

philippine studies

Ateneo de Manila University • Loyola Heights, Quezon City • 1108 Philippines

Aklat ng Pagmimisa sa Roma: A Critique

Sabino Vengco

Philippine Studies vol. 31, no. 2 (1983) 253–271

Copyright © Ateneo de Manila University

Philippine Studies is published by the Ateneo de Manila University. Contents may not be copied or sent via email or other means to multiple sites and posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's written permission. Users may download and print articles for individual, noncommercial use only. However, unless prior permission has been obtained, you may not download an entire issue of a journal, or download multiple copies of articles.

Please contact the publisher for any further use of this work at philstudies@admu.edu.ph.

<http://www.philippinestudies.net>
Fri June 27 13:30:20 2008

Aklat ng Pagmimisa sa Roma: A Critique

SABINO A. VENGCO

AKLAT NG PAGMIMISA SA ROMA. Lupon para sa Wikang Tagalog sa Liturhiya, 1981. 1023 pages.

The new *Missale Romanum* was published in 1970. In March of 1975, the National Liturgical Commission's Regional Committee for Tagalog in the Liturgy started the project of translating the Roman Missal into Tagalog. The completed version was submitted to the Sacred Congregation for the Sacraments and the Divine Worship on 30 June 1981, for the needed confirmation, which was duly given on 8 August 1981. On 27 December 1981, the *Aklat ng Pagmimisa sa Roma* (ANPSR) came to be in force as the official Tagalog translation of the Roman Missal. This much awaited sacramentary in Tagalog has been received with objections and strong criticisms, particularly by members of the clergy. So much so that Cardinal Sin issued an instruction on 20 February 1982, to the Archdiocesan Liturgical Commission of Manila that the *Aklat ng Pagmimisa sa Roma* (hereafter ANPSR) is not obligatory in the archdiocese until the questions that have arisen in connection with it are settled. Further studies are therefore imperative.

A thorough critical analysis of the ANPSR will cover the theological, the philological and the literary aspects of the translation. This article will focus on the first two aspects. The theological examination considers whether the affirmative quality of the translation's content corresponds with the intention of the original. Inseparable from the theological is the philological integrity, which rests on the formal, content-related correspondence between the translation and the text translated. Both the theological and the philological analyses are concerned with the translation's authenticity, material and formal, while the literary analysis would be more taken up by its linguistic bearer-function or communicability. By authenticity we do not mean a word for word equivalence, but the fidelity to the original meaning. The 1969 *Instruction on Translation of Liturgical Texts* (hereafter ITLT), issued by the Concilium for the Implementation of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, says as much when it states that a liturgical translation "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 place" (no. 6). Since its purpose is to proclaim the message of salvation to believers and to express the prayer of the Church, "the translator should give first consideration to the meaning of the communication" (no. 8), and follow the scientific methods of textual study "to discover the true meaning of a text" (no. 9). And even when prayers "may need to be rendered somewhat more freely," still this must be done "while conserving the original ideas" (no. 34).

In the first part of this review, we shall sample the ANPSR translation of the relatively short presidential prayers. For the second part, we shall examine the ANPSR in certain distinctive innovations it has introduced. Then we shall round up our study with corresponding conclusions.

TRANSLATION OF PRESIDENTIAL PRAYERS

The so-called presidential prayers (opening prayer, prayer over the gifts, prayer after communion) can be understood as summaries. Following the pause for personal prayer after the invitation "Let us pray," the celebrant then prays aloud in the name of the assembly. These prayers conclude the foregoing parts of the celebration (opening rites, preparation of the gifts, holy communion). They easily sound abstruse at times, being often succinct and pregnant with meaning. How have these prayers fared in the translation of the ANPSR? Let us make a representative probe. The opening formulae and the conclusions of the prayers shall be taken up later in the second part, since they are distinctive features of the ANPSR.

1. First Sunday of Advent: Opening Prayer

ROMAN MISSAL:

*Da, quaesumus, omnipotens
Deus, hanc tuis fidelibus
voluntatem, ut, Christo
tuo venienti iustis oper-
ibus occurrentes, eius
dexteræ sociati, regnum
mereantur possidere cae-
leste. Per Dominum.*

ANPSR (p. 125):

*Ama naming makapangyarihan,
bigyan mo kami ng paninindigang
tumahak sa landas ng kabutihan.
Sa pagdating ni Kristo
makasalubong nawa kaming may
mabubuting gawa
upang kapiling niya sa gawing kanan
kami ay makapisan sa iyong
pinaghaharian
sa pamamagitan niya kasama ng
Espiritu Santo
magpasawalang hanggan.*

a. "Paninindigang tumahak sa landas ng kabutihan" for "hanc voluntatem" is well advised, as also the non-translation of "quaesumus." But the "ut" of the original has been incorrectly valued. This is not just one of those

final clauses in Latin whose function is to avoid having another sentence. The "*voluntas*" (will) above is to enable the faithful to welcome Christ's coming with concrete deeds of love, so that (*ut*) they may be included in the reign of God. This spells out the program of the season of Advent. In the translation, no philological, i.e. syntactical, sign indicates such theological relationship. Instead we have two parallel and unconnected sentences. A simple *at nang sa gayon* could have conveyed this important stress of the original.

b. "*Kami ay makapisan sa iyong pinaghaharian*" is a rather weak rendition particularly for "*regnum caeleste*" (*heavenly Kingdom*). The adjective "*caeleste*" has been dropped in the Tagalog, thus sacrificing what the Latin explicitly presents as a perspective of the eschatological time: that "*Christo venienti*," the movement for all is toward the "*regnum caeleste*." There is a glorious finale in heaven to the story of Christ's coming.

c. This coming on the part of Christ connotes not only the parousia, but also the incarnation and his sacramental advent here and now. This multi-dimension of the Advent *anamnesis* in the liturgy is lost in the ANPSR, because the adjectival phrase "*eius dexterae sociati*," which is a clear reference to the last judgment (Mt 25:33), has been translated as if it were the immediate effect of welcoming Christ's coming with good deeds. Consequently only the end-time coming of Christ comes into play in the translation. His sacramental coming in the celebration of Christmas has been emptied. Actually the phrase is but a Christological explication in apocalyptic image of "*regnum caeleste possidere*." The English sacramentary and the German *Messbuch*, for instance, give the phrase that synonymous meaning. The ANPSR in a twist different from the original prays that we may meet Christ with good deeds (at the end of time), so that being with him at his right side we may be united with God where he reigns. The context of the season of Advent has disappeared.

