prayers that speak to people in a language that flows and they understand.

---

I am truly pleased with the new translation of the Missal.

---

I am used to the new Roman Missal. I feel comfortable using it. please, do not make any changes.

---

I am very disappointed in this translation. The language resulting in many places in the text is stilted, distancing, disconcerting, awkward, and very hard to pray. It is difficult to lead the community at prayer. I often feel like I am “telling” something to them rather than praying to the Lord. I am exhausted by the end of a mass text setting during Mass. I don’t like it.

---

I am very informed about the new Roman missal. From the beginning of the Curia’s efforts to publish a Roman missal, they have been most deceitful and dishonest. They violated the norms in the Vatican Council decree, Sacra Concilium, they lied about the procedures they followed and they used very incompetent people for the formation of the missal. Being a priest of [number] years, the Curia actions made me very angry and greatly disappointed. [Sentence removed.] [Name, Degree, Academic Institution, Years]

---

I appreciate the efforts in improving the language of the Liturgy, but this one, unfortunately, was a failure. Spanish is my first language and when I read the English translation, I can see what the intent is, but I notice right away the unsuccessful result. There are beautiful images that the translator, with all due respect, has ruined, trying to be “faithful” to the Latin structure.

---

I appreciate the new translation greatly and am looking forward to the new translation of the Liturgy of the Hours, mostly for the ending prayers for Morning and Evening Prayer.

---

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the new Missal. Too bad priests’ consultations didn’t take place by the Holy See prior to issuing this edition. It saddens me at times to preside at Mass and have to proclaim such poorly composed prayers. There is actually some very good theology in sections of the Missal but it gets twisted in the verbage. And to think this will be the case for the rest of my life as a priest. I am saddened for the Church; it reflects poorly on Rome - rather ironic, given that new leadership is being chosen now to lead the Church.

---

I appreciate the texts in expressing our beliefs with more clarity, some turns of phrases and poetry are wonderful. I particularly am concerned about the Latin syntax, the use of technical theological terms, e.g. consubstantial and pervenient and the many subordinate clauses which make it very difficult to proclaim and hear since English is better expressed in pithy sentences.

---

I approve of the “elevated” style the prayers are striving to accomplish. The old presidential prayers were in many cases quite pedestrian and plain silly. However, I did appreciate the directness and simplicity of proclamation of the former Sacramentary. I don’t mind as much the new translations that the people pray. I don’t find such words as “consubstantial” or the thrice “mea culpa” overly burdensome. Some prayers, such as the “Lord, I am not worthy”, are quite beautiful, consistent with Scripture, and an improvement on the old form. However, the priest’s prayers are simply unprayable in so many instances. There are times when I don’t understand the syntax even when it’s before my eyes! There are phrases that are clumsy and unintelligible. Others have pointed out the many instances where this is obvious, so I don’t need to repeat them. It is no secret

that priests are making intelligent adjustments as they vocalize these prayers. And I don't think that this is so much a rebellion as a sincere desire to make these prayers accessible to the mentality of the congregation. And isn't this what a leader of prayer should be doing? In conclusion, I think a distinction must be made between the people's prayers which are usually quite acceptable, and the priest's prayers which are a disaster in so many cases. I thought that the multiple choice questions above failed to make this distinction and thus some were, for me, difficult to answer.

---

I argued for not speaking negatively about the translation from the pulpit. But I think the new translation is MUCH MORE DIFFICULT not only to proclaim, but even to pray. Perhaps the precedent established by Pope Benedict in allowing free use of the Latin Missal could be followed in allowing the use of the much more understandable texts of our previous Sacramentary by priests who are concerned that their people be able to active participants as Vatican II proposed.

---

I attended a presentation before the Missal came out in our local parish and it was sorely lacking. The presenter seemed fixated on the blogger who does the "Whispers in the Loggia" website and bashed him a number of times - what that had to do with the new translation of the Mass was a mystery to me. Then he acted like the new translation was going to be no better than the old one - which totally inaccurate. I have looked at the translations side-by-side and the old translation missed so much. When comparing them, I sometimes wondered if both prayers came from the same text! I was very pleased to find out that the actual translation was nothing like the presentation I endured before it I saw the actual finished product!

---

I believe we can have a prayerful, reverent, and formal translation that allows a special distinction to our conversation with God without the awkward, clumsy, verbose, stilted translation that the Church has given. I believe with one bishop who recently said this translation is a cross for the present church, esp her priests, to carry for a while.

---

I believe it was the ICEL that oversaw the previous English translation of the Sacramentary. I wish they could do it again. It was UNDERSTANDABLE English. Reverence doesn't come from the words as much as from the attitude of the proclaimer. Formal words don't automatically bring a sense of reverence.

---

I believe our prayers to God should be straight-forward and not flowery. The text lacks a natural rhythm and the language is difficult when praying the prayers. I sometimes find myself wondering what am I saying? (It is especially hard for our children to understand and follow and that concerns me.) I thought the reason to put the Mass in English was to make it more understandable and encourage participation. I was hoping the new translation would be more accurate. It may be from a legal or literal point, but it certainly lacks the heart of the older translation. I think it could certainly be improved.

---

I believe Rome should have let the English speaking bishops take care of the translation issue. It is clear that the new translation is an effort to stick more closely to Latin, so it sounds like poorly translated Latin, i.e. not into idiomatic English. Sentences are too complicated for public speaking. They are even difficult for silent reading. It is true that the earlier translation needed work, but I would have been given a poor grade in Latin class back in the [decade] for this kind of work.

---

I believe that most of the priests that have complained, or at least shared their dissatisfaction with the texts are the ones that often celebrated mass by memorizing words, thus reducing the prayer factor of their role as presider. I am very happy that the new texts have made us slow down and pray the words more reverently with newer and richer meaning with its poetic style.

---

I believe that this survey is inadequate due to the fact that each question should have a comment box to clarify the choices. I'm multilingual and noticed that the former English Translation was deficient when celebrating Mass, and was looking forward to the new translation. But, the problem with the new translation is that it does not flow smoothly. In other words it's awkward and needs to be revamped before they even think about retranslating the Breviary or other rites.

---

I believe the Holy Spirit is working through the church in our times for the good of all and that we should allow Him to blow where He wills. Keep up the good work.

---

I believe the new translation is based on a false premise. The Latin text was never designed to be proclaimed aloud to the people; it was the prayer of the priest. Vatican II changed that but the new translation ignores the change.

---

I believe the New Translation is not having its desired effect. I believe the people are using and going along with it, but I do not believe they are experiencing a deeper appreciation of the Liturgy and Mass.

---

I believe the New Translation was foisted upon the Church by a very small minority of people who reject Vatican II.

I believe the new translations were too literal and were controlled by a small group of insiders including several bishops and cardinals. The earlier version of the English translation had a better, more prayerful flow and was less awkward. I think we can do better [Bishop] and your colleagues!

---

I believe the theology with an emphasis on “merit” is defective

---

I believe those responsible for the new translation and for forcing the people of God to use are guilty of grave sin. Beyond the errors of grammar the language itself sounds the babbling of a 19th century stroke victim. Those who attend regularly have reluctantly accepted it, and those who attend infrequently find themselves stumbling all the way.

---

I can appreciate the attempt to make the Mass more reverent and conform to the Latin text but it seems that the translators did not take into account the many differences in the English language throughout the world. At times the language seems stilted, contrived and not the language of the people. Considering that the majority of people in the world are under forty years of age, I wonder if the liturgical language even speaks to this group at all. It does not speak to me or helps in my prayer life- Mass has become an exercise in endurance rather than prayer.

---

I can approve of the leadership of the Holy See in regards to the translations if they find the right people to do it rightly and who are in touch with the people in the pew. When it came to this particular translation I believe that Benedict made the unilateral decision to bypass the 1998 translation, which was much better than what we ended up with. It needs to be revisited sooner than later. Thanks.

---

I can not tell you how many times as I offered the opening collect or any of the prayers that the presider offers that in the middle of the prayer all I can think of is why I am speaking this way. 95% of the priests probably do not use this language in their vocabulary or dialogue with others. Its almost arrogant in its use to make it seem like I am speaking in a way that most who hear it “can’t”. I have never spoke or wrote where it seems like every sentence has 14 commas, pauses, etc. God bless those who gave it so much time and effort but it truly for the most part “did not work”. I do not feel at all I am in the minority in this view, priests and lay folk included. SO many have “rolled their eyes” at the new language of these prayers, and said “what”? Its over kill. In the Eucharistic prayers we have just longated and replaced phrases, that as I compare the texts to those given before, I can not see how the changes show a better translation, but only a change and replacement by a new phrase.... why? I am not mad, unhappy, or a rebel... I’m just dissapointed, and frustrated. Its not about taking time ahead and going over the prayers before I preside. Its about presiding with the texts of prayers in language I simply do not quite often use, nor do the lay folks who hear it... Thanks for listening....hope its heard and useful for your study....

---

I can only imagine what the jamokes [diocese] are going to say, especially those stuck in the 1970s, those who refuse to leave the 70s, and those who still are trying to promote their liberal crap for the rest. There are priests in [diocese] who refuse to follow the missal who have not been told to do so! The new Missal was and is necessary in its present form. Stop changing stuff and leave it as it is!!!!

---

I can understand some of the reasoning behind the revision. I like the chants of the prefaces. It seems to me that what I must do as a presider at Mass is understand the texts so as to proclaim them effectively. Whether the people understand is another matter.

---

I could have written a beautiful, poetic, theologically more sublime liturgical text in my sleep. Who is the God these people worship. It is not the Trinity of Love, but of uncompassionate Power. Submission, not collaboration in humble, mutual service, seems to be the Divine Will. I’ll keep adapting.

---

I deeply enjoy celebrating Mass with the new translation. The new translation makes the pedagogical dimension of the prayers much richer, and it is so much easier to relate them to the readings and homily.

---

I did fill out the survey, but did not have time for some comments. The first few months I spent a considerable amount of time and effort to understand the intent of the prayers with out much success. Now I spend that time editing the prayers so that they make some sense to me and hopefully the congregation. The multiple clauses not only elongate the prayers, but make them difficult to understand being read much less being heard. My English teacher would have had a field day if I ever submitted anything like this translation to her. I would never have graduated.

---

I dislike the Mass setting commissioned by [diocese]. We have not yet begun to use it in either parish and I think our music ministers are not at all enthused to use it.

---

I do applaud the attempt to eliminate “men” and “mankind” in the prayers, but the vocabulary is often obscure (e.g., how many priests know what “prevenient grace” is?) and the sentence structure is convoluted (and occasionally incorrect).

I do find it difficult in most cases to pray the prayers so that I can get some meaning from them. I can only assume that those who are listening to them have even less a chance of plugging into their meaning.

---

I do like elements of the new translation. The questions above did not give an opportunity to say that. Some phrases are beautiful and meaningful, though overall I find the language awkward for prayer. It is important to take care to have the prayers reflect accurately what we believe, but I think that can be done without slavishly and literally translating the Latin into English.

---

I do not believe the priests who would be using the new language was taken into consideration. English is a living language and not merely a translation from the official Latin. I feel as though the priests were left out of the decision making process.

---

I do not consider the new translation as a more formal style -- I believe it is just poor English. I grew up [Christian Denomination] with the King James Version of the Bible -- that was poetic English, that was formal English, what we have with the New Roman Missal is just bad English. I hope there will be an adjustment in the future before we move on to other projects. I believe one can be very thorough and faithful to the Original Latin texts and still respect English grammar rules -- this translation does not do this. I believe you can create an English translation that is reverent and respectful without being as awkward as the present translation. It seems that those who support the translation hide behind the argument that a more formal and liturgical English composition will be inherently awkward because its different from how we speak in every day life. I agree with that to a certain extend -- again the King James Bible is written quite differently than the way we speak, but at least it is poetic and adheres to English grammar rules. I believe a far less awkward and combursome translation can be achieved and still have a reverent feel to it. A liturgical English can be both reverent and intelligible -- there is no reason why the liturgical setting of a language has to be difficult to comprehend. The RSV Bible is proof positive of that.

---

I do not sing, so the chant question is meaningless. What happened to the Conference of Bishops in providing the translations for their areas of the world? Rome is reversing Vatican II.

---

I do not think that the translation is the best.

---

I do not think the views of priests should matter much at all in the future decisions about liturgical translations. I do agree that the new Missal could use some revision. Particularily in two ways: first, the translation (in some spots) is not quite close enough to the Latin. Second, places where "qui" was dropped or replaced with "you" should be translated properly, for theological and pastoral reasons.

---

I do not trust the Congregations of the Holy See to faithfully facilitate communication between the Holy Father and the Bishops. I work with people who, though adult, are poorly educated and/or mentally very disadvantaged. Lofty language is not helpful to me. But I appreciate the ACCURACY of the new translation and much prefer it to the tawdry and pedestrian rendering we endured for 40 years.

---

I do think that we did need a more spiritual and reverent language for the liturgy BUT literal translation from latin using their syntax leads to confussion and not understanding the prayer.

---

I don't answer those first questions, because I realize that I do like the new translation, but sometimes I am still distracted by some terms, such as the words "chalice" and "cup" are still used.

---

I don't care if most priests are listened to. The Pastors of the Church have the charism of governance. And the new translation still isn't close enough to the Latin.

---

I don't fiend the new translations any better than the old ones, and I prefer the old ones. They are less pretentious and just as prayerful as the new ones.

---

I don't have a problem with more precise theological terms, elevated vocabulary, or poetic imagery. My concern is problematic syntax - sentence structure, parenthetical phrases, and the inherent difference between the written and spoken word. In preparation of the text, didn't anybody ever read the collects outloud to see how difficult it is to make them comprehensible to a listener? Obviously not. Or do they just assume that nobody is listening? It seems that the folks working on the project were so focused on the sacred and dogmatic nature of the text itself that they didn't well consider that there would be speakers (chanters) and listeners.

---

I don't that it will revert back to the previous format, but I feel that the change was a sad loss. In my parish, most of my people are Hispanic, so, for many of them the new translation is a tongue twister... For me as well. I do like the art in the new Roman Missal.

---

I don't think it wise that the "views of priests will be taken seriously" in discussions regarding liturgical translation. First, most priests have absolutely no expertise in this area and are poorly formed. Secondly, this is

not a democracy in which the Sacred Liturgy is up for debate and popular opinion. I like the fact that as I pray the Sacred Liturgy in English I know that I am now saying the exact same words that are there in the Latin and in the other translations around the world. The new Missal translation is a great gift to catholicity.

---

I don't think the language is distracting, but I do think some of the prayers (especially a handful of the Collects) are difficult to understand because of their structure or choice of language. In other words, it can be difficult to capture the intended meaning of some of the Collects when one hears them prayed only one time.

---

I don't understand why so MANY people, lay and priests, were and are against this translation which is a great improvement.

---

I don't use the chant so I can't offer an opinion. As a presider, do I gather the prayers of the people and life them to God? Do the people speak in such combersome ways? Does God need stiff cubersome phrases to be praised. Are people really lifted up by this language? Why did the new translation not offer more prayers of Mass for some of the new saints

---

I enjoy the more poetic language with the new translation. This is a plus. The minus is that the syntax is so complex as to inhibit proclamation and comprehension.

---

I feel like I am more prayerful with the new text.

---

I feel that many of the prayers in the sacramentary were meaningful ,reverent and more suited to both relating to people and giving due honor to God.I don't feel that a literal translation from Latin overlooks the fact that idiomatic expressions vary from language to language and that literal translations do not do justice to the authentic meaning. Giving praise to God is not well served by a strictly literal translation that is oftentimes awkward at best.

---

I feel that the new language is a deterrent to our worship. My people stumble over the clumsy language and it takes there mind away from the Mass. That is never a good thing! Seeing people laugh at the Mass is not fun and they do laugh about "under my roof" etc. The Orations are too wordy and they don't make sense. I sometimes forget what I just said!

---

I feel this is another example of how the Vatican imposes seemingly unimportant things on us. I would prefer that the church focus on issues that are vital to our lives-- not externals, like words and dress, but internal on how we live our lives in love and consideration of others.

---

i feel we have gone backwards-i use only the aptostles creed since the other is orrible with words that we do not use.i use e.prayer two since the other three are done very poorly.people also feel that we have gone backwards.

---

I find a complete lack of "poetic flow" in the language. I was very supportive of any proper sharpening of the content especially letting biblical images become more "visible". Even with preparation I find myself inadvertently stumbling over words. It just doesn't flow. The complexity and (I'm not a linguist) slavish adherence to the latin word order and need to get every word into every sentence leads to losing the prayer in the words. My most telling critique is probably my feeling that I could have made this translation and although I've been a priest long enough to have had the full latin training in seminary I'm no linguist.

---

I find it difficult and clumsy

---

I find it hard to say anything good about the new Missal. Linguistically, theologically, pastorally, it is a disaster.

---

I find it very difficult to pray using the new translation. It is very hard to read it and make it helpful for the people in the pews. Thank you for asking.

---

I find some of the syntax (the way the words are placed in sentences)awkward and difficult. They are not how we speak - I think liturgical language needs to be poetic and beautiful, but not stilted and jerky as some of the prayers are now. Example - ending almost every prayer with the incomplete sentence "Through Christ our Lord" When it should be "We ask this..." or "We pray this..." through Christ our Lord. There are also too many run-on sentences with the word "and." More effort should be made to capture the meaning of the Latin, but conform to the rules of good grammar and syntax.

---

I find that if I am having problems with the language, the people most certainly are. I believe that the New Missal is a symbol of the Church being disengaged from the everyday lives of people. The new missal needs to be revised to make it more user-friendly and people friendly.

---

I find that it does not bring our people into a prayerful spirit they do not connect with this translation it actually is more detractive to the liturgy

---

I find the Collect, Prayer Over the Gifts, Prayer After Communion and the Blessing Prayers are awkward and difficult to get used to.

---

I find the language stilted and awkward; it does not meet the needs of American Catholics. We, the Church leaders are struggling to keep parishioners coming to Church. The new Missal in many ways can drive people away. People, in many cases, do not understand the Liturgy, The new Missal often times is not helpful.

---

I find the Missal awkward at best. I am a priest who feels that the language of the Mass must be easily understandable by children and non-believing seekers. If the words are not understandable by them we will and are turning them off to the Mass.

---

I find the new translation, especially the Collects, to be almost impossible to pray. They are clunky and awkward, difficult to proclaim and just as hard to hear. Sometimes they seem entirely unintelligible.

---

I find the prayers do not make sense, are difficult to understand and do not speak at all to the people or the scriptures of the day. I am very distracted celebrating the Liturgy because some of the language is beyond understanding!

---

I find the syntax of the presidential prayers to be very awkward - primarily because there are so many dependent clauses due to the demand of the leadership of the Holy See that they be only one sentence. I disapprove of the leadership of the Holy See in that many changes were made without consulting with the bishops of the countries in which the Missal was to be used. This is why I am not confident that the views of priests will be taken seriously. The views of the bishops were not taken seriously.

---

I find the translation cumbersome and distracting. In an attempt to "make more sacred" the language we have succeeded in making it difficult to relate to and, in some instances, we have made it sound "precious" and a bit ridiculous.

---

I find the translation cumbersome. I find that the prayers do not flow and are confusing. I believe that the timing of the change with all the difficulties in the church was poor especially in light of the bad publicity over the sex scandal it seemed the church as disconnected from the people.

---

I find the wording of most the prayers to be bizarre; at times I wonder "what did I just say." I do like a couple of the Eucharistic prayers for various needs. I find the set up of Eucharistic Prayer 1 to be confusing and as such I hardly use it.

---

I find this Third Edition of the Roman Missal to be more prayerful and I believe was a great improvement on the banal language of the previous Missal.

---

I found it difficult at first, but the longer I use it the better I like it.

---

I fully support the new translation as a more faithful rendering of the Latin editio typica. I think the principles of Liturgiam Authenticam are sound, and I do believe that our liturgical language ought not sound like our everyday language. The new translation is more difficult than the previous translation and requires the celebrant to prepare the orations beforehand, which is not a bad thing. The collects are all in the same standard form, so for me it is not too hard to follow the ideas. Certainly having relative clauses does make it harder to follow the ideas through to the end of a prayer, but the fact that the liturgy challenges our English abilities and calls them to improvement is not a bad thing at all - if the liturgy does not challenge our abilities and call us to more noble and elevated discourse, especially as we address the Lord God Almighty, what will? Thank you for taking the time to read this!

---

I had no problem whatsoever accepting the revised Missal. I realized it was necessary, and beneficial, for the entire universal Church, including English speaking peoples. I said, "Let's just be good sports about this" to my parishioners. And they responded very well! [Name] [City, State] [Diocese]

---

I have a hard time praying the Eucharist with the language that is used. It doesn't flow like it should and therefore it is hard for me to pray with this language. What the hell does duefall mean anyhow? That doesn't fit in my area.

