Peter M. Farrugia[1]

A Critical Perspective of Liturgical Translation in the Vernacular

Ressourcement: Returning to the Source

Defined by poet Charles Péguy as "an overtaking of depth, an investigation into deeper sources, a return to the source in the literal sense,"[2] ressourcement was at the heart of the Second Vatican Council's journey into liturgy. Freeing liturgical discourse from the stultifying implications of a "baroque theology"[3] where processes of metaphysical self-reference had "volatized [God] into simulacra,"[4] ressourcement promised a coherent foundation upon which the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy *Sacrosanctum Concilium* (1963) could be built. In order to affect this shift away from purely formal representation, the Liturgical Movement in the twentieth century undertook a reevaluation of Catholic ritual and an exploration of the liturgy's radically Christological identity.

Ressourcement methodology encouraged just such a creative return to early Christian texts, approached as a hermeneutical key to unlock "new rooms in the

---

[1] Peter Farrugia is a graduate of the University of Malta, George Mason University, and the University of Cambridge. He is consultant to the Office of the President of the Republic of Malta for intercultural dialogue and peace-building among faith communities.

[2] Nicholas J. Healy, Jr., "Evangelical Ressourcement,*" First Things* 213 (2011): 56.

[3] Yves Congar and Marie-Dominique Chenu coined the phrase in reference to the theology that had dominated Catholic ecclesiology since the Reformation. Theology was approached as a deductive logical exercise, with an emphasis on submission to authority and a Church ostensibly conceived of in juridico-canonical, hierarchical terms alone.

[4] Mark Poster, *Jean Baudrillard: Selected Writings* (Stanford: University Press, 1988), 166-184.

treasure house of tradition."[5] These would be integral to restoring the communal dynamics of ritual and subsequent attempts at rediscovering the liturgical expressions of pioneer Christian communities. It is no surprise that the use of vernacular languages was highlighted throughout the Council, emblematic of the drive for liturgical reform and a direct, uncomplicated intimacy with the liturgy.

This focus on a renewed approach to the liturgy was shared by two major perspectives within the predominant 'Nouvelle Théologie' of the period - "neo-Augustinians (Daniélou, de Lubac, Ratzinger, von Balthasar) and neo-Thomists (Chenu, Congar, Rahner, Lonergan, Schillebeeckx)."[6] The neo-Augustinian school's deep-rooted concern for a fundamental disunity between the Church and the world (where any "openness to the world would be 'naïve optimism'")[7] contrasted with "a new 'progressive' group focused on a re-interpretation of classical Thomism, counselling openness to the world"[8] in order to engage with modern philosophical and social innovations, in much the same way "Thomas [Aquinas] had done with Aristotle in the thirteenth century."[9]

Neo-Augustinians and Neo-Thomists came together in a mutual vision of the Church's privileged participation by grace in the worship offered by the Son, explored (particularly since the Second Vatican Council) via a *complexus* of sensuous material "demonstrative of the present invisible sacred realities,"[10] and pointing to the liturgy as an earthly manifestation of a graced world through multimodal semiotic systems[11] conditioned by both culture and history.

What is most important in terms of the Council, and its impact on the liturgy, is that both these theological anthropologies, overcoming apparent dialectical opposition, were united to declare a single vision for the Church and a new model for understanding the unitive potential of liturgical utterances. This was concretized in *Gaudium et Spes* (and *Dignitatis Humanae*), promulgated on the

---

[5]   Marcellino D'Ambrosio, "Ressourcement Theology, Aggiornamento, and the Hermeneutics of Tradition," *Communio* 18 (1991): 530–55.

[6]   Massimo Faggioli, *True Reform Liturgy and Ecclesiology in Sacrosanctum Concilium* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2012), 56.

[7]   Ormund Rush, *Still Interpreting Vatican II: Some Hermeneutical Principles* (New Jersey: Paulist Press, 2004), 15.

[8]   Ibid. 16.

[9]   Massimo Faggioli, *Vatican II: The Battle for Meaning* (New Jersey: Paulist Press, 2012).