2. Christmas Day at Dawn: Prayer over the Gifts

ROMAN MISSAL:

*Munera nostra, quaesumus,
Domine, nativitatis hodie-
nae mysteriis apta proveni-
ant, ut sicut homogenitus
idem prae-fulsit et Deus,
sic nobis haec terrena sub-
stantia conferat quod divini-
um est. Per Christum.*

ANPSR (p. 159);

*Ama naming Lumikha,
nawa'y mabagay sa aming pagdi-
riwang ang aming mga alay
upang ang pagka-Diyos mo ang
idulot nito
sa aming pakikinabang
sapagka't ito ay nasisinagan
ng Diyos na naging tao
at namamagitan kasama ng
Espiritu Santo
magpasawalang hanggan.*

a. "*Munera nostra proveniant nativitatis hodiernae mysteriis apta*" is inadequately rendered by "*nawa'y mabagay sa aming pagdiriwang ang aming mga alay*." The Latin text asks God's blessing on the earthly offerings, so that they may reflect the mystery of Christmas. "*Mabagay*" (to become harmonious or fit) is not exact. What is meant in the original is the sacramental transformation of the bread and wine into the body and blood of the God-Man. "*Nativitatis hodiernae mysteriis*" should be translated properly; "*pagdiriwang*" alone is too generic. The prayer's explicit reference to the day's great feast does not come through in the translation.

b. The precise meaning of the Latin text eluded the translation, as is obvious in the misappropriation of "*sicut homogenitus idem praefulsit et Deus*" as the reason for the hoped for divinity ("*pagka-Diyos*") from the offerings when they are received in holy communion. The appositional *sicut* clause is most surprisingly translated as "*sapagka't ito [ang aming mga alay] ay nasisinagan ng Diyos na naging tao*." This is a crass misinterpretation of the original *sicut-sic* Latin statement. First, the picture of the God-Man shining on the offerings and these in turn conferring divinity on communicants presents a primitive sacramentalism and a magical *theopoesis* that have no place in the liturgy. Secondly, this *ut* clause is an opposite example of what we have earlier seen above (1, a). It is primarily to serve the Latin oratorical *cursus*, one elegant sentence with subordinate clauses. And such Latinism is better not carried over into a translation (ITLT, no. 28). Actually this final clause unfolds what is meant in the principal clause. Thus, in explicating "*nativitatis hodiernae mysteriis*," the clause simply says that Christ the newborn man shines as true God. And so, just as the newly born is man and also God, the prayer asks that the earthly offerings of the Church may be enabled by God similarly to be instruments of divine life. This is how the "*munera nostra*" may reflect the mystery of Christmas. In a beautiful interplay in this *sicut-sic* statement is the typical *confessio* of the Church prayer radiating into a *supplicatio*. This is totally lost in the misinterpretation of the ANPSR.

c. The phrase "*ang pagka-Diyos mo ang idulot*" must be corrected. "*Quod divinum est*" in the original refers to divine life as shared, to grace, not to the *esse ipsum subsistens*.

d. "*Sa aming pakikinabang*" tacks too far from the Latin text, because "*haec terrena substantia*" simply means these offerings or this earthly food. By the introduced prolepsis the ANPSR has improperly turned the prayer into "a prayer before communion."

3. Mary, Mother of God (January 1): Prayer after Communion

ROMAN MISSAL:

*Sumpsimus, Domine, laeti
sacramenta caelestia: prae-*

ANPSR (p. 165):

*Ama naming mapagmahal,
loobin mong sa pagdiriwang namin*

*sta, quaesumus, ut ad vitam
nobis proficiant sempiternam,
qui beatam semper Virginem
Mariam Filii tui Genetricem
et Ecclesiae Matrem profi-
teri gloriamur. Per Christum.*

*sa dakilang kapistahan ng Mahal
na Ina
ng iyong Anak at ng iyong sambayanan
kaming nagsalu-salo sa piging
na banal
ay makapakinabang nawa sa iyong
buhay
sa pamamagitan ni Hesukristo
kasama ng Espiritu Santo magpa-
sawalang hanggan.*

a. What the Roman Missal gives in effect as three independent sentences, the ANPSR has awkwardly crammed into one. The first statement in the original is the grateful affirmation that the faithful have joyously received the holy sacrament. This is an explicit and principal part of a postcommunio, picking up once more the eucharistic leitmotif of the entire celebration. The translation threw it away by disregarding "*laeti*" and by reducing the sentence into a relative clause: "*kaming nagsalu-salo sa piging na banal.*"

b. The Latin "*qui beatam semper Virginem Mariam Filii tui Genetricem et Ecclesiae Matrem profiteri gloriamur*" is translated as "*sa pagdiriwang namin sa dakilang kapistahan ng Mahal na Ina ng iyong Anak at ng iyong sambayanan.*" The Tagalog missed the point of the original, which is in "*profiteri gloriamur.*" The feast is indeed a celebration, but this celebration in particular according to the mind of the Church is to proclaim the Virgin Mary as the Mother of God. Confessing Mary as the *Theotokos* is the finality of this feast. The translation unnecessarily omitted "*Virginem Mariam.*" We shall comment later in the second part over the rendition of "*ecclesia*" as "*sambayanan.*"

c. Where the Latin "*Filii tui Genetricem et Ecclesiae Matrem*" clearly distinguishes between the two Marian titles: Mother of God and Mother of the Church, the ANPSR lumped them together as "*Ina ng iyong Anak at ng iyong sambayanan.*" The explicit distinction in the original between the two models of motherhood has not been preserved in the ANPSR.

d. "*Makapakinabang nawa (kami) sa iyong buhay*" is a rather poor translation for "*ut ad vitam nobis proficiant sempiternam.*" The subject of "*proficiant*" is "*sacramenta caelestia.*" That is why, for example, both the official English and German versions expressly pray that the holy communion or sacrament may lead us to eternal life. The ANPSR set aside this meaning to focus on its own "*makapakinabang.*" This term is apparently an intended counterpoint to the foregoing "*nagsalu-salo,*" introducing into the prayer the idea of heavenly banquet. But the translation fell short of it and also of the original meaning because of the careless omission of "*sempiternam*" (eternal). *Makinabang sa iyong buhay* conceptually does not go beyond *magsalu-salo sa banal na piging*. Sacramental communion is a participation already now in the divine life. *Sempiternam* is what makes the difference.