---

I have a very strong opinion about this. I'm glad that the Lord's Prayer has remained unchanged for decades despite its "archaic" English because extraordinary language (of ANY kind) always alerts the listener to the fact that something extraordinary is being said. So now I'm glad that we are finally utilizing that fact by using "formal" language as a clear indicator to God's People that we really do consider the Mass to be something extraordinary, and not merely another social gathering. The formality of the translation forces me to read it more slowly, with meaningful inflection, so that it is properly understood by all present. The end result of all this is greater edification... and that's the whole point of liturgy, right? [Name]

---

I have been in awkward situation in which priests were most critical of the translations in front of their parishioners. Observing these priests in celebrating, I doubt that any language could improve their "rattle it off" approach to liturgy.

I have been ordained [number] years and have found the current Mass translation to be extremely difficult to read aloud so the meaning is plainly understood. I hear from many of the people that the prayers are not understandable even when the people read them themselves.

---

I have been ordained over [number] years. I like the more accurate and elevated language. However, there are some tongue twisters (e.g. “kindly countenance”) and I see that a literal translation from the Latin comes off as awkward American English. Translating is not an easy task!

---

I have come to appreciate the new translation

---

I have doubts that the opinions of priests in the parishes will be taken seriously into account but I do hope that the opinion of our bishops will be taken more seriously in Rome. The feelings of the bishops were over ridden by Rome in the new translation for the sake of a uniformity that is a figment of imagination since English is not the same in all the countries that use it as their primary language. Some of the structure of prayer as we finally received it is stiff and overly cumbersome. It is more difficult to proclaim for the people to hear with understanding. They are enduring it remarkably well from my experience and that is a tribute to their faith and the desire to worship.

---

I have experienced the revised translation of the missal in English as an obstacle to prayer for the congregation and the presider and an impediment to full and active participation. I am appalled at the process by which the translation came to be - a process which disregarded the work of ICEL for 13 years and rejected a translation that was overwhelmingly approved by the English speaking bishops of the world in 1998. I find that the translation is an assault on the Gospel teaching of inclusivity with regards to women and other Christian traditions. I see it as an attempt to obscure the teaching of Vatican II. It verges on heresy by implying that Jesus died for some chosen ones and not for the whole human race by using the word “many” instead of “all” in the Words of Institution. In summary, if it is true that “lex orandi, lex credendi” (the law of prayer is the law of faith), then this translation will tend to weaken the faith of Catholics. It is bad English, bad theology and bad ritual. I believe that we should start all over, and begin with the translation approved in 1998 and revise the new missal according to that translation. [Name]

---

I have mixed feelings about the wording or the changes; some are nuances of the theology of Mass while others are out of touch with the people. The Roman Missal has created some separation or distance with the priest and the people. The changes and the rubrics have created the Liturgy to become more impersonal.

---

I have more difficulty with the new addition of the Lectionary! When the 4th edition comes out, try to make the lectionary and missal use the same norms for translation. I still do not like the new lectionary. I think more dynamic equivalence is needed.

---

I have never experienced such run on sentences and some useless expression, “olike the due fall”, eg. Even though I really appreciate the word “consubstantial” in the creed.

---

I have no objection to reviewing the text of our prayers but the revision needs to be a language that is similar to our daily speak. I preferred the previous translation process where the text were more tied to the spirit of the Latin Text. Translating more in the spirit seems to respect the tension between unity and diversity.

---

I have not been able to pray the Roman Canon at all due to the poor language and grammar, the confusing images and sentence structure. It seems incomprehensible to me.

---

I have strong objections to both the top-down process and the incredibly bad results.

---

I have to believe that Jesus spoke in words easily understood and commonly used by the people of his time, even when he prayed. Many of the prayers are very oppressive and speak of how sinful we are as opposed to be encouraging and uplifting. Maybe it’s time for a real change.

---

[Sentence removed] The grammar in most of the collects is awful. The prayers are overwritten, obscure and archaic. If I ever wrote anything like this, editors would simply throw it out!

---

I hope it does actually make a difference in my responses.

---

I hope that the revisions of the Liturgy of the Hours and the other rites will do not take as long a time as the improved version of the Missal!

---

I hope that those who were eager to sell missals got all the revenue coming to them. I do not see that the changes are so great that God is more or less honored...because of the notion that ‘whatever (the Church) changes on earth will be changed in heaven’...then we are to go along with the changes regardless if we like them or not. I see the obedience part in all this...but still don’t like the twisty turned phraseology. However...may the Good Lord be praised in all things...especially the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass....in whatever language it is offered!

I hope with our new Pope Francis we will have a new style of leadership. The "New Missal" has made me ashamed to be a Catholic. I love to preside at Mass. I HATE the words I have to say. It is very difficult to pray to a God I love with words I hate.

---

I know its impossible to do a survey other than the style of this one but there are so many of the above areas where the options of answers DON'T really capture my true feeling/attitude,/etc. Some of the prayers are wonderful and do add to our giving thanks, praise and worship to our God. BUT so many of the others are so awkward and archaic that I am not sure I will ever get to the point of being able to truly "pray" them.

---

I like everything about the new translation, the style, the form the words chosen. I look forward to having the other rites translated the same way the mass has been revised.

---

I like nothing about this new sacramentary.

---

I like the attempt at a more precise understanding, but some of the english translation is not able to be proclaimed well in liturgy. Some of the 'graciously' done translations make no sense in english and are even beyond understanding.

---

I like the idea of the prayers being reverent and a somewhat special language. However, we never use words like conciliation or laud .....and I just think that gives people permission to dismiss us.

---

I like the new prayers and style of the prayers; but, some of the literal English translations from teh Latin is awkward and hard to pray through with a smooth pattern and flow. Some of the people in the pews find them hard to understand and follow;while others like them very much.

---

I like the new translation

---

I like the new translation, but sentence structure is often cumbersome. It demands the presider's full attention. In time, priests will become accustomed to it.

---

I like the Ordinary of the Mass more than the opening prayers and the other two prayers in the Missal

---

I like the reverence in the newly translated texts. And, I want the texts to remain as faithful to the current Roman Missal, but the wording needs to be changed so that it isn't so awkward. I believe parishioners don't really even understand what they are hearing in the prayers as they are written now. Using words such as "prevenient" and "consubstantial" have no meaning for them either. The new chant setting is just OK. The "Save us Savior" is an awkward chant. I hope the views of the American priests will be taken into account. I am orthodox. I want liturgy to be done well. I want it to connect with the people. The new translation, in many way, makes that difficult.

---

I like the translation. We just have to pray it slowly , so to give it more meaning.

---

I liked the Mass much better when we prayed it in the language we speak on a daily basis.

---

I look forward to seeing the results of this survey as i'd like to know if my thoughts are in the majority or not. Thank you for offering this means of expressing my views.

---

I love the more reverent and solemn language. I think some of the syntax is what throws people off. Some of the phrasing is clunky but I appreciate the more poetic feel. I also appreciate that some of the images and theological language are returned, such as "wonderful exchange", the play of day/night at Christmas, the focus on eternal life/salvation in Easter and "consubstantial" in the Creed. I appreciate the greater fidelity to scripture, tradition and the closer match with other vernacular translations. Some of the choices are odd at times, such as dewfall vs. dew in EP II, and whether that is even in the Latin typical edition. I think the changes were necessary, that there were glaring omissions and inconsistencies in the previous texts, and that the language was too colloquial and watered down. I look forward to a restored and congruent translation of the LOH, where the great prayer of the church is put further in continuity with the previous Roman Breviary, the Latin typical edition and I hope there is an even greater focus on the Patristic and theological heritage through its choice of texts and language.

---

I love the Theological thought behind the new translation. It actually brings up the concept of sin which had almost been eliminated in the previous version.

---

I loved the Mass and its prayers before the new translation. Now I FEEL I AM TRYING TO MAKE SENSE OF IT RATHER THAN PRAYING.GET RID OFIT AND LET US USE THE OLD ONE .ANY NEW TRANSLATIONS SHOULD BE TRIED OUT IN A SAMPLING OF PARISHES FOR ONGOING FEEDBACK.

---

I miss the former version

---

I never did like the Latin because for the most part i didn't know exactly what I was praying . The sentences were too long. Now it is the same in English. It is much too structured and I have to look at the text too much, I

was just getting used to the New Missal following Vatican 2. Now I think it is just too difficult to pray reverently and enjoy the Mass. I'm not comfortable at all. I think it should have been left alone. We have changed too much with the Liturgy and not made more important changes like allowing optional Celibacy for men wanting to be Priest but also having a family. I sincerely hope Pope Francis will consider this or what will happen to the Priesthood? We have to take our heads out of the sand and face the reality of what is happening in our Church today. AMEN< AMEN!!!!!!!

---

I obviously like very little of the "new translation." I am especially concerned that it distances the assembly and we run the risk of having what we had in the pre-Vatican II church where people resorted to their private prayers during liturgy. The priest cannot pray (even with preparation) because of the tongue twisting that is required. I am greatly concerned that the process for the new translation reduced the Diocesan Bishop to a mere lackey and compromised his role as the chief liturgist of the diocese. The same can be said for the local conferences of bishops.

---

I often find myself ministering in small rural communities. Much of the vocabulary is far beyond anything they can comprehend. Even when I am ministering in small cities words like "prevenient grace" or when the people are not familiar with words like 'ineffable,' 'consubstantial,' 'incarnate,' 'inviolable,' 'oblation,' 'ignominy,' 'precursor,' 'suffused' and 'unvanquished.' The vocabulary is not only incomprehensible but turns people away as they are made to feel less than. The laity feel alienated enough from the Church must we do it with our prayers and sacraments and language as well?

---

I pray that one day we may have a beautiful liturgy in English.

---

I prefer the former because it was closer to American English, more lively and less stilted.

---

I prefer the Latin Mass.

---

I prefer to call this missal the New Transliteration. It is much more a transliteration of the Latin, with complete disregard for English, than it is a translation. Some of the work is beautiful. Overall this could have been a tremendous moment for the people of God, if only they had taken into account how English works. The more I pray with the New Transliteration, the less I like it. I also noted above that the people generally find it positive. But I should also note that I have been told by numerous parishioners that they don't pay close attention to what the priest says anyway during the mass. . .

---

I put "neither agree/disagree" on some, because there are parts of the new translation that I really like and there are parts that I really dislike. While I can agree that the language should be formal, reverent, and not simply ordinary, I don't believe that it is necessary to have complicated and run-on structures to accomplish this. In addition, since one of the desires was to bring the language closer to that of Scripture, why not "correct" the Latin when it strays from Scripture? E.g., the "Lamb of God" takes away the "Sin of the world" (singular). How about looking to the Greek to see whether a definite article is appropriate or not. As for trusting that parish priests' voices will be heard and as for approving the leadership of the Holy See (more specifically the congregation most in control of the translation--and I do mean control, certainly not collaboration), past experience is the best indicator of what will happen in the future. I hope and pray for better; I will be grateful if future liturgical translations, etc. are better handled.

---

I question the prudence of such a survey because its hidden premise seems to be that one can adduce the rightness or wrongness of the translation from the survey itself. In other words, what difference would this survey make anyway? What's the point of it? What do you aim to achieve? Furthermore, the questions themselves reveal the bent from which they are written. I hope that you use the results of this well, and not to advance something contrary to the best interests of the Church.

---

I really have tried to be positive and done all I could to bring people on board with learning the new responses. I work very hard at pronouncing the Mass well so that both the people and I understand what I am saying. I find the text cumbersome and I find it mentally exhausting to say Mass. The chant settings for the Prefaces are not musical and I have not been able to comfortably learn them to sing them. Overall I continue to be positive but find it a challenge to do so. I pray that more Mass settings come forward. Honestly, I have found some of the prayers from the initial English translation after Vatican II are better done than they are now 50 years after the fact. I also find this translation to be grammatically deficient. "Through Christ our Lord," is not a complete sentence.

---

I rejoiced when the vernacular first came -- I could pray in my own language. The current translation is not my language. I find it hard to pray the Mass. The intention was laudable ("lofty" language "for God"), the result verges on dismal, I fear. I have to prepare carefully so that I know what I'm praying. The people...?

---

I see the need for greater uniformity within the English translations on the whole. It seems that the attempts to

be more “formal” sacrificed what appeared to be the more natural flow, leaving the translation more stilted and artificial. Sometimes the translation is more deliberate and prayerful in it’s arrangement; but more than often not. The chant settings aren’t something that I give a whole lot of attention to. Why was “like the dew fall” in Eucharistic Prayer II considered to be such an improvement? I appreciate your attempt to get feedback, I don’t feel like it really matters what we have to say especially since ISCEL’s voice didn’t seem to carry much weight.

---

I sometimes wonder why the subject goes at the end of the sentence, e.g., the first line or two of the Gloria. I understand that it is part of the Latin syntax, but that is not how we speak in English. I find some expressions in the Roman Canon to be excessive, e.g., precious chalice. Some of the opening collects make me wonder what they are praying for which makes me bring out the Roman Missal after Mass and look for myself. I wonder how many lay people are in the same boat as I, but do not have a Roman Missal to look at on their own. I find some of the expressions in the collects to be mind-boggling, e.g., prevenient grace. Which lay person knows what that means? Regarding the music, I should write at the outset that I am not a musician. With that said, I have not been able to figure out the tune to be used for the collects. While I look at the Appendix of the Missal, I am left wondering what do some of the terms like flex and the like mean and how are they applied to the specific collect that I am looking at. I have figured out the tune for most of the prefaces and in some instances it seems to me that we are asked to move up or down on the scale at musically incorrect times. I am sorry that I am unable to give any examples as to what I am trying to express. A big help to me has been [npm.org](http://npm.org) which has recorded somebody singing all the prefaces. Those recordings have been a huge help to me. Concerning revisions to the office, I think work should move forward on it incorporating the Revised Graille Psalter. With regard to the orations used for the office or other rites like marriage I do not have any advice to give at this time.

---

I still find it awkward to use. When I have a hard time praying it; imagine the people who have to listen to it.

---

I still find the Roman/Latin style somewhat clumsy and I have to practice it aloud beforehand. Aside from the translation, I really appreciate the new FORMAT (e.g. Preface within the feast texts )

---

i still prefer the 2nd edition. so the 3rd is one-step down for me. The prayers are not coherent; in fact they are filled with fragments that would cause more distractions than help people pray!!!!

---

I strongly agree this is the good time to change.

---

I strongly believe the bishops of a particular country should determine the translation that best meets the needs of their people. They and they alone, with the help of native translators and linguists, know what works best for their people in the liturgy in their country. Not all English speaking countries use the language in the same way.

---

I strongly object to the process by which the translation was done. Constitutionally it belongs to the local conference of bishops to translate the texts. Rome violated the rights of the bishops by forcing the translation on them.

---

I strongly recommend that the result of this survey be published for all to review.

---

I struggle with some wordy and confusing phrasings. I also don’t like that the person speaking the prayers(the priest)is not included in the intention of the prayers.

---

I thank Pope Benedict XVI for this great gift to the Church.The priests can grow in their spirituality in using good translation of the Missal and that is what is happening according to my friends in their spiritual lives.

---

I think it is fine

---

I think it is important for priests to be team players. In my experience since November 2011, I have not had even a single parishioner complain about the new translations. I can see why some priests don’t like it, but I do not personally find the new translations problematic, nor do I think our people find it problematic. I sincerely believe there are greater and more pressing issues to which our energies and efforts should be devoted. It is a fait accompli, for the most part we priests are treated well by the Church and owe so much to the Church, so let’s stick together and move on.

---

I think that ‘Liturgiam Authenticam’ should be revised radically before any future translations are attempted.

---

I think that some of the new translations should have occurred to be more consistent with other language translations. As a bilingual priest, the new translation is more literally like the Spanish version. However, the translation of the Introductory, Offertory and After Communion prayers is not consistent with current English usage. The syntax is awkward, and the run-on sentences are offensive to anyone who passed high school English.

---

I think that the formality of language is desirable and enhances the liturgy. The ‘transliteration’ (rather than

'translation') of Latin texts has resulted in a grammatically awkward product. The long run-on sentences are not effectively communicative; they are challenging to the speaker and incomprehensible to the hearer.

---

I think that the more exact language first of all makes the people have to think and reflect more deeply; secondly, it requires the priest to have to read and enunciate the words more slowly, and hopefully more prayerfully. This translation is also more theologically rich and accurate in handling on the content of the faith.

---

I think that the new translation is beautiful when you sit down and read it. But when it is proclaimed, it is often awkward. It is an improvement over the last one, but it introduced its own set of problems.

---

I think that the new translation will go down as one of the worst mistakes in recent church history ... it has made the people's Mass parts inaccessible to most. Priests shouldn't have to translate the texts for the people during Mass ... he should focus on elucidating the truths of the faith as found in Sacred Scripture and the teachings of our church. It reminds me of certain Hispanic countries where the people are very distant from the church because of a high ecclesial language which is unintelligible to the people. If I feel this way in the US with a doctorate, I wonder how the people feel in Africa who celebrate Mass in English as their third language?

---

I think that the usage of some Latin words in the Missal is great, however it needs to be explained to the congregation of the meaning so they can feel it deep in their heart.

---

I think that what we have been given is an outrage. It is lacking in language that is intellegible and does not create a spirit of prayer in me and does not help in bringing my people to prayer, as did the last translation. It is furthering separation of altar and pew.

---

I think the liturgy should be in good English. Emphasis on English. I studied [subject] for five years and know that the current missal tries to make English follow Latin syntax. This makes for clumsy English. What ever happened to the 1998 version that was being worked on?

---

I think the Missal should be revised. The awkwardness of the grammar obfuscates the beautiful imagery that's been included in the new translation.

---

I think the new translation is awkward and does not flow as well as the old translation. Maybe it takes getting used to but after a year and four months it is difficult to read some of the prayers meaningfully because of the language.

---

I think the new translation is more noble than the old; but it needs major revisions. It is very awkward.

---

I think the problem is that english words are used but not english grammer. Some of it doesn't make any sense.

---

I think the second to last question needs more nuanced. As it stands, it seems to be a misleading question. Are we really expecting every priest in the English speaking world to weigh in on every translation that happens? I think not. Nor, would I ever want that to happen. Nothing would ever get translated, we would be waiting on feed back and the amount of feedback would be too broad and in such large quantity that it would be impossible to do anything with. However, do I believe that there could be a group of bishops and priests who are competent in ministry as well as in Latin and proper English grammar who could advise translators, sure, I would say that I am confident in those views taken seriously and ultimately those are the views I want taken seriously.

---

I think they should publish a bilingual( English/Spanish)roman misal and the rest of the sacramental rituals.

---

I think too much Latin is included in the Roman Missal. I have to turn the page for each sentence of the communion rite because so much Latin is included.

---

I think we should have a new revised translation. The language of the current one is ready awkward and distracting.

---

I thought that the language of the former was much more wholesome to our USA Congregation - to enter under my roof is well for Spanish and Italians. but it doesn't say much for Americans, when it is for American...Lord I am not worthy to receive you but only say the word and my soul shall be healed.. [Name] [Religious Order] for [number] years, priest for [number].

---

I thought the [diocese's] program of preaching and bulletin inserts really helped the people and priests to understand the changes.

---

I thought the entire process was disrespectful and arrogant. The translation made no attempt to accomodate today's English language. We took something that was working well and replaced it with wording that is clumsy and in many instances incomprehensible. It would have been better left undone.

---

I thought the ICEL translations in the Sacramentary were poor but, at least, I could work with them. The publication of the Third Edition of the Roman Missal was an opportunity to correct past mistakes and, quite frankly, they blew it. The language is so stilted and the grammar is abysmal. You cannot translate directly

from the Latin since the sentence structure is not the same but that is exactly what they did. In some cases, even the theology is poor - e.g. When they talk about “merit” and “reward”. Another example - it uses the word “help” when it could easily have used the word “grace” etc. I think this translation is a regression from what was poor in the first place.

---

I thought the previous translation suited our needs in a very fine way. I saw no reason to go to the extraordinary expense of time and money for changes that were not at all necessary. The language of the new translation is not the language we normally speak.

---

I understand that a “liturgical” language for worship rather than daily speech is necessary. However, I think a better translation is possible that is not so stilted, in places, and is more poetic. For example, I believe that the translation of the Fourth Eucharistic Prayer in the old translation was beautifully poetic. It used to send goose bumps up my arms. The new translation of this prayer is so literally translated as to lose all of its beauty.

---

I understand the Vatican’s concern regarding the previous English translations: British, Irish, American, Australian, etc., and a concern for more fidelity to the Latin. However, let us remember that the original was probably Aramaic (why not translate it from that...?), and I wonder if the current translation is appealing to any English-speaking people. I just don’t think that the translation had to be that awkward-sounding, especially if we’re trying to wean the people in the pew from reading the missalettes during Mass. Thanks for the opportunity. [Name]

---

I use the new text of course but find it a big distraction to myself and wish it had never happened. If given the option I would go back to the former text and if the liturgy of the hours is this bad I am not sure that I will switch.

---

I used to like diagramming sentences in grade school. I haven’t done that for [number]-something years. At the very least it would be a nightmare to have to diagram many, if not most, of the sentences in the current Roman Missal Translation. Catholic Book Publishing will make even more money if we (I) have to buy new (and improved???) Liturgy of the Hours, Marriage, Confirmation, Christian Burial, etc., etc., etc. books. Maybe this is all part of a Communistic plot.