[10]   Cipriano Vagaggini, *Theological Dimensions of the Liturgy* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1976), 74.

[11]   Liturgical acts necessarily incorporate linguistic, visual, audio, gestural and spatial systems within ritual.

last day of the last session of the Council, 7 December 1965. The documents highlight a newfound sense of Christian confidence in dialogue between the world and the Church, striving for a revitalising closeness to the ancient liturgical traditions of early Christianity.

This would be achieved by establishing ressourcement (the spirit of Nouvelle Théologie) in the Catholic consciousness, a point of continuity with the Church Fathers and a hermeneutic of renewal in theological study and liturgical practice. The new "ressourced liturgy" reset the cultural and ideological praxis of Catholicism in contemporary life and informed the drafting of *Gaudium et Spes* in particular. Not only was the document's focus on the relationship between the Catholic Church and the modern world ground-breaking, it was drafted organically within the ongoing Council (while Pope John XXIII, deathly ill, watched the proceedings on closed circuit television) and not as a result of any preparatory schemata.

Just as one of the last documents to be promulgated by the Council contained a strong message of ressourcement, so did one of the "first fruits which the Second Vatican Council [began] to offer to the world,"[12] in *De Sacra Liturgia, On General Principles for Reforming and Fostering the Liturgy*. This schema would develop into *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, described positively by Congar as "meeting the standards of ressourcement."[13] It received "a favourable judgment that was, remarkably, virtually unanimous"[14] from the Council Fathers, announcing a new phase in the "spiritual and pastoral life of the Church."[15]

The text of the schema's article 36.2, substantially retained in the constitution's final draft, already makes clear that "the use of the vernacular very often can be very helpful to the people in Holy Mass… [thus] a larger role is conceded to the vernacular"[16] as a principle of fundamental importance. Father Vagaggini, the liturgist appointed by Pope John XXIII to assist with the formulation of *Sacrosanctum Concilium* along with catechist Josef Jungmann and philosopher Philippe Capelle, wrote, "It is noteworthy that this question [of the vernacular] was the most discussed in all the debate on the liturgy … The Second Vatican

---

[12] Cipriano Vagaggini, *L'Osservatore Romano*, 8 December 1963. See https://vaticaniiat50. wordpress.com/2012/12/10/father-vagagginis-article-on-liturgy-document.

[13] Yves Congar, *Mon Journal du Concile* I, 2 volumes (Paris: Cerf, 2002), entry of August 5-6, 1962, "Le texte sur la liturgie est bon; il est beaucoup plus au niveau du ressourcement actuel."

[14] Ibid.

[15] Ibid.

[16] *De Sacra Liturgia*, 36.2.

Council, officially introducing bilingualism into the life of the Latin liturgy, takes a memorable stride in history."[17]

In response to these momentous changes, the International Commission on English in the Liturgy (ICEL) was formed in 1963[18] during the ongoing Council, as a mixed commission with representative Catholic Bishops' Conferences from all major English speaking countries. The purpose of the Commission was, and remains, the preparation of liturgical translations out of Latin in accordance with the teachings expressed by *Sacrosanctum Concilium*: "Respecting [the] norms and also, where applicable, consulting the bishops of nearby territories of the same language, the [Bishops' Conference] is empowered to decide whether and to what extent the vernacular is to be used."[19] Structures for enabling these processes of translation soon emerged, and by 1983 these were reflected in Canon Law.[20]

Comme le prévoit: Dynamic Equivalence

The Bishops' Conferences were able to implement the aspirations of the Council Fathers by working together in ICEL, cooperating on a shared translation of the liturgy as the expression of a single "literary and linguistic heritage"[21] while retaining sensitivity to the complexities of such a far-reaching project. Immediately following the Council, the Holy See pushed for provisions to be made for the creation of one translation in each vernacular, designed to reflect the ideology set out in the charter for translation known by its French title *Comme le prévoit*,[22] issued by the Consilium for Implementing the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy[23] on 25 January 1969.

---

[17] Cipriano Vagaggini*, L'Osservatore Romano*, 8 December 1963.

[18] The Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments officially formed ICEL as a mixed commission in 2003, as per *Liturgiam authenticam*.

