NOTES ON THE BICOL TRANSLATION OF THE ROMAN MISSAL - A SEQUEL

J. Rojas

Enriching the Bicol Language in Liturgy

As the work continues of translating into Bicol the *editio typica tertia* of the *Missale Romanun*, it becomes imperative that difficult texts be explained once again not only for promoting wider acceptance of these texts but also, in no less important measure, to respond to if not anticipate valid objections. The explanations offered here are a sequel to a previous essay published in this journal in 2008.[1]

The issue of translation and the use of the vernacular in liturgy is always generally a sensitive subject, that it is almost a given that any effort in this regard should meet stiff scrutiny if not opposition from critics of various persuasions. It is always a good sign when people complain because it is an indication of their interest and their concern for linguistic purity, accuracy and aptness (elegance), which are by no means the monopoly of the liturgical translators. This interplay between translators and critics, it is hoped, will further lead to the development and growth of the Bicol language, particularly as it is used in liturgy.

To understand some of the textual choices made by the translators, it is necessary to discuss some of the principles, apart from those already delineated in *Liturgiam authenticam*,[2] upon which these choices were based and justified. These principles are by no means universally recognized, but having gained the consensus of at least the translators made the task of liturgical translation a lot easier.

First, it is *Bicol Naga* (the same Bicol spoken in the neighboring towns) that ought to be used in liturgy as it is recognized by all Bicolanos as the *standard Bicol*.[3] Be that as it may, its being recognized as such does not necessarily bestow upon it any kind of superiority over the other Bicol dialects, only an acknowledgment that it is the Bicol that is understood by most Bicolanos almost everywhere in the region. This, in fact, is the advantage of Bicolanos over other linguistic groups as far as liturgy is concerned since such universal recognition is what has precluded any wrangling or grumbling over which Bicol to use in the liturgy. In fact, Bicol Naga has been readily accepted and used in the liturgy in the Bicol Region ever since the liturgy was celebrated in the vernacular consequent to the reforms of Vatican II.

It must nonetheless be admitted that Bicol Naga does not have it all. There are ideas or concepts expressed in peculiar words in the other Bicol dialects with precision that do not exist

---

[1] See J. ROJAS, "*Notes on the New Bicol Translation of the Roman Missal*", in Vinculum 26/1 (October 2008), p. 1-47.

[2] See Congregation for Divine Worship, *Liturgiam authenticam,* On the Use of Vernacular Languages in the Publication of the Books of the Roman Liturgy, "Fifth Instruction for the Right Implementation of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy of the Second Vatican Council" (*Sacrosanctum Concilium,* art. 36), Rome, May 7, 2001.

[3] Some scholars say that the most *neutral Bicol* (that is, referring to the *tone*) is that spoken in Libmanan and by close affinity that spoken in Calabanga which is just a river away from Libmanan. Such, however, is by no means a claim that has been proven and accepted by all.

in Bicol Naga. For example, "*magsanong*", which occurs in the present translation of the *Sanctus*, exists in Bicol Albay and Catanduanes but not in Bicol Naga. It means "*to sing along*", that is, to sing the "*same song at the same time*". Bicol Naga would render this simply as «*magsabay*» or «*magsunò*» *sa pagkanta o pag-awit*. *Sabay*, however, can be used practically for just anything – *sabay magkakan* (to eat at the same time), *sabay maglinig* (to clean at the same time), *sabay magkawat* (to play at the same time), etc. - unlike *sanong* which is applicable only to singing. Besides, two people can sing two *different* songs, but they would still be singing "*sabay*" if both sing at the same time. *Magsanong*, however, does not only mean to sing at the same time but more precisely to sing the "*same song*" at the same time. As for *sunò,* it can mean not only "*to sing along*" but also to "*backride*" (as on a motorcycle or on a bicycle). *Sanong* thus has an advantage over both *sabay* and *sunò* in expressing the idea expressed in the *Sanctus*, "*Cum quibus et nostras voces ut admitti iubeas…*" Thus, in the new Bicol translation, the *Sanctus* towards the end reads, "*Auot pa man lugod na ipagboot mo na makasanong sainda an samong mga tingog…*" (cf. Lenten Preface IV).

This brings up the issue of "*assimilation*" insofar as the above is an instance of Bicol Naga assimilating a word from another Bicol dialect. As a result, ever since *sanong* was introduced in the liturgy, more and more people in Camarines Sur have become familiar with the word and started using it even in ordinary conversation. Furthermore, what one may not immediately realize, the other Bicol dialects have also been enriched by Bicol Naga. Albayanos, for instance, used to simply say "*dai ki*" to express what in English is "*there is none*", but the frequent use of Bicol Naga's "*mayo nin/kan*" in liturgy has made it easy for Albayanos to adopt the latter expression as well. This, indeed, is fortunate since *dai* is simply a general expression of negation, the equivalent of the English "*no*" or "*not*", whereas *mayo* specifically and more precisely means "*there is none*".

Assimilation, of course, is not new to the Bicol language. In the past, Bicol has assimilated many Spanish words and now it has even started to assimilate English and other foreign words. What is probably unappreciated[4] as far as liturgical translation is concerned is the idea of Bicol Naga *assimilating words from the other Bicol dialects*, that is, when these words are in existence anyway and found to be appropriate, even elegant enough for use in the liturgy. Why not indeed, if standard Bicol is to be enriched and allowed to grow and develop on its own without sounding too foreign as when it assimilates words from Spanish or English? It should be noted that the preference over the years was to assimilate from Spanish - though now more it seems from Tagalog and from English. That, of course, would be fine should there be no equivalents in any of the Bicol dialects. But should these equivalents exist in other Bicol dialects, why not give preference to these words over Spanish or Tagalog equivalents, especially if they are found to be suitable?

A case in point is the word "*singaki*" which is used in Catanduanes and some parts of Albay (perhaps also in the Caramoan peninsula) to mean "*cousin*" – meaning "*aki*" (child) in relation to another "*aki*" (thus, "*magsing-aki*") of parents who are siblings. Thus, why prefer the Tagalog "*pinsan*" to the Bicol *singaki*? Because *pinsan*, as some might argue, has been assimilated long enough and is now practically understood by everyone as it has become part of the Bicol

[4] Every now and then, people frown at words and expressions from other Bicol dialects that find their way into liturgical use.

language.[5] Fine, it can stay that way. But would not assimilating *singaki* allow this word, after frequent usage, to also become part of standard Bicol, thus another word for "cousin" in Bicol? And here is a word that is genuinely Bicol, thus an enrichment!

Moreover, might one also ask, between *Spanish* and *Tagalog*, that is, supposing there is no equivalent in any of the Bicol dialects, why not prefer Tagalog, not unless the Spanish equivalent has already become part of the Bicol language?[6] To give an obvious example, for the Latin adverbs *"ob", "pro"* or *"loco"* (the English "*instead*") which strictly have no Bicol equivalents, one cannot but choose the Spanish-derived "*embes*" (*en vez*) notwithstanding the Tagalog equivalent (*sa halip*) because the former has already been in usage (assimilated) over time and has therefore practically become part of the Bicol language. But why cannot some people, for instance, feel comfortable with the Tagalog "*magpaubaya*",[7] which means "*to entrust*", when there is even no Bicol equivalent for it, so it seems?

Still, on the subject of enriching the Bicol language in liturgy, there is a provision in *Liturgiam authenticam* that encourages the use of *neologisms*, a move no doubt that could contribute to the development of a language, of liturgical language in particular. It says:

> *Especially in the translations intended for peoples recently brought to the Christian Faith, fidelity and exactness with respect to the original texts may themselves sometimes require that words already in current usage be employed in new ways, that* «new words or expressions be coined»*, that terms in the original text be transliterated or adapted to the pronunciation of the vernacular language…*[8]

Although the present Bicol translation is no longer *intended for peoples recently brought to the Christian faith*, there is nothing in the above-mentioned provision that seems to prevent the initiative that would introduce *newly coined* vernacular words and expressions into liturgical language as long as these are linguistically justifiable and could serve the purpose of signifying exactly just what the Latin original denotes.

To illustrate this point, the present translation proposed to introduce into the text what seems to be a new word, "*popônan*"[9] to mean "*womb*". There is actually a current word for this concept used not only in Bicol but also elsewhere (for instance in the Tagalog provinces) which is,

---

[5] Incidentally, over time, *pinsan* has also come to mean just any *relative*, making it very broad in meaning and application.

[6] There seems to be more tolerance in assimilating Spanish, and only resistance towards Tagalog in the liturgy. Is this not rather an attitude that smacks of colonial mentality?

[7] This occurs, for example, in the Preface for Easter V and in no. 117 of the Eucharistic Prayer IV. In the former, *sa pagpaubaya* translates *commendans* (*commendare*, entrust) and in the latter *ipinaubaya niya* translates *tradidit* (*tradere*, hand over, surrender).

[8] *Liturgicam authenticam*, #21 (quotation symbols added). See also #53: "*Whenever a particular Latin term has a rich meaning that is difficult to render into a modern language… various solutions may be employed in the translation, whether the term be translated by a single vernacular word or by several, or by coining a new word…*" One derives from this statement the impression that Liturgiam authenticam encourages neologism in those instances when the vernacular is in want of words to express what the original Latin is meant to signify.