---

[For those using Sign Language for the Deaf,] with the new translation, there are so many differing words and phrases that are very difficult for the deaf to grasp. If our celebration is for all people, then the translation should have been taken into account in order for the deaf to appreciate and understand the wording. It is unfortunate that the Church translates the liturgy with only the hearing in mind. I am very disappointed in this translation and get the impression that the Church really doesn’t care about the deaf.

---

I was initially happy about the new translation only for the reason that it would be an opportunity for comprehensive liturgical education and re-commitment to the liturgical renewal of Vat II in the parish. As for those prayers that are clumsy or affected, I respectfully and prayerfully re-word them.

---

I was looking forward to a more reverent and less familiar style since I also celebrate the [Eastern Rite] liturgy, and I think the beauty is there, and also understandable. However the New Roman Missal I find clumsy and awkward and the lack of flow keeps the beauty from emerging

---

I was not looking forward to the new translation. I have made the best of a less than stellar situation, but I find myself changing parts of the translations to make better sense, e.g. word order, some words, etc. (Who knows what “prevenient” even means?!) The best part of the new translations is the fact that there are special prefaces within the Missal itself on particular days that are written with the feast in mind. Some of the prefaces are quite good. But, all in all, I think a revision is in order, more along the lines of the ICEL translation. Using Latin word order and stilted and specifically theological terms do not aid our people to be full, active participants in the liturgies. They are accepting and willing; but I don’t see it helping them pray. And I, as a presider, find it cumbersome to constantly try to find ways to make the words intelligible when heard. Thank you for asking.

---

I was ordained in [year]. I ‘practice’ the prayers before Mass, yet become ‘tongue-tied’ constantly. Some words used are no longer common today. “Like the dewfall” (Euch.Prayer II) brings an inner smile to my soul! I find Mass less prayerful.

---

I was very disappointed in the New Missal. Although there are a few inspiring prayers, for the most part, the language is not engaging - even at times so abstract as to be difficult to understand what is meant - especially when proclaimed in a liturgical, that is, public setting.

---

I was very much looking forward to the new Missal, but I now find the language off-putting, uninspired and even alienating. The previous edition may have been too stripped down and generic, but this one is a mess.

---

I was very satisfied with the way it was, but I can live with the way it now is.

I will not give an up or down on the whole missal...there are parts that are great, there are parts that are neither here nor there, but there are parts that need simplifying. In chanting, often the meaning is lost to me and certainly others, but in reading it...it can make perfect sense. It means I have to be prepared to pray it. Your first question is too black and white.

---

I wish our opinions as celebrants were taken into consideration. The prayers are something to muddle through; most are only one sentence long. Incredible. I'd even donate some money to buy some periods for the prayers. Just because they are unintelligible doesn't mean they are reverent. Let's remember that liturgy means "work of the people." Let's speak in a language we actually use and understand. Thanks for listening.

---

I would go back to the old translation in a minute.

---

I would have liked more time between the publication and the implementation of the 3rd Edition of the Roman Missal, in order to provide us with more time to familiarize ourselves with the new translation.

---

I would hope priests are listened to. Some theology of texts need to be addressed. We do not need to keep saying we pray in all of the prayers. Is that not what we are doing? A lot of repetition. Are we not worthy of God's mercy? Can we not rejoice more in the prayers. Is there a reason the order of seasons and prayers were not put into place. i.e. Trinity, Corpus Christi to follow immediately after Pentecost. Why the old way. Let's be more practical. Is there a reason why the Latin text is not included for priests who want to do that? Please listen listen listen and do not ignore comments.

---

I would like to have been able to select percentages of agreement or disagreement, but you know what you need to complete your work. Best Wishes!

---

I would like to nuance the opinions I have expressed in my selection of responses to the statements in this survey. I find the new translation a decidedly mixed bag, just as I found the former edition to be so. There are times when the new translation brings out the synonymous or antithetical parallelism between phrases of an oration, for example. I also applaud the translators for clarifying the scriptural allusions in some of the prayers. However, I have the same problem with many of the prayers in the new missal as I have with the Revised NAB translations of Paul's epistles: fidelity to the original language has, at times, rendered the English text incomprehensible--particularly when the text is heard, rather than read. 21st century English speakers are not used to long, periodic sentences. Another problem with slavish fidelity to the Latin text of the prayers is the annoying repetition of "we pray." It's an oration, for goodness' sake. Of course, we're praying! Would that the translators of the missal had adopted the standard of the translators of the RSV: as literal as possible, as free as necessary. It strikes me that the 1952 edition of the RSV struck just the right balance between literalism in the service of fidelity and freedom in the service of comprehensibility. I can live with the new translation, and I certainly wouldn't fall on the sword for the restoration of the old one whose prose was often pedestrian. I also need more time to live with and to pray with the new missal, and think that a revision at this time would be premature. But I have no doubt that it needs to be re-visited in the future, and that the translators of the other liturgical texts learn from the mistakes of missal committee.

---

I would like to see the original translation that ICEL developed. I think the old translation needed work, but the group that hijacked the process did a poor job. The bishops should have shown some courage and rejected the new translation until a more representative group of scholars could be appointed to oversee the work.

---

I would never recommend changing the laity's parts in any way or the Eucharistic Prayers, but tweaking the priestly orations including prefaces should certainly proceed but in a common sense literal way from the Latin not in an equivalent way. [Name]

---

I would prefer that there be chants for the eucharistic prayers set out in an appendix.

---

I would revise Eucharistic Prayer 1: in some passages it is just too verbose.

---

I'd like to see the results of this survey and all of the internal stats that reflect its validity and reliability. Outside of that, this is a total waste of time!

---

I'm disappointed that the survey did not provide an option stronger than "strongly disagree"!!

---

I'm glad this data is being collected, but I sure hope you're not going to use it to pressure ICEL or the Vatican one way or the other. The Church isn't a democracy, nor should it be, and the successors of the Apostles, the bishops, are the ones who have to make these decisions. It is good that they are informed of priests' views, but only if that's done appropriately and not by you guys taking this and going to the press!

---

I'm not sure what the goal of this survey is. While I find much of the language of the new translation very awkward, I agree that a formal liturgical language is probably appropriate. But, as with any significant change in language, it seems to me it's impact and value can only be truly measured after a much longer period of use -

- I would say at least ten years. Language is certainly one of our primary symbol systems (if not THE primary symbol system) we use as human beings. Changing language, I believe, changes our perception of the reality in which that language is used, and in a very real sense serves to create that reality. Trying to measure such a change after only a year and a half of use appears to me to be unproductive at best, if not use-less.

Respectfully, [Name]

---

I've been a priest for [number] years. I am very disappointed with what has been done.

---

I've waited for this translation since the early 1970s when the first one came out: the prior translation struck me---even when I was in high school at the time---as an insipid, vapid, and massively inaccurate paraphrase. I am of the conviction that it was a massive scandal and disgrace that the prior so-called "translation" was allowed to be used for the at least two generations. The new translation will go down as one of Benedict XVI's greatest accomplishments. God bless!

---

If Charles Dickens wrote his novels in Vaticanese nobody would have read any of his great novels. We live in a world where people are living in a Hands On Mode. People do not just stand there like cows looking over a gate. God has probably updated His/Her communication skills also. Jesus spoke the language of his people and "His Father was well pleased."

---

If the "Liturgy" is the action of the people so should be the language.

---

If the current English translation is a faithful rendering of the underlying Latin, I doubt that any English translation is worth doing. The theology/piety of the prayers are not an improvement. The current English translation's rhetoric is very bad causing one to wonder if the translating team ever consciously prayed their piece aloud in a liturgical setting. Whatever happened to praying to the Father through the Son in the Spirit? The plain fact is that the current translation does not pray and those who say it does have taken a long swig of ecclesiastical Kool-Aid as they look for further preferment. [Name] [Diocese]

---

If the Liturgy of the Hours is revised in the same way, I will continue to use the present form. The sung Gloria our Diocese chose is too difficult for the cantors/some choirs. To use that lame "WWJD?", I doubt that He would approve. The good thing is that I now have to study every prayer before I can pray it aloud. It helps when I realize that a Latin sentence is really a paragraph.

---

If the objective is communication with the assembly, I feel it has failed. If it is to impress God, I guess it has succeeded. Altho English is used world wide, meanings are different in different cultures and this needs to be addressed. Only English first language translators should be involved.

---

If they ever correct this tremendous blunder and get someone besides Yoda from Star Wars to translate the texts, they might try to be more gender inclusive if they believe women are part of Christ's Church. It frightens me that some of the Church's leaders seem to have no faith in the Spirit and think that "parroting" a Latin syntax of the texts is the only way to express the same thought. It also seems they are afraid of using "we" instead of "he". The Church won't fall apart if it uses common sense and helps all to feel included. Rome "believes" "in our money, perhaps it can bring itself to believe in our ability to select the English we need to use.

---

If we don't like it would we have an option to go back to the Sacramentary, like the Latins?

---

If you gave the Roman Missal translation to a second grade english teacher, it would receive a failing grade. It has comma splices, incomplete sentences, run on sentences, hanging modifiers, and is flat out unintelligible at places. I guess being incomprehensible means it is "holy" language. Try translating it into grammatically correct English next time.

---

In a word, COUNTERPRODUCTIVE to Faith of the people and to Evangelization.

---

In general I like the new translation but in some cases the syntax is difficult to read aloud without pre-reading them. I think there could be some minor tweaking.

---

In general, it is an improvement; however, there is always room for improvement in any translation, as there is here, too. It does need to be kept the same, however; especially the parts that the people do. ... I know that the prayer before Communion, "Lord I am not worthy .... is now the same all over the world, but I really don't know why it doesn't stick closer to the scripture, saying "... say but the word and your servant will be healed."

---

In general, I like it as an improvement.

---

In my experience, if the priest chants the collects, prefaces, etc. then the new wording flows much, much more smoothly. Those who complain about awkwardness of the texts should look a little more closely at the current translations of the Psalms in the breviary. The structure is similar, more poetic. If one has trouble pronouncing the texts, one must pray over them first, follow the punctuation (commas are very important), and find the verb!

Then the emphasis can be added were one feels so moved. I do feel strongly that the new translation restored more of a balance between the relationship and responsibility a member of the faithful has with God rather than thinking that God's will is done, so what's the point of my own participation in my own salvation. The language is more poetic, it is more mature and diverse English. American English is already so impoverished and that is pretty well-known. Many people remark from time to time about the small amount of words that any given person uses in the course of a day. Mass is time made more sacred and is set apart from the mundane; the language really should contribute to that reality because the music, vestments, and setting already do. Thanks for the chance to offer my opinion. [Name]

---

In my opinion, the new translation is really awkward in some areas. Being close to the original language is okay but I think the text has to flow in its translation.

---

In regards to the last question in this section. I will not judge the actions I perceive on before of the Holy See. They must have felt it was for the best, I simply don't think that what the new translation has become was necessary. Yet, I pray it the best I can.

---

In some rare cases, the translations were better, but it was not at all the norm.

---

In the collects the language is too theological, too stilted, and too complicated to read, let alone pray. The chants of the prefaces are very badly done: the music and the words don't match. Please, Please, don't let them do this to the liturgy of the hours and the sacrament of Baptism.

---

In the consecration we say: this is the chalice of my blood, perfecta, . Why we continue using answering the mystery of faith the word cup? I understand we need to change their too the word cup for chalice

---

In the Creed, the language was changed from "one in being with the Father" to "consubstantial"the word,"consubstantial". How many of parishioners know what "consubstantial" means, even those college educated!

---

In the new translation, I make a distinction between the people's parts and the parts meant only for the priests (orations, prefaces, etc. especially the orations). To me, the people's parts are not too bad; they are comprehensible and can be spoken smoothly. That is not the case with the priests' prayers. In trying to imitate the sentence structure of the Latin and in translating the prayers literally, they come out sounding clumsy and archaic. The reason for this, I believe, is that some of the concerned bishops worked hard to convince the committee in charge to make the people's parts simple and comprehensible; there was not the same effort regarding the priests' parts. This is unfortunate because the priests' parts are intended for the people to hear and I don't believe that the people understand them well. There is no reason why Latin scholars, English scholars, and liturgical scholars cannot get together and come up with a correct, dignified translation which ordinary people in the pews can easily understand and be inspired by the content and the beauty of the prayer. Also, after a draft translation is done, they should ask pastors and lay people to review it to get their input as to how it comes across to them. Because I make the above mentioned distinction, I found it difficult to answer some of the above questions, since the survey questions did not make this distinction. My advice and hope is that the Church keep the liturgy of the hours and other rites as they are for a long time until they can come up with a more reasonable method of translating.

---

IN THE THREE PRAYERS THE LANGUAGE IS AWKWARD. CLAUSES THAT MAKE YOU FORGET WHAT IS THE SUBJECT OF THE SENTENCE. IT IS GOOD BECAUSE IT BRINGS BACK MORE OF THE SACREDNESS OF THE MASS MANY PRIESTS FOLLOW THE OLD WORDINGS BECAUSE THEY ARE IN A HURRY. I FEEL IT HAS NOT SANK IN YET.

---

Incorrect grammar, horrible phrasing, ridiculous vocabulary, writing that wouldn't be accepted in a junior high composition class.

---

It appears that the translators have never spoken English in a public forum, or before a large group of people. Even with the most devote priests, the translation is very rough and difficult.

---

It appears that whomever approved the translations did not take into account English as it is spoken in the United States. If they did, it was not successful.

---

It distracts me from praying because I'm concentrating on understanding what the prayer says. It is bad.

---

It feels like you need to be glued to the text to get the words correct, and it does not feel like one is in conversation with God.

---

It has taken time to get accustomed to new translation but after a year of usage I feel comfortable with it.

---

It is a joke--it comes across as badly done satire. It is a betrayal of the spirit and promise of VCII. In allowing themselves to agree with this translation, the USCCB abdicated its role as part of the Magisterium.

It is awful!

It is awkward, clumsy and not inviting to creating a more prayerful environment. I hope they leave other translations alone!

it is confusing that the bishops voted to approve this translation and mandate its use, but at least some of them sometimes change the wording themselves, for example at parish Confirmation Masses

It is cumbersome and difficult at times

It is difficult to have an English translation that speaks to all English cultures. Often it is difficult to know to whom the pronouns refer, especially in the lectionary. I think there should be a discussion about the principles of translation.

It is doubtful that those in the Holy See were able to read all of the adaptations or recommendations made to the English text from around the English world. The lack of options in the introductions to the various parts of the Mass is in conflict with those provided by other editions (Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, etc.). For multilingual priests, this lack of consistency is cumbersome. Our language at the Liturgy cannot be mediocre or colloquial. It certainly requires a poetic and sacred context, but this translation's use of passive tenses, consistent adverbs and awkward constructions does not make it sacred or poetic....

It is hard to translate a romance language into an anglo-saxon tongue. If we want the people to join us, we must catch their ears as well as their eyes. I am a [seminary] grad, and a [subject] major from [academic institution].

It is my opinion that some of the questions on this survey lend themselves to a negative response of those who are participating.

It is my opinion that the National Council of Bishops should have more leadership in the decisions on the national level than all such directives coming from a Roman mind-set. In the Vatican II mind-set collaboration and collegiality were called for. I would like to see this leadership model restored.

It is not a matter of likes or dislikes to me. It is more a matter of what allows people to connect to God more readily as we pray with them.

It is not clear that the Holy See so much led as took over something that had been entrusted to conferences of Bishops. I consider that a mistake.

It is not how we speak demeans the spirit of our language. Most parishioners are not pleased with the new translation, but tolerate it. They do not sense a new spiritual desire. In fact, they sense a reversal in spiritual development of parish families.

It is obvious that "The new Roman Missal" tried so hard in translating and preserving the ancient text and not really gave a thought about the liturgy as the public worship of the everyday common people.

It is obvious that no one who works with the faithful was consulted in the revision. It is awkward. The liturgy should be in the language of the people. I know of no one who speaks in the matter the missal is written. After almost 16 months I still find it cumbersome. I now "read mass." I no longer "celebrate the liturgy."

It is obvious the translators were working to avoid breaking up the collect and other daily prayers into multiple sentences. I think it makes it a bit awkward at times and could have benefited from more than one sentence. Nevertheless, glad to have an accurate translation instead of a paraphrase which the previous "translation" was.

It is precisely the lack of true leadership in the writing of the Roman Missal that is at stake here. It was an experience of institutional violence (from the sacking of ICEL in 1997, to the fearful failure of the US Bishops to respond to the abuse that Liturgiam Authenticam did to Vatican II teaching, to the propaganda machine of the Missal's forced reception), of Roman Cardinals not respecting the English speaking conferences of Bishops, of not truly entering into dialogue with the clergy and the church at large. It was a farce and an insult the way this new Roman Missal was foisted upon us.

It is really not the vernacular (that which is easily understood (Vatican II)) and not written in a speakable style. Are we putting God too far away for the people?? Unapproachable?? The translation also separates the priest from the community, treating the community in the 3rd person, sort of standing above the community.

It is so difficult to proclaim that I cannot PRAY the Eucharistic Prayers! The Collects or Opening Prayers are atrocious; I am substituting beautiful and fluid prayers published in England. Let's get back to the ICEL translations. [Name]

It is too late now.

It looks like this survey is designed to change something already in place, otherwise, why ask?

It might be good to leave off Liturgy of the Hours and other rites for now.

It seems better to describe the new work as a literal translation rather than a vernacular translation. A

translation can be achieved, even using formal language, which respects the rules of English grammar and syntax. In its current form, the word-for-word translation is awkward, making it difficult to speak and incomprehensible in the hearing.

---

It seems to me that the Eucharist should be important enough that we would make every effort to use language which is clear and understandable to the people. Instead this translation is not only awkward but in many places (especially the propers) is can be unintelligible. One of the articles sent to us by [person] in preparation for the implementation of the new translation began with this line: "For 40 years the Vatican II people had their way, now its our turn." I think this new translation is a deliberate affront to the reforms of the last 50 years.

---

It very difficult to pray because I am trying to figure out what it is saying.

---

It was a waste of time. The old one worked fine, and we were used to it.

---

It was great to revise the old translation, which simplified the Latin prayers excessively. But the newest translation is unnecessarily a mouthful, especially with its frequent parenthetical phrases, and Latinized vocabulary. It also is disappointing that the collects don't begin with a title of God as the first word, as if to get a running start before saying who you are addressing. Overall it is \*much\* improved, but could use some further refinement--a little more simplification--especially for the sake of those for whom a very educated, formal English is not a first language.

---

It was my understanding that those who worked on the present translation were language experts. BUT, having used this translation for a bit more than one year, I've discovered that there are still places of poor language choices. Some of the phrases are not used in the parts of the USA where I have served in ministry and can be very confusing.

---

It wasn't broken, why did we fix it???

---

It would have been good to keep the ICEL intact and have input into language for use in the English speaking world that had a greater sense of English spoken today. This equivalent to the Latin has led us down a bad road.

---

It's a sad note that the work of the USA bishops was overridden by a small committee in Rome (several of whom were not native American English speakers).

---

It's about time that the English speaking Church was provided with a translation which more faithfully reflects the deep mystical quality of the Latin texts. I suspect that many priests, especially those 30+ years ordained, are not too keen on the translation. Many are still "ad-libbing" their own versions of the Mass and their personal idiosyncratic language cheapens the Mass and distracts from the spiritual transparency which should be part of every liturgy. Please don't consult the priests. Go ahead with the wise advisers who produced this translation. Good work!

---

It's all about helping people grow closer to God. I don't get too excited about change.

---

It's difficult for me to answer this survey because I have so many mixed emotions about the new translation. Yes, I do feel that some of the wording is awkward, and I do wonder at times what the translators were thinking, but I think that over time that awkwardness could pass away with use. I do like the more reverent tone of the new translation, but I don't like how it is formatted in the Missal. It seems to me that the mass chants could be in a separate section. Or a briefer version of the Missal could be published without all the musical notation. I am more fearful of going through yet another effort to change translations. It was difficult enough going through this change; to change again in such a brief period of time would just add even more to the confusion of the people. I also think of the cost of changing translations, and the cost of changing books. I have been obedient to the church with this new translation. If we were to change again, I would be tempted to ignore it, because It would seem that every time there is a shift ideologically we have to change the translation. We shouldn't be changing the translation every five years, only every fifty years. I also think that the priests who have rejected this new translation were against it before it even came out. And so, of those priests who are against it, they aren't about to even try to learn a new translation. Pertaining to the ongoing efforts to translate other books, I think the policy of accurate and reverent language should be continued, but perhaps also bending a little bit to the camp who wishes a little easier flow to the English.

---

It's good to have a feed back on the new Roman Missal just to know how comfortable the priests and the people are with changes.

---

It's hard for me to pray the Mass with this Missal. I do like the strong scriptural connections/words in parts of the new Missal. I do like that some of the prefaces are right there with the Mass propers.