[19] *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 36.

[20] "It is the prerogative of the Apostolic See to regulate the sacred liturgy of the universal Church, to publish liturgical books and review their vernacular translations, and to be watchful that liturgical regulations are everywhere faithfully observed ... It pertains to Episcopal Conferences to prepare vernacular translations of liturgical books, with appropriate adaptations as allowed by the books themselves and, with the prior review of the Holy See, to publish these translations" (CCL 838).

[21] Tom Elich, *Liturgical Translation at a Crossroads*, http://compassreview.org/summer02/6.html.

[22] Tellingly, the document was written in French and subsequently issued in six major languages. A Latin version was never prepared.

[23] The Consilium was established in 1964, before being merged with the Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship in May 1969.

Comme le prévoit established the prevailing method of translation implemented by ICEL and equivalent commissions, declaring, "It is not sufficient that a liturgical translation merely reproduce the expressions and ideas of the original text. Rather it must faithfully communicate to a given people, and in their own language, that which the Church by means of this given text originally intended to communicate to another people in another time."[24] In proposing this principle, *Comme le prévoit* defined the method of dynamic equivalence (although the term itself is conspicuously absent in the document) as applicable to all liturgical translations.

Both the first and second English editions of the Roman Missal followed this principle of dynamic equivalence, a methodology developed from the work of Eugene Nida in the fields of translation theory and linguistics. Nida's application of the semantic domain concept in Biblical translation remains particularly relevant,[25] where a contextual semantic domain corresponds to what cognitive linguistics describes as a cognitive context, focused on the syntagmatic relationship between a specific lexical item and other lexical items used in the same cognitive framework. [26] This is distinct from lexical semantic domains where the focus rests on paradigmatic relationships between lexical items and other members of its same category.

Therefore biblical (and liturgical) translators working within dynamic equivalence as proposed by Nida derive a substantial portion of the meaning of particular words from the context in which those words are generally used, determining what meaning best resonates with a specific verse by critically observing various uses applied elsewhere in Scripture and related texts.[27] These concepts were endorsed by *Comme le prévoit* and brought to bear upon the earlier English editions of the missal, shaped with attentiveness to English language style, idiomatic usage and colloquialisms.

It is important to recognise the contribution of the "father of modern linguistics"[28] Noam Chomsky, whose work (in relation to Nida and Nida's influence on *Comme le prévoit*) also merits a closer look. The theoretics of

---

[24] *Comme le prévoit,* 1.6.

[25] Philip Stine, *Let the Words Be Written: The Lasting Influence of Eugene A. Nida* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005).

[26] This is discussed in Comme le prévoit (CLP) Section 1, article 12.

[27] Nida's (along with Johannes P. Louw) *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains* (New York: United Bible Societies, 1988) applies this theory, and is considered a standard lexicon for New Testament word studies.

[28] Thomas Tymoczko, Jim Henle and James M. Henle, *Sweet Reason: A Field Guide to Modern Logic* (New York: Springer, 2000), 101.

translation was significantly motivated in the 1960s by Chomsky's *Syntactic Structure* (1957) and *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax* (1965), alongside Nida's *Message and Mission* (1960) and *Toward a Science of Translation* (1964). Chomsky and Nida defend an integrated model of semantic-transformational translation[29] as an essential approach to translation theory.

It is interesting to observe that Nida's development of a science of translation in biblical studies was partly inspired by his distrust of the critical methodology that had been characteristic of the nineteenth century, "an emphasis on technical accuracy, an adherence to form, and a literal rendering of meaning."[30] This contrasts with the methods proposed by Chomsky and Nida - Chomsky attempts to demonstrate the existence of universal rules of grammar and universal lexical forms as the central object of the process of translation,[31] while Nida makes "metaphysical claims about an original divine message."[32] Language as understood by Chomsky and Nida in the 1960s is an ultimately "psychological phenomenon, organized in terms of mental properties"[33] with an implicit reliance on the intuitive discernment of others. What Chomsky brought to the field was an "elaborate model of formal linguistics"[34] capable of interpreting the rule-governed creativity of language as a system.[35]

The authors of *Comme le prévoit* follow this line of thinking when they propose that, "a liturgical text, inasmuch as it is a ritual sign, is a medium of spoken communication."[36] The sign is received by the senses and communicated as *mysterium* when formulated in a liturgical context. "By spoken words Christ

---

[29] The transformational model affirms that every language has areas of equivalence to other languages, and the translator works upon these nuclear structures by transforming them into equivalent nuclear structures that can be synthesized within the translated text.