[9] See Advent Preface II.

"*matris*". Nonetheless, not only does this word sound foreign as it was derived from the Spanish "*matriz*" (also perhaps from Latin *mater, matris,* meaning mother), it also appears too informal and could even sound funny, thus making it unsuitable for liturgical use.

Incidentally, however, an old woman somewhere in Libmanan (Camarines Sur) was heard using it, and when asked what it was, said that it meant the mother's womb. When pressed for an explanation, she clarified that *popônan* is that part of the woman's body that serves as a *base* (from the Bicol root *poón*, as in *poón nin kahoy* or *poón nin bukid*) on which the fetus rests and is nestled during pregnancy. After all, she continued, that is where life really begins (*dyan nagpopoon an buhay*). The old woman's second statement, of course, is highly contestable. Certainly, there are those who would grab this statement to support the view that prior to implantation there is no human life. Yet ever since the second half of the nineteenth century, when microscopic techniques improved enough to allow scientists to observe the nuclei of cells, it has become the common opinion (*certainly the Catholic position on the issue*) that fertilization, which occurs outside the uterus, instantiates the beginning of human life, involving as it does the merging of cell nuclei from the male and female parent. From the Catholic point of view, it would thus be inaccurate, if not patently erroneous, to say that human life begins in the uterus, as the old woman's statement would have everyone believe.

Nevertheless, this is not reason enough to dismiss outright the word *popônan* out of the liturgical vocabulary. First, the woman's statement should be taken in context. It gives the impression that *popônan* may be of ancient vintage and could probably have been coined at a time predating scientific discoveries. How it disappeared from everyday use is anybody's guess. But the absence of an indigenous word for the Latin *uterus* seems to be reason enough to revive its use. After all, one can continue to invoke the woman's explanation that the word refers to that part of the woman's body that serves as a *base* (*poón*) on which the fetus rests and is nestled during pregnancy. As for her second statement, this could be rectified, presumably in *catechesis*, by having the word *popônan* assimilate an extended meaning,[10] that is, as that part of the woman's body where the human embryo *begins* (*nagpopoón*) *to implant*.

But supposing the word never really existed and that this was simply an instance of an old woman inventing a term, would this not constitute just the same a legitimate opportunity when a neologism might be introduced to further enrich the Bicol language? After all, the word has an etymological indigenous root (*poón*) and not too far-sounding from the Tagalog "*sinapupunan*" which means exactly the same thing.

The above discussion also raises another issue in this whole subject of liturgical translation which is the *revival* of archaic words. On this *Liturgicam authenticam* again has something to say:

> *If indeed, in the liturgical texts, words or expressions are sometimes employed which differ somewhat from usual and everyday speech, it is often enough by virtue of this very fact that the*

---

[10] Assimilation in language does not only refer to the process in which a change of a sound in speech is effected so that it becomes identical or similar to a neighboring sound. Over time, if a word is heard often enough given a certain meaning, it will become yet another part of the language, invariably by the process of passive assimilation. It this case, a word acquires added meaning apart from its original meaning.

> *texts become truly memorable and capable of expressing heavenly realities. Indeed, it will be seen that the observance of the principles set forth in this Instruction will contribute to the gradual development, in each vernacular, of a sacred style that will come to be recognized as proper to liturgical language. Thus it may happen that a certain manner of speech which has come to be considered somewhat obsolete in daily usage may continue to be maintained in the liturgical context.*[11]

There is actually a lot that this quotation is saying. First, what is considered to be obsolete may not necessarily be useless. Second, in fact, what may differ from usual and everyday speech (which should include strange sounding words or words deemed archaic) may be capable of expressing heavenly realities. Third, use of such words in the liturgy can contribute in the gradual development of a proper or distinctively liturgical language or what is now called "*liturgical vernacular*".[12] In other words, just by looking at the words themselves would immediately give the impression that they belong to the liturgy and not to ordinary and conversational language. The goal of liturgical translation then is not to transform liturgical expressions into indigenous expressions but rather to render in the vernacular these expressions while keeping their liturgical character.

Such is the case of the Bicol word "*magdatong*" (to come).[13] This word has become obsolete (archaic) in conversational language as there is now much more preference for the word "*mag-abot*" in its stead, but it has never really disappeared from liturgical language. In fact, its usage has become *distinctively* liturgical to refer to the "*coming of Christ*" or to the "*coming of the kingdom*". Retaining, therefore, the use of *magdatong* in liturgy is actually an enrichment. On the other hand, expunging it altogether out of liturgical language can only lead to further impoverishment of the language as it would mean another word relegated to the dustbin of oblivion. A less developed language as Bicol cannot afford to keep losing words this way when it actually needs to expand its vocabulary for it to grow and be levelled up, to keep it at par with the other more developed languages.

In sum, stubbornly resisting *a*) legitimate indigenous neologisms (indigenous because they are rooted in the language itself anyway), *b*) valid assimilation of related dialectal or even foreign vocabulary, *c*) acceptance of unusual but liturgical or biblical expressions,[14] and *d*) revival or retention of archaic but still suitable words, while serving to keep a language "pure" – *linguistic purism* - can only impede the growth and enrichment of a language, keeping it stale, underdeveloped and impoverished. If Bicol were to stay that way, given its present state of poverty in vocabulary, it can never adequately express many concepts and symbols peculiar to the liturgy and its language.

---

[11] *Liturgiam authenticam*, #27.

[12] Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, A Working Draft of the Ratio Translationis for the English Language (Rome 2005), p. 13; C. MOHRMANN, "*Notes sur le Latin liturgique*", in *Étude sur le Latin des Chrétiens*, 4 Vols. (Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1961), Vol. 2, p. 93-108.

[13] For more discussion on this, see J. ROJAS, "*Notes on the New Bicol Translation of the Roman Missal*", p. 32-35.

[14] On this, there are so many examples: *asin sa saimong espiritu* (et cum spiritu tuo), *sa kapanahonan kan mga panahon* (in saecula saeculorum), *pamanggi kan Cordero* (cena Agni), etc.

Difficult Texts

Mention has already been made of the word "*popônan*" (*uterus*, *uteri*). Initial reaction to its use in the liturgy from lay people is fortunately one of acceptance, resistance to it coming mainly from a few purists. Adequate catechesis has proven to be of great help in persuading people to use it in devotional prayers and in the liturgy. If there is any complaint at all from these simple people, it is the difficulty of memorizing revised prayers and not the difficulty of understanding the "new" words and expressions that have been introduced. In fact, these words, particularly *popônan*, are quite easy to understand and the fear that these words might be vulnerable to misunderstanding is turning out to be unfounded and misplaced judging from the positive response they have already been getting from people who "frequently" pray the Hail Mary and the Rosary in the parishes despite protestation from those who "seldom" pray in the vernacular anyway!

a) Commercium

A more difficult word to translate is "*commercium*". This word occurs in a number of prayers during the Christmas season.[15] Literally, its equivalent in English is as the Latin sounds, *commerce* which means *trade* in goods and services or a large-scale buying and selling of goods and services. When used in liturgy, the word loses its business connotation and simply signifies an "*exchange*". An illustration at this point is in order. Part of the third preface for the Christmas season reads:

> *Dómine, sancte Pater, omnípotens aetérne Deus:*
> *per Christum Dóminum nostrum.*
> *Per quem hódie «commércium» nostrae reparatiónis effúlsit,*
> *quia, dum nostra fragílitas a tuo Verbo suscípitur,*
> *humána mortálitas non solum in perpétuum transit honórem,*
> *sed nos quoque, mirándo consórtio, reddit aetérnos.*

This preface speaks of an *exchange*: the Word assumes human frailty and in *exchange* human mortality receives unending honor and is transformed into eternity. This idea is difficult to express in Bicol. The word "*pagriribayan*", while it may also literally mean exchange, does not quite succeed in describing the mutual "interchange" between humanity and divinity that is spoken of in this beautiful preface.

What *pagriribayan* fails to express seems to be just what another Bicol word, *honglonan*, appears to capture. Between a landowner and his farmers, the word *honglonan* is used to refer to an agreement, actually an oral contract, between the landowner and a group of farmers according to which the former agrees to hire as harvesters the same people (farmers) who tilled the land and sowed in it. The payment for the sowing (*pagtarok*) could be in the form of money or a share in the harvest. The concept of *honglonan* seems appropriate because it represents what indigenous economy (exchange) was, apart from the idea of barter in olden times. It thus

[15] See December 29, Super oblata; Christmas feria secunda, Super oblata and; Christmas Praefatio III.

appears that *commercium* could be better translated as "*honglonan*". Admittedly, *honglonan* may smack of a business connotation, but so does the Latin *commercium*. In fact, in Latin, that is, according to W. Whitaker, *commercium* could mean *trade*, *traffic*, *exchange* and *commerce*, or even (of all things!) *sexual intercourse/relations* and *friendly intercourse*. The use of *honglonan* then cannot but be metaphorical.