4. Passion Sunday: Prayer over the Gifts

ROMAN MISSAL:

*Per Unigeniti tui passionem
placatio tua nobis, Domine,
sit propinqua, quam, etsi
nostris operibus non mere-
mur, interveniente sacri-
ficio singulari, tua perci-
piamus miseratione praeven-
ti. Per Christum.*

ANPSR (p. 239):

*Ama naming Lumikha,
pakundangan sa pagpapakasakit
ng iyong Bugtong na Anak
sumaamin nawa ang iyong pag-
papaunlak
na di makakamit ng tanging
aming pagganap
kundi ng paghahaing minsan la-
mang para sa lahat
na mula sa iyo'y pinakikinabangan
namin at tinatanggap
sa pamamagitan ni Hesuskristo
kasama ng Espiritu Santo
magpasawalang hanggan.*

a. "*Pagpapaunlak*" does not translate "*placatio*." This Latin term is coupled with "*miseratione*" below and means the divine goodness and mercy. "*Pagpapaunlak*" indicates mere allowance or sufferance with the connotation even of non-commitment. The prayer's specified forgiveness from God and reconciliation with him emanate from the divine commitment.

b. "*Mula sa iyo*" does not even give an inkling of the Latin "*tua miseratione praeveniti*." The stress in the original is explicitly on God's mercy. The twofold reference to it in Latin does not come out once in the Tagalog. In the context of the start of the Holy Week, this theme is rather central.

c. "*(Paghahain) na pinakikinabangan namin at tinatanggap*" is a derailment from the originally intended meaning. Where the Latin speaks of the unmerited divine mercy being made available to us through Christ's perfect sacrifice, the ANPSR wandered off with a relative clause about the once-for-all sacrifice (Heb. 7:27) which we are receiving from the Father and from which we are making profit. The direction here seems to have been lost: the sacrifice was originally to the Father from the Son and is now from the Son with us to the Father. But the translation speaks of the perfect sacrifice coming from the Father. Now it is true that Christ is from the Father, *a Patre*, and out of the goodness of the Father we are able to offer the sacrifice. But the sacrifice as such is to the Father, *ad Patrem*, from the entire *Corpus mysticum* of Christ.

Is the use of "*pinakikinabangan*" in this prayer supposed to be again an allusion to holy communion? "*Pakinabang*" has been an old Tagalog term for holy communion, underlining the reception of benefits (*pakinabang*). But precisely because of its original and primary utilitarian meaning, the word is of limited theological applicability. Its usage has definitely contributed to the

popular misconception that one goes to communion principally for one's own intentions or to get something out of it for one's own interest, material or spiritual. The ANPSR uses this word and its various forms with remarkable abandon especially in the prayers after communion, introducing it even when it has no basis in the original texts. Some forms of this word, like *pinakikibangan* above or *pakinabangan*, are so clearly oriented to profit or self interest that they ill-fit the Eucharist.

d. This one long, complicated ANPSR sentence has managed to outdo the Latin in long-windedness. Very obviously, it is even intentionally rhymed.¹ The choice of "*pagpapaunlak*" and the insertion of "*para sa lahat*" and "*tinatanggap*" are evidently influenced by that purpose: to make the lines rhyme. Unhappily, this has been at the expense of precision and of fidelity to the original meaning. The ITLT (n. 15) observes that "liturgical texts must sometimes possess a truly poetic quality, but this does not imply the use of specifically 'poetic diction'." Intentionally making Tagalog lines rhyme is working for a poetic diction. Tagalog is naturally poetic, but a pursuit of rhymes like that by the ANPSR introduces artificiality into the vernacular liturgical texts. Poetry is not the literary genre of the presidential prayers, nor is rhyme what makes a rhetorical style. In fact, no style helps, if the translation fails to transmit the original message.

ANPSR INNOVATIONS

Let us now take a look at some of the innovations adopted by the ANPSR in translating the Roman Missal. Attention shall be given to their logic and theological acceptability.

5. The Opening Formulae of the Presidential Prayers

All the presidential prayers in the ANPSR begin with the address "*Ama namin*," as our examples above show. According to the explanation given by the Regional Committee for Tagalog in the Liturgy, this is meant "to make all the prayers be recognized as patterned and derived from the 'Our Father.'"² The Our Father and the Eucharistic Prayer are said to "have a common basic outline derived from the Jewish Eighteen Benedictions," as established by G. Bahr and L. Bouyer. Thus the Our Father "can be considered as a shortened Eucharistic Prayer while the Eucharistic Prayer can be called an

1. See p. 11 of the ANSWER (hereafter ANS) submitted by the Regional Committee for Tagalog in the Liturgy to Jaime Cardinal Sin on 20 February 1982, as a reply to the initial criticisms against the ANPSR. These 154 pages of documentation and explanations have been prepared by Fr. Moises Andrade, translation project director, and approved by Archbishop Ricardo Vidal, coordinator of the regional committee.

2. Ibid., pp. 15, 17; also, M.B. Andrade, " 'Ama Namin' in Tagalog Daily Missal Explained," *Daily Express*, 9 January 1982, p. 13; R. Vidal, "Notes on the Tagalog Translation of the Roman Missal," *Notitiae* 191-92 (1982): 368-69.

elaboration of the Our Father." The presidential prayers in turn are said to be "either partial anticipations or specific replications of portions of the Eucharistic Prayer."

a. The above allegations do not hold together. First of all, it has not been established that the Our Father and the Eucharistic Prayer have a common basic outline derived from the Jewish Eighteen Benedictions. G. Bahr, who has been cited by the committee to support the claim that Our Father's outline originated from the Jewish prayer, merely made observations that "suggest that the primitive Church used the Lord's Prayer in exactly the same way as the contemporary synagogue used the Eighteen Benedictions."³ No one has ever proven that the outline of the Our Father was derived from the *Shemone Esre*, as the Jewish Eighteen Benedictions are called.⁴ Also, L. Bouyer, cited to support the derivation of the basic outline of the Eucharistic Prayer from the Jewish Eighteen Benedictions, although he voices the commonly accepted conclusion that the Eucharistic Prayer is basically patterned after the Jewish *berakot*, does not prove however that the outline of the former was derived from the *Shemone Esre* in particular.⁵ The connection of both the Our Father and the Eucharistic Prayer with the Jewish Eighteen Benedictions has been exaggerated in order to claim a linkage between the Our Father and the Eucharistic Prayer. There is a connection between the two, but not because of any common genetic link with the Jewish Eighteen Benedictions. J.A. Jungmann pointed out long ago that the first part of the Our Father is in a way a summary of the preceding Eucharistic Prayer.⁶

3. Gordon J. Bahr, "The Use of the Lord's Prayer in the Primitive Church," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 84 (1965): 159.