---

It's not the vernacular. It pidgen English. They sentence structure is awkward and convoluted. I feel as if I'm

talking around the words rather than leading prayer. Perhaps it would be more comprehensible to the people if we were mouthing the Latin words. I hate it. I use it. But I hate it.

---

It's people who pray. It should be language of people and not poets or gods. Make things easy and not difficult. All are not English professors. Understand common man's language and not theologians who have no experience of common people and make things hard for people.

---

It's a mixed bag some good, some not so good. I am sure there are folks with lots stronger opinions about it than I have.

---

its wonderful prayerful a joy to preside with and to pray with.

---

lacks anative understanding of english. reads like a european construct & flow.

---

Language is awkward and sometimes confusing. Phrases do not reflect local culture, eg in your face. Prayers are very stilted and the whole book is a huge disappointment.

---

Language is clumsy, sentence structure awkward, except for the "Our father", the projected image of God is a kingly God who primarily seeks praise and reverence

---

Language is difficult to pray and for people to understand..so many ask me what certain words mean...oblation, etc. in the prayers..language is too formal and awkward.

---

Latin is not a sacred language in the sense that it is infallible. Some of the new translations are theologically regressive (for example, the prayer before communion that separates the soul from the whole person--it is not the soul that should be healed, but the whole person!) I think if a Eucharistic prayer is composed, the ones we previously used were well done. Some of the language used in the new translation is meaningless to a large portion of the people.

---

latin should be out when people never study it co, bining english and latin makes no sense to me

---

Like so many things in life, the new translation, even if it was not requested, can be taken as an occasion to give new emphasis to the church's official prayer and worship. It can be viewed as a blessing, even in the midst of its challenges.

---

Liturgical Authenticam's basic philosophy of translation - that the original language, Latin, should control the receiving language, English, should be replaced with a translation philosophy closer to that of Comme le Prevost. For example, Comme states under General Principles: "5. A liturgical text, inasmuch as it is a ritual sign, is a medium of spoken communication. It is, first of all, a sign perceived by the senses and used by men to communicate with each other. But to believers who celebrate the sacred rites a word is itself a "mystery" By spoken words Christ himself speaks to his people and the people, through the Spirit in the Church, answer their Lord.[d]" Further: "7 Thus, in the case of liturgical communication, it is necessary to take into account not only the message to be conveyed, but also the speaker, the audience, and the style. Translations, therefore, must be faithful to the art of communication in all its various aspects, but especially in regard to the message itself, in regard to the audience for which it is intended, and in regard to the manner of expression." Applying such principles would, I believe, result in a translation that more effectively communicates to the People of God the saving mysteries that are spoken of in the prayers of the mass.

---

Liturgical language is different from the ordinary style of communication. See how awkward it seems when we listen to the way our children speak. After a few years, it will be a different new language. Thanks.

---

Long sentences with the interjection of phrases like "O God" read well in print but are terrible for oral reading and even worse for hearing. The use of words which are wonderful Latin but never used by most people make the meaning of prayers difficult for everyone but scholars. Language can be holy without being complicated or obtuse.

---

Looking forward to the Spanish revisions as well!

---

Many parishioners feel the new language is awkward and hard to understand; therefore, little connection with the Lord.

---

Many sentence structures are appalling.

---

Many thanks for the opportunity given to us to contribute.

---

many times things do not get clear for the people. Sometimes I do not even come across clearly for them to understand what I'm saying so I have not been pleased

---

Mass parts for the people are a definite improvement except for "consubstantial". Priest parts excessively, slavishly, follow the Latin creating stilted and incomprehensible verbiage.

---

May the new pope help us correct this disaster which has been inflicted on us.

---

Maybe things will change with a new pope. We need subsidiarity and inclusion, not the Vatican-centric

---

heavyhandedness of the way this missal came about.

---

Millions of people around the world who attend Mass in English but for whom English is a second language now do not understand much of the Mass. Also, some terms are simply distractions--"dewfall," "laud;" overuse of "graciously;" awkward placement of adverbs, adverbial and prepositional phrases.

---

Modification may have been needed not complete overhaul. Two troublesome examples of words that are normally not used in spoken American English. They are oblation instead of offering and imbue instead of fill or inspire.

---

Most of the collects, prayers over the gifts, and closing prayers are not understandable. What a backwards step regarding the liturgical prayer of our church. Another reason for people to leave or not return to the church.

---

Most people can't stand it It is not speakable English awkward use the translation the U.S. Wanted in the first place

---

Much of the language is so formal that it does not reflect standard usage for anyone with less than a master's degree or doctorate degree. The translation seems to have been done by people for whom English is not their primary language. Sentences are far too long, and the conclusions are not even complete sentences. (e.g.: "Through Christ our Lord." The language is more philosophical than spiritual. One should not need to have a master's degree or a doctorate degree in philosophy in order to pray at Mass. Jesus, the Son of God, spoke to the people in parables -- he told stories -- so that the people could UNDERSTAND him. This translation makes Jesus' teaching more difficult to understand, rather than easier to understand. Complex theology belongs in the classroom, NOT at the altar. The Mass is the People of God at PRAYER, NOT proclaiming complex theological concepts. God wants us to pray from the HEART, too, NOT just with our minds. This translation is nearly all intellect, and no heart.

---

Much of the text of the opening prayer, prayer over the gifts, and prayer after Communion, as well as the texts of the solemn blessings are verbose and lack a sense line intelligibility. The texts run on and on and are as difficult to read as some of the Pauline and Johannine biblical texts. They are difficult to comprehend for the celebrant, even if he studies and practices them beforehand, so this may also be true for the members of the congregation as well. Many of the words in the prayers are awkward as well. They just do not seem to fit the context of prayer. As someone who is fluent in Spanish and can translate from English to Spanish and Spanish to English, I can tell you that it is impossible to do justice to the translation of any language by translating literally "word-for-word" into the other language. Liturgical language is "liturgical poetry". One cannot translate poetry and do so in a way that does not also destroy the beauty of the original translation. Latin is beautiful in itself, but to translate it into English, "word-for-word" is a horrible injustice and only results in a liturgical poverty! We are poorer liturgically as English speaking Catholics as a result of the current texts in the revised Roman Missal. Before the current revised Roman Missal, I was able to "pray" the Mass for [number] years. Now I am forced to literally "read" the Mass and it is no longer something that flows evenly and smoothly as prayer. The current texts are filled with redundancies and the only "mystery" I find in the new texts are the incomprehensibilities of many of the words. We have the biblical equivalent of the "King James Version" text in the Roman Missal now. It does not read the way that English speaking Catholics in the United States of America speak. How is this an improvement when it comes to the celebration of the Mass? I shudder to think of the further spiritual harm that will result if we continue on ahead with the exact kind of translation of the Liturgy of the Hours and all the other sacramental and liturgical rites. Can you even begin to imagine how "comforting" the funeral liturgical rites will be if they are translated in the same way as the Roman Missal has been translated? Perhaps as many tears will be shed over the unintelligibility of the texts and prayers of the funeral rites and their inability to console the mourners as over the grief experienced by the death of a loved one.

---

Much of the time it reads as if someone who did not speak English as a native translated it. Sometimes the prayers make no sense so I look to the 1998 translation to make sense of it. Now the 98 translation was beautiful, poetic and reverent, it's a shame the present text was hijacked by ideologues. Many of the priests I know are making changes ad libitum or using the 98 translation or combination thereof. I have grammatical notes written all over our sacramentary. It is also a shame that the inserts for the Eucharistic prayers were not kept they are wonderfully pastoral which the new translation is not

---

My appreciation is as uneven as the translation itself. Some parts are likeable; other parts are too long, making them unintelligible and very hard to follow. I don't know if the texts were given for review to anyone but bishops, but some of the awkward parts might have been caught by some good pastors. In fact, some of the survey statements were hard to answer because they were not nuanced well.

My celebrating style has been stymied by the new translation. A year of using the new versions has not helped me get used to the new translation. I would rather talk to God than read to God.

---

My difficulty with the text is in the sentence structure rather than with the vocabulary. The previous translation needed to be improved but the new translation could have been so much better with a little compromise for the sake of speech and intelligibility. The literal does not necessarily capture the majesty of the text.

---

My main problem with the new translation, in the language, is that our children are lost. The language is too lofty for them. They need to consider Masses for the children in our schools.

---

My mine objection is the obvious disregard for some very basic aspects of sentence and paragraph construction in the English language, and the connotations of some Latinate images that are yet hard to feel comfortable with. The lack of pronoun references and the somewhat tortured and lengthy clauses do no make for easy comprehension or enhance worship. It's not all bad, but decent respect for grammatical structure and syntax of the English language would make it more tolerable and effective.

---

My parish had very good congregation participation in the singing of the Gloria and all the other Mass parts. The new translation has destroyed the congregations confidence with the new, awkward translation....I am so grateful that there was no change made to the Lord's prayer. My good song leaders have died and the new ones are very shy about the new wording and melodies of the Mass parts.

---

My problem is that it is written in a style more designed to be read than proclaimed. For instance: Second Sunday of Lent, pulled up a random: Let us pray: O God, who have commanded us to listen to your beloved Son, be pleased, we pray, to nourish us... Be pleased, we pray? The presider just said "Let us pray." The Collects need minor word smith "tweaking" so that the presider can keep from developing "marble mouth."

---

My responses might sound somewhat stronger than they are, but after more than a year my experience of the revised language is similar to my first impressions. Generally, there are some changes that I think help worship, i.e., some of the collects have more depth than before and where scripture is quoted it is helpful to have the actual wording of the scriptures, but at the same time I think the more formal style has created more of a distance between the expressions and the people, i.e., word choices like oblation, beseech, compunction, to name a few, and even between the people and God, i.e., the frequent use of the word majesty. I find myself sometimes appreciating a different way of expressing an image or prayer, but more often missing the expressions in the previous translation. I just prefer a simpler and more familiar style of language than the more formal language of the new translation. I also find the replacement of "love" with "charity" in many of the prayers to be a loss - charity just carries a connotation of assisting those in need, which is certainly an essential part of our mission, but seems more limiting than "love." The frequent use of the word "ceaselessly" is also a distraction - somewhat difficult to say for one thing, and just not a word that is commonly used and that sounds awkward. People-wise, I can't say I have heard a lot of comments in either direction. I've heard from some who don't like it as well as the previous translation, but I don't have any evidence that we have lost people because of it. I find it somewhat ironic that at least several people who generally prefer a more traditional style of worship have complained about the changes in the prayers and responses. Thanks for the opportunity to provide input. [Name] [Diocese]

---

Never were we asked about our intake on things. There are more prevalent problems in the church than to worry about wording and what kind of vessels we use. Lets get to welcoming people back to the church. Let us stop trying to put on the false imagaie of holier than thou, forget obsolete attire and get to the heart of the matter. Why walk around pretending to be holy rollers and then act like a jerk to people. Get with it.

---

New edition is much better than old.

---

New pope=new hope.

---

New translation is awkward and doesn't fit in with our ordinary English. Feel it is harder to understand and relate to let alone be engaging. People leave the church because they feel it doesn't speak to them! We are just making this more a reality!

---

new translation needs radical revision;it has done more to complicate and obscure than clarify the beauty of goog liturgy and the Word. The "latinization" of the English language is unconscionable.

---

New translations are needed as time goes by. It was time for this one.

---

No English professor would agree with the translation. A common English translation might be a good idea, but it should not destroy the beauty of the language and make it difficult to pray. Translating from the Latin word for word does not work. Is the idea an almost word for word from the Latin or helping all of us to pray.

---

No matter how one tries to pray the new missal reverently, the syntax alone is enough to cause one to constantly

stumble. This isn't how the English language works. It needs to be seriously revised. The use of more poetic language isn't a serious problem, but the sentence structure is just a big mess. I've encountered so many priests making big mistakes all over the missal. It's distracting, for the congregation, and the priest. How that can be "more prayerful" I simply do not know.

---

NONE

---

None

---

Not English. Englished Latin.

---

Not only do I find the new wording to be quite awkward but the inaccuracies in the translations worry me most deeply.

---

Not only is the translation awkward and difficult, often it is obtuse and just plain hard to understand. I often say to myself: "What does that mean?" I even go back to the old missal just to try to understand what the prayer is trying to say. This translation simply goes against the principles of the Vat. II document on the liturgy. Thank you for being able to have a voice.

---

Not worth the money spent on the new translation. That money could have been better spent on meeting the needs of our poor and oppressed. No more money or effort should be spent either bringing back previous translation or translating other documents. Let's spend wisely.

---

Nothing dynamic about it. The original was much better. I hope it will be scrapped ASAP.

---

O my God! Please help us!

---

Obedience to the Church is the key to overcoming the squabble among those who have problems with the translation.

---

Obviously, this was a decision from "on high." There was consultation, but nobody listened.

---

Old translation was much better and prayerful. I am so disappointed in the new translation.

---

On the occasions that I offered Mass in Spanish I noted how much more faithful the Spanish translation is to the original Latin texts. With the new Missal in English we now have a more faithful, poetic, and beautiful translation. I find the new Missal very satisfying and a real aid in praying the Mass. I have found much material to help me explain theologically what is being celebrated at Mass and within feasts and seasons. The former Sacramentary lacked imaginative language. I found it did not take into account the need to preserve word imagery, concepts, and a dignity that I remember as a child in English translations of the older Roman Missal, and even in the texts that bridged to the Sacramentary. I am very grateful for all the efforts over many years to replace and improve a hasty and not very beautiful translation in the Sacramentary. One more thing - I have noted a satisfying compliment to the Lectionary - our most wonderful reform.

---

on the whole, I so much appreciate the beauty of the Roman Missal. HOWEVER, in some of the prayers especially the collects during Lent, I believe that they needed Not only a good Latinist but also a good lyricist and poet to avoid some incredible "awkwardness" albeit, Many of the new prayers are stunningly poetic , prayerful, reverant and beautiful!!!

---

One volume easy tearing of paper and backing.

---

Only that I find the new translation more of a distraction than a help in facilitating prayer. The word "consubstantial" has very little meaning in our language. Hopefully, advice will be asked in the future from those who are liturgically astute!

---

Ordained in [year], I really felt that the language had begun to limp, even as I did my best to pray it..and was very happy with the change.

---

Overall I think it is a great work - nothing will be perfect (there are a few cumbersome words/wordings), but it is a vast improvement over the old one, and certainly more faithful to the approved original texts; to me, that is the main thing - that it is a faithful rendering. I look forward to seeing how the other liturgical texts will be rendered and what other things might become apparent that are now missing.

---

Overall my own spirituality and our parish celebrations have benefited. Please continue with the Liturgy of the Hours update. The translation of prayers, prefaces, etc. does seem too formal and obscure at times, needing to be explained to be understood. The text should speak more clearly on its own. Thanks for the survey.

---

OVERALL, I LIKE IT BUT I DON'T LIKE THE FORMAL LANGUAGE.

---

Particularly "awkward" are the prayers of the Mass ie Collect etc

---

People feel that this new translation "distances" them from the celebration. They tolerate it without enthusiasm. Their "acceptance" was made easier due to the unusual unity they experienced with their pastors... as both priests and people struggled with putting a good face on a difficult and "off-putting" change.

Perhaps you could send this survey to the People in the Pews and you will see that they really don't like the language. They felt powerless in this move. I can speak with [number] years experience.

---

Personally, I find a lot of the old terminology/translations reintroduced, e.g. the confiteor, gloria etc. which I learned in elementary school too many years ago. Besides, the changing of a similar word here and there in Mass text indicates change for the sake of change and creates difficulty for octogenarians  
prayers are difficult to proclaim

---

Prayers should be reverent, but a "special" language is a bit much. I have not used the chant. Often the prayers are simply difficult to pray in public -- I am sure people do not comprehend them. The prayer life of the church should be accessible as it is used -- proclaimed aloud in the assembly -- not only do people have restricted access to the prayer life of the church, the celebrant gets lost, entangled in the long sentences. Simplicity is key! Translators need a better appreciation of who is sitting in the pews. Ordinary folks, some are erudite, but like Saint Paul says, not many are highborn.

---

Productions of the missal have been thoughtfully carried out. Art in wrong places most the time. Catholic Book seem to be the best of all publications. Magnificat editions are also very well done but not as popular as CBPC. I think people need to address God in the language they understand. The prior translation was an English translation of the Roman Missal in our idiom and understanding. Prayers translated (carried across) the meaning of the prayer in the Latin editions. Too many "graciously"s and lauding everywhere. Latin sentence structure is NOT English sentence structure. Let's return to sense and faith deepening with a translation that is faithful to prayer. Also: I am not a centurion. The communion greeting need not be a slave to the Domine non sub dignus. I also love the Latin Missal and use the Latin when it is sensible at daily Masses. I feel fortunate that the committees have not yet destroyed the Diving Office and other ritual books. Finally there far too much dewfall: why could it not have been hoarfrost? remember THE FEED BOX REPLACING THE MANGER THE LORD WAS LAID IN? WE SO SOON FORGET.

---

Question 1 - , some of it. Question 6 - While I disagree, I find most of the Biblical imagery very good for instance the Lamb of God and the response. Question 8 - Modified changes. Comments: I like the preface a lot but the Collects are sometimes difficult to pray and to make sense to the listener. I spend more than an hour each week, practicing them, praying them so that I and the faithful can understand them. I'm often told by them that they still don't get it. Perhaps that's my fault but I do find the language quite obscure.

---

Question 1-I find the flow kind of klunky.

---

Questions above do not provide for other possible responses, poorly worded. I think the new translation does bring a sense of reverence to the liturgy, but at same time some of the wording is awkward. Sentences may be a closer translation of the Latin, but they are too long. The English structure mimics the Latin structure; makes it difficult for those listening to prayers, not reading along, hard to follow. While a new translation for the celebration of sacraments and Liturgy of Hours may be needed, I'm afraid of what will be the new wording, in light of how the Missal has been done.

---

Quite frankly I am good at making awkward sentences less awkward [comment removed] so I look over the prayers before and reword or drop awkward clauses to make it make sense to people. Not supposed to do this I know but if they don't provide something better (not the GOD awful former translation) I will just do what I am doing: this applies to the orations not the ordinary of the Mass

---

Re question 4, elevated and reverent language is appropriate for public liturgy. But, that's not quite the same as saying we need a special language to address God.

---

Regarding the question about urgent revision, I think a revision of some of the texts need work - some of the phrases are too long or the grammar is too complicated - but an urgent revision would not be good stewardship. Parishes have invested too much in the new books to require another change before these wear out.

---

RM# comes off as contrived language, not sacred language. It lacks a truly poetic beauty and contains too many Latinate words that are awkward to articulate in English. The theological images are antiquated, sometimes too militaristic or completely esoteric. The Missal as a book is poorly laid out. The directions are hard to read. There are too many prayers crammed onto a page so that the reader has to stop, scan, focus...and this becomes disruptive. Not infrequently the laity have asked what it is I said. Some have indicated they do not grasp the meaning of some of the prayers. Others have told me they've stopped listening and so the new missal isn't really engaging. Putting all this together leads me to say, I do not experience myself as praying from the heart but reading words off a page. My conclusion: it's a spiritual and liturgical disaster. I'm not saying that the Sacramentary of 1979 didn't need improvement and tweaking. But what we have is simply dreadful!!! English was obviously not the translators' first language.

Roman Missal is a disaster. Theologically out of sync with all the best of liturgical prayer written in the Spirit of the Second Vatican Council. Feel often confused and disillusioned as I preside at Eucharist with Roman Missal. Need a dynamic translation not a literal translation of Latin text. Thank you for taking a survey.

---

Rome usurped the authority of local bishops. The USSB had developed a fine translation and it was rejected.

---

Run on sentences leave much to desire for a meaningful and reverent worship.

---

See 1st Sunday of Advent Preface (snail mail) - How would you pray it?

---

Seems like this survey is just trying to stir dissent. Remember these are Vatican 2 prayers, many of them newly composed for the new Mass. If you don't like them, talk to the Council Fathers. We shouldn't change their accurate translations just because we don't like them.

---

Serious revision is needed!

---

Simply because a furniture is old does not make it a valuable antique. It just makes it old. And simply because the language used in the new missal is not common does not make it prayerful and awe inspiring. It simply makes it odd. Redo the entire missal, or return to the previous missal. And please, do not make any other similar changes in any other liturgical setting. Thank you.

---

[Comment removed], I was trained with the New Translation, and this made it easier for me to adapt to this text and to pray with it.

---

Since Vatican II we are called to be multicultural, so I see no need to be attached to the language of the Roman Empire. We do not need an aristocratic Latin translation,, we are called to be a people's church.

---

So much of the language and vocabulary is irrelevant, arcane argot; it does not speak to children and young families. I think Rome and the American bishops really made a huge mistake because they did not consult with the people in the pews. They only consulted with "experts" in latin language who want a pristine translation not an understandable text. The entire translation is a distraction at best, an obstacle at worst, to people's prayer.

---

Solution - return to previous translation - that flows and can be understood by the people. This latest translation is an abomination!