Following this discussion, the translation of the third Christmas preface now reads:

> *Huli saiya nagbanaag ngonian sarong honglonan*
> *na nagdara kan samuyang pagtubos,*
> *ta kan an samong kaluyahan inako kan saimong Tataramon,*
> *an magagadanon na pagkatawo,*
> *bako sanang nagin danay na kagalang-galang,*
> *kundi sa makangangalas na pakisumaro,*
> *ginibo man kami kaining magdanay sagkod pa man.*

Elsewhere in the eucharistic liturgy,[16] *sacrum* (in Bicol, *banal*) precedes *commercium* as modifier, thus making the Bicol equivalent, "*banal na honglonan*" (holy exchange), even more suitable for liturgical use.

b) Visibilium et Invisibilium

Several Latin expressions in the creed, particularly in the Nicene Creed, also seem to pose some difficulties. One of these is *visibilium omnium et invisibilium*. In the new Bicol translation this has been rendered as *kan gabos na nahihiling asin dai nahihiling*.[17] The objection to this new translation has been raised by a lay theologian from Nabua (Camarines Sur), *A. Fajardo*, in that it takes for granted the precise sense in which *visibilium* and *invisibilium* are used in the creed, a sense that could be gleaned if one were to take into account the distinction between *possibilities* and *actualities*.[18]

On close inspection, there indeed is a significance in the *visibilium/invisibilium* distinction as compared, for example, to the *visum/non visum* distinction (that which is seen and that which is unseen) in that the former conveys a meaning not found in the latter.

In the creed, *visibilium* denotes something that "*can be seen*" (capable of being seen) and not necessarily that which is "*actually seen*", while *invisibilium* describes something that "*cannot be seen*" (that is, because of its very nature is not capable of being seen) and not necessarily that which is "*actually not seen*" (even if perhaps it "*can be seen*"). In other words, that which is "*unseen*" is not necessarily "*invisible*", in the same way that neither that which is "visible" is

---

[16] See December 29, Super oblata; Christmas feria secunda, Super oblata.
[17] The old translation read: "*nin gabos na nakikita asin dai nakikita*". Although this expression has been in use also for many years, it sounded like "Tagalog" to many of the translators, thus the change to the more Bicol "*kan gabos na nahihiling asin dai nahihiling*".
[18] Cf. A. FAJARDO, *Letter to Msgr. Rodel Cajot*, n.d.

necessarily always "seen"![19] Or, saying it in the reverse, what one does "not see" may in fact be "visible".[20] It is on account of this that the new English translation replaced "of all things that is *seen* and *unseen*" in the creed to "of all things *visible* and *invisible*". The advantage of using the *visible-invisible distinction* over the *seen-unseen distinction* is that the former conveys a more specific demarcation between the bodily and spiritual realms.[21]

Further expounding on this, *faith* then is about seeing (believing) not only that which can be seen, but also more so about seeing (believing) even that which cannot be seen, whereas the lack thereof would be not to see (believe) not only that which cannot be seen but more so even that which can be seen.

On this point, there is actually no dispute. The creed very well talks about "*the visible*" and "*the invisible*" in the sense explained above as the object of faith. But the real difficulty is how to express these concepts in the vernacular insofar as the Bicol language does not have the precise and exact words to convey such concepts. Fajardo, suggests to replace the present "*gabos na nahihiling asin dai nahihiling*" which, as he argues, corresponds more to the *seen-unseen* distinction (level of actualities) with "*gabos na puedeng mahiling asin dai puedeng mahiling*" or by implication the shorter "*gabos na mahihiling asin dai mahihiling*"[22] which Fajardo sees as corresponding to the *visible-invisible* distinction (level of possibilities). Apart from being a little bit more wordy and foreign-sounding, what with the help of the Spanish *puede*, the suggested formula, on close inspection, does no better in expressing the *visibilium-invisibilium* distinction.

But first, a word about *nahihiling* and *dai nahihiling* is in order. A closer look at these words would reveal that they might actually be characterized, in the context of linguistics, as *polysemous* expressions. A *polyseme* is, of course, a word or phrase with different, but related senses. A classic example in English would be the word "*man*" which can mean *a*) the human species (as contrasted to an animal), *b*) males of the human species (as contrasted to a woman), and *c*) adult males of the human species (as contrasted to a boy).

Similarly, *nahihiling* behaves in the same way and can mean two things, an object that is actually *seen* and an object that *can be seen*, while *dai nahihiling* can likewise mean either an object that is *unseen* or one that *cannot be seen*. To give an example, Bicolanos would simply say "*An doros dai*

---

[19] This interpretation is supported by at least two dictionaries, that of W. Whitaker and that of C. Lewis and C. Short. Whitaker translates *visibilium* as that which is capable of being seen (on the part of the object in itself) and that which is capable of seeing (on the part of the subject). Lewis and Short, on the other hand, mentions the adjective *visibilis* (related to the substantive *visibilium*) and lists two meanings: a) a *passive* meaning, "that may be seen" or something visible, and b) an *active* meaning, "that can see".

[20] On this, the English translators have an example: "*…a child playing hide-and-seek may be unseen yet is still considered visible, whereas one's guardian angel is indeed invisible by nature…*" (Commentary on the Order of the Mass, "*Changes in People's Parts*", through USCCB.org).

[21] See Commentary on the Order of the Mass, "*Changes in People's Parts*", through USCCB.org.

[22] This shorter form is preferred to the longer "*gabos na puedeng mahiling asin dai puedeng mahiling*" as proposed by A. Fajardo (see his letter to Msgr. Rodel Cajot). The prefix "*ma-*" in Bicol coupled with the first syllable of the verb being repeated is the equivalent of the Spanish "*puede*" and the English "*can be*" (followed by the passive form of the verb). For example, *magigibo* means "can be done", *masasabotan* (can be understood), *mababasa* (can be read), etc. Thus, in the present text, *mahihiling* means "*can be seen*" or *visible*.

nahihiling" to mean either that the wind is invisible (cannot be seen), or that it is simply not seen. The same is true with the sentence "*An baroto dai nahihiling hale digdi*" which can mean that "the boat is not seen from here" or "the boat cannot be seen from here".

The expression "*dai puedeng mahiling*" is not much different. It is likewise polysemous and can mean either "*unseen*" or "*invisible*", depending on the way it is used. While it can mean invisible, there are also some instances when it does not necessarily mean so. For instance, one can say "*An harong dai puedeng mahiling ta harayo*" to mean "*the house cannot be seen because it is far*", but this does not at all imply that the house is invisible. From all this, it appears that one can invariably say "*dai nahihiling*" or "*dai puedeng mahiling*" to mean the same thing, whether in the order of possibilities or in the order of actualities.

It would be good to illustrate this point by way of an example. The collect for December 29 reads: "*Omnípotens et invisíbilis Deus…*" One need not translate this to "*O Dios na makakamhan asin dai puedeng mahiling…*" insofar as to say "*O Dios na makakamhan asin dai nahihiling…*" conveys exactly the same meaning. When the Bicolano says, "*An Dios dai nahihiling*", he actually means "*God cannot be seen*" and not simply "unseen" as though owing to his being concealed behind an obstacle. Thus, to say *"An Dios dai nahihiling"* is almost the same as saying God *is* not seen precisely because He *cannot* be seen.

Indeed, many times Bicolanos are not very particular about nuances, especially in regard to ideas derived from foreign languages. This accounts for the lack of a huge diversity of vocabulary and nuances in Bicol that are otherwise present in other languages. Accordingly, Bicol conveys the same meanings by using words with a broader sense. For example, the word *"pagkamoot"* can practically translate a variety of Latin words such as *caritas*, *dilectio*, and *amor*. The drawback, of course, with words in Bicol having too broad a meaning or with too many completely different meanings is that they can unfortunately become ambiguous. But that is the Bicol language. Such limitation leaves very little room for choice and proper diction. Thus, as far as the present text is concerned, given the two alternatives, it seems more appropriate to translate *visibilium* and *invisibilium* in the creed to *nahihiling* and *dai nahihiling*, these being pure Bicol expressions that do not employ the Spanish verb "*puede*"(from *poder*).

c) Passus et sepultus est

Another contentious word as far as its meaning in the creed is concerned is the word "*passus*". Literally, *passus est* is derived from the deponent verb *patior, pati, passus sum*, which in the infinitive (*pati*) means *to suffer, to allow, to undergo, to endure* or *to permit*. It is in itself a perfect participial phrase in the masculine third person and when, therefore, literally translated into English should read *"he suffered"*. The text in the Nicene creed where this occurs partly reads: *"Crucifíxus étiam pro nobis sub Póntio Piláto; passus et sepultus est…"*

The present English translation renders this in a way that is instructive: *"For our sake he was crucified under Pontius Pilate, suffered death and was buried…"* While the new Bicol translation of

the original text is not necessarily based on this English translation,[23] it sounds almost parallel to it: *"Ipinako pa sa cruz para sato kan panahon ni Poncio Pilato; nagtios sagkod sa kagadanan asin ilinobong…"* One will immediately notice that in both translations, *passus est* is translated comprehensively to integrate both the suffering and death of the Lord. While it is not clear why the English translation followed the same line of thinking, for the Bicol translators the reason for expanding the literal meaning of *passus est* is more theological than just a matter of mere semantics. The reason for this is that, given the context in which the expression occurs, the semantic meaning of *passus est* cannot just be taken apart from its theological meaning for in this part of the creed there is clear reference to the whole Passion story of the Lord, which is what the Paschal mystery is all about. In this context, the suffering and death of the Lord belong together and cannot really be separated from one another. In other words, the suffering of the Lord is of itself inclusive of his death on the cross.