4. Points of similarities and contacts between the two are seen by experts. See Jakob Petuchowski, "Der Ketzersagen," in M. Brooke, W. Strolz, J.J. Petuchowski, eds., *Das Vaterunser. Gemeinsames im Beten von Juden und Christen* (Freiburg: Herder, 1974), p. 91; Anton Voegtle, "Das Vaterunser – ein Gebet fuer Juden und Christen?," *ibid.*, pp. 170-171. The Our Father has parallels too in the "Kaddish" prayer of the Jews: see Baruch Graubard, "Das 'Kaddisch'-Gebet," *ibid.*, p.104; Voegtle, "Das Vaterunser," pp. 169, 198. The English edition of this book is *The Lord's Prayer and Jewish Liturgy* (London: 1978). The Eighteen Benedictions had its *siddur* or arrangement only c.90 A.D. in Jamnia by Gamaliel II. See J. Petuchowski, "Das Achtzehn-Gebet," in Hans Hermann Henrix, ed., *Juedische Liturgie. Geschichte-Struktur-Wesen* (Freiburg: Herder, 1979), p. 85.

5. Louis Bouyer, *Eucharist: Theology and Spirituality of the Eucharistic Prayer* (Notre Dame University Press, 1968), pp. 227-43. See L. Bouyer, "Von der Juedischen zur christlichen Liturgie," *Internationale katholische Zeitschrift Communio* 7 (1978): 509-19. Also, in no way supporting the above claim of the regional committee is Louis Ligier, S.J., "Textus Liturgiae Iudaeorum," in Anton Haenggi and Irmgard Pahl, eds., *Præx Eucharistica* (Fribourg: Editions Universitaires Fribourg Suisse, 1968), pp. 40-54, cited by Vidal, "Notes," p. 369.

We can speak of roots in Judaism for our Christian liturgy, but not of outright derivation. See Hermann Reifenberg, "Der christliche Liturgiker vor dem juedischen Gottesdienst," in Henrix, *Juedische Liturgie*, pp. 141-42; S. Cavalletti, "Christian Liturgy – Its roots in Judaism," *Sidic* 6 (1973): 10-28.

6. Joseph Andreas Jungmann, S.J., *Missarum Sollemnia*, 5th ed. (Vienna: Herder, 1962), 2: 346.

Indeed the whole Eucharistic Prayer finds echoes in the Our Father.⁷ For as Tertullian himself already explained, the Lord's Prayer is a "*breviarium totius evangelii*."⁸

b. It is only *sensu lato* that the presidential prayers can be called anticipations or replications of portions of the Eucharistic Prayer. It is not the purpose of the opening prayer to anticipate the preface.⁹ Nor should the prayer over the gifts be an anticipation of the epiclesis or of the oblation after the consecration.¹⁰ The occasional proleptic terminology of this prayer is in fact a theological problem still in search of a satisfactory solution.¹¹ And the prayer after communion does not intend to reduplicate the epiclesis.¹² These are all parts of one organic celebration. But each has its own distinctive function, avoiding duplications and redundancy. They are connected to each other thematically, and they lead one to the other. To see anticipations and replications among them the way it has been claimed would be already eisegesis.

c. When closely examined, there is no theological and liturgico-historical basis to the thesis of the translation committee that the presidential prayers are patterned or derived from the Our Father. It is therefore very much the subjective wish only of the ANPSR to make the "*Ama namin*" as the opening formula for all the presidential prayers. And it is along this same subjectivism that, as we have seen in the examples in the first part, the ANPSR added to "*Ama namin*" the modifiers: i) "*makapangyarihan*" for all opening prayers for supposedly anticipating the preface; ii) "*Lumikha*" for all prayers over the gifts for allegedly anticipating the oblation or the epiclesis; and iii) "*mapagmahal*" for all prayers after communion for ostensibly reduplicating the epiclesis. In themselves there is nothing wrong with these formulae of divine appellation. They are not even exclusive of each other, nor particularly apt for the reasons brought forth for their introduction. But rigidly fixing them in all the presidential prayers is arbitrary and an unworthy imposition in an official liturgical book.

d. The unsound logic behind these innovations in the ANPSR is further revealed by the pastoral rationalization given for them. "Such peculiarities are intended to enable the participants in the Tagalog Mass [to] identify their most familiar memorized prayer with the various parts of the celebration so

7. Walter Duerig, "Das Vaterunser in der Messe," in T. Maas-Eward and K. Richter, eds., *Gemeinde im Herrenmahl* (Freiburg: Herder/Benziger, 1976), pp. 326-30.

8. Tertullian, *De oratione* 6 in *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* 20:185; *ibid.*, 18, in *CSEL* 20: 191.

9. See Jungmann, *Mis. Sol.*, 1:479-82; Helmut Buesse, "Das Tagesgebet als intergrierendes Element der Eröffnung," in *Gemeinde im Herrenmahl*, p. 226.

10. See Jungmann, *Mis. Sol.*, 2:117-19, 121-25; Rupert Berger, "Gabenbereitung und Gabengebet," in *Gemeinde im Herrenmahl*, pp. 269-70.

11. See Karl Amon, "Zur Sprache des neuen deutschen Messbuches," *Liturgisches Jahrbuch* 25 (1975):85; Berger, "Gabenbereitung," p. 270.

12. See Jungmann, *Mis. Sol.*, 2:521, 524.

that what the priest voices out in the name of the assembled faithful may be recognized as the prayer of each member of the gathering."¹³ Will the Tagalog Mass participants actually identify the various presidential prayers with the Our Father simply because of the opening formula which among the Tagalogs is not exclusive of the Lord's Prayer? Is such an identification by our people important at all? And how will this identification help the people to recognize that the prayer by the priest is the prayer of each member of the assembly? Where is the logical necessity, considering that the Our Father itself is most often used as a private prayer or in private prayer?