---

Some have criticized the new translation as being awkward and hard to proclaim. But like with anything new, it just takes a little practice. After using the Missal for well over a year now, I find it flows quite nicely and smoothly. Is it perfect? No, what translation would be? But it is infinitely better than the previous translation which I would describe as banal and insipid. Regarding the second to last question - why should the views of priests matter? How many priests are qualified to do translations? How many bishops are qualified, for that matter?

---

Some images of the new translation are good. However, the language is, at times, almost impossible to read let alone understand.

---

Some may consider that the new translation requires us to rehearse the phrases prior to liturgy and that we have to speak slower and with more concentration, but I don't see either of those issues as flaws but rather helps to give our people well-prepared, thought-filled and purposeful liturgy. Also, I think that other ritual prayers should now be translated to give consistency to our rituals.

---

Some of the chant settings for the prefaces are difficult to sing; the Latin is easier. [Sentence removed.] A simpler chant notation would be better.

---

Some of the information was simply too much; we only went from English to English, not to Latin, or something else.

---

Some of the language and terms used (brought about solely by the 3d Revised Roman Missal) are not understood or resonate with the ears/hearts of the faithful. There are some weekend Collects, to truly understand and appreciate the references cited, require the listener(s) to have a much higher level of liturgical, scriptural, philosophical, or theological knowledge.

---

Some of the language is awkward and distracting. Those who are entrusted with making decision about the Liturgy have an urgent need to understand that even though many countries speak English it is not the same style or form. The US English is different than all others; a fact the the USCCB knows well. The New Translations is indeed awkward, we do not use that kind of expression in the US. The language is not what gives God glory and praise, it is the attitude of the priest. Please, consider revising the priest parts. The People parts should not be revised, the people have been through enough in the last 15 months in trying to adopt. If they revise the priest parts, especially the Collect, Prayer over the Offerings, prayer afte communion, preface and any other part that belongs to the priest, it would be great. Not the Preface dialogue, that would confuse people. The Spanish Missal has two or three versions, why should we not have an English version that is

adopted to the US? I do hope it will happen and soon. Thank you for affording the opportunity to express our opinion.

---

Some of the mass prayers are unnecessarily wordy and can be cumbersome to recite.

---

Some of the new prayers in the Mass are beautiful.

---

Some of the new translation is an improvement, especially in the Eucharistic Prayers. On other occasions, in some of the prayers, I have not been sure what I just pray for or about. I also think that the expression “prevenient grace” for Immaculate Conception is a classic example of language that people do not understand--they have also said they do not see the need for ‘CONSUBSTANTIAL’ or INCARNATE in lieu of ONE IN BEING and BORN OF.

---

Some of the phrasing could be improved, esp. in the Collects. The number of subordinate clauses taken directly from Latin to English can be difficult to follow and hard to understand in English (unless you are good at diagramming sentences).

---

Some of the prayers have long phrases without comma which make it difficult for meaningful reading.

---

Some of the questions are poorly worded. “We need a special language with which to address God.” You intend, I presume, “style of language” not new or “special language.” And you also intend, I presume, to be inquiring of this style of language only within the liturgy; and yes, I would strongly agree that ritual language should not be the same as “table talk” or street language. Nothing else that we do ritually is the same as home (I don’t light candles at home for lunch or wear a chasuble around the house or process with ministers, etc., etc.). It’s too much of a leading question. “I am confident that the views of priests will be taken seriously in future decisions about liturgical translation.” That seems designed to cause rancor. I really don’t know what you intend by that kind of question. Who is the person or persons who will take seriously or not take seriously my views? My Bishop? The BCDW? The CDWDS? The Pope? Do I feel that my bishop listens to me? Yes. Do I feel that if I make my opinion known to him that he will take it seriously? Yes. Do I think that therefore everything I relate to him will happen or that everyone else shares my opinion? No. That was probably the most poorly phrased question. The last question also is similarly poor. What is meant by the “leadership” of the Holy See? Do you mean the Pope? The Prefect or Secretary or under Secretary of the CDWDS? By “bring about the new English Missal”, do you mean that the document “Liturgiam authenticam” was promulgated or that a third edition of the MR was promulgated? Do you mean the reported changes that the CDWDS made to the final text? The three questions listed here are very poor questions and leading questions and raise a question about the “scientific” nature of this survey and your own presuppositions in designing it. Some of your questions come across as neutral, but others decidedly do not...

---

Some of the time in reading the text (it is difficult to pray it), I stop and look at what I just said and wonder what it is saying...it doesn’t seem to speak to the hearts of the faithful in the assembly either.

---

Some of the translation is very beautiful, but awkward in reading out loud. I think the meaning of the prayers can be lost if the people are not reading the prayer from a missalette as the priest is praying from the altar.

---

Some parts of the new missal flow well, eg., some of the Eucharistic Prayers, but, generally, the translations of the priest’s prayers are awkward.

---

Some praise the new Missal indicating the entire English speaking world is using the same translation. The English language has variations throughout the world. The uniformity has backfired and since so many priests are dissatisfied with the texts, they are modifying them to their own liking. Instead of unity, there is more disunity. Many bishops did not read the texts before voting and also failed to listen to the concerns of those who did. While there are some phrases that are more expressive, the majority of the texts fail due to lack of following the rules of English grammar.

---

Some were difficult to answer since there are points that I like but not all the points.

---

Sometimes it might be some difficult for some people and myself, but I like the new translation with more prayerful phrases

---

Sometimes the formal language can give the impression that God is so other-worldly that it overlooks the incarnation of Jesus. If anything, the language is a bit too heavy on the transcendent aspect of God.

---

Sometimes the wording is awkward and confusing. Some words appear to be translated into English by someone whose primary language is not English, as though the translation from Latin was made by these persons from a dictionary. Language has become too formal and not personal enough, as though God has an outside relationship with his people.

---

Sounds like an agenda behind the survey. Hope you stay in accord with the Church.

---

Stilted. Use the American idiom that conveys an accurate meaning. A number of terms are not familiar to the assembly or are outmoded. Word “graciously “ is overused. Many things about the physical arrangement are great improvements. A book of the chair for Sunday celebrations would be very useful. While it is theologically appropriate, our people are there to pray. It’s like an intro of a new lectionary which turns out to be the KJV. It’s nice but why bother; it’s not really better, just different!

---

Thank you for allowing us to “vent” a little. I don’t know if it will do much good on the practical level, but it sure “felt” good !!!!!!!!

---

Thank you for asking my advice concerning the New Roman Missal. This is the first time any Church leader or body has asked my opinion. THE NONINCLUSIVE LANGUAGE AT THE BEGINNING OF THE FOURTH EUCHARISTIC PRAYER IS DISTRACTIVE TO ME AS A CELEBRANT. THE MESSAGE OF THE PRAYER IS BEAUTIFUL BUT I PRAY THAT EUCHARISTIC PRAYER INFREQUENTLY SINCE THE LANGUAGE IS SO EXCLUSIVE. CAN THIS OVERTLY EXCLUSIVE LANGUAGE BE CHANGED?

---

Thank you for asking!

---

Thank you for asking.

---

Thank you for considering my input.

---

Thank you for implementing this survey. My feelings are rather strong because this new translation interferes with “full, conscious, and active, participation” rather than helps with the Council’s goal. There are too many subordinate clauses that half the time I don’t know what I’m supposing to be praying about. I don’t believe that Latin translates well into English without altering the phraseology. English is more of a Germanic language while Latin works better with Romance languages. The new translation also interferes because its wording is so foreign, its phrasing is awkward, and it often leaves the very people who are supposed to be part of the celebration wondering what was just prayed. It leaves the people assembled out and centers things too much on the celebrant.

---

Thank you for listening

---

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in the survey.

---

Thank you for your concern regarding the new English Missal...

---

Thanks for allowing a survey.

---

Thanks for asking our input. [Name]

---

Thanks for the opportunity to fill out the questionnaire. The language is a bit awkward in the new Missal,lofty a times but in English that is hard to follow for the congregation.

---

Thanks for the opportunity to voice my opinions.

---

Thanks for the work everyone has put into the new translation. I enjoy using it. My two critiques are that 1) sometimes the prayers seems to end abruptly, and 2)they do not lend themselves to ecumenical settings. I am grateful for the new translation. I feel it helps me be more prayerfully intentional in celebrating the Eucharist.

---

Thanks for your good work, [Name]! [Name]

---

The “new “ translation was a scam to make money for the publishers. The fact one is compelled to buy the book is testimony to the crass nature of the endeavor. Spare me the necessity of buying a new set of books for the office and the sacraments.

---

The “New” missal uses theological language instead of pastoral, spiritual language. The latter reflects the true sense of mystery. For example, “Consubstantial” is theological language reserved for documents but not worship and celebration.

---

The “views of priests” being “taken seriously in future decisions about liturgical translation” is irrelevant. It is up to those people who have been entrusted to do the translating of the Rites to do their job well and in accord with the norms laid out by the Holy See. The consensus of the priests of a region or nation about what they want doesn’t matter, it is obedience to the norms of translation that matter. We are to be obedient to what we are given. The only “decision” we have is obedience or disobedience, and humility will, God-willing, guide us to the former.

---

The 1998 translation prepared by ICEL and approved by the USCCB (this was before ICEL’s staff membership was completely replaced by the Holy See) was a far, far better translation. While I agree the old translation was not a good one and needed to be revised, this one was poorly done and is only marginally better. It is possible to translate accurately and still have a loftier, “religious” vocabulary and style with the result still being good and inspiring English. But I have little confidence in the English-speaking bishops’ abilities or interest in achieving this.

---

The 3rd Edition of the Roman Missal is superior to the watered-down, dumbed-down 2nd edition translation which was translated using a secular tool for translation. The 3rd edition's language is confluent with the Sacred Mass texts, which should be different than common, every-day language.

---

The 50+ year old parishioners find the language impossible to follow. The 18+ year old parishioners find the language impossible to understand. I'm [number] years old and find the language impossible to read and pray.

---

The attempt to translate literally from Latin was a misguided concept from the beginning. It doesn't sound right to the native English speaker and ear. One does not speak naturally with endless subordinate clauses.

---

The basic near-slavish attention to literal adherence, to the verbal AND syntactical correspondence to the Latin text has driven yet another wedge between the presider and the gathered People of God,

---

The biggest problem with the new missal, to me, is not the translation, as awkward as that is. Some of the prayers are shallow, almost an embarrassment to read. A billion catholics in the world: church leadership should tap into that resource. Not yet seen a prayer in the missal that I would use if I had a choice.

---

The cadences of the chants are often placed on awkward syllables and do not flow properly. They need to be re-written to let the sung language meaning be expressed more naturally and clearly. The music is supposed to be at the service of the text, not the other way around.

---

The celebrant opens each oration with "Let Us Pray" then in aprox 90% of thge subsequent prayers after the first few words AGAIN he says "we pray". The first sentence of Eucharistic Prayer has 83 words! What is "dewfall"? Several of the opening orations are simply "conviluted" and this overshadows the occasional beautiful phraseology.

---

The celebration of the Eucharist becomes real thanksgiving when it comes from one's heart. A language that is so formal and sounds so artificial does not help in this regard. The language used is so uncommon that I do not even understand what I am praying. When the Jews and Gentiles are called to worship together the One True God, uniformity of language is not the most important aspect, but unity of faith and praises that come from the heart. A language that is so "foreign" to peoples daily life cannot come from the heart as much as from the head.

---

The changes that have been made are not sufficient to warrant the tremendous expense of buying all new missals. The money spent on them could have been better used to help the poor.

---

The chanting is difficult for me to learn. I barely use it.

---

The Chants need to be re-done. They are boring and have no beauty to them.

---

The choice of archaic and complex words should have been more clearly identified and a catechetical summary provided educating parishioners.

---

the choice of some words was poor. While we must be reverent in prayer, we must be aware that the vernacular for the poor needs to be remembered. Some "formal" language is part of their education and they can't be in "communion" when they don't understand!

---

The Church is not a democracy, and thank God for that.

---

The collect prayers are sometimes very awkward, like backward translations. The word "and" is often a distraction, also "oblation". The eucharistic prayers are also awkward, except #2. Number 1 & 3 are more awkward, as is number 4. Penitential rite, intro to Our Father, Holy Communion and dismissal rites are fine.

---

The Collects are particularly horrendous. Can any of those sentences be diagrammed? You wonder whether they are 2nd person or 3rd person. When put on the computer, how many would be rejected as being too long and too complicated? Changing now would cause distress.

---

The collects suffered especially from poor translation and have been much improved. The more literal rendering of the Latin was needed in contrast to the earlier translation philosophy. Of course not all is perfect, but one can usually pray now without being distracted by the language.

---

The collects tend to be convoluted and verbose. The meaning is often obscured. Not a single soul is likely to be saved by this cumbersome translation, imposed from on high.

---

The consultation with ICEL was greatly missing. Language is a living thing. This language does not comport with a language that is easily accessible to the faithful. It is a language of scholars. It is not the language of authentic prayer, that should be easily understood and apprehended by the faithful. It lacks a lyrical beauty that the missal of Paul VI had. The eucharistic prayers that were prepared by ICEL should be reviewed again.

---

There is beauty and poetry in those translations that convey a deep echo in the heart for God. I don't find this translation of the new missal to be inspiring, but rather labor-some to proclaim and confusing at times to understand. We should take a fresh look at this again... This time with real conciliation with scripture scholars,

bishops, theologians, priests and laity. It needs to be an open and reflective process, that looks to the best of all the faithful, allowing for a true full, conscience and active participation in developing our worship for the most meaningful and beautiful proclamation of our faith in the Liturgy.

---

The current transliteration of the Missal is unspeakable, quite literally. As a [profession] friend of mine says of it: "It's the liturgy of commas." I seriously doubt that the authorities - whoever they may be - will take any note of the priests' views. The current Missal embodies the traditional Roman way - impose from above and ignore subsidiarity. I'll endure the thing, but damned if I will like it.

---

The English language has rules that are different than Latin. The Translations must follow the English rules. i.e. subject, verb, object. It sounds like Yoda of Star Wars did some of the translating.

---

The English translation of MR-III is not perfect, but it is light years better than the dumbed-down, impoverished, inaccurate and lame embarrassment that preceded it. Also gone is the political agenda behind the old words. And ICEL has been reformed as a bonus. Thank you Pope Benedict. And thanks also to the former Anglicans now Catholics, who know how to use the English language in worship with grace, beauty and clarity.

---

The Eucharistic prayer II for Reconciliation is simply beautiful. I appreciate the closer translation as per Liturgicam Authenticum.

---

The Eucharistic prayers are generally much better, though parts are awkward. The opening, offertory and closing prayers are mostly very poor.

---

The fact that this translation was never pew-tested remains a great source of my discontent. Now that missals are printed (at a great price) how can adjustments be made to faulty parts?

---

The first question was difficult to answer because none of them accurately represented my perspective, which would be closer to "Before it was introduced I was apprehensive about it and now have mixed feelings about it." The translation process should be led on the local level with more consideration given to quality of translation and not such a literal approach.

---

THE FIRST QUESTION WAS LEFT "BLANK" ON PURPOSE AS IT DID NOT ADEQUATELY EXPRESS MY THOUGHTS; NOW I find myself HAVING to give one of the "preselected answers" which I have done so, but which does not entirely express my mind thoughts WHICH WOULD BE SOMETHING ALONG THESE LINES: Before it was introduced I was looking forward to it and I am somewhat disappointed with the language structure but over all I like it.

---

The formal equivalent is very difficult to speak because of the placement of the words within the sentences. Some of the sentences are so awkwardly constructed you feel and if your speaking in damaged sentences. The formal words are poetic and beautiful, but it seems little attention was given to the fact that these would be spoken publicly by anyone.

---

The former translation needed improvement but the new one did not achieve this. What is wrong in praying in a style the people are accustomed to? I find praying the new translation quietly is one thing but when prayed out loud (in the assembly) it is awkward and does not flow very well. There are too many long sentences containing too many expressions before they end. When praying out loud, it's very difficult to know where to put the emphasis on an expression. I fear it will take the people and the clergy a loooooong time to get use to this translation.

---

The good thing is that the people in the pews aren't really listening to the words, they are just hearing sound and watching action. Prayers that are so formal just don't seem like prayers.

---

The Gospels were written in common Greek to make the story of Jesus more accessible to people. Later, Jerome translated the Bible into Latin. Now the Bible is available in many languages. So are the liturgies. We need to do what God has done for in Jesus: meet people where they are! The "new" translation does not do this. Many passages are unnecessarily wordy, and the construction of many sentences are clumsily arranged. They do not sound the way we speak in English.

---

The great gift of Vatican II liturgical reforms was worship in the language and idioms of the people who share with the ordained presiding priest an active share of Christ's priestly office. Language and expressions that are nearly as foreign and unfamiliar as the Latin of Tridentine Liturgy is a step backward and a transparent effort at re-clericalizing the Church. We have set the stage for massive departure of laity who expected much more in a post-conciliar church that appeared briefly welcoming to full and active membership of laity.

---

The Holy See has done a great job, the only problem I see is that before bringing the new work that they should consider more the point of view of the experts in this country and the opinion of the parish priest.

The Holy See refused to listen to the USA bishops, and so I think it is unlikely the Holy See will listen to the priests in parishes who preside at Mass daily. However, the election of a pastorally-sensitive pope might mean that we will be listened to.

---

The lack of coordination, and genuine consultation with the priests, and most bishops of the USA, is distressing. This survey is a pleasant surprise.

---

The language (of the prayers especially) is not reflective of American English. It is confusing to read and difficult to make sense out of it for the listeners. I would be afraid of this style of translation for the Sacraments of Marriage, Bapt. etc. Translations from one language to another cannot just be literal. The meaning needs to be preserved.

---

The language at times is not even English; it is awkward in its phrasing; the language is foreign to the listening audience (as well as to the presider but he at least can see the words!); it is pedantic and clumsy.

---

The language change has caused me to reflect more deeply on the words used and their theological significance. While the language is more difficult to use, the message conveyed is worth the effort.

---

The language does not easily roll off your tongue and sometimes uses words that ordinary Americans will not understand. The language continues to be sexist when there is no need for it to be so. I do not object to change just change that will help people draw closer to God not be turned off by language that ordinary people do not use.

---

The language in the Mass texts are too wordy, repetitive and try to do too many things (teach, theologize and pray) in the same paragraph. It doesn't work for the priest or the people. Let's stop and rethink this process for the 21st century instead of going back to the 18th and 19th century theological frame of reference.

---

The language in the new Missal seems to have been drafted by non-English speakers. The grammar, the syntax, the punctuation and the sentence structure are very poor. Words have been added or changed in manners, and in intent, that are unclear.

---

The language in the new Roman Missal is cumbersome, distracting and often irrelevant. Previously, we had a translation that was easily understandable and prayerful. It did not need to be fixed! I suggest the option of continuing to use the former translation rather than trying to revise the new Roman Missal. I very, very seldom meet a priest who is supportive of this new translation. Laity continually ask the question, "why"? Thank you for your work on this important issue.

---

The language in the new translation is cumbersome and unwieldy. How many American English speaking people were involved in making this translation?

---

The language indeed is reverent and definitely prayerful. However, the flow is awkward and this is what I think needs review and revision while stay maintaining the reverential language. Good luck!

---

The language is awkward and cannot be easily spoken aloud or understood by the laity.

---

The language is difficult to read and in a style we do not speak. It is like a literal translation from the Latin with no sense of style. American liturgists should be involved in the translation and the guidelines for translation from Rome need to be revised.

---

The language is foreign. There are many forms of the English language--almost as distinct as a different language. Why for example, should an Australian be expected to celebrate the Liturgy of the Eucharist in the exact same translation as someone from the United States? The idea is to employ the vernacular. Why aren't we doing that?

---

The language is generally an improvement because the old version was so weak. However, some of the language and grammar is almost unintelligible and awkward. The National Conference should have been supported by the Holy See in the translation.

---

The language is too formal and a little stilted. I find it a little hard to focus on the collects and other prayers because the title for God is never in the first words and often is in the second or third line. They often feel like run-on sentences. Under my roof seems strange, even in Spanish it is Mi Casa! I miss the introduction to the collects. They helped to announce and focus the prayer and quiet and collect people in the one prayer. Hosts in Sanctus should be Hosts of angels or heavenly Hosts. People have told me it is confusing since we also refer to the unleavened bread as hosts. Each prayer 1. we offer it or they offer it for themselves... awkward and confusing I find scattering the prefaces around the missal confusing. Putting the Lord have Mercies in the appendix is confusing and awkward. I think you need to simplify the language in the collects before you redo the liturgy of the hours and other sacramental books.

---

The language of the new translation ranges from awkward to clumsy to almost unreadable out loud. I have yet

to speak with any layperson who actually likes the new translation. The long, run-on sentences are distracting at best. They do not produce a more prayerful spirit and reverence for the liturgy. I hope the translators can redo the current translation of the Roman Missal before they attempt the Liturgy of the Hours or the other sacraments. Get some pastors who serve in parishes to help with the translation and the style of the language. They have a better idea of what is needed than some very well meaning academic.

---

The language of the prayers of the Mass is too antiquated. It is very much less personable. For young people it is irrelevant. Prayers need a simplifying revision.