Even from the point of view of Logic, there seems to be enough reason for including the idea of death in *passus est* because the Lord could not have been buried (*sepultus est*) had he only suffered, plain and simple, without him having to have suffered death! After all, this was to be the consequence of the crucifixion that is mentioned in the line that precedes the text in question. In other words, the crucifixion meant for the Lord not only suffering, but more precisely suffering until death.

d) Resurrexit and Resurrectionem Mortuorum

A more thorny issue is that raised by the words *resurrexit* and *resurrectionem mortuorum* also mentioned in the Nicene Creed, inviting as it does further detailed discussion and debate:

> *…et resurréxit tértia die, secúndum Scriptúras…*
> …and rose again on the third day, in accordance with the Scriptures…
>
> *…Et exspécto resurrectiónem mortuorum…*
> …and I look forward to the resurrection of the dead…

The English translation as shown above is less problematic than the Bicol translation which reads:

> *…asin kan ikatolong aldaw nabuhay-liwat, sosog sa mga Kasuratan…*
> *…Asin naghahalat ako kan pagkabuhay-liwat nin mga gadan…*

Literally, *resurrectio* is a noun derived from *resurgere* which means *"rising again"*. In Whitaker's dictionary, however, it can also mean "*being restored*" or "*being revived*". As such, it can also be literally rendered in Bicol as *"pagbangon-liwat"* as A. Fajardo suggests,[24] in contrast to the present translation *"pagkabuhay-liwat"*. Following the suggestion, the Bicol equivalent of *resurrectio mortuorum* would be *"pagbangon-liwat nin mga gadan"*. To support this interpretation,

---

[23] The new Bicol *ordo missae* (*An Pasunod-sunod sa Misa*) was published and used in 2008 long before the new English translation was officially approved by the Holy See and came to be used in 2011.
[24] See A. FAJARDO, *Letter to Msgr. Rodel Cajot*, n.d.

distinction is made between "*resurgo, resurgere*" and "*revivo, revivere*". The present Bicol translation would seem to correspond more to the idea of *revivere* (*mabuhay-liwat*), whereas in truth, in the language of the New Testament and the Fathers of the Church, the Christ *resurrexit* (in Greek, *anastasis*) and not *revixit*. Jesus did not "*live again*" (*nabuhay-liwat*) as it were after dying - his old life having been restored back to what it was before - but rather He "*rose again from the dead*" and passed over to another life, a transcendent reality that is completely different from what His human life used to be before he died. How this happened, of course, is a mystery since this idea of passing over to another life is something that is not perceptible to the senses.

While it must be acknowledged that there is no disputing this very insightful interpretation of the resurrection event, the real difficulty lies in the Bicol language itself once again as it lacks the precise vocabulary to describe what the *resurrectio* in the theological and biblical sense is really all about.

The resurrection implies that Christ destroyed death precisely by dying himself, thus rising from the dead would mean victory over death. This idea is not lost in the English *rising from the dead*, but the Bicol *pagbangon-liwat sa mga gadan* falls short of this profound theological meaning. *Pagbangon* in Bicol refers to the movement of the body when assuming a standing or vertical position after sitting, kneeling, or lying, or assuming this body posture to recover from a fall. In reference to the present subject, *magbangon liwat* might just imply that Christ simply "*stood up again*" and never really died. In other words, in Bicol *pagbangon* evokes the idea of "*pagkapadungkal*" (fall) rather than the idea of "*pagkagadan*" (death) or of life being restored and transformed into the glorious state characteristic of Christ's resurrected body.

Besides, *pagbangon-liwat* would seem to imply an idea that is alien to the Latin text, that is, that there has already been a previous rising (after a previous fall) for that is what *"liwat"* would necessarily imply, this being what the Latin prefix *"re-"* also means. Compared to *"pagbangon-liwat"*, *"pagkabuhay-liwat"* also implies an action that is being repeated, but one that is not alien to what the Latin text is saying, that is, the restoration of life, though by this is meant life indeed that is completely "new" and "different".

Furthermore, the meaning of *"pagkabuhay-liwat"* is inclusive both of the idea of the English "rising from the dead" and more importantly the idea that Christ conquered death which *"pagbangon-liwat"* unfortunately does not necessarily convey. These arguments may not necessarily overcome the difficulty with *"pagkabuhay-liwat"*, but they do show its advantage over *pagbangon-liwat*. On the whole, although *"pagbangon-liwat"* literally translates the Latin *resurgere,* it is just too weak a word all the same to express the whole mystery that is signified by the resurrection.

In one of the Prefaces for the Dead,[25] however, *pagbangon* is used. In this instance though, it translates the Latin *excitare* and not *resurgere*. The Latin text says, *"…ad ipsius resurrectionis gloriam tuo nutu excitamur."* The Bicol translation reads, *"…sa pagtugot mo, binabangon para sa kamurawayan kan saiyang pagkabuhay-liwat."* Here, *pagbangon* is effected by *pagkabuhay-liwat*.

---

[25] Preface IV for the Dead.

e) Confiteor unum baptisma

Towards the end of the Nicene creed, the verb *confiteor* (its object being *unum baptisma*) replaces the verb *credo* which is presupposed practically as the main verb in the entire profession of faith. In the Apostles Creed, *credo* is used all throughout. In English, *credo* is translated "I believe" while *confiteor* is translated "I confess".[26]

In Bicol, *credo* is translated "*Nagtutubod ako*", whereas *confiteor* can either be translated "*Nagkukumpisal ako*" or "*Nagpapahayag ako*". Of course, in the creed, it is the latter that is meant (the former expression belongs to the penitential rite). On close inspection, as used in the creed, *confiteri* has the force and sense of *credere*.

Even in the penitential rite, to confess does not only mean acknowledging one's sins, but more so owning them - an admission of guilt - as to cause repentance. In the creed, to confess means more than simply to issue a declaration but to express belief. It is on account of this, that *confiteor unum baptisma* has been translated in Bicol to "*nagpapahayag ako nin pagtubod sa sarong pagbonyag*" for to render it simply as "*nagpapahayag ako nin sarong bonyag*" is too weak an expression, that is, lacking in conviction as to reduce the idea of *confessio* to a mere *declaration* rather than a *firm avowal* (profession) of faith.

f) Accipite et manducate… Accipite et bibite

A point of grammar is raised by the translation of *"accipite et manducate ex hoc omnes… accipite et bibite ex eo omnes.."* These are the two formulae which the priest recites during consecration within the Eucharistic Prayer. The old Bicol translation read: *"Akoa asin kakana nindo gabos… Akoa asin inoma nindo gabos."* These formulae were used for many years until they were replaced with the present version that reads: *"Mag-ako kamo gabos asin magkakan kaini… Mag-ako kamo gabos asin mag-inom kaini…"* A third option would be to render this as *"Akoon nindo gabos asin kakanon (ini)… Akoon nindo gabos asin inomon (ini)…"*, as is now being proposed.[27]

Used for many years, the defect of the first translation was never detected until it was subjected to scrutiny that later showed the ambiguity of *"gabos"* as employed in the imperative sentence. Here, *"gabos"* could modify *"nindo"* (thus, *nindo gabos*) in which case the sentence could be taken to mean "*all of you, eat and drink*", or it could function as the object of *"kakana"* or *"inoma"* (thus, *kakana/inoma gabos*) in which case the sentence could be taken to mean *"eat and drink it all"*, namely, everything that there is! While everybody knew what the formula meant, the grammatical construction was such that it made the sentence say something more than what it was really meant to say.

To correct the defect, an immediate solution would be to place *"nindo gabos"* after the first verb "*Akoa*" for the whole sentence to thus read: *"Akoa nindo gabos asin kakana ini"* and "*Akoa nindo*

---

[26] The other meanings of *confiteri* include: to admit, to acknowledge, to reveal, to disclose, to concede, to allow and to denote.

[27] See A. FAJARDO, *Letter to Msgr. Rodel Cajot*, n.d.

gabos asin inoma ini". Such a formulation immediately brings to mind the present proposal which sounds the same except for the verb forms: *"Akoon nindo gabos asin kakanon (ini)… Akoon nindo gabos asin inomon (ini)…"* In support of this translation, it is argued that couched in the passive voice, which is peculiar to the Bicol language, the text thus formulated captures the real significance and impact of the command – an advantage that is lost if the same command were to be expressed using the active voice.

Compelling as the aforementioned argument goes, there is, however, one equally if not more cogent reason that would justify the use of the active voice in the present text. That is, not to be missed in the original Latin are two prepositional phrases: *ex hoc* after *manducate* and *ex eo* after *bibite*, both of which are best translated in Bicol to *"ka-ini"*, a pronoun that requires the active voice. The use of *"ini"*, a Bicol pronoun which goes with the passive voice, is ruled out as there is nothing in this single word that expresses or at least corresponds to the Latin preposition *"ex"*.