6. The Conclusion of the Presidential Prayers.

As seen in the examples above, the ANPSR has adopted only one way of concluding all the presidential prayers: "*sa pamamagitan ni Hesus Kristo kasama ng Espiritu Santo magpasawalang hanggan.*" The *Institutio generalis* for the Roman Missal (no. 32) directs that the opening prayer, when addressed to the Father, is concluded with the long form: "Through our Lord Jesus Christ your Son, who lives and reigns with you in the unity of the Holy Spirit, God, for ever and ever." There are variations to this, if the Son is mentioned toward the end of the prayer, or when the prayer is addressed to the Son himself. The prayers over the gifts and after communion are generally concluded with the short form: "Through Christ our Lord." The reason given by the regional committee for adopting its own exclusive version of the short ending is to bring out the mediatorship of Christ and the importance of the Holy Spirit in the liturgy.¹⁴

a. This radical reduction of the prayer conclusion by the ANPSR even went beyond the Portuguese: "*Por nosso Senhor Jesus Christo, vosso Filho, na unidade do Espirito Santo.*"¹⁵ This Portuguese version of the conclusion for all presidential prayers has not been imitated in any other language. In fact, where the French, the Dutch, the Italian and the Spanish translated in full the long form, the German and the English even amplified it by adding: "We ask this" or "Grant this" and "*Darum bitten wir.*"¹⁶ The reason is firstly because there is nothing wrong or in need of correction in the old, long form. Secondly, the conclusions of the prayers have been so delicately constructed in their long and rich history, that tampering with them can be very tricky theologically. Yet the ANPSR has rushed right into it.

13. Footnote 2 above.

14. ANS, p. 18; also, "Missal Has New Prayer Ending," *Daily Express*, 30 January 1982, p. 13; Vidal, "Notes," pp. 369-70, 372. The ANPSR (p. 42) also made changes in the *Institutio generalis* in the vernacular to suit these innovations.

15. *Missal Romano. Ordinario da Missa* (Lisboa, 1969); *Missal Romano* (Petropolis and Sao Paolo, 1973).

16. See Reiner Kaczynski, "Der Ordo Missae in den Teilkirchen des roemischen Ritus," *Liturgisches Jahrbuch* 25 (1975): 120.

b. First, the idea of Christ's mediatorship in the sacred liturgy is already being proclaimed in the traditional conclusions of the presidential prayers, as has been studied and made popular by Jungmann since his epoch-making *Habilitationsschrift* in 1925.¹⁷ This truth of the mediatorship is not now in any danger of being forgotten or neglected so as to merit a rescue operation like the ANPSR's exclusive use of a short conclusion to the presidential prayers.

c. Secondly, in the four examples alone that we have seen in the first part of this study, the conclusion of the prayers has been reduced by the ANPSR to a handy reason or support for whatever is being said at the end of the prayer. Thus, in example 2 the prayer conclusions has become part of a relative clause modifying the God "shining" on the offering, while in example 4 it is through Christ that we are said to be receiving from the Father the perfect sacrifice. Instances of these bizarre combinations with the prayer ending in the ANPSR versions of the presidential prayers can be multiplied.

d. Paradoxically enough, the mediatorship of Christ, which the ANPSR purportedly wanted to stress, loses out in this massive, undifferentiated use of the ANPSR short form. As Jungmann pointed out, the meaning of this mediatorship in the prayer conclusion is well expressed in the Roman Canon: "*Te igitur . . . per Jesum Christum . . . supplices rogamus ac petimus*."¹⁸ In other words, we address our prayer to God through Christ our High Priest (Rom 1:8; 16:27; 2 Cor 1:20; Heb 13:15; 1 Pet 2:5). With him in front of us and for us, we present ourselves to the Father with confidence in our hearts (Eph 3:12). This is the reason the English and German sacramentaries even add the additional words of clarification: "We ask this," meaning that it is our whole liturgical action and prayer that Christ is mediating to the Father. Instead of this, the ANPSR has reduced Christ's mediatorship to an all-purpose *adiutorio*, whereby we expect God to send down favors and helps to us because of the merits of Christ. This downward thrust is opposite the basic direction of *per Christum* in liturgical prayer.¹⁹

e. This theological impoverishment in the ANPSR is even greater when one considers that the elements of the traditional long form abandoned by the Tagalog version are not merely decorative. "*Dominus noster, Filius tuus*" connotes precisely that Christ stands before the Father in our behalf, because he is our Lord to whom we belong and who has redeemed us with his own life. And as the Father's Son, he is most intimately bound with him. "*Qui vivit et regnat*" indicates that our mediator is the risen Lord who is now glo-

17. J.A. Jungmann, S.J., *Die Stellung Christi im Liturgischen Gebet*. Liturgiegeschichtliche Forschungen 7/8 (Muenster, 1925); 2nd ed. Liturgiewissenschaftliche Quellen und Forschungen 19/20 (Muenster, 1962). See Cyprian Vagaggini, OSB, *Theological Dimensions of the Liturgy* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1976), pp. 209-17.

18. Jungmann, *Mis. Sol.*, 1:489.

19. *Ibid.*, pp. 488-89.

riously one with the Father. It is our faith that Christ our head has returned to the Father like the firstborn of a new humanity and as the mediator of his people. All these aspects of our Christian faith are fundamental in the life and liturgy of the Church. That is why they have come to belong to her official prayers, which express and profess them while at the same time being constantly impressed and refreshed by them.²⁰ Yet all these facets of the faith have been banished by the ANPSR from its Tagalog version of the prayer conclusion and for no valid reason at all. Even the short Portuguese form has "*nosso Senhor*" and "*vosso Filho*," and the short Latin form is still "*Per Christum Dominum nostrum*."

f. The regional committee in trying to justify this ANPSR version of the prayer conclusion indulged in a misleading argumentation. "The short ending has been commonly used even for the opening prayers of the English Sacramentary's alternative prayers as well as in many instances in the German *Messbuch*. This is warranted by the *Sacramentarium Veronense* where only the short endings occur wherever they are given completely."²¹ The use of the short ending does not have to be justified. The *Missale Romanum* itself uses it. Thus it is not strange that it is also used by the English and the German missals: to do so, one does not need any warrant from the *Sacramentarium Veronense*. But, definitely peculiar and unlike the Latin, the English, and the German practise is the ANPSR's *exclusive* use of its version of the short ending for *all* presidential prayers all the time. This particular innovation, and the total exclusion of the traditional long form, are what need justification.

g. Another feature of the ANPSR's exclusive prayer conclusion is the added phrase "*kasama ng Espiritu Santo*." The ever-increasing appreciation of the Holy Spirit is characteristic of the Church today. But it cannot be claimed that in the liturgy the Holy Spirit is neglected.²² Why then must the Holy Spirit be included at the end of every presidential prayer? The *per Christum* of the prayer ending is essentially an appeal to the high-priestly function of our Lord. The Holy Spirit cannot be indiscriminately inserted into Christ's act of mediation without causing confusion as to the appropriation of roles. The Spirit is an indispensable partner in what we do in the liturgy as the Body of Christ, for the Holy Spirit is the one praying in us (Rom 8:26). He is not being left out — needing insertion by way of re-