---

The language seems stilted in many ways. I don't know if the "oremus" in the Latin is on line 2 or 3, but in English "we pray" seems more suited at the beginning of the prayer, not 8 words into it.

---

The language used is very foreign to the way American people speak, words such as beseech and your majesty just sound very strange to the ear of many and this has been said to me time and again from various people.

---

The liturgy has become a "battle ground" again. Too bad for the people who would like to pray prayerfully. When are we going to mature and stop using the Liturgy as our personal proving ground? I have been ordained [number] years and the winners and the losers have been going back and forth--trying to prove something about what they know and "who has it right" rather than the beauty of being drawn into the presence of the Father in Jesus Christ. Too bad. I do find the new Eucharistic Prayers beautiful on the whole. The former translation in general was too bland and lacking in beauty and poetic imagery that was in the Latin text. We needed a new translation. But from the point of view of syntax too many of the Collects, Prayers over the Offerings and the Prayers after Communion are often more of a conundrum than English. I find the language in many cases not to be "elevated" or "sacred," rather it appears to be "affected" or "elitist." The winner today, in 30 years will probably lose some of their overly self-assuredness and become more pastoral, but by that time I fear another group of "wannabe winners" will be waiting in the wings. I am obedient and I observe the new translation, but I do have to struggle at times to make sure the disappointment I expressed here does not creep in and affect my presence before God and his people when I am at the altar. I have to pray with the Church and love her as she is and not as I would like her to be--as any husband has to love his wife.

---

The Liturgy of the Hours is in desperate need of being updated! It would be nice if the other Rites reflected the prayers found in the Roman Missal (especially for Funerals and Weddings)

---

The Mass is done in a written vocabulary that does not lend itself well to oral interpretation. It's sad that we get phrases such as "disordered affections" in a Preface for Lent, when one word - "sin" - would most certainly suffice and be understood by all.

---

The Missal could use a few tweaks for the sake of clarity, but in general I do believe that the new translation is better and more appropriate.

---

The missal should be revised in the sense that the language is awkward and the beautiful imagery used gets lost in translation.

---

The missal should reflect the way that English is spoken in this country.

---

The missal was more of a TRANSLITERATION more than a TRANSLATION language is dynamic and must express the meaning of ideas

---

The more I pray the new prayers and get used to the rhythm and cadences of the structure, the more I am at ease with it. In terms of connecting with the people in the pews, I don't see how this has helped at all.

---

The more literal translation of the liturgical texts brings out the true meaning and beauty of the Latin originals. The previous English translation was not really a translation, but a dynamic equivalence that often missed the point of the orations or omitted much of the rich theological meaning contained in them. I often found some of the orations embarrassing to recite publicly, because the language was so impoverished and unworthy of the prayers that they were meant to express. Having said that, I do think that some of the revised prayers are awkwardly worded, but none so awkward that I think would merit a major revision of the Missal any time soon. One omission from the first Eucharistic Prayer that I find glaring is the first "Memento," where it is abruptly rendered, "Remember, Lord, your servants." Whereas, the Latin indicates both male and female "servants." Why not use the perfectly beautiful Biblical language of: "Remember, Lord, your servants and handmaids"? If our Lady referred to herself as the "handmaid of the Lord," why not use the same dignified terminology to refer to the women who make up a large part of Christ's faithful? Thank you for the opportunity to express some thoughts on these matters. God bless you!

---

The nature of these questions do not address my concerns at all. While I was looking forward to the new translations, the benefits that I have found have been quickly countered by words or phrases which are awkward and distracting. While I do not think the presbyterit need to be consulted and I agree with the authority of the

Holy See and the Conference of Bishops to regulate the Missal but at the same time I think the usability needs to be considered. While I agree the other liturgical books need to be changed, it is only for usability and continuity. And not an approval of the translation

---

The new "transliteration" is a travesty. It's not prayer. It's a lame attempt at theatrical performance.

---

The new 4-volume Liturgy of the Hours when they are done, might be too expensive & aside from that it takes many years to finish & by the time it is done I am too old to have new set.

---

The new English Missal is a disaster. It may follow the Latin in its literal translation, but it in no way follows the spirit, the grace, and the flow of the Latin. Many sentences of the Collect have 60 or 70 words in them that try to express 7 or 8 different ideas. For [number] years I used to enjoy celebrating mass. Now my mass is a "rote reading" of texts that are almost impossible to understand. I have not heard one parishioner offer a compliment of the new text. All I see are the empty pews at the [number] churches I help out at on Sundays. Catholics are voting with their feet on the new English Missal.

---

The new English translation helps me to switch from [three different languages] to English, the meaning of the prayers now are more similar

---

The New Missal appeals so much to the reverence of liturgy, however, some terms used are difficult to comprehend especially to the faithful. Hope something will be done with the revised one in future.

---

The new Missal in Mexico was done in a popular Spanish to make it more approachable to people, but in English seems to be very apart of the common language using words that I never hear before and are hard to pronounce.

---

The new missal is a disaster. I find its language stilted and awkward and in many places grammatically incorrect.

---

The new missal is awkward, cumbersome, and uses language that is antiquated and distant. I do not believe the new translation engages the people. In fact, they appear to glaze-over. What is the problem with punctuation as in where is it? Or why incomplete sentences? One needs oxygen to get through the many run-on sentences. By the time one gets through the theological treatises the meaning is lost.

---

The new missal serves us where we need to be in our time and leads us into the future by continuing to improve on the liturgy.

---

The new missal translation has been a pastoral disaster. Yes the old Sacramentary was in need of revision, yes liturgy needs to have a sacred linguistic style, but we don't need an incomprehensible text. The whole point of vernacular liturgy is that people can understand the aural proclaimed text. Obviously it is not enough to understand the words, but if we can't understand the proclaimed words we might as well go back to Latin!

---

The new missal was an answer to a question that no one I know was asking.

---

The new Roman Missal surpassed my expectations. Though there are a few translations that still don't fully render the Latin, this is an enormous leap forward. Fellow priests and my parishioners have commented about the richness of the texts and that Mass feels more reverent. It's a tremendous richness to have the musical notation for so many of the prayers and ordinary parts and to have both a solemn and simple set of chants. Moreover, the texts themselves really do feel more sacred: the Missal's added weight, the inclusion of gorgeous religious art, and the typefaces chosen are befitting of such an important, sacred book. My only sadness over the new Roman Missal is that it only contains the Latin for the Sanctus and Pater Noster, which makes it difficult to celebrate ordinary rite Masses with the inclusion of more Latin. Also, there appear to be no chant notations for the Prayer over the People or the special version of the Final Blessing that goes with it. Other than these elements, this is so vastly superior to the old translation and editions that I've frankly forgotten them. I pray and hope that future translations of the other rites and the Liturgy of the Hours will follow suit.

---

THE NEW SACRAMENTARY, ALONG WITH THE NEW TRANSLATION OF THE LECTIONARY "SUCKS". FOR example, instead of saying that at the stoning of Stephen, "he died", we now say he "went to Sleep". WAS HE A NARCOLEPTIC?" AFTER SAYING THE PRAYERS IN THE NEW SACRAMENTARY, I WONDER WHAT THE HELL I JUST SAID. IT IS TERRIBLE!

---

The New Translation is very Heavenly in Style and I like it.

---

The new translating is awkward and repetitious. The wording is clumsy and disturbs my praying even when reading over before hand. I am sure it disturbs the people also. I will not purchase or use the Breviary in the new translation.

---

The new translation can soar, but is such a tongue-twister it challenges a good thespian. This is helpful neither to the presider nor the congregant. Let's make it simpler. And do it in a few years rather than decades.

The new translation does add a richness. The only drawback is some of the words are a little hard to pronounce, but overall I like it.

---

The new translation does not improve with use: the language is needlessly artificial and creates barriers to ready intelligibility, thus violating one of the basic principles of the Vatican II liturgical reform. The concept of forcing English to follow Latin word order makes no sense. (How does one make Chinese or Quechua or, for that matter, Polish, follow Latin word order???) The idea that Latinized English words communicate religious truths more accurately (à la a “sacred vernacular”) is also ridiculous. We should not be trying to preserve the use of English words that have lost relevance and are no longer familiar to people. The obsequious tone of most of the prayers does not convey reverence, but distorts the perception of God. The wording’s obviously intentional separation of the priest from the rest of the praying assembly makes the latter once again into a group of observers rather than participants in the liturgical action. For the priest, the wording of the new text is hard to pray aloud, as run-on phrases and sentences defy natural breathing patterns and grammatical oddities distort sense-lines. IN ITSELF, THE REVISED TRANSLATION IS A FAILURE: THE FORMER TRANSLATION, DESPITE ISOLATED (usually minor, and easily correctable) INSTANCES OF IMPRECISION OR INELEGANCE, WAS BETTER, PERIOD! As for the process, it all but excluded the vast majority of Catholics, laity and clergy, who were expected to “pray” the new translation, from meaningful consultation not only on the wording, but on the very need for the translation in the first place. All the confident assurances of bishops that “the people” have “accepted” the revised translation are baseless, apparently intended to gratify only the Roman officials who insisted on visiting this dreadful plague upon us. The notion that “the English-speaking world” can pray effectively according to a single text that ignores regional and national linguistic distinctions is stupefying. Why (if it is true) does “the Spanish-speaking world” get 8 distinct translations to account for differences in spoken Spanish? Steadfast defense of the new text by our bishops risks perpetuating yet another crisis of confidence in their leadership and fosters more skepticism about their proper authority. A possible solution that might alleviate the awkwardness of our current situation without making the Church seem hopelessly inconsistent (in effect, saving face for the pro-revision party): following the principle extended to those who wish to use the “extraordinary form” of the Tridentine missal (not to mention the prospect that former Anglicans may incorporate elements of the Book of Common Prayer in their worship), simply allow parishes to use either the revised text or the formerly approved text of the Roman Missal at designated Masses. Let the real voice of the people be heard by allowing them to decide which they prefer. The alleged acceptance” of the new text by our people should not be interpreted as an enthusiastic embrace of a welcome improvement: it is more accurately a mute and exasperated submission to hierarchical power, effectively compromising one of the most successful outcomes of the Second Vatican Council in the experience of the majority of Catholics.

---

The new translation doesn’t flow..is not uplifting, compassionate, gentle, life-giving, focussed on Scripture, oblivious to the needs of the people, or inspire faith. Not really reverential, it pushes God away and makes our prayer the realm of the high brow ordained. Locked into a book, no matter how it “reads” is not prayer or building up a faithfilled relationship among the people and presider. This new missal should be scrapped and perhaps replaced with others...I understand a previous sacramentary was put together and remains unused but well composed. We need images of Jesus’ teaching, poetry, and beautiful language to help us encounter Christ among us. [Name]

---

The new translation has destroyed my spontaneous response to the beauty and prayerfulness of the mass. I now feel awkward at the altar and a “stranger in paradise.” I sense much of this same feeling in the parishioners. This so called new translation is ridiculous and it was uncalled for- especially considering all the other major, pressing problems the church is currently facing.

---

The new translation has numerous violations of essential rules of English grammar: dependent clauses treated as independent sentences, serial clauses with non-parallel structure, displacement of pronouns and adjectives from their referent nouns . The very goals of the translation (dignified style and tone, etc.) are severely undermined by this. This often renders prayers not only cumbersome but non-intelligible when proclaimed verbally. (Again, this is not simply a matter of style, but of basic grammar. The rather long -and for modern English excessively drawn out- sentence structure can be accommodated by verbal modulation, but the basic grammatical errors simply can not. The translation of the Roman Canon illustrates many of these problems). I do appreciate inclusion of material excised in the earlier translation, and the restoration of the basic pattern of thought in the orations. Often this is effective. However, there are instances where the attempt to follow the word order of Latin is overdone and slavish without contributing to what is being said (and in fact distracting

from it by sheer oddity to the ear). Unless these problems are taken seriously I would strongly dissuade any changes in other texts. On the other hand, If these issues can be taken seriously, the goals of the New Translation could be better served and the “finished product” as a whole be not only better received, but also much more effective.

---

The New Translation has taken away the joy and spirit of prayer.

---

The new translation HEARS very well by the congregation, is more difficult to SAY OUT LOUD. As someone who also celebrates in Spanish, it was a constant reminder about how bad the old translation was.

---

The new translation is a blatant violation of the directives given by the II Vatican Council and principles of translation of any text into a living language.

---

The new translation is a challenge no only for the presider but also for the people in order to understand some of the prayers. I think that the intention to get closer to the original texts was a great initiative, but in some cases I think they forgot about the people of God that is today using those prayers.

---

The new translation is a disaster.

---

The new translation is a good start, but it is to stilted. Direct object, verbs, and indirect objects seem to be rearranged. Often at the end of a prayer, I'm not sure what I prayed for. The Chant is hopelessly pedestrian and ugly. I use my own chant for the Eucharist prayers ([Chant Name]...works great.) I do like the added reverence in the Eucharistic Prayers.

---

The new translation is a mess. It makes religion seem disconnected from real life. Some of the prayers make no sense. Even after reading them several times, I am not sure what is being prayed!

---

The new translation is a scandal. The ideological translators showed no respect for pastors or people, nor did the pope and bisops.

---

The new translation is actually like something that is far away from the common language of everyday people. We still do not understand the meaning of some words.

---

The new translation is an abomination. It translates words, not meaning. It produces a distance between the people and God.

---

The new translation is awkward and not at all conducive to prayerful celebration! I would do everything I could to go back to a speakable and understandable rite. At least I would dissuade the translation of other rites into this awkward and garbled translation!

---

The New Translation is awkward to pray and difficult to understand ie Consubstantial. Should have left well enough alone. Simply a power play.

---

The new translation is better in some ways and much worse in most. Functional equivalency is better than formal equivalency because Latin doesn't translate well literally into English. We say we want to be more biblical yet we changed cup, which is biblical, to chalice because the Latin has chalice. Why do we need a special language to address God? Doesn't he know English? The need for a special language is an argument for Latin, which then undermines intelligibility. The views of priests who agree with the new translation will be heard; the views of those who don't won't be heard.

---

The new translation is better than the old, because the old wasn't a translation. The new translation is not good, because it is not in English.

---

The new translation is just terrible. It is impossible to proclaim it prayerfully. It is just not American English. It is cumbersome, distractive, and just awful. There is no attempt to include the people and their prayer life in it. I think that the powers in Rome have done a great disservice to the American Church by forcing this mess of a translation down our throats. I also have very little hope that any new translation will include any concern for either the priests who proclaim it or the people who will hear it. This, in my opinion, is just another power play by a bunch of Anti Vatican II clerics who want to force the Church into their extremely Conservative Ideology.

---

the new translation is lousy and akward!

---

The new translation is much better, I've yet to use Eucharistic Prayer 1/ too long, too wordy. I use #2 #3 and at time #4 in that order....The whole thing does need work to straighten out the wording some.....overall...i like it much better than the previous translation

---

The new translation is neither more reverent or awe-inspiring. I have heard anecdotally of several bishops complaining about the texts - think “disordered affections” in the Preface for Lent, “did not disdain to be nailed for our sake to the wood of the cross” (EP, R1), and “ compunction” on Ash Wednesday. When I hear that, I think that many (most?) of them never looked over the texts before they voted on them. I am appalled that the authority given to the Bishops' Conferences to issue liturgical texts, given at Vatican II, was unabashedly

ripped from their grasp with nary a complaint or protest. Their failure to support what was their right given at an Ecumenical Council has resulted in the travesty that is before us today. At the very least, I hope that our bishops would appeal to Vanna White or Pat Sajak to help improve the texts. Not t buy a vowel. Rather, they should buy a period...or lots of them - in order to stem the calvalcade of run-on sentences throughout the text!

---

The new translation is not awkward nor distracting. We just have to get used to it. I like it.

---

The new translation is not English language. I don't know what it is; but it is NOT ENGLISH! Some of it makes no sense. The parts that do make sense are lost because of the clumsy construction; so what meaning there was is lost. In short, it is a nightmare and destructive of prayer: mine and the people's!

---

The new translation IS NOT in the spirit of Vatican II - allowing people to pray in their language.

---

The new translation is very wordy and uses too many words that people do not even know what they mean. (i.e.) consubstantial, incarnate, dewfall) There are many dangling participial clauses that are not connected to each other. There is no rhythm to the flow of the words in prayers. Most of the collects, prayers over the gifts, and prayers after communion do not make any sense at all. The repetitive use of the words "we pray" is distracting, to say the least. It seems that as we open the prayers such as the collect with, "We pray." why do we have to say it again in the prayer itself? Do we constantly keep using it so that it reminds the priests, or the people that we are praying? There is nothing about this new translation that I like. It is not prayerful at all. The prefaces are hard to read and make very little sense. The translation we had flowed and lent itself very much to being prayerful. I think the new translation is a direct slap in the face of those who did the other translation. Because they claim that this new translation is more in keeping with the spirit of the old Mass. One of the reasons behind the new translation was to be more literal with the Latin meaning. Anyone who has studied a foreign language knows you do not translate literally because you lose the meaning. I am studying and working in Spanish with our Hispanic brothers and sisters, and if there is one thing I have learned is that things are said very differently in Spanish from English. A beginner in a language translates literally, not someone who knows a language. Was the new translation done by someone who did not know English very well? It certainly seems to be the case. One other thing, English is very different in Great Britian and Australia than here. To treat English the same for all three is ridiculous. If we got permission to use the old translation again, I would switch in a heart beat. I love Eucharist and I really desire to be able to celebrate it prayerfully again. This new translation prevents me from praying the Mass. Too often I wonder what I just read, or I even have problems reading it. Priests are changing words on their own now because of how poorly the wording is. The new translation is encouraging a quiet revolt on liturgy as people adapt the new translation to their needs. We need change and we need it very soon. Thank you for this opportunity to "sound off" on with this survey.

---

The new translation just doesn't read welland if not read very carefully is difficult to understand. The Collect sounds like it was written by someone for whom english was a second language. Why are plural verbs used with the name of God?

---

The new translation makes me appreciate the previous translation more and more. It is extremely difficult to read the new prayers in such a way as to make them comprehensible to the listeners.

---

The new translation may be an exact translation from the Latin into English, but it steps miles away from bringing it into the vernacular. Everything we were taught about sentence structure is neglected here which makes it difficult to understand especially if people do not have the translation in hand. Many lay people have commented that they dislike it. Imagine using words like 'supplications' 'countenance' and 'oblations' within one sentence (prayer over gifts in marriage third Mass), or 'offices of fraternal burial' (funeral opening prayer b). I as presider am insulted by them and refuse to further insult the faithful by even considering many options that are available. I now understand why Latin 'died' as a language. Please, please bury it again and lay it to rest! Bring something to us that is living, sensible, understandable, approachable. Just as non-Catholics were able to join us in common expressions like "And also with you," we have again stepped away from being more ecumenically minded. I am saddened to think that one of the things that used to bring great joy to my priesthood was celebrating the Eucharist, has now come to be something that I dread and am embarrassed about.

---

The new translation of the Missal brings some refreshing things. I like the fact that the prayers are less "demanding" and a bit more supplicant in tone... we ask the Lord for things we don't demand them. The use of "who", while faithful to the Latin, is very strange and the general gist is a translation that does not have much to do with how English speakers think or speak. The stiff language does not feel much like prayer to me. While a good part of it is nice and I like the greater fidelity to biblical origins of much of the text I don't like the slavish translation of the Latin syntax. I think that lots of folks in the pews have tuned out the prayers that are

difficult to understand and sometimes difficult to read. There is very little sense of poetry in the new text.

“Lost in translation” My general sense is some success but mostly failure. Thanks for the survey. God Bless

The new translation of the Missal is a great blessing, but our parishes must preserve Latin in the sacred liturgy.

The new translation reads like it was made by someone who learned English as a second language!

The new translation shows the continuity between the Ordinary and the extraordinary forms of the Mass. I like the new translation, it is a great improvement over the former one.

the new translation uses words that are not familiar to us in the u.s. i end up having to look them up in the dictionary so i can explain them to the people.

The new translation, while faithful to the Latin, is not uplifting nor inspiring. There is nothing more sacred about it and I do not believe it engages the community in prayer. It is stilted and formal and often does not fit the spirit even of the original Latin. I had sincerely hoped that the new translation would engage the community in prayer, inspire their spirits and lift their minds and hearts up to the Lord. I do not experience this happening with the new translation.

The new translations are awkward. Nevertheless, I think there was a need for updating and we should make the most of this effort.

The new translations do not reflect real prayer; the laity who participate agree. They even say that the language is TOO formal and sometimes incomprehensible.

The new Translations is awkward. That is not the way we usually speak and read English.

The new version is a joke and makes the Bishops even more irrelevant than before.

The older translation was mellifluous, reverent, and elegant. It flowed easily off the tongue, and the meaning could be grasped easily by the listener because the meaning was readily apparent to the presides as he reads. In the new translation the syntax is confusing, and the sentences are much too long. It is unclear to me why the more literal translation is necessarily more reverent and elevated. This seems an unwarranted claim.