Keeping the translation as integral as possible and faithful to the Latin, one cannot simply ignore these prepositional phrases. For one thing, the present English translation seems to have also taken pains in preserving such little details as can now be seen in the present text: "*Take this all of you and eat of it...*" and *"Take this all of you and drink from it…"* Going back to the Bicol translation, preserving the prepositional phrases which disappeared in the old translation, and giving preference to *"kaini"* insofar as it seems to correspond to *"ex hoc"* and *"ex eo"* at least in form, the text should now read: *"Mag-ako kamo gabos asin magkakan kaini…"* and *"Mag-ako kamo gabos asin mag-inom kaini…"*

Ultimately, the difference here between the active and passive imperatives in terms of their impact is actually very minimal: *mag-ako kamo gabos* carries as much force and weight as *akoa* or *akoon nindo gabos*.

g) …qui…pro multis effundetur

What remains debatable in this text, as far as the Bicol translation is concerned, is not so much the prepositional phrase *pro multis* as this has already been settled with the issuance of a *notitia* coming from the Holy See requiring that it be translated *"for many"* (*para sa dakul*) instead of *"for all"* (*para sa gabos*) as was done in the past.[28] What is rather problematic is the exact Bicol translation of the verb *effundetur* (third person, singular, future passive indicative of *effundo, effundere, effusi, effusus*).

In English, *effundere* can actually mean two things. It can either mean *"to pour out"* or *"to shed"* (especially when matched with blood and tears). A. Chupungco differentiates "to pour out" from "to shed" in that the former does not always include the condition of hurt or pain and can

[28] See Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, *Letter to Bishops' Conferences* (Vatican), signed by then Prefect of the same Vatican Dicastery, Francis Cardinal Arinze, dated October 17, 2006.

mean simply the act of emptying out, whereas the latter suggests sacrifice or suffering – thus, a meaning that evokes the brunt of Christ's pain and the horrible reality of the cross.[29]

If one were to agree with Chupungco that the sacrificial undertone of *effundere* ought not to be weakened (which to him the English "*pouring out*" does), how is this to be expressed in Bicol – *papaboloson* or *papabuhoson* (*ibubuhos*)? The new Bicol translation opted for *papaboloson*.

A. Fajardo, however, opines that *ibubuhos* is the better alternative, arguing that this is the literal and biblical meaning of *effundere*.[30] He finds the use of *effundere* in the consecratory prayer over the wine as reminiscent of the Old Testament temple *sacrifices*, in which the *sacrificial* victim's blood was "*poured*" on the altar of *sacrifice* as an expiation for Israel's sins. Similarly, he sees Jesus as *pouring* his sacred blood on the altar of the Cross for the redemption «of many». While Fajardo acknowledges that "*papaboloson*" captures the meaning of "*shedding*" (without actually defining what it specifically meant in the same way that Chupungco did), he believes that this is not the meaning of *effundetur*, but rather "*ibubuhos*" (poured out). Yet, on the other hand, Fajardo describes Jesus as "*our Paschal Sacrifice*", thereby implying that Jesus' *pouring out* his blood on the cross has a *sacrificial* meaning, a meaning that would in fact favor the use of *papaboloson* over *ibubuhos* – that is, using Chupungco's distinction.

But more must now be said about "*magbuhos*" or simply "*buhos*" from the point of view of semantics. The word seems to have been assimilated from Tagalog. Following the principle enunciated above, there is nothing of course that should prevent a Tagalog word, *buhos* in particular, from gaining entry into the Bicol liturgical vocabulary should there be in fact no Bicol equivalent for it. But such is not the case. Bicol has such words as *magbolos*, *magpalis* or *magbobô* which can express the same idea conveyed by the Latin *effundere*. Curiously, *buhos* is not even listed in *M. Mintz* and *J. Britanico's* Bicol-English Dictionary,[31] an omission that could very well indicate that the word had been borrowed from elsewhere (Tagalog).

In any case, this probably explains why in Bicol, unlike in English, there seems to be no congruence between *buhos* and *dugo* (blood) and neither between *buhos* and *luhà* (tears). *Buhos* might be appropriate, though uncommonly done, to describe in Bicol the downpouring of rain because that is also the way it is said in Tagalog, namely, "*bumuhos ang ulan*" (*nagbuhos an uran*). But to apply it to *dugo* or *luhà* seems not only unusual but more so disparate. In English, "*pouring out blood*" is infrequent; the Bicol "*magbuhos nin dugo*" sounds even much more rare. In English, the expression "*blood is flowing*" is more congruent than "*blood is pouring*" in the same way as saying "*to pour water*" than "*to shed water*"!

Going back, however, to the use of *buhos* in Bicol, to say "*an tubig nagbuhos*" (active voice) is rather unusual as it is much better to say "*an tubig nagbolos*". Moreover, *buhos* in Bicol has almost come to always mean the liquefied cement mixture, *usually in such huge volumes*, for concreting roads, bridges, structural columns and beams (in buildings) and the action of

---

[29] A. CHUPUNGCO, *The New English Translation of the Roman Missal: A Catechetical Primer*, House Printers Inc., Manila (copyright 2011 by Archdiocesan Liturgical Commission, Manila), p. 55.
[30] A. FAJARDO, *Letter to Msgr. Rodel Cajot*.
[31] See M MINTZ-J. BRITANICO, *Bikol-English Dictionary, Diksionariong Bikol-Inglés*, New Day Publishers, Quezon City, 1985.

pouring this mixture into the same. It is, therefore, unimaginable in liturgical language to have blood in such quantity being poured out by Christ for the ransom of many!

h) Panem nostrum cotidiánum

Unchallenged for so many years, but which finally may have to be changed, is the Bicol translation of the Latin *panis* (third declension) into *kakanon*, as this occurs in the fourth petition of the *Our Father*. Literally, *panis* means bread. Thus, the Latin «*Panem nostrum cotidiánum da nobis hodie*» was and has always been translated into English to read, «*Give us this day our daily bread*».[32] This, on the other hand, has been translated in Bicol to *"an samong kakanon sa aroaldaw"* which in English means *our daily food*. In fact, most if not all Filipino languages would render the same petition in a similar way, as in the Tagalog translation which reads: "*Bigyan mo kami ngayon ng aming kakanin sa araw-araw."*[33]

There is no doubt that the Bicol translation of the present text was made in consideration of liturgical *inculturation*. Bread is not the staple of Bicolanos and if this petition was really about what people, especially poor people, actually ate and still eat for daily subsistence, it seemed more appropriate to speak just of *food in general* and not specify this as *bread* which Bicolanos, at least in olden times, seldom ate and eat. It is not so much that Bicolanos ate/eat something else (i.e. *rice*) on a day-to-day basis, but rather more of the fact that bread is not what they ate/eat everyday. Thus, to say *"an samong «tinapay» sa aroaldaw itao mo samuya ngonian"* would seem to be not just the kind of prayer that Bicolanos would feel and prefer reciting for it is not *tinapay* that they want to eat everyday but rather something else. In a way, one could ask, why would Bicolanos pray for bread when that is not what they really need in day-to-day living?

It should be clear by now that the old translation (it still is the present translation anyway!) was based on the interpretation and understanding of *panis* as *food* that is required for daily subsistence. A more profound reading and analysis, however, of the *Our Father*'s fourth petition reveals something else. According to this analysis, *panis* as used in the *Our Father* is actually a polysemous term as it is loaded with a deeper meaning than is usually acknowledged. The idea comes from Pope Benedict XVI in his book, "*Jesus of Nazareth*".[34] The Holy Father says that the fourth petition of the *Our Father* is the most human of all petitions. By

---

[32] Other Western languages have done the same, for instance: *a*) *French*: "Donne-nous aujourd'hui notre *pain* de ce jour."; *b*) *Italian*: "Dacci oggi il nostro *pane* quotidiano."; *c*) *Spanish*: "Danos hoy nuestro *pan* de cada día."; *d*) *Catalan*: "Dóna'ns avui el nostre *pa* de cada dia."; *e*) *Portuguese*: "O *pão* nosso de cada dia nos dai hoje."; *f*) *German*: "Unser tägliches *brot* gib uns heute."; *g*) *Dutch*: "Geef ons heden ons dagelijks *brood*."; *h*) *Greek*: "Ton *arton* hēmōn ton epiousion dos hēmin sēmeron."

[33] Compare with: *a*) *Cebuano*: "Ang *kalan-on* namo sa matag adlaw ihatag kanamo karong adlawa."; *b*) *Hiligaynon*: "Tagai kami sa amung *kalan-un* sa adlaw adlaw."; *c*) *Ilonggo*: "Panhatagan mo kami nian sing *kan-on* namon sa matag-adlaw."; *d*) *Waray*: "Tagi kami yana nga adlaw kan *pagkaon* nga amon kinahanglan."; *e*) *Masbateño*: "Tagai kami san among *pagkaon* sa oroadlaw."; *f*) *Kapangpangan*: "Ing *kakanán* mi king aldo-aldo ibie mu kekami."; *g*) *Ilocano*: "Itedmo kadakam ita *titaraon* mi iti inaldaw."; *h*) *Ibanag*: "Nu ic *canam* mi tac caggaggau yàna-t mu nicamí ta àggau au."; *i*) *Pangasinense*: "Say *kanen* min inagew-agew iter mod sikami ed agew aya."; *j*) *Bisaya* (Borneo): "Ihatag mo damun an *canum* namun sa matag-arlao."