20. Ibid., p. 490.

21. ANS, p. 16; Vidal, "Notes," 372.

22. See Philip Harnoncourt, "Vom Beten im Heiligen Geist," in *Gott feiern*, ed. Josef G. Ploeger (Freiburg: Herder, 1980), pp. 110-15; B. Bobrinskoy, "Quelques reflexions sur la pneumatologie du culte," *Ephemerides liturgicae* 90 (1976): 375-84; *Le Saint-Esprit dans la Liturgie*, XVI^e Semaine d'Etudes Liturgiques, Paris 1969, in *Bibliotheca Ephemerides Liturgicae*, Subsidia 8 (Roma, 1977); A. Verheul, *Einfuehrung in die Liturgie* (Freiburg: Herder, 1964), pp. 61-91.

paration into those prayers where He may not be mentioned *nominatim*, as when the priest echoes St. Paul at the beginning of the Mass: "The grace and peace of God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ be with you" (Phil 1:2). In fact, we can only say that *in Spiritu Sancto*.

A theological short-circuit is the result of this undifferentiated junction between "*sa pamamagitan ni Hesukristo*" and "*kasama ng Espiritu Santo*." The Holy Spirit has thus been dragged by the ANPSR into all sorts of bizarre combinations to which the mediatorship of Christ has been reduced. Thus, in example 2 above, the Holy Spirit is said to be together with Christ, but in three possible combinations that are all theologically unacceptable: with "*namamagitan*," with "*naging tao at namamagitan*," and with "*nasisinagan*." In example 4, the Holy Spirit is together with Christ in mediating that we profit from and receive the perfect sacrifice from the Father. These are cases of a veritable *confusio idiomatum*. The role of the Holy Spirit in the sacred liturgy is not in any way enhanced by such a blurry theology.

Furthermore, "*kasama ng Espiritu Santo*" is a seriously inaccurate translation of the Latin "*in unitate Spiritus Sancti*." This is the idiom used by the Roman Missal when referring to the Holy Spirit at the conclusion of the prayers. In the long form which stresses precisely the mediatorship of Christ, the phrase means that Christ, the risen Lord, lives and reigns with God "*in Spiritu Sancto*," who is the principle of unity between the Father and the incarnate — glorified Son, just as He (the Spirit) is the principle of the intratrinitarian unity.²³ Switching the preposition to *kasama* in the ending which stresses Christ's mediatorship, for the purpose of bringing out the role of the Holy Spirit, is a misplaced egalitarianism and a misunderstood pneumatology.

7. Gloria — Luwalhati

Some other peculiarities of the ANPSR pertain to the use of words. We have already seen its uncritical use of the word "*pakinabangan*" (4, c). An example of a different type is its rejection of the traditional word *luwalhati* when translating *gloria*. The reason presented is based on the explanation by the Philippine Bible Society regarding *luwalhati* — *kahuwalhatian*: "The basic concept seems to be lack of hardship, problems or accidents, and everything going along properly and in order. Therefore it is sometimes used to refer to 'heaven'. This word seldom means 'glory' (*doxa*)."²⁴

23. See Harnoncourt, "Vom Beten," p. 109; Jungmann, "Die Doxologie am Schluss der Hochgebete," in *Gemeinde im Herrenmahl*, p. 319, n. 14; *idem*, *Stellung Christi*, 2nd ed. (1962), p. xvii; Vagaggini, *Theological Dimensions*, p. 216.

24. ANS, pp. 15-16, 22; Vidal, "Notes," p. 371. The regional committee used Rev. Louis Dorn's three page "Letter of the Philippine Bible Society to the Tagalog Review and Consultative Members," dated 16 September 1970, as one of its guiding documents (ANS, pp. 14, 21-23; Vidal, "Notes," p. 367). The uncritical reliance on this letter by the committee for Tagalog in the liturgy is surprising, to say the least.

a. The above explanation simply disregards many facts. First, in Catholic writings *gloria/doxa* has been traditionally and most often translated as *luwalhati-kahuwalhatian*. Secondly, some leading Tagalog lexicographers, Dr. Jose Villa Panganiban and Fr. Leo J. English, C.Ss.R., to cite but two, both give *kahuwalhatian* in their dictionaries as the first translation of glory in Tagalog. Thirdly, the said analysis of the usages of the word *luwalhati* fails to take into consideration, the term's philological evolution. *Kahuwalhatian* traditionally means glory, and it is by way of popular reflection expressing itself semantically in a metonymy that the greatest *kahuwalhatian* should be heaven, just as the greatest misery would be hell. That is why in this sense *kahuwalhatian* means heaven too. That is also why anything in this life that is harmonious and glorious, proper and in order, hence heavenly or blessed by heaven, is readily referred to as *mahuwalhati*. It is with this meaning that we wish each other, for example, "*Mahuwalhating paglalakbay!*" This philological development is the linguistic antecedent that our translation of Catholic liturgical texts must take into consideration. It is unfortunate that the regional committee uncritically took over the opinion of the translators of the Philippine Bible Society and abandoned our solid tradition because of it.

b. Another element of the above-mentioned analysis that has been simply adopted by the ANPSR concerns the biblico-theological meaning of *gloria/doxa*: "'Glory' essentially is a word signifying 'honor, praise, esteem'. Only rarely is 'glory' used to refer to heaven. And when the glory of the Lord shines around the shepherds, this cannot be '*luwalhati*', because the concept of the common tao doesn't include the possibility of 'shining' under that term. A special problem we often have to deal with is the fact that 'glory' occasionally refers to the presence of God manifested by a bright cloud or fire, as in the Old Testament."²⁵

The explanation is admittedly brief and incomplete. But a more reliable biblical theology of *doxa* would show,²⁶ that both in the Septuagint and in the New Testament the term when used in relation to God means divine majesty, magnificence and power, and God's luminous splendor in the theophanies. It has become the Greek equivalent of the Hebrew term *kabod*.