[30] Huaizhou Mao, Yingling Gu and Ming Liang, "Commentary on Nida vs. Chomsky's Translation Theories," *Theory and Practice in Language Studies* 2/6 (June 2012): 1285-1290.

[31] Chomsky's general theory of universal grammar proposes a common and innate mental sub-structure that "generates" language. Chomsky considers these "deep structures" common to all languages.

[32] Mao, Gu and Liang, "Commentary on Nida vs Chomsky's Translation Theories."

[33] Anthony Giddens and Jonathan Turner, *Social Theory Today, Giddens, Structuralism, Poststructuralism and the Production of Culture* (Stanford: University Press, 1987), 197.

[34] Ibid.

[35] Noam Chomsky, "Current Issues in Linguistic Theory," in *The Structure of Language: Readings in the Philosophy of Language*, eds. Jerry A. Fodor and Jerrold. J. Katz (Englewood Cliffs, NJ : Prentice-Hall, 1964), 50-118.

[36] *CLP*, 1.5.

himself speaks to his people and the people, through the Spirit in the Church, answer their Lord."[37]

The text continues, "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."[38]

The process of liturgical translation championed by *Comme le prévoit* aims at discovering relationships between the global context of a text (historical, cultural, doctrinal and literary) and the reformulation of the text into a new embodiment in the receptor language, directly relevant to the needs of the receiving individual. An effective translation is thus capable of expressing content through the quality of equivalence, and is "able to produce in the audience of the receptor language the same effect as the source language has on its original audience. In short, it achieves the same purpose as the original text."[39]

Comme le prévoit is explicit in stating the shortcomings of formulae (passed on from some other historical period or geographical location) when translated literally, because ecclesial prayer is by its very nature the prayer of an actual and living community with its own particular history. For this reason, liturgical translators must work carefully[40] to ensure that each translation suits the intimate prayer of the assembly in which each believer articulates his/her own spirituality. To reflect this, the document states that translations "from another language are clearly not sufficient for the celebration of a fully renewed liturgy. The creation of new texts will be necessary."[41]

It was through the agency of Nida and Chomsky's metaphysics of translation, and efforts at returning to the source of Christian liturgical life (as originally experienced in an immediately understood vernacular by a participatory community), that *Comme le prévoit* interpreted the Second Vatican Council's desire to engage the world in heartfelt dialogue. "The accuracy and value of a

---

[37] Ibid.
[38] *CLP*, 1.7-8.
[39] Anscar J. Chupungco, "The Translation of Liturgical Texts," in *Handbook for Liturgical Studies: Introduction to the Liturgy*, ed. Anscar Chupungco (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1997), 389.
[40] *CLP*, 20-21.
[41] *CLP*, 43.

translation can only be assessed in terms of the purpose of the communication"[42] which is to say the truthfulness of a translation is only reflected in the inward reception of the liturgical reality. *Comme le prévoit* sought to explore this relationship through a method of dynamic equivalence, emphasising fluent communication and immediate accessibility of meaning.

In the atmosphere of intellectual excitement at the end of the 1960s, *Comme le prévoit*'s pressing message was received with open arms. It upset existing standards of liturgical translation in favour of experimental processes, and instituted a liberating message of theoretical innovation. The document opened textual meaning to a method of re-reading that aimed at developing liturgical texts specific to individual cultural orientations. The translator's intervention, always evaluative and containing both conscious and unconscious choices,[43] was everywhere motivated by the call to discover "God's word in Man's language."[44] However, *Comme le prévoit* would not be the foundational document for the twenty-first century translation of the Mass.