Shakespeare is grander than American English, but the new translation is hardly Shakespeare. And the Bard isn't trying to lead me in prayer. If he were, I might be equally confused, but at least I would feel as though I had been in the presence of elevated language from a great writer. Please make the older translation an option.

The older translation was not very beautiful, but the new one can be very difficult with its rather complex sentence structures. It might be a good study tool but not helpful in public proclamation. Surely a balance can be achieved between fidelity to the original text and greater understanding and beauty in the receiver language.

The older translation gives a much better flow of the English language. I compare this with current Breviary and it is very noticeable to me.

The only area of improvement would be in the Eucharistic Prayers for Masses for various needs. Its language and theology seems to bland.

The only priests whom I know who dislike the new translation (even to the extent that they continue to make up their own words) were never faithful to the old translation anyway. The biggest complainers don't want to “go back” to the old translation, they are upset that the congregation now has a greater understanding of the extent to which the priest “does his own thing” at the Mass.

The only real issues for me are words that are so strange that they confuse people. For example, I have no problem even with “consubstantial - people use the word substantial -- even if in a different context; but the words “chalice” and “oblation” are foreign (and thus distracting, words and will remain so. I am not a literalist, but if Jesus used a chalice (which is a Latin (calix) word anyway), I am sure it does not have the connotations that it carries today (and those need to be taken into account and to be taken seriously). I am thinking of those priests who (unfortunately), say “These hands are made for chalices and not for callouses” -- ouch.

The only word which I find problematic for many is “consubstantial” in the creed. Although a technically correct word, I believe many parishioners do not understand the word--if they can even pronounce it.

Otherwise, I find the changes a beautiful improvement which brings us closer to understanding our faith.

The Our Father chant tone in the appendix should be in the main body and the one on the main body should be in the appendix!

The people in the pews do not understand the language due to sentence structure mostly, vocabulary secondarily. My biggest grief is that the prayer is taken from the people; it is not longer their prayer; it is the officials' prayer in their behalf ... that is a loss to me.

The people's parts (responses) are fine - some I like better than the former translation. I appreciate a translation closer to the Latin text. The English translation is often poor - I would mark down students for some of the

English in the new Missal. The Mass proper (prefaces, Collect, offertory, & closing prayers) is difficult to read. The new translation is also hard to translate on the spot into other languages or adjust for young children or the mentally challenged. I do not remember struggling with this issue with the former translation.

---

The Pope reversed the direction set by Vatican II concerning the translation of liturgical texts (a violation of collegiality). He also disregarded the creative work of experts who had been preparing a far more pastoral and prayerful translation. The result is confusion within communities (ex: "and with you/ with your spirit = chaos!) and a return to passivity among those gathered for liturgy.

---

The prayers are not helpful to prayer. There are some beautiful phrases but overall it is difficult especially the collects. Please return the "the cup" in the institution narrative as well as the words "for all" not "for many".

---

The prayers are often unnecessarily complex and convoluted, difficult for the congregation to understand.

---

the prayers are really difficult to speak - sentences are too long, word choice difficult to understand, phrases simply not used in speech, some images of God are rare

---

The prayers are sad. They in no way uplift people's spirit. Many of us translate the translation so it has meaning and the people can comprehend some meaning. Very poorly done!

---

The prayers for daily Mass.. the Collect, are ponderous, hard to understand, and show little evidence of English composition. Why use the word "chalice" by the priest, but in the acclamation the word "cup" is used? This suggests a definite "class distinction" between the priest (royalty, aristocracy) and the laity - granted the ontological difference but what happens to the priesthood of the laity? The creed: how many people grasp the meaning of "consubstantial" as opposed to "equal to?" or incarnate as opposed to "born of?" Pedantry??

General estimation: the new translation deserves no credit or congratulations to those responsible - it is beneath them. A subtle reversal of Vatican II is a bit perceptible, in parts. "Remind the laity where they belong."

---

The prayers for Mass---Collect, Over Offerings, After Communion---are very awkwardly written. And they are not grammatically correct. It seems whoever did them would never have to orally pray them. The Prefaces are much harder to find & are not as flowing at all as the previous ones. The Roman Missal has a much more "stilted" nature to it than the Sacramentary.

---

The prayers have too many long and confusing clauses. Some have no meaning. I don't think the average parishioner understands them. They are a disappointment.

---

The prayers in the Missal are truly food that nourishes, both in public worship but in private prayer. They are rich and deep.

---

The prayers say "Pray" when we have already said "Let us pray" The english does not flow as when there is a verb before a noun. Unrun sentences!

---

The previous "translation" was so poor, more like a free composition with semi-Palagianism shot through it, that this stilted difficult-to-understand-by-listening version is, by comparison, a gem. What the American Church should do, as a service to the larger Anglophone Church, is hire a number of Catholic poets and prose writers and create a new English Missal without a theological axe to grind, as ICEL's 1970/1985 product clearly was. IMNSHO the Sacramentary was a D-. The current Missal is a D+ or C-, although the people's responses deserve an A. With a hundred million English-speaking Catholics, we should be able to produce an A product.

---

The previous text was theologically ambiguous. It reflected a misconstrued desire to be pastorally relevant. At the end every priest ended doing his own thing. Unfortunately to be an american priest has turned to mean a liturgically ego-centered animal either conservative or liberal. You can change the rubrics all the heck you want still your homilies make people in the pews fall sleep. So what is the point? Just to get even with Ratzinger? Please get a job! You liturgists enjoy making us waste our time. You dont speak for the people in the pews; you just think you do.

---

The previous translation flowed and made more sense- I really dislike the Penitential Act - the I Confess- with the striking of the breast and the ...through my most grievous fault( that is old theology to my thinking and not very compassionate as our God is). I don't the change in the change in the Apostles Creed with Jesus descending to"hell" try yo explain that to young children. Those are my comments

---

The priest orations & prayers are terrible - ther are not leading anyone to a prayerful relationship with God

---

The principle of formal equivalence is faulty.No other work of literature is translated from one language to another using this principle.Who would read Moliere or Moravia or Goethe in the stilted English of such a translation?Many U.S. bishops resisted the new translation as long as they could.Its adoption was a power play by the Roman Curia over a national bishops' conference.[Sentence removed]The new translation comes out of

an ultramontane view of the Church and the world. It is a coup by the heirs of the “prophets of doom (gloom)” John XXIII singled out in *Gaudet Mater Ecclesia*. By the way, I speak and read a number of languages, so I know something about translation.

---

The problem with the new English translation is not the vocabulary but the syntax. The premise that the syntax of the Latin prayers somehow plays a role in passing on the Faith is flawed.

---

The process lacked proper consultation with our bishops, our parish priests, and our laity. It seemed to be an exercise of power by a small group at the Vatican. It was disappointing that our Bishops’ Conference did not object as did other National Episcopal Conferences.

---

The process of excluding the work done by the American priests was shameful and really hurt our church.

---

The process was not good since it did not take into account the changing spirit of the clergy and the people. Need to adjust the aim of the program has not been reached.. Thank you for the survey.

---

The question of awkward and distracting does not describe the language of the translation. And on considering the views of priests on future translations is good if they shall be a medium to bring about the varied shades of opinions that such will generate.

---

The range of answers for the first question is very poor and for that reason was left unanswered.

---

The response of the parishioners has been positive. Although some of the texts are awkward, for the most part it is an improvement over the prior text. With small revisions, I could see it used for the other Rites. Thank you for asking!

---

The revision are always a work in progress. Keep up the good work!

---

The revision was unnecessary and should not have been undertaken,

---

The Roman Missal is a terrible translation and has no poetic feel to it. A huge step backward!

---

The run on sentences are difficult to pray well. The language in many cases is archaic or otherwise uses too many words that not of common parlance and therefore difficult to comprehend, especially for those in the pew who have not had the opportunity to prepare the texts and therefore are hearing the words for the first time while at Mass. The revision done in the late 1990’s was much better. It was an improvement over what was being used while still closer to the language commonly used by the general population.

---

THE SECOND GREETING FOR THE MASS DOES NOT ELICIT THE RESPONSE. PENITENTIAL RITES OUGHT TO BE UP FRONT. INCLUDING THE SPRINKLING RITE MARRIAGE RITE BOOK AND FUNERAL RITE BOOK OUGHT TO CONTAIN THE MASS ALSO.

---

The second time around is still a punishment. The assembly is laughing at the terrible excuse for English in the presider prayers. I refuse to pray EP 1,3 and 4. I use the four EP for special occasions as often as I can. EP 2 is bad; but not as offensive to the listener. The year preparing for the new translation WAS A WASTE OF TIME. This primarily Anglo parish still stumbles over their new words. THE CHANGE MIRRORS THE LEADERSHIP IN THE CURIA. Pretty soon American assemblies will be as small as those in Europe. Glad the cardinals had small turnouts for their gigs on 3/10/13 in Rome. Do they send money for the upkeep of those titular churches in Rome’s diocese. Hope USA church is not paying to keep lights on.

---

The sentence structure is awkward and the prayers themselves are condescending to the assembly. I remedy this by changing the third person - they - to the first person collective - we.

---

The sentence structure is awkward. Some words that are used I have to go back and look up the meaning. I agree with the “God language” but this is not how the everyday person in the pew speaks.

---

The sentences are too long. It takes a lot of preparation to correctly and meaningfully deliver the sentences.

---

The sentences are way too long with too many words and commas. God should be addressed at the beginning of the prayers instead of in the middle of sentences.

---

The sentences do not flow. Words such as “Your” Christ in some of the Canons do not make sense. I frequently have to stop, words do not agree with the thought of the sentence. Parishioners smile knowing the words are awkward. Folks keep asking the meaning of certain words.

---

The survey forced an answer on the first question - none of which reflects my position. Here is mine: “Before it was introduced I was apprehensive” but I can live with it. I checked the last alternative - which is rather weak option. From the beginning the survey is flawed when your first question does not give latitude to neutral conclusions. I think the new translation is what it is and I gave it a chance and 1 year later am fine with it. Having said that, I speak several languages and the translation reminds me of a translator whose first language was not English (I realize they were English speakers) - the use of words not common to the lexicon of American English does not in itself make it more prayerful. Some parts are so awkward they jar the prayerful

tone of the Mass. There are parts I like, for most I am obedient and it is fine, some I think truly need to be reworked - and that is OK with me. And no rush to do it.... we can let it sit for a bit. Given the earlier process, I have no confidence that the views of parish priests will be considered at all (much less seriously). I don't think there is ill will, it is just the attitude of liturgist. There is a reason that the old adage rings true: it is easier to negotiate with a terrorist than a liturgist.

---

The Syntax found in this document is awful. The writers and editors should be immediately enrolled in a High School English Class.

---

The text of the new edition of the Roman Missal is very awkward and difficult to follow. It takes away from its value as prayer simply and gracefully expressed.

---

The Third Eucharistic Prayer,,,,, first sentence, 72 words long!

---

The translation of the New Missal took almost ten years and during that time only the opinions of the Bishops were considered. After publishing the new Book, what is the use of asking the opinion of priests? This survey could have been conducted on the draft of the Book, not on the final product. Is Holy See going to change anything in the light of the opinions of the priests?

---

THE TRANSLATION DOES NOT FLOW , BUT IS AWKWARD

---

The translation is a bit much and I find myself dropping words to make it a bit more simple. it is a great improvement over what was but it is clumsy, ex EPI the changes don't add much and it becomes much more cumbersome.

---

The translation is a disaster.

---

The translation is a source of frustration and an obstacle to true worship.

---

The Translation in some cases is well done, but other times the translation is just too wordy and difficult to make sense of. It seems to be more of a distraction for the priest who must be careful about the words they say.

---

The translation misses the point of being in comfortable language of the people--the old translation had it! Is it more important praying in language the people understand or spending time explaining terms that mean the same thing? It sounds like a bad translation by a 1st year latin student--getting all the phrases in without trying to get the sense--I would give a grade of F! I think the bishops are more interested in preserving THEIR traditions than in serving the needs of the people--I think the priests need to understand the theological terms but the prayers should be in language that speaks to the common person in the pew. I think the desire to denigrate VatII borders on heretical--the teachings of VatII were the official teachings of the Church--I do not trust the bishops to move the church forward to speak to the people--they are only interested in enhancing their position in the Church.

---

the translation process and protocols is far too complicated to allow for consideration of presbyterates around the world, Individual bishops would be far and away benefited if they opened their own participation in the process and protocols by asking their representative presbyteral groups to offer comment. Respect for Conference of Bishops work by Vatican Dicasteries is all future translation work should not be a matter of "lip service" but a collaboration with integrity. Adherence to typical edition of Latin text should be respected but but not at the expense of an intelligent vernacular translation.

---

The translators seem oblivious to the actual written and spoken English (American) language.

---

the use of certain terms again and again (merit)(majesty) and awkward phrasing doesn't lend itself to prayerful celebration. Some of it is good, I agree, but I am put off by some of the heretical language employed.

---

The way this survey is asking questions seems to be begging for further divisions among presbyterates rather than teasing out the finer points about what is good and bad about the texts. I am in strong favor of what has been done and even how it got done, but I also acknowledge that there are improvements that need to be made in places for readability and slightly more deference to the English idiom. Stay with what we have, if it is a choice between this and another wholesale re-working... Improve what we have under the same basic principles, if possible.

---

The whole process that was used was faulty. the Bishops of the United States were totally locked out of the process and their comments and suggestions almost universally ignored in the final edition.

---

The whole project is an abomination. The process did not respect collegiality, aesthetics, nor the norms established by the spirit or constitutions and decrees of Vatican II. The Roman missal is not a witness to the beauty of Christian prayer, it does not allow the faithful to understand with ease and take part in the sacred rites fully, actively and as a community (SL 21). The bishops have failed in their leadership, disavowing their own liturgical and episcopal experts, have foisted a mauled and unwieldy prayer script upon the church without

consultation or experiment (why couldn't we just wait) and have offered convoluted explanations for poor grammar, words (chalice, many, etc.) and theology. The Roman missal offers prayer forms that alienate, confuse and are unfitting due the dignity of our worship.

---

The wording used in the Collects may make sense in Latin, but they seldom make sense in English. Even the object of the sentence is sometimes simply incorrect. For example asking the Holy Spirit to send out the Spirit. This type of thing does not enhance but distract from the prayer of the Mass. Sadly, because of the poor sentence structure of the Collects and similar prayers, as well as the kind of thing mentioned above the liturgy is no longer prayerful. The most powerful prayer we have has been taken away from the people of God. How very sad!

---

The wordings of the prayers in the 3rd edition of the Roman Missal need to be revised urgently and rewritten in a way that everyone can understand. In their current form, they are confusing, awkward (tongue twisting to pronounce) and incomprehensible.

---

The words with which address God in our common prayer is significant and ought not be treated cavalierly. The prayers in Latin were constructed to convey certain truths about our faith. Likewise, the English translations should be as careful as possible to communicate the Latin originals as clearly and accurately as possible.

---

The work of ICEL was not sufficiently respected. If there were concerns about ICEL's first effort, these should have been addressed in a collegial, collaborative way. What happened to the revised ICEL draft that mysteriously never came to light? We are not living in the dark ages! The new translation is a good effort, and I like the elevated language style, but the language needs to be intelligible to both priest and assembly. Awkward and confusing structures need to be fixed. Forcing English to conform to Latin structures is not logical. English is a different language, and its rules of grammar and usage need to be respected even as translators are trying to convey the meaning of Latin texts. It also seems to me that Latin is not the original language of the Mass, and so to treat Latin texts as if they are the final word on liturgical prayers ignores the history of liturgical languages and the development of liturgical texts. We should be after such values as profound meaning, reverence, beauty, style, and be informed by the entire liturgical tradition of the Church. That being said, I am grateful that we have recovered many beautiful metaphors that were lost in the previous translation, as well as a more humble approach in addressing our prayers to God. I pray that common sense, charity, and good scholarship will be the foundation of future efforts. The new English Missal is a good, but imperfect start. I give it a grade of B- as a tool of prayer, but C- for English grammar and usage.

---

The worst thing about the new Missal is the way it is laid out. It seems as though people who don't understand English and never use the Missal wrote it and laid it out. If chanting the mass were so important why wouldn't they include a cd to help priests learn to chant it? You have to be constantly flipping pages to use the Missal properly. The language is not beautiful and I don't really experience it as difficult, it's just awkward, poor English.

---

The new translation makes the prayers sound as if I am using English as a second language

---

There are aspects of the new translation that I really do like. But there are some aspects that I do not; such as the very awkward English translation of some of the prayers is just plain confusing and too "longwinded". I think just a little more "common sense" translating of some of the prayers would greatly improve the new translation. I don't think we need to start over again just do some adjustments to some of the prayers.

---

There are certain words that have been put in that are not part of our everyday language such as beseech and others that I cannot think of at present.

---

There are certainly passages, especially in the collects, that require real attention to pray well aloud. That isn't necessarily a bad thing. Some of the prefaces are simply awkward, but I do appreciate the more reverent tone throughout. I wish we had used chant notation for the musical settings rather than modern notation, but I don't get the sense that it's a widespread sentiment.

---

There are moments in the new translation that I like very much. But, in general, I find it awkward and difficult to proclaim. Some of the imagery, e.g. "dewfall", "under my roof", is practically meaningless to most in the congregation. A middle ground between faithfulness to the latin original texts and good poetic, proclaimable translations should be able to be developed by competent authorities.

---

There are phrases in the Eucharistic Prayers that are truly beautiful and inspired. The great majority of the collects and prayers over the offerings are really difficult to pray. Priests should not be the only ones consulted.

---

There are positives and not so positives, especially the vocabulary and sentence structure. Some collects and other prayers are awkward and need to be rehearsed. However, we work with what we have; congregations

have adjusted so further change not recommended so soon.

---

There are some improvements, but there are some words that are awkward and do not flow easily in praying it. Now that we have it, I am getting used to it, and I think we should let it alone. To keep changing the text is jolting to priests and people both, and is an unnecessary great expense. I am amazed that the people do respond to it as well as they do, although people who do not attend regularly get caught off guard.

---

There are some things about the new missal that are very good, like more choices of prefaces, and special ones for special feasts. There have been improvements in many of the prayers but the language is too awkward in too many of the prayers. That phrase that is in just about every prayer "we pray" is really silly. Actually many of the prayers are really more meaningful in the new than in the old, it is just that the language is so awkward. It just is not good English.

---

There are things that should be changed immediately. One example is the use of the word 'chalice' in the Eucharistic Prayer. The Scripture translation we use says 'cup'. On Holy Thursday it will be obvious that the true intent was not to be more authentic to the Scriptures when we read 'cup' and then later say 'chalice'. The language is awkward & distracting. In the past year I've not heard a single positive comment from a brother priest or member of the faithful. Most have just wrote it off to hierarchy not being concerned for the needs of the faithful. The 'liturgical' language is as much a barrier to God & the Eucharist as communion rails & Latin once were.

---

There has been way too much fuss by some priests on the changes. Everything changes - be open to the working of the Spirit in the church - not just your own little corner of the world. ([number] years ordained)

---

There is no balance to this new transition, we have traded one extreme for the other. If the previous translation was too banal, etc. the new translation is overly formal, clumsy, etc. I don't feel like I am praying to God, but petitioning a distant King who didn't know me, and what he knows of me is not very positive.

---

There is no flow in the new translation. It is hard to pray with it because the construction of sentences are hard to follow. I wish we could go back to the previous translation which was for me easy to pray with.

---

There really is a beauty in the translations that I appreciate as it slows me down and gives reason to explain, communicate better and be moved by the grace of being a presider.

---

There should have been requirements that the various publishers had greater similarity with page numbering, etc.

---

There was a need to improve the bland language of the old translation but this new translation now is too elitist and the syntax is not English--especially the Collects. I like the Eucharistic Prayers, generally, but most of the Collects not at all. I have been ordained [number] years and am saddened that rival camps are making our liturgy a battle ground to win partisan victories at the expense of fostering prayer among us as a People of God. The present "winners" will, I fear, find themselves "losers" in 20 to 30 years when a new crop of liturgists with all the answers will be out to make a name for themselves. I love the Church and I do not express my dissatisfaction to the people, but try to pray these Collects as best I can. I keep reminding self I AM A PRIEST WHO MUST LEAD MY PEOPLE IN PRAYING THE MASS.

---

There was no consultation regarding the preparation and publication of the NEW ROMAN MISSAL. The USCCB's preferred translation was rejected for a much inferior one.

---

there were no questions about bilingual priest that English is his second language

---

There were some improvements made in the new translation, but, on the whole, the new translation is clunky and awkward.

---

These choices did not entirely fit my thoughts and opinions. I don't mind the attempt in general to make the prayers "more reverent." And some of the translations I like quite a bit. But an equal number are cumbersome, distracting and all but impossible to understand. They need revision. The book is a mixed blessing. Nice try, improvement needed.

---

These translations are very difficult to proclaim in public and are a disaster. When can we get something that is better English? Let the USA bishops be responsible for the translation and leave Rome out of it with this awkward literal translation of the Latin.