25. ANS, pp. 16, 19, 22, 53; Vidal, "Notes," p. 371.

26. See s.v. "glory," "gloire," "herrlichkeit," "doxa": J. Bauer, *Encyclopedia of Biblical Theology* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1970); X. Leon-Dufour, ed., *Dictionary of Biblical Theology* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1973); *idem*, *Dictionnaire du Nouveau Testament* (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1975); H. Haag, *Biblisches Woerterbuch* (Freiburg: Herder, 1971); G. Kittel and G. Von Rad, *Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, 2 (Stuttgart, 1935-50); L. Coenen, E. Beyreuther, H. Bietenhard, *Theologisches Begriffslexikon zum NT* (Wuppertal, 1971). One can hardly read biblical theology from a work much quoted by the regional committee in imitation of the translators for the Philippine Bible Society: W. R. Arndt and F.W. Gingrich, *Greek Lexicon* (Chicago: 1957), an English adaptation and translation of Walter Bauer's *Griechisch-deutsches Woerterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der uebrigen urchristlichen Literatur* 5th ed. (Berlin, 1958).

The root *kbd* means to be heavy. And *doxa* secularly connotes riches, fame and esteem by which one has weight in society (Gen 13:2; 31:1; Mt 4:8; 6:29). But with reference to God it means power and divine majesty, something objectively God's, pertaining to his divinity, and not dependent on the opinion or estimation of others.

Thus, this glory of God, *doxa Theou*, is something that is shared by the angels (Heb 9:5; Rev 18:1; 2 Pet 2:10), but showed itself fully and uniquely in Jesus Christ. He is the greatest *gloria Patris*, as expressed in the doxology at the end of the Eucharistic Prayer. And Christ's followers will share in this glory (Mt 13:43; Phil 3:21; Col 3:21; Rom 5:2; 8:17). It is to the eternal glory, *aionios doxa*, of heaven that Christ is calling and leading the members of his body (2 Cor 4:17; 1 Thess 2:12; 2 Tim 2:10; 1 Pet 5:4, 10). And because of the Spirit in him, Christ could already give the *doxa* to his disciples, although still in the world (Jn 17:22). This divine glory and presence were there and part of the hour which saw Christ lifted up on the cross (Jn 12:23ff). For the Fathers of the Church, *gloria* is something pertaining to the divine essence, as distinguished from mere *claritas* or the motif of luminosity in the theophanies. Hence they could speak of the glory of the Cross, *gloria crucis*, and of the glory of the Passion, *gloria passionis* and not only of the *gloria resurrectionis*, because Christ's suffering also revealed the power and majesty of God. This precise theologico-philological evolution of *kabod-doxa-gloria* is what the ITLT (no. 18) specifically refers to as exemplifying a word's eventual assumption of a distinctive biblical and Christian meaning through usage.

In the light of the above, the ANPSR translation of *gloria* as *liwanag* (for example, pp. 158 and 198) or some form of *ningning* (for example, pp. 418 and 423) is patently inadequate. It focuses exclusively on the experiential level of the theophanies. Phenomenological luminosity is an element of *gloria*, but it does not exhaust the meaning of the term. Light, heavenly or unearthly, is only an externalizing experience of the *mysterium fascinosum*, of the Uncreated Majesty revealing himself to man. That is why just as the New Testament expressly speaks of "*doxa perielampsen*" (Lk 2:9), "the glory shone," in Tagalog we must say: "*nagliwanag ang kahuwalhatian*" or "*ang kahuwalhatian ay nakitang nagniningning*." Mabuting Balita's translation of it: "*lumaganap ang kaningningan*" bogs down on the periphery of the divine manifestation, so to say. Light is but a sign that is supposed to make the divine glory somehow accessible to human experience and comprehension. In this sense, contrary to the claim of the Philippine Bible Society translators, it should be no problem at all to translate that God's glory is at times manifested by a bright cloud or by fire. *Luwalhati*, like the Greek *doxa*, is a comprehensive term standing for the divine presence, majesty and power, which can be manifested by many and sundry (oft in the Old Testament, meteorological) signs.

c. The faulty linguistic analysis and deficient biblical theology²⁷ used for the ANPSR show their shortcoming in its translation of the ancient hymn *Gloria in excelsis*. This time *gloria* is rendered as "*papuri*," similarly in the doxology at the end of the Eucharistic Prayer. In spurning the traditional and more comprehensive and exact term *luwalhati*, the ANPSR here manages to touch only an element, but not the essential, of the original meaning. *Doxan didomai*, to give glory, means principally to recognize the divine majesty (Acts 12:23; Rom 4:20; Rev 14:7). The emphasis is on God's glory, on what He alone has (Is 42:8, 12; Rev 4:9). That is why in the doxologies of the New Testament (1 Pet 4:11), the understood verb is not *ein*, but is, *estin*: singing the glory of God is indicative, not optative. The glorification of God does not consist in the first place in our praising Him, but in the revelation of His power and love. This is the sense of Luke 2:14, whence the *Gloria in excelsis* directly originated.²⁸ The ANPSR's *papuri* is too vague and does not specify God's glory and power. *Papuri*, deriving immediately from the verbal-noun *pagguri*, is focused on man's act of praising and giving *puri*; it does not reflect *doxa's* stress on the givenness of the majesty and honor of God. Substituting *papuri* for *luwalhati* is definitely a theological impoverishment, missing so much of the original nuances.

d. This problem which the ANPSR created by doing away with the traditional term *luwalhati* is encountered again and again everytime *gloria* comes up in the Latin texts. Thus, in *Gloria in excelsis* after the opening *papuri*, the ANPSR has *kapurihan* for "*propter gloriam tuam*." The noun affix makes an abstraction of *puri* or of whatever is *kapuri-puri* in somebody. Unlike the verbal-noun *papuri* which underlines the act of praising, *kapurihan* connotes merely that there is something praiseworthy or honorable in somebody or something. But the term does not indicate in what that honor

27. Another traditional Tagalog word spurned by the ANPSR is *biyaya* for *gratia*. And again this is on the authority of the analysis by the Philippine Bible Society (ANS, pp. 15, 21, 32-34; Vidal, "Notes," pp. 371-72). Suffice it here to say that had the regional committee been more critical, both the linguistic and the theological inadequacies of the said analysis would have been detected. Another very vital observation to be made is that the regional committee did not seem to have been aware of the essential difference between the philological perspectives of the Philippine Bible Society in translating the *Mabuting Balita* and that of a *Lupon para sa Tagalog sa Liturhiya* in translating Catholic liturgical texts.