Liturgiam Authenticam: A Formal Focus

On the first Sunday of Advent 2011, the Church in all English speaking regions began using a new translation. Formed by ICEL working in union with the Vox Clara committee, this translation implemented the programme of change laid out in the instruction *Liturgiam Authenticam* (2001) as more closely grounded in the Latin text of the third *editio typica* of the missal. One year later, a preliminary study conducted by Georgetown University, USA, found that 70 percent of self-identified adult Catholics agreed with the statement, "Overall, I think the new translation of the Mass is a good thing."[45]

Explaining this journey towards ever more comprehensive liturgical communication in the vernacular, Jeremy Driscoll, Benedictine monk and member of Vox Clara, concluded, "The decision at Vatican II to move from Latin to the vernacular was a great decision... But 40 years down the road, there (were) quite a lot of differences between the original Latin and the translations."[46] ICEL

---

[42] *CLP*, 14.

[43] Jeremy Munday, *Evaluation in Translation: Critical Points of Translator Decision Making* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2012), 20.

[44] The title of Nida's 1952 introduction to the history and theory of Biblical translation.

[45] Michelle Bauman, "Catholics Strongly Support New Mass Translation After First Year," *Catholic News Agency*, 30 November 2012.

[46] Nancy Haught, "New English Translation Alters Familiar Language of the Catholic Mass," *The Oregonian*, 29 January 2011.

and Vox Clara sought to address these differences under the aegis of *Liturgiam Authenticam*.

Initial responses to *Liturgiam Authenticam* were varied and revealing. Some commentators expressed anxiety over a perceived political agenda behind the new Instruction's replacement of *Comme le prévoit*, while others celebrated its role in encouraging effective and formal translation as a core feature in the transmission of Catholic doctrine. Those who believed the former said it struck "at the heart of Vatican II ecclesiology by centralizing power in the Curia and by insisting that local cultures adopt an essentially Roman style of worship,"[47] while supporters received the document as "a direct, organic development of the vision of the Council Fathers."[48]

There can be no doubt that ecclesial paradigms of authority changed dramatically following the Second Vatican Council. The cultural reconfiguration undergone by society at large led to troubling questions over "who or what (was) to be used as the arbiter of correct belief, action, and control."[49] Claims of authority became increasingly rooted in personalist and pluralistic forms of expression, distanced from hierarchical structures of traditional teaching. Phyllis Tickle defines these new shapes of authority as driven by *orthonomy*, relational harmony and *orthoparadoxy*, dissolved dichotomies. The new authority becomes the perception of harmonious beauty, in itself a means of influence, where "the employment of aesthetic or harmonic purity [is] a tool for discerning the truth.[50]

This changing paradigm impacted ways of undertaking liturgical translation. The 1990s' disagreements over liturgical intent (between ICEL and the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments) are a case in point, while the most common arguments posited by critics of the current translation are primarily aesthetic, in reaction to a translation "which some have welcomed as 'poetic' and others criticize as 'clunky and archaic.'"[51] If Christians are to discern truth in the holiness of beauty, "sorting through their beliefs as they greet Christian theology and doctrine in the liturgy,"[52] the responsibility

---

[47] John L. Allen, "New Document Replaces 35 Years of Liturgy Work - *Liturgiam Authenticam*, A Power Grab or Fulfillment of Vatican II Vision?," *National Catholic Reporter*, 25 May 2001.

[48] Ibid.

[49] Phyllis Tickle, *The Great Emergence - How Christianity is Changing and Why* (Ada: Imprint Baker Books, 2008), 45.

[50] Ibid.

[51] Roland Flamini, "Mass Confusion: Catholics Adjusting to New Translation of the Liturgy," *The Washington Times* 29 (22 December 2011).