[34] J. RATZINGER, Jesus of Nazareth, Bloomsbury Publishing, London, 2007, p. 150-157.

teaching us to pray for bread, the Lord also knows about and acknowledges our earthly needs. He thus recognizes that when "daily bread" is prayed for, it is that kind of bread that we need in order to live (necessary for existence).[35]

Yet, he says that daily bread is also actually that bread for the future. Praying for daily bread to the Father is actually asking to receive today tomorrow's bread. This bread then is bread that belongs to the future, thus an *eschatological* meaning of daily bread. This bread is the true manna of God, the bread of the new world which is no other than *"himself"*.

Moreover, the Holy Father points out that the Fathers of the Church were unanimous in understanding the fourth petition as a eucharistic petition. In the liturgy, the Our Father is prayed in the first place in view of holy communion – in other words, it is actually a eucharistic table prayer. Nevertheless, the Holy Father is quick to caution his readers that this interpretation does not do away with the immediate meaning or the earthly sense of the petition, but in a deeper sense it is a petition to be fed by God himself just as he did his people in the desert.

Finally, read in the light of Jesus' great discourse on the *bread of life*, the ultimate idea that emerges is that man's real food is the *Logos*, the eternal Word that becomes fully *manna* (bread) in the sacrament, the gift of the bread of the future given to us already today. The Holy Father concludes that if Jesus' message were to be considered in its entirety, it is impossible to expunge the eucharistic dimension from the fourth petition of the *Our Father*.

If the eucharistic meaning of *panem cotidianum* in the *Our Father* were to be given such emphasis, indispensable as it is, and if such meaning were to be adequately evoked in the liturgy, then this seems to be a compelling reason to translate *panis* to *tinapay*. After all, *tinapay nin buhay* conforms with eucharistic vocabulary, one that is biblical in the first place. Jesus, after all, refers to himself as the *"bread of life"*[36] (*"tinapay nin buhay"*) and not as "food of life" (*"kakanon nin buhay"*). In fact, this vocabulary is used in the preparation of the gifts when the priest says, "*Benedíctus es, Dómine, Deus univérsi, quia de tua largitáte accépimus panem, quem tibi offérimus, fructum terrae et óperis mánuum hóminum, ex quo nobis fiet* «panis vitae»." In Bicol, *panis vitae* as used in this part of the liturgy has always been translated *tinapay nin buhay*. Thus, to simply say *kakanon* does away with the specific symbolism of Jesus giving himself to us in the form of bread in communion.

It must be admitted, however, that despite such compelling reason to change now *kakanon* to *tinapay*, it is not that easy to do so. The move to make such a significant and "radical" change cannot depend solely on the decision of a group of translators. For one thing, more than any other prayer, Bicolanos have been so used to reciting by heart the *Our Father* with "*praying for daily food*" in mind, that changing this to *"daily bread"* might make them feel just be a bit uneasy and uncomfortable. Thus, if there should be any such change, it should obviously require intensive debate and the approval of all Bicol bishops, if not of the entire episcopal conference.

---

[35] J. RATZINGER, Jesus of Nazareth, p. 154.

[36] A. FAJARDO, *Letter to Msgr. Rodel Cajot*: "…PANEM would best be translated as TINAPAY and not "kakanon" (food). What the Lord brings us is not an ordinary staple food like rice, but Himself, the very Bread of Life."

Indeed, such a debate, should even involve the other Filipino language groups, considering that most, if not practically all Filipino languages, use the same vocabulary in referring to the "daily bread" that is mentioned in the fourth petition of the *Our Father*.[37]

i) Kagurangnan: A Personal Name or a Title?

The Latin "*Dominus*", whose equivalent in English is "*Lord*", has always been translated in Bicol to "*Kagurangnan*". While such translation is unproblematic, it has become unclear as to whether the same word is to be regarded as a personal name or as a title in the liturgy owing to its use in ordinary conversations. The issue is significant, at least as far as the Bicol language is concerned, because regarding it as a personal name would require the use of personal articles such as *si*, *ni* and *ki*, as Fajardo suggests. Whereas if it were simply to be regarded as a title, no such articles are required. Fajardo enumerates what he finds as appropriate expressions if *Kagurangnan* were to be used as a personal name: *si Kagurangnan*, *ni Kagurangnan* and *ki Kagurangnan*, thus, also the following texts in the liturgy:

> …Ipamibi *ki Kagurangnan* tang Dios (… rogamus in Domino Deo nostro)[38]
> Tataramon *ni Kagurangnan* (Verbum Dómini)
> *Si Kagurangnan* mapa-saindo (Dóminus vobíscum)
> Akoon man lugod *ni Kagurangnan*… (Suscípiat Dóminus…)
> Magpasalamat kita *ki Kagurangnan*… (Grátias agámus Dómino…)
> …banal *si Kagurangnan*, Dios nin mga Hukbô (…Sanctus Dóminus Deus Sábaoth)

It appears, however, that to couch the above liturgical texts in such wise would make the Bicol mode (pattern) of speech, *informal or idiomatic* Bicol to be more specific, as the basis for saying whether *Kagurangnan* is a personal name or a title. This, however, seems to be ordinarily not the norm in liturgical translation; rather it is the original function of the word in the Latin liturgy, if not its original meaning in Greek, in particular in the New Testament which ought to count as normative, as *Liturgiam authenticam* stipulates.[39]

In the original texts being considered, *Kyrios* (*Dominus*) is a Christological title meaning "master", which is clearly not a personal name. That it has somehow come to be regarded as a personal name is a later development in the Bicol language perhaps because of the influence of such incongrous Tag-lish or Bic-lish expressions, as Fajardo himself would describe them, in informal conversations like "*nagdadasal ako kay God*", "*sabi ni Lord*", or "*Harong ni Lord*".[40] These expressions and ways of addressing God sound intimate and personal, thus their appeal and popularity, but they also strike one as too informal as to be suitable for use in the liturgy.

---

[37] See footnote 33 above.

[38] This does not occur as such in the Roman Missal.

[39] This can be gleaned by implication from *Liturgiam authenticam's* statement (#30) that "*When the original text… employs a single term in expressing the interplay between the individual and the universality and unity of the human family or community… this property of the language of the original text should be maintained in the translation.*" In other words, there is preference to keep intact as much as possible the Latin text's original properties, among which for sure is its meaning and function.

[40] This is a name of a retreat house in Pamukid, San Fernando, Camarines Sur.

This is exactly what also happened to "*Cristo*" (*Christus, the Christ*) which is another Christological title meaning "*the anointed One*" that has evolved into becoming a personal name such that in the compound *Jesucristo*[41] or in the English Jesus Christ, people have even started to regard it as the family name of Jesus, which it is not. This is rather unfortunate for this is not what "*the* Christ" really stands for in the liturgy and certainly not in the New Testament. On account of this, it seems it is the reverse that is to be desired, that is, to prevent these titles from being regarded as personal names and instead restore their original biblical function and meaning precisely as Christological titles.[42] This goes true with *Cristo* in particular since people have generally gotten used to regarding it already as a personal name.

The clearest example in which *Kagurangnan* functions as a title is in the collect ending which reads: "*Per Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum Fílium tuum, qui tecum vivit et regnat in unitáte Spíritus Sancti, Deus, per ómnia sáecula sáeculorum.*" In this text, *Dominum nostrum*, like *Fílium tuum*, serves as an appositive title to *Iesum Christum*. To insist that *Dominum* here is a personal name would also mean assigning the same function to *Filium* since both go together in the prayer, in which case one would be forced to say "*Huli ki Jesus, si Cristo, si Kagurangnan mi, si Aki mo…*" – all of which sound awkward if not outright funny. Strictly speaking, this formula should be translated in English as, "*Through Jesus, the Christ, our Lord, your Son…*", or in Bicol as, "*Huli ki Jesus, an Cristo, samong Kagurangnan, saimong Aki…*" Here, both *Kagurangnan* and *Cristo* function as titles as they do in the original text.

Three more examples would show that both *Christus* and *Dominus* function as titles and from the way they are used cannot simply be regarded as names. First, the title of the Last Sunday in Ordinary Time reads: "*Domini Nostri Iesu Christi Universorum Regis*". If *Domini Nostri* in this instance were to be regarded as a name, what would prevent one from looking at *Universorum Regis* in the same way? That being the case, the whole thing would be translated in the genitive as "*Ni Kagurangnan Ta Jesu Cristo ki Hade kan Gabos*" or in the nominative as "*Si Kagurangnan Ta Jesu Cristo si Hade kan Gabos*" – both of which sound awkward and peculiar for a title of a feast, compared to the more elegant, "*An Satong Kagurangnan Jesu Cristo Hade kan Gabos*" or simply "*Satong Kagurangnan Jesu Cristo Hade kan Gabos*". Clearly, *Kagurangnan* as used here is parallel to *Hade* which also functions as a title.