28. Josef Ernst, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1977), pp. 109-10; Gerhard Schneider, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Wuerzburg: Guetersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1977), p. 67. See Adolf Adam, "Vom Ruehmen des Herrn," in *Gott feiern*, pp. 89-90; Jungmann, *Mis. Sol.*, 1:451.

The regional committee (ANS, pp. 63-65) tried to answer the objection against this substitution of *papuri* for the traditional *luwalhati* by saying that the *Pasyon* and the *Compendio Historico de la Religion* (1865) rendered it so. First, the *Pasyon* gives no translation of the *Gloria in excelsis*. Secondly, even if the *Compendio* translated it so, that still would not make up for the inadequacy of the translation. Neither the *Compendio* nor the *Pasyon* is authoritative for the translation of Sacred Scripture or of liturgical texts into Tagalog.

may consist. Consequently this word does not measure up to *doxa* which means specifically God's majesty and power. *Kapurihan* is too bland a substantive to translate the divine *gloria*. The ANPSR uses *kapurihan* for *gloria* also in the *Suscipiat* before the prayer over the gifts and in the people's acclamation after the Our Father.

Another term used by the ANPSR for God's glory is *kadakilaan*, as "*in gloria Dei Patris*" of the *Gloria in excelsis*, in "*hymnum gloriae tuae canimus*" at the end of the prefaces, and in the *Sanctus*. This word is more acceptable than *kapurihan* in that it connotes a specific element of *kabod Yahweh*, God's greatness. Still another substitute used for *luwalhati* is *kagandahan*, as in the Third Eucharistic Prayer just before the doxology and in the preface of the Fourth Eucharistic Prayer. This term is likewise more specific than *kapurihan*, but less relevant than *kadakilaan*.

8. *Ecclesia* – *Iglesia*

Just one more example of a traditional word that the ANPSR has removed from its liturgical vocabulary: *Iglesia* for *Ecclesia*. The reason advanced is because "several bishops asked for the substitution of other terms . . . because the gathered Catholics immediately associate it with the outsiders and the congregations could not identify themselves with the terminology."²⁹

a. Such observations may be true of some localities, but they are by no means valid everywhere. More importantly, they are not reason enough to justify depriving our liturgical texts of such a basic biblical term. We cannot go about abandoning a biblico-theological *terminus technicus* or surrendering its use to some group, just because of misconception on the part of some of our own (not even on the suggestion of several bishops). As the ITLT (no. 15) points out, "the correct biblical or Christian meaning of certain words and ideas will always need explanation and instruction." More catechesis may be what is needed, not a theologico-philological amputation.

b. Furthermore, the substitutes given by the ANPSR for *Iglesia* limp. *Simbahan* (e.g., in the *Te igitur* of the First Eucharistic Prayer, in the *Memento* of the Second Eucharistic Prayer, in the *Respice* of both the Third and the Fourth Eucharistic Prayers, and in the Creed) on the one hand is so inadequate for *ekklesia* that theologians have been moving away from its use. *Simbahan*, even when understood dynamically, still stresses one-sidedly the notion of worship, which is only one of the functions of the Church. Inadequate words like this have nourished numerous misconceptions, in this case that the Church should occupy herself only with the things of the *simbahan*. *Sambayanan* (e.g., in the *Suscipiat*, and in the prayer after communion for Easter Sunday) on the other hand improperly restricts, since the image

29. ANS, pp. 15 and 69; Vidal, "Notes," p. 371.

of the *plebs* or *populus* (people) is only one of the various biblical descriptions for the *ekklesia*.

In one instance, avoiding the term in the prayer before the sign of peace, the ANPSR translated "*fidem ecclesiae tuae*" as "*aming pananampalataya*." This translation dislocates the delicate balance of the original prayer. In it we beg Christ not to look on our sins, but on the God-given faith of his Church. For on our own we cannot boast of anything. The ANPSR version says: Look on our faith, not on our sins.

CONCLUSION

In this review, we have seen enough examples of the way the presidential prayers have been translated by the ANPSR to be able to make the painful conclusion that this Tagalog version of the Roman Missal has not always faithfully given the intended meaning of the original texts. Surprising is the apparent insufficient grasp of the real meaning in Latin — sometimes due to superficiality, at other times to sheer carelessness. Nuances essential to the meaning failed to be conveyed; pivotal words unexplainably dropped out. A perusal of the Tagalog versions side by side with the original Latin gives the distinct impression that the ANPSR translation has been done in a "more or less" manner. Precision is definitely not a quality of this Tagalog version of the Roman Missal. Damaging and unworthy of the sacred liturgy are the outright, albeit unwitting, theological misconceptions and misinterpretations. We do not encounter in the ANPSR "the greatest care [which] must be taken that all translations are not only beautiful and suited to the contemporary mind, but express true doctrine and authentic Christian spirituality" (ITLT, no. 24).

Unnecessary innovations have been introduced, resulting in the theological impoverishment of the Tagalog version. Lack of theological sensitivity has allowed ambiguities and even falsities into the texts. Traditional words have been replaced with less adequate ones, which certain other terms are idiosyncratically promoted. Sources have been espoused uncritically.

Prima theologia est liturgia. As the basic expression of our Christian faith, our liturgical texts must be authentic and orthodox. How can we, for instance, preach in the vernacular on the texts of the Mass, as we urged by the *Institutio generalis* (no. 41), when the versions given us in Tagalog are theologically unreliable? A poor and mangled theology can never serve the cause of inculturation, nor promote liturgical renewal. Indeed, eventually we should be composing our own indigenous prayers for our official liturgical books. But we still have to successfully pass first the school and discipline of properly appreciating and translating our Roman heritage (ITLT, no. 43). And as the Prefect of the Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship warned the 1974

Synod of Bishops in Rome, liturgical renewal truly involves adaptation, but authentic adaptation must avoid the pitfalls of particularism and subjectivism.³⁰

It is hard to understand how or why the ANPSR with so many and serious defects could come out as an *editio typica*. Has it been previously and sufficiently examined by Filipino theologians, scripturists, philologists and other experts aside from liturgists? Were such co-workers involved at all in an interdisciplinary approach to the task of translating liturgical texts, as demanded by the ITLT (no. 38)? Why was there no *ad interim* version of the whole work for experimental use and for consultation with the public (ITLT, no. 39)? Infringing on these prudent guidelines can be very self-defeating. Further studies of the ANPSR are now necessary. There is no evading the imperative of correcting and improving it. As it stands, in our judgment, the book is theologically unsuited for liturgical use.

30. *Notitiae* 10 (1974): 359.