[52] Mary Gray-Reeves, Michael Perham, *The Hospitality of God: Emerging Worship for a Missional Church* (London: Seabury Books, 2011).

of translators is considerably magnified. The Church is on a journey to develop "a Christian theology in the light of [a theological aesthetics], that is to say: to complement the vision of the true and the good with that of the beautiful (*pulchrum*)."[53]

At the heart of disputes over an aesthetics of liturgical translation rests a deeper concern as to what constitutes authentic belief. The theoretical questions prompted by *Sacrosanctum Concilium* and explored in *Comme le prévoit* ask whether a praxis of logocentric interpretation can indeed be fruitfully applied to the liturgy of the Roman Church. This was certainly part of Nida's plan for dynamic equivalence in practice,[54] combined with a phonocentric imperative acknowledging "the power of speech, which animates the extraordinary power of the word."[55]

Logocentrism becomes a double-edged sword, whereby texts and signifying systems generate "a desire for a direct, unmediated, given hold on meaning, being and knowledge"[56] that goes necessarily unfulfilled - speech is the original signifier of meaning, and the written word is confronted by the spoken word. It is this access to and control over conceptual, significatory identity that typifies the logocentric desire to know "the phenomenal world, and oneself as a conscious subject."[57]

Escaping the essentially polarizing structure of logocentrism[58] is the key message of *Liturgiam Authenticam*, by an attempt at reorienting the translation of liturgical texts in order to evade the objectification and erasure of the subject and recover a "liturgical negotiation of identity"[59] in a journey of openness, crucial to the restoration of the subject. Only then can the liturgical text "join the eternal divine text of the Logos which is nonetheless a book perpetually uttered by the Father, uttered as writing, only to re-expire in the out-breathing of the Spirit."[60]

---

[53] Hans Urs Von Balthasar, *The Glory of the Lord*: Vol 1, trans. Fessio and Riches (Edinburgh: T&T Clark,1982), 9.

[54] Karl Simms, *Translating Sensitive Texts* (Amsterdam - Atlanta: Rodopi, 1997), 9.

[55] Ibid.

[56] Elizabeth Gross, "Derrida and the Limits of philosophy," *Thesis Eleven* 14/1 (1986): 26-27.

[57] Ibid.

[58] Constructing a binary system where an *other* must exist against which the privileged term distinguishes itself to ensure its identity. For example, presence and the category of absence, non-being, non-existence.

[59] Catherine Pickstock, *After Writing: On the Liturgical Cosummation of Philosophy* (Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell, 1997), 199.

[60] Ibid., 216.

Befriending the Texts

At their core, both *Comme le prévoit* and *Liturgiam Authenticam* encourage the liturgical translator to attempt a delicate process of interpreting the out-coming manifestation of divine reality in the liturgical celebration[61] and the believers' in-coming apprehension of something wholly *Other*. In doing so, the tension between subject (where the subject's founding gesture is of voluntary subjection) and object (most radically, "that which disturbs the smooth run of things"),[62] at the heart of the twenty-first century's anxieties of consumption, is subsumed into the theological assertion that "*nothing* is one's own, but rather everything, life and death alike, arrive not as possessions but gifts."[63]

What occurs when we "do" the liturgy is therefore a gifted rupture in being, through which the subject is realized and reconciled with the Logos, Truth. This event[64] opens a path towards the emergence, in Christ, of "the perfect achievement of our reconciliation,"[65] and by this dynamism (in which we are fully participatory and not the mere discoverers of ready-made objects) "the fullness of divine worship [is] given to us."[66] This is a central feature of the ressourcement approach to liturgical action, explored in both Instructions. It is the consummation of a movement of desire beyond desire, Saint Paul's imperative to know and love what cannot be known and we dare not love, against hope believing in hope.

The idea behind such an approach to the liturgy is metanoetic[67] and transformative, creative and re-creative. The performative encounter occurs within the opening created by the liturgical moment, where the text itself constitutes the "very border of the Holy of Holies, and then, having abandoned the utility of language, [the believer] tangentially 'senses' the Beloved"[68] and undergoes a transformation into a diastemic refiguring of the *mysterium* itself.

---

[61] *Cathecism of the Catholic Church*, 1326.

[62] Slavoj Zizek, *The Parallax View* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2009), 17.

[63] Pickstock, *After Writing*, 111.

[64] Badiou's *événement*.

[65] Leo Cunibert Mohlberg, *Sacramentarium Veronense* (Rome: Herder, 1966), n.1265 cf. also n.1241, 1248.