The *post communion prayer* for December 17 also reads:

> *Divíno múnere satiáti, quáesumus, omnípotens Deus,*
> *hoc desidério potiámur, ut, a tuo accénsi Spíritu,*
> *ante conspéctum veniéntis «Christi tui»,*
> *velut clara luminária fulgeámus.*[43]

Finally, the *collect* for December 23, also shows the same pattern:

---

[41] To underline the fact that *Cristo* in *Jesucristo* is a title, it is now written separately from *Jesu*, thus, *Jesu Cristo*.

[42] This tendency to turn titles into personal names has generated such incongruous if not funny ways of addressing the Blessed Virgin Mary, for instance, "*si Santa Lourdes*", "*ki Inmaculada Concepcion*", "*si Medalla Milagrosa*", etc. The question is, should this tendency be encouraged in liturgy, just because these "names" have crept into ordinary conversation and personal (devotional) prayer?

[43] Post Communion Prayer, December 17 (parenthetical marks added).

Omnípotens sempitérne Deus,
nativitátem Fílii tui secúndum carnem
propinquáre cernéntes,
quáesumus, ut nobis indígnis fámulis tuis
misericórdiam praestet Verbum,
quod ex Vírgine María dignátum est caro fieri,
et in nobis habitáre Iesus Christus, «Dóminus noster».[44]

It is certainly more faithful to the text and certainly more elegant to translate *Christi tui* in the first prayer "*an saimong Cristo*" rather than "*si Cristo mo*" and *Dominus noster* in the second prayer "*samong Kagurangnan*" rather than "*si Kagurangnan mi*".

The same might be said of the introit for the Tuesday of Christmas time which is taken from Psalm 117, 26-27: "*Benedíctus qui venit in nómine Dómini: Deus Dóminus et illúxit nobis*." *Dominus* in this text is a title ascribed to *Deus* and is best translated into Bicol thus, "*An Dios Kagurangnan*…" and not "*An Dios si Kagurangnan*…" Or, might insisting otherwise force one to also treat *Deus* in much the same way when not used in the vocative, in which case this line would read, "*Si Dios, si Kagurangnan*"?

In all these, it is the original Latin and biblical usage which should determine the function of these words and not how they might have already been used in colloquial language, however appealing and trendy this might have also become.

Rarely Used Bicol Words

Translation of the new Roman Missal into Bicol has occasioned the use of rare Bicol words; rare indeed but appropriate to express liturgical concepts. They need to be mentioned and explained here to facilitate understanding.

Napatimasang

This word translates the Latin *amittere* (*amitto, amisi, amissus*), a compound of the prefix *a-* and the verb *mittere*. Ordinarily this verb can simply mean to lose something (etymologically, *to send away*). But the prefix *a-* suggests that what is lost is something that was allowed to slip *away*, as though to go to waste .

The word occurs in one of the prefaces on Ordinary Sundays: "*…tua dona… amiseramus…*"[45] In this preface, we recognize that it was through Jesus' *obedience* to the will of the Father that restored His gifts to us, yet it is through our *disobedience* that these gifts are lost. We see here the contrast between the consequence of Jesus' obedience and that of our disobedience: obedience restores God's gifts, thus making these gifts available to us for our great benefit, yet

[44] Collect, December 23 (parenthetical marks added).
[45] Preface VII, Ordinary Sundays.

disobedience wastes this opportunity and lets these gifts simply to slip away from our grasp. This idea of squandering God's gifts is best expressed in Bicol not just by *"winarâ"* (lost) but more so by *"napatimasang"*.

Magharubay

A word unknown in many parts of Bicol but commonly used in Camarines Sur is the verb *magharubay*. In Calabanga (Camarines Sur) there is a village at the foot of Mount Isarog whose name is *Harubay*.

There are at least two Latin words that *magharubay* translates: *praedicare* (Eng., *to proclaim* or *to foretell*) and *praeconari* (to proclaim) and its derivative noun *praeconium*, *praeconii* (a *proclamation beforehand*, thus a *prophecy* or an *oracle*). Both words are prefixed with *prae-* which means *before*. Both can be used together to constitute one sense of a meaning, for instance in the second Advent Preface which reads: *"Quem praedixerunt cunctorum praeconia prophetarum…"* Here, *praeconia* is the subject of *praedixerunt* which is translated in Bicol in the passive form, "*Ihinarubay siya sa (mga) hula kan gabos na profeta…*" In other words, it is the oracles (*mga hula*) of the prophets that proclaimed (*nagharubay*) the coming of Jesus.

Praedicare occurs once again in the first preface for feasts of the Virgin Mary, *"Et te in … beátae Maríae semper Vírginis collaudáre, benedícere et praedicáre."*[46] In Bicol, unlike in the English translation, *praedicare* is distinguished from *glorificare*, thus the Bicol translation of the whole sentence reads, *"Asin sarabay na mag-omaw, magrokyaw asin magharubay saimo sa…ni Santa Maria danay na Virgen."*

A noun which is derived from *praedicare*, i.e., *praedicatio (-onis*), is used in the fourth common preface: *"…verbo praedicatiónis erúdias…"*[47] In this preface, there are three verbs attributed to the Lord, *corroborare* (to strengthen), *erudire* (to teach) and *tueri* (to protect or to watch over). The Lord *strengthens* the Church, *teaches* her and *watches over* her, said preface proclaims. In particular, the Lord teaches the Church by way of the word that is the object of proclamation (*verbo praedicationis*) – thus in Bicol, *"… (an saimong Simbahan)…hinuhulitan (mo) kan tataramon na hinaharubay…"*

Praedicare could have also been translated in Bicol as *magrokyaw*. But *magrokyaw* can also translate *benedicere*, *affere* or *adferre*, *nuntiare*, *denuntiare* or *pronuntiare*. Nonetheless, in keeping with a caveat from *Liturgiam authenticam*, the use of a single vernacular word for rendering differing Latin terms is here as much as possible avoided.[48] Thus, *magharubay* (*praedicare* or *praeconari*) is distinguished from *magrokyaw* (*benedicere*), *magbalangibog «kan marahay na bareta»* (*evangelizare* which is to spread by way of announcing or preaching), and *ipaisi* or magpa-isi (*nuntiare*).

---

[46] Preface I, Blessed Virgin Mary.
[47] Preface IV, Common.
[48] *Liturgiam authenticam*, n. 51.

Magsubang/Magsirang and *Subangán/Sirangan*

While *magsirang* and *sirangan* are frequently used especially in conversational Bicol, such is not the case with *magsubang* and *subangán*. Both pairs of Bicol words are used to translate the Latin verbs *orior*, *ori* (to originate or to rise from) and *orior*, *oriri* (to proceed from or to originate from), and the Latin noun derived from these verbs, i.e., *oriens*, *orientis* (Orient or the East). These Latin words figure in several texts.

Subangan and *sirangan* are synonymous but they are slightly different in nuance. *Subangan* refers more to the idea of *origin* (source), whereas *sirangan* refers more to the action (movement) itself of *rising*. Thus, *magsubang* means to originate from (to proceed from), whereas *magsirang* means to rise from – in reference to the sun, both *subangan* and *sirangan* point to the East. On account of this difference, "*oriatur…in cordibus nostris*"[49] is translated "*magsubang lugod sa samong mga puso*".

An instance where both *subangan* and *sirangan* occur is in the introit of the vigil mass of Epiphany (Baruch 5,5): "Surge, Ierúsalem, et circúmspice ad *orientem* et vide congregatos filios tuos a solis *ortu* usque ad occasum."[50] In this text, *subangan* (oriens) is where the sun *originates* and *sirangan* is where it *rises*. Thus, in Bicol, the text reads: "Bangon Jerusalem, asin mangalagkalag sa *Subangán*, dangan hilnga an mga tiniripon mong mga aki, poon sa *sirangan* kan saldang sagkod sa solnopan."

In the communion antiphon on the Epiphany mass during the day – "*Vidimus stellam eius in Oriente"* (Mt 2,2) - the mention of *"Oriente"* seems to make reference to where the star *"rises"* thus justifying the Bicol translation, "*Nahiling mi an bitoon niya sa Sirangan*." The same sense is expressed in the third Eucharistic Prayer which says, "*ut a solis ortu usque ad occasum*",[51] the Bicol equivalent being, *"…tanganing poon pagsirang sagkod pagsolnop kan saldang…"*

Maghumang and *Magsupang*

The Collect for Friday, Week I Advent speaks of "ab *imminéntibus* peccatórum nostrórum periculis". When one reads the context of the prayer and considering that *imminéntibus* is used with *perículis*", *imminéntibus* (from *immineo*, *imminere*) comes to mean not only something that looms or is forthcoming but something imminent as *to threaten*. In Bicol, this is best expressed by *naghuhumang* and not simply by *nagdadangadang* (approaching), thus the text above is translated, "*…hale sa mga naghuhumang kapahamakan kan samong mga kasâlan…*"

Not really rarely used in Bicol is the word *supang* which refers to something that sprouts from a plant, either from the plant's trunk or branch or directly from the ground as from a seed. In Liturgy, however, its use is metaphorical as in the Introit of Sunday IV Advent which reads: *"Paambona, O langit, hale sa itaas; asin an mga alapaap mag-oran nin katanosan; magbuka an daga asin magsupang an Paraligtas."* In this biblically derived text, *magsupang* translates *gérminet* from

---

[49] Collect, Saturday, Advent Week II.
[50] Introit (Bar. 5,5), Epiphany Vigil Mass.
[51] Eucharistic Prayer III.

germinare, which literally means to sprout forth. The idea is that when the earth is nourished by dewfall and rain, it would bring forth the Savior.