---

This disaster began with the "new" translation of the Lectionary. It is awkward, very poor grammar, and in general a very poor form of American English. I admit it is a wonderful literal translation of the Latin. Is that what we want and need in our Church? If we want a "special" form of our language for worship, let's adopt the King James version of the Bible. Would that be formal enough? The Scriptures and Mass should be understandable by the average person without use of printed text. The translations of the present Lectionary and

Missal are deplorable. Did someone actually believe that this would bring people closer to God? How tragic! People pray in their own words, like Jesus did. As omniscient as God is I sometimes wonder if He has to go to a dictionary to understand our present Scripture readings and Missal prayers. Rome blew it big time as well as our spineless Bishops in this country. The Vatican depends heavily on the USA for its financial stability. Our Bishops have never used this powerful tool for influence. Let's learn a lesson from big business. When funding is cut off, it brings nations to their knees. I guess our Bishops are just so happy to be Bishops that they forget about the needs of their people. Pope Francis is a sign of hope as he forsakes the grandeur of his office. Maybe he can accomplish what our timid, and grateful Bishops, cannot. My advice: trash the Lectionary and Missal as they now exist. Accept the Jerusalem Bible translation and go back to prayers in the Missal that people can relate to. Leave your pocket dictionaries at home. Something this divisive cannot be the work of the Spirit.

This English Missal clearly is an insult to God and to all the members of the Church. It clearly shows that the Vatican and most American bishops are more concerned with shepherding themselves and Church traditions rather than shepherding God's people.

This entire experience was fruitful and blessed. It was a wonderful opportunity for catechesis and it continues to be a source of renewal of parish liturgical life.

This new translation is into a language that is not English. English is a living language and has idioms and usages that are fluid. However the new Roman Missal is in a language other than English. It breaks many of the grammatical, construction, punctuation, verb usage rules. It is clumsy, confusing, and definitely unintelligible. It destroys good liturgy, reduces full and active participation of the people and fails to lift the hearts and minds of the people to God. It is a nightmare!

this new translation is very awkward for the presider. I find myself changing language daily in its use.

This new translation is very difficult to vocalize. It does not flow. The phraseology is of another language and gets me tongue-tied

This survey doesn't really capture my attitude. I don't DISLIKE the new Missal, but I do find the language at times heady and unclear. I think, with some revision, we could still keep a reverent and beautiful prayer without being so difficult to understand.

This translation is a disaster and an obstacle to worship.

This translation is a disaster.

This translation is definitely a "good literal translation, and highlights the scriptural references, and preserves Medieval prayer form.; But any good linguist would point out that a "slavish" conformity to the phraseology, formality, or sentence construct of the Latin text is more a "transliteration" of the *typico editio*. Such a work is better suited for reference, intensive linguistic study, or medieval textual criticism. This "translation" or "transliteration" is less suited for public proclamation and prayer, or even private

This translation is not for the people it is for liturgists and academics. It is the english of 100 years ago and the structure is very awkward!!! I find it to be a pain!!! But we are stuck with it. In this as in other things the Church seems to be more concerned with appearances than the transmission of truth!!! It has not enhanced the liturgy but made it more obscure!!!

This translation is the best thing that happened since introduction of vernacular languages. I do not understand the hype against the new translation in some circles. However, what is the purpose of this survey: to promote the new translation, or is it to discourage it? The following question is so vague: 'I am confident that the views of priests will be taken seriously in future decisions about liturgical translation'. Is the author of this survey suggesting that from now on we are going to vote on language that we use to pray in the Church? What if 51% of views are strongly disagreeing with the new translation. Are we to say the old translation was better. No. I think the old translation served for a time we needed it. Now we have the new translation and it serves well. Those who do not like it should get over it. If they do not like this translation they will not like any. Unless of course it is improvised by them. Finally, it is not about particular individuals it is about the mind of the Church. The Church wishes to express herself in a language of the new translation. Unless one is to say: I am smarter than the prayers and the language of the Church.

This translation is awful. I wasn't a good Latin Student but translating the other way it flunks! The Phraisology is awful and terribly hard to proclaim with any inflection or meaning! I must say that a few very few of the short phrases are becoming prayful for me. I am glad that I [phrase removed] will not have to put up with this for very long! My [relative] who is a daily mass attender said,"What a waste of time & Money -just to get frustrated when we try to pray as a congregation."

Though I like the Roman Missal, the people in the pews are still not used and they don't particularly like it,

especially those who are old.

Though supposedly more literal, the new translation is actually biased ideologically (e.g., references to standing during the Eucharistic Prayer removed, obsolete vocabulary) and clerically (e.g., distinct vocabulary for “priestly” matters---”chalice” instead of “cup”).

Three Mass prayers are awkward, stilted and rather stiff. Not very “prayerful” to this priest.

To all questions: The language is so stilted and often archaic that it inhibits prayerful participation. Any translation of the other rites should not follow the same *raison d’être* as that of the missal.

To clarify the answer to the statement about the people’s response: there has been relatively little reaction to the translation, once we have been using it now for a year, but what reaction I have heard is not positive.

To do another translation of the Roman Missal would be extremely detrimental to the faithful and our public prayer. Moreover, it would be absolutely unnecessary.

To properly use the new translation requires an effort on the part of the celebrant, especially by pre-reading the text. This may annoy some but is a hidden blessing for better disposition to celebrate.

To qualify the first Q, which doesn’t leave much room for nuance: I like the higher range vocabulary - I think it enhances reverence. However some of the awkward phrases could be smoothed out, without losing the overall tone. If this could be done, I would strongly support a revision, otherwise not at the moment. I have no problem with important words like consubstantial and incarnate - these are such key words in our tradition and all need to be familiar with them.

To quote Fr. Ronald Knox on translations: They are either literal or literary, you can’t have both. I am reminded of my [school] Latin homework when I read the new prayers. I have to practice them, on occasion, rearrange the text to make it more understandable. The people are not moved to deeper prayer but often have a blank look even when I try my best to make it understandable. It seems that some of the verbal changes from the old text were change for the sake of making a point that someone had the power to change the text. But they were not qualified to make a decent translation. At it’s best it is turgid and lugubrious!!

To the second last question one of the options should have read: “I can only hope”. In regards to the last question - I think the Holy See needs to have the English speaking nations have their own particular translation based on the genre of the particular English speaking country. I have found a very small selection of phrases in this revised translation inspiring. I also think that since Paul in 1 Corinthians uses the word “cup” that this should be the term used in the words of institution. Also, if we are going to keep the translation of “many” in the words of institution then it should be: “the many” so it gives the broad sense of salvation is inclusive and total. Also, I think that the Eucharistic Prayers for Children should be added to Roman Missal, since these are approved texts. Thank you for including me in the survey. I look forward to reading the results.

Too bad comments were not asked of priests BEFORE the new translation was approved and published.

Too many subjunctive clauses are contained within the text . This revision has an awkwardness about it. When the Mass first came into English in 1966 or 1967, that translation was fine. Why weren’t prayers like the Gloria or the Creed or the Sanctus kept that way? It was a mistake to change them into what we have now.

Totally unprayerful. Continually tongue-tied. Need to go back to the old Sacramentary!

Translation were left in the hands of the bishop’s conference and should have been left there. They know the language of their consistency better than Romans. The language does not make sense to me or many people.

Updating the calendar of saints was necessary. I liked that.

Urge the USCCB to strongly ask for approval of the 1998 translation

We failed to ask two vital questions. First, will the translation help our people pray? Second, will the translation be helpful in presidential functions? The new translation is awkward and grammatically difficult. Passive voice, strange sentence structure, and archaic language make the translation unapproachable.

We had no voice in this matter: neither did the American Bishops...hope things will change.... [Name]

We have such a poor translation because the priests out in the foxholes were neither consulted nor listened to. When several raised objections at Diocesan training - they were pointedly ignored. It was obvious that this was being pushed from somewhere on high. A few things here and there needed to be improved -- but not such a radical re-working. The new translation is so awkward that I often finish a prayer and ask myself, “What did I just say?” Sentence structure is bizarre and cumbersome.

We need a translation for the USA, which corresponds to how we use the English language, which is at the same time true to the Church.

We need language that is both reverent AND in common parlance with today’s world. This translation does

neither. It is too awkward and slavishly attached to word for word Latin translation. I can only hope that a revision is in the works that reflects a meaning for meaning translation, as the older Missal did. Thank you.

---

We needed a much better English translation of the Missal. For years I looked forward to the promised translation [1987]. What we have been given is a first draft of a literal 'pony' for the Latin text. It does not sing. It does not aid in prayer. It is not English. I would hope that the Bishops would be given back their oversight of the vernacular liturgy and that the norms of *Liturgiam Authenticam* will be revised.

---

We should be allowed to try the trial version before the final version is printed. This will enable us to have an effective input.

---

We use the basic chants in our daily Mass and people sing them well. I found the questions did not always reflect my position, e.g., I think much of the new translation is prayerful but am not sure that we need a special language to address God (q. 5). Also, I had some apprehension about the advent of the new translation and find it generally usable but there are some prayers, sections that do need work. I would not be in favor of a wholesale revision but work on those prayers/texts that are most problematic (q. 6, 7).

---

We were in need of a better translation on. However the current translation is, in many place, poor, ever bad, English. The sentence structure is often jarring, sometimes incomprehensible. It seems to have been done by people who don't speak English as a first language.

---

Well overdue. Has transformed the prayerful and reverent celebration of the Mass. Glaring omissions from the previous translation have been reinserted in this new translation. Chant: I think some of the Preface settings could be slightly improved. Sometimes the music doesn't quite follow the phrasing in my view. Not a big issue but I would have written one or two of them slightly differently. Marvelous that they are modeled on the Latin chants of old. I do sometimes make some errors in the reading but I should prepare better and not think it acceptable to approach sacred texts (oraisons etc) without preparation. I'm not sure about the views of priests being heard or not. I wasn't personally consulted and there are too many of us to consult. The move for this re-translation came from many sources including concerned laity. It took a long time to get these changes made. No further changes, now, please. A great treasure for the Church.

---

Well written

---

What a waste of time, money and energy. We need a translation that reflects the spoken language of the people and connects with their prayer expressions. The verb 'laud' is 'old English' and not used in modern English. what a waste!

---

What good is it to be technically correct if the people in the pews do not understand what you are talking about? Please try speaking the text to see if it is verbally easy to read/pray out loud. Spoken language is different from a text designed to be read quietly. If it does not flow orally, it will be lost to the people.

---

What I find difficult with the present Roman Missal is that it was translated word for word from the Latin and was not nuanced so as to make it more user friendly. I find it hard to get through certain prayers because of the way they are structured and worded. Overall, I like the new translation and do find it more prayerful and not as "fluffy" as the old Sacramentary.

---

What I find most awkward in some of the priest prayers is sentence structure: not so much the words themselves, but their organization. The flow of the prayers is often quite poor. Even the best speaking qualities - inflection, tone, pauses, accent - cannot overcome some cases.

---

What I most like about the new translation is that it makes me concentrate to think about what I am saying. I purposely read over the prayers before Mass so I can appreciate what I am praying with the people. The New Translation has definitely improved the way I celebrate the Sacred Mysteries. I am caught up much more in the "Mystery" of Faith and Sacrament I am celebrating. It definitely has taken the "routine" out of celebrating the Holy Mass. In short, I love it.

---

What I said above may sound confusing, but while I like a more poetic and "liturgical" style, some of the wording, grammar, and even the facts are awkward, difficult to understand, and just wrong. Let me point this one out: From the Easter Proclamation: I like the mention that the wax of the candle is the "work of bees and your servant's hands" it goes on to say that "it is fed by melting wax, drawn out by mother bees." The only "mother bees" are the queen bees of the hive and they have nothing to do with the creation of the bee's wax. That work is done by the drone bees and worker bees, all of whom are male. No other female bees are found in the hive but the queen bee and her job is only to procreate and form the nexus of the colony. How unfortunate this mistake is, only adding to the criticism that the Church is woefully inadequate to talk about "the birds and the bees," so to speak. Prayers should be written so that they make complete sentences, and words that are comprehensible to the people should be inserted because when they don't understand what is being said.

Prevenient grace might be a great theological concept but who even knows what it means or how it relates to their life?

---

What was [Bishop] thinking? I just don't get it ...

---

What we have is not perfect, nor will there ever be 100% agreement on what is considered perfect! There is a noticeable improvement in the majority of the collects. The collects that remain in the Lit of Hours are a reminder that it was time for a change. Full disclosure: I do not often celebrate Mass in English nor pray the Office in that language.

---

When I went to [Country] and learned the breviary in [Language]. I regretted returning to the English later as it was so plain, perhaps banal and did not have the beauty of expression. The people who have translated these things (ICEL in the past) appear to have little talent for language.

---

When translating from the Latin text find someone who speaks American English for the USA and someone who speaks Australian English for them and someone who speaks the English of Great Britain and its colonies. One size doesn't fit all!

---

When you singing when I have stop to brief? Liturgical translation it is "0" Old was pastoral 100% bedder this is for linguistics users . [Name]

---

while adhering to the Original version there are some new additions from imagination please correct them. Most of the translation is good and appreciate.

---

While I am by and large happy with the change, there are a few items where the good intention of reverential language becomes unfamiliar and therefore counter-productive. But they are the exception and not the rule.

---

While I appreciate the attention to the musical settings and certain inclusions in the EP II, and EP III, inclusion of the alternative prayers, and the omission of the children's prayers (which I never thought were fitting) and the various options for sending forth the assembly, my biggest concern is the English phrasing itself. The cadence of the English simply does not flow and no matter how much I practice the prayers ahead of time, the words are simply clumsy.

---

While I do not like the new translation, I do not think it "urgently needs to be revised." We do not need to go through another revision. Furthermore, there's no way of knowing that another revision would be any better. The new text is quite difficult to read. The sentences are too long. Even as the one doing the reading, it is hard to maintain a train of thought. The text is convoluted and wordy.

---

While I think, in general, that the new translation is an improvement, it badly needs another revision, this time paying more attention to how it reads aloud. Some of those collects are next to impossible to pray with any hope that the faithful are catching the intent. I appreciate the faithfulness to the Latin form but, please! Why is it considered such a sin to break a thought into two sentences so that it can make sense in English? Sacrificing intelligibility for the form of a long-dead language is just absurd.

---

While some of the changes in the Eucharistic prayers and other texts are good, the syntax and vocabulary are awkward. I would like to see both reverence and a greater ease of comprehension in future liturgical texts.

---

While the prayers of the Sacramentary could have used some work to more adequately express the truths of faith, the current translation is not a step forward since it does not flow smoothly or use common language or poetic language or rhythms to engage the Assembly

---

While the previous translation did need updating the current translation is not what we needed. The current translation illustrates the catastrophe that is liturgiam authenticam and proves once for all that comme le prevoit is the penultimate church document on translation for the ages. As pope francis said why are we afraid of the direction of the spirit? It is forward not backward.

---

While the translation may be more faithful to Latin, it is clumsy and, often, bad English. Translations should clarify not obscure. Commons are slightly better than Propers. One has the impression the Propers were rushed through at the last minute.

---

While the words of New Missal might be a faithful translation of the Latin language, they are horribly painful to hear in the English language. If a student were to turn in a paper using this sort of grandiloquence, he or she would be told to rewrite the paper. Sometimes I pray the collects, and I have no idea what we are praying for. I do like the new translations of the Eucharistic prayers and the collects for the newly canonized saints. Overall, though, the new Missal is a disappointment. If the goal was to inspire greater reverence in the liturgy, I don't believe it has accomplished that. It has created greater confusion.

---

While there are certain words and phrases that are unique to the Church and can be explained, I believe that the Church is quickly becoming irrelevant as a result of such formal jargon.

While we priests obviously use the Rites on a daily basis, it is not up to us to determine whether we like the translations or not, because the Pope, as guardian of unity (which includes liturgical celebration), has the right to mandate changes in the liturgy which aids in the worship of God and the edification of the people, even if priests are not in favor. While asking for input is a good practice in the understanding of reception, it seems odd to ask whether a priest likes a translation, as if that has any effect or bearing.

---

Who would inflict such conflict in words, tense, and gender on the faithful? Having viable language to mediate people's relationship to God is very important. The new missal reflects a very heavy-handed approach to translate literally from the Latin into English. It doesn't serve people's spiritually and is almost an insult on the way people can "speak" to God in ritual. This new Roman Missal has not helped in any ways.

---

Whoever did the English translation from the original Latin did not translate the missal in a way that allows for the English to flow. It is choppy, too many commas, a very cumbersome translation! It is much too literal a translation which did not take into consideration the way our prayers should flow like our normal, spoken English.

---

Why are we calling on all the choirs of angels at daily liturgies and not in our solemn celebrations of Sunday and principle solemnities/feasts?

---

Why are you asking these questions now? This should have been done 15 years ago.

---

Why be totally slavish to the Latin order of words? We're not that literal when it comes to the NABRE ... it even reads so much smoother ... easier on the ear, easier to pronounce. I have asked specific people to pay real close attention to the collect, and after Mass tell me what I prayed. No one. NO ONE even came close. Isn't it sad to say "Amen" to something the ear can't comprehend?

---

Why did "they" not listen to those who speak English? The syntax is "latin" therefore modifiers are often NOT place next to the word or ideas they intend to modify. Prayers are now more "theological STATEMENTS" than prayerx I don't speak to God / prayr by paroting old-theology! (some that are in fact heretical).

---

Why in the text under St. Pius V, pope, the text is "the fifth" and not "V"? Also, in the text for the feast of St. Martin I it states: "The first" and not "I"? Thank you.

---

Why introduce words that need a long explanation like: oblation, consubstantial, incarnate. Why take away the freedom for the celebrant to use his own phrases for the Lord have mercy; or introduction to Our Father, and dismissal.

---

Why was it necessary to translate literally from Latin to English. It simply does not work. It makes for a bad translation.

---

With few exceptions...a long time effort and study was undertaken for the sake of an English translation more in tune with the Latin transcript. While certain phrases and literary/ Biblical images in the new translation are indeed inspiring, overall most prayers and prefaces are dry, too theological in some instances and causes a distraction rather than a deeper comprehension to this most sublime communal worship which is the Holy Eucharist. Overall I am disappointed with the new translation....I see no reason why the beauty and language customs of local national cultures had to be sacrificed for the cause of exactness to the Latin text. However I want to make it clear that I indeed believe and embrace the need for greater reverence, participation and Biblical richness in the Liturgy, I just think that too much time was spent in Curia offices translating and adjusting...at the expense of having as a priority the pastoral reality of our people, the richness of culture and, quite frankly, putting emphasis in the need for liturgical renewal among the priests for, lets face it, no matter what translation is used, the faith, style, prayerfulness and animation of he who presides makes all the difference in the end.

---

With people of all different age grouping and educational and cultural experience, let alone people of multi-cultural, multi-lingual parishes, elegance of language in wording that is anachronistic does not help the prayer life of the people. For the priest presider, phrasing of long convoluted prayers only leads to stumbling over the words and ultimately, in place of more profound understanding, real mis-understandings. The effort to increase the variety and number of different orations has seemed to only lead to greater obscurity in thoughts being expressed in these new orations. One would seriously wonder if the prayers and the language in general of the new Roman Missal was verbally experienced aloud before approval or only studied and reviewed as written on paper. Overall, the new missal seems to distance the people from the mass and from the prayer that it is meant to engage them in.

---

Wording in the New Translation is not useful, doesn't take people to God if it's not understood in the first place. Priests were told it would flow easier; however, I find it more choppy than the previous translation.

---

Words like "laud" are hard to pronounce and are not the language we use; and it's more difficult to be "at

prayer” with the new translation.

---

Would like to have seen this translation back in 1975 [phrase removed]. It even deepens my spirituality and priestly vocation.

---

Years of fuss about getting ready for it. The first anniversary came & who celebrated it? It’s an awful, intimidating book. I agree the need for noble language, yes, but the Missal’s vocabulary & sentence structure are cumbersome, unintelligible. If submitted to a professor of English, I dare say it would get an “F.” How will anyone grasp the mysteries of salvation using that lofty gibberish? I predict a century from now, we’ll return to the previous translation.

---

Your questions did not allow me to fully express my views; so here goes: 1)Overall I like the approach of the new English Missal. I think there was a big mistake, however, in the translation. I agree the new translation needed to be more faithful to the original Latin. However, the syntax of Latin is different from the syntax of English. I feel that the translators could have been faithful to the Latin, but in a way that respects the syntax of English. 2)While some of the translation is fine, a lot of it is just plain klutzy. I serve in a parish that is predominately working class, and I just do not see the new translation connecting with them. Personally I hope we will see a revision of the the revision, not just of the Missal, but also of the Bible translations we use at Mass. I would like to see a general invitation extended to priests to send in complaints and suggestions to an open-minded commission whose job it is to come up with a new translation that is faithful, but also relates to regular people. Here is one example I have in mind: In the Preface of Holy Pastors one line states: “teach us by his words of preaching.” I would think it would sound better if the line said something like, “instruct us by his words of preaching” ...or even better, “instruct us by his preaching.” Or in Preface E of Holy Martyrs there is the line, “and on the feeble bestow strength to bear you witness.” How about something like, “and to the weak you give strength to bear you witness”?