[66] Ibid.

[67] A term coined by Hajime Tanabe in his *Philosophy as Metanoetics* (translated in 1987), to describe a situation where the awareness of Kantian radical evil as a result of a crisis of reason initiates further crisis, and the opportunity for salvific metanoia.

[68] Scot Douglass, *Theology of the Gap* (New York et al.: Peter Lang, 2005) 247.

Language becomes the vehicle of connection across this vacancy, between oneself, others, and God - the human activity of language expresses the desire to transcend the alienation of distance and the longing to know as well as be known. The human creature's attempts at effective communication are a method of negotiating the space between words and the reality behind them, bridging the distance between speaker and listener. Despite language, the deepest knowledge remains unknown and the liturgical utterance is painfully necessary because "the object of [God's] love is bound in language."[69]

The recovery of linguistic features inherent in the Latin text is principally what the new translation set out to achieve, on a mission to restore the relationship with transcendental beauty that was somehow hidden in a blurring of "our constitutive, positive, and analogical distance from God"[70] by the previous translations. For example, forms of repetition occur throughout the Extraordinary Form yet these were identified by early translators/reformers with decadent, late accretions rather than acknowledged as integral elements. Rather than effecting a fullness of liturgy, incorporating the re-beginnings "endlessly postponed"[71] in anticipation of eschatological consummation, the liturgy produced under *Comme le prévoit* focused on the image of a primitive meal that had supposedly been obscured in the Roman Rite's layered text.

Conclusion

In conclusion, there is thus a palpable necessity to continue promoting processes of befriending between the orientations described in *Comme le prévoit* and *Liturgiam Authenticam,* rather than perpetuating false oppositions. It is clear that these texts have vital messages for one another, and for us. Indeed, each document complements (substantially "completing") the other, with their different focuses on the purpose of liturgical translation, but mutual commitment to the centrality of worship as a gifted moment of grace between the individual and the community, and community members with God.

These texts make it clear that liturgy's logic is not a linear progression of inexorable cause and effect, but rather, follows an apophatic trajectory with an inherently ambiguous destination. Paradoxically, the journey toward the liturgical destination of God's presence requires us to "seek a purity that is impossible (and yet is always already given) and we must struggle (through repetitious starts,

---

[69] Ibid., 67.

[70] Pickstock, *After Writing: On the Liturgical Cosummation of Philosophy*, 173.

[71] Ibid.

stops, backslidings and recommencements) towards a place where we've already arrived."[72] It is a redefining of this complex liturgical character, assumed by the celebrant and congregation, that *Liturgiam Authenticam* seeks to achieve while still working in the medium of the Paul VI Missal.

The freedoms of *Comme le prévoit* benefit from the corrective catholicity of the liturgy, and orthodoxy of doctrine, which are contained in *Liturgiam authenticam*. What is potentially most mystical in understanding *Comme le prévoit* is also most vulnerable, because of its emphasis on individual intelligibility. The individual is introduced within the corporate act of communal worship, creating possibilities of sacred friendship, patterned on the likeness of Christ himself.

For this reason, modifications to the third edition of the *General Instructions to the Missal* are part of an ongoing process of review, loyal to the Council's theological vision and not yet fully realised in the liturgy. This journey of liturgical renewal is in organic continuity with the Second Vatican Council's desire to bring the Mass into ever-greater contact with the people of God by means of translation in the vernacular. By centring all actions on Christ in the pursuit of relational harmony, the Mass is continually renewed, "(drawing) the faithful into the compelling love of Christ"[73] through whom "grace is poured forth upon us; and the sanctification of men in Christ and the glorification of God, to which all other activities of the Church are directed as toward their end, is achieved in the most efficacious possible way."[74]

Peter M. Farrugia
33, Lower St Albert Street
Gzira
Malta

peter.farrugia@cantab.net

---

[72] Nathan Mitchell, *Real Presence: The Work of Eucharist: Nathan Mitchell* (Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications, 2007), 133.

[73] *SC* 10.

[74] *SC* 10.