Kasalinggayahan and *Kagayagayahan*

Much more rarely used is the word *masalinggaya.* A word that is close to *masalinggaya* in meaning, at the same that it rhymes with it, is *magayagaya*. There is, however, a difference between these two Bicol adjectives. *Masalinggaya* translates *serenus* (*-a, -um*) meaning calm or serene and necessarily cheerful, while *magayagaya* translates *placitus* (*est*) and a number of other words like *iucundatus* (*est*), *laetificus* and *gavisus* (*est*) meaning pleasing, delightful or joyful.

This difference is best seen in the Collect for December 29 where *serénum* modifies *vultus*: "*…sereno vultu nos…intuére…"*, rendered in Bicol as "*…hilnga kami kan saimong masalinggayang lawog…"*; and in the communion antiphon of the second Sunday of Advent: "*…et vide iucunditátem, quae véniet tibi a Deo tuo*" (Bar 4,6), which in Bicol reads, "*…dangan hilinga an kagayagayahan na madatong saimo gikan sa saimong Dios."* In this biblical passage, *kagayagayahan* translates *iucunditátem* to mean *joy* or *delight*.

Other Vernacular Words of Interest

Some words which some Bicolanos, especially those of the younger generations, may not immediately recognize include the following:

1. magtingraw, v., *effulgere*[52] or *infulgere*,[53] to shine forth, to glitter
2. magsanggawad, v., *succurrere*,[54] to run or hasten to the aid
3. magsadol, v., *incitare*,[55] to inspire, to arouse, to urge on
4. magmunda, v., *dirigere*,[56] to direct or to guide
5. balakid, adj., *largitus* (*-a, -um*) from *largire* (*magwaras*, to grant) and related to *largitas* (*-atis*),[57] bountiful, generous
6. dagyâ, adv./adj., *affluenter*,[58] abundant/abundantly or copious/copiusly (thus *kadagyaan*, n., for *affluentia*, abundance or profusion)
7. nakakadagká, adj. or adv., *alacris*, *alacriter*[59] spirited or lively
8. kaladman, n., *penetralis* (adj.),[60] innermost part, interiority
9. hipà, n., *laqueus* (*-i*),[61] snare or trap

---

[52] See Preface I for the Dead.
[53] See Preface I of Christmas.
[54] See Preface III of the Sundays in Ordinary Time.
[55] See Preface II of Saints.
[56] See Communion Antiphon of December 19.
[57] See Preface II of the Blessed Virgin Mary.
[58] See Post Communion Prayer, December 21.
[59] See Collect, Sunday III of Advent.
[60] See Post Communion Prayer, Saturday of Week III of Lent.
[61] See Introit, Sunday III of Lent.

10. kalasag, n., *munimen, muniminis* (n.), shield, protection, fortification, defense; *scutum, scuti,* n., shield
11. katigayonan, n., *dispositio, dispositionis* (n),[62] (good/beautiful/orderly) disposition
12. maghumang, v. *imminere,* v. The Collect for Friday, Week I Advent speaks of "ab *imminéntibus* peccatórum nostrórum periculis". When one reads the context of the prayer and considering that *imminéntibus* is used with *perículis*", *imminéntibus* (from *immineo*, *imminere*) comes to mean not only something that looms or is forthcoming but something imminent as *to threaten*. In Bicol, this is best expressed by *naghuhumang* and not simply by *nagdadangadang* (approaching), thus the text above is translated, "…*hale sa mga naghuhumang kapahamakan kan samong mga kasâlan*…"
13. maghurot, v., *urgeo, urgere*, v., press hard in pursuit, urge
14. magsulang, v., *insurgo, insurgere* (v.), rise up (against), impede
15. ma-orop, adj., *intentus* (a, um), adj., eager; *alacriter* (adv.), eagerly; *propensius,* adj., ready willing, eager
16. masigkat, adv., *festinanter* (adv.), promptly, speedily, quickly
17. magtalanhok, v., *insero, inserere* (v.), plant into, graft, insert
18. magtugis, v., *exsequor, exsequi* (v.), pursue
19. nahimahaan, v. part. (from *pahà*, thirst), *inebriatus* (v., part.), quenched (sense of being saturated or drenched)
20. pinangilin, v. part., *parsus* (from *parco, parcere*), spared
21. tatá, n., *ianua, ianuae,* n., gate, door

As far as assimilation is concerned, a couple of words so far have been borrowed from Tagalog, namely: *pagsubok* (instead of the Spanish-sounding *kadificilan* or *pagprobar*), n., *aerúmna*,[63] hardship; and *ipaubaya*, v., *commendare*,[64] to entrust or to commend to.

Several words/phrases and expressions have also been tentatively adopted for want of a better equivalent in the vernacular and these include: *pangharong-harong*, adj., *domesticus* (*a, um*),[65] domestic; *naturang kinabanon* for *terrena substántia,* earthly substance; *an diosnon*, substantive adj., *quod divinum est*,[66] the divine.

Conclusion

Liturgiam authenticam has anticipated well the difficulties that might be encountered in translating Latin into the vernacular when it acknowledged that "… *fidelity and exactness with respect to the original texts may themselves sometimes require that words already in current usage be employed in new ways, that new words or expressions be coined, that terms in the original text be transliterated or adapted to the pronunciation of the vernacular language…"*[67]

---

[62] See Collect, 9th Sunday of the Year.
[63] See Post Communion Prayer, Feast of the Holy Family.
[64] See Preface V of Easter.
[65] See Collect of the Feast of the Holy Family.
[66] See Prayer Over the Gifts, Christmas Dawn Mass.
[67] *Liturgicam authenticam*, #21.

On close inspection, what *Liturgiam authenticam* suggests here are not entirely new. In the past, foreign words have not only been transliterated or adapted to the vernacular's way of pronunciation. Some of them have also been completely assimilated as they are even in their original spelling. Words like *allelúia*, *hosánna, amen, evangelio, misterio, gracia, sacrificio, liturgia* and *eucaristia*, or even *Kyrie eleison*, come to mind. These words never existed in Bicol, but their frequent and constant use in the liturgy has made them almost part of the Bicol language itself. As a result, these words are now readily understood.

Over the years, frequent use has also made some biblical (but otherwise strange) concepts familiar and understandable, such as "*Cordero kan Dios*", "*Aki nin Tawo*" and "*Misterio Pascual*". In no time, it is therefore hoped, through continuous use and catechesis, such expressions as "*Asin sa saimong espiritu*" (*Et cum spiritu tuo*), "*ambon kan saimong Espiritu*" (*Spíritus tui rore*), "*Sa kapanahonan kan mga panahon*" (*in saecula saeculorum*) and "*Pamanggi kan Cordero*" (*cena agni*) now used in the new translation would gain familiarity and acceptance as well, even if at first they may also sound strange and peculiar.

What seems novel, however, is the application of the provision that *a)* words in current usage may be employed in new ways, and that *b)* new words and expressions may be coined in order to convey the meaning of the original text. This is just what the new Bicol translation of the Roman Missal hopes to achieve, for instance, in adopting such words as *honglonan* and *popônan* as already explained above.

What is also distinctive of the new translation is its openness to adopt (assimilate) words or expressions taken from the other Bicol dialects and Tagalog, as exemplified in the use of *sanong*, *pagsubok* and *ipaubaya*. This time, such appreciation for the other Bicol dialects will allow ideas to be expressed in these dialects when seen fit and suitable, where Bicol Naga is unable to articulate and put across. This should be good not only for the liturgy but for the growth of the Bicol language itself.

Now Detroit's Archbishop *A. Vigneron's* plea to his fellow Americans in an effort to persuade them to accept the new English translation of the Roman Missal is worth rephrasing here: "*…we should be patient with the new translation of the Roman Missal… this translation will take work to get used to… simply because it is new, and most of us generally resent the effort to change*," nonetheless, may the explanations offered in this essay help everyone see "*that the trouble to be caused by the new translation will be worth it.*"[68]

To conclude, one must always bear in mind, that according to the wish of the Holy Father himself, the new Bicol translation, very much like the new English translation, has been occasioned - necessitated in fact - by the desire, to make the vernacular text as faithful so far as possible to the original Latin text and thereby be in harmony and in *communion* with the liturgical language of the rest of the Catholic world – indeed in the spirit of *one faith*, *one worship*, and *one liturgy*.

---

[68] A. VIGNERON, *The Art of Pastoral Translation: At the Service of Communion*, Address at the Gateway Liturgical Conference in St. Louis, Missouri, November 7, 2008.