

THEOLOGIE DER LITURGIE

Verlag Friedrich Pustet

Joris Geldhof, Daniel Minch,
Trevor Maine (eds.)

Approaching the Threshold of Mystery

Liturgical Worlds
and Theological Spaces

THEOLOGIE DER LITURGIE

Herausgegeben von
Martin Stuflesser

Band 10

Joris Geldhof, Daniel Minch,
Trevor Maine (eds.)
Approaching the Threshold of Mystery

Verlag Friedrich Pustet
Regensburg

Joris Geldhof, Daniel Minch,
Trevor Maine (eds.)

Approaching the Threshold of Mystery

Liturgical Worlds and Theological Spaces

Verlag Friedrich Pustet
Regensburg

All articles in this volume have undergone a rigorous peer review process based on an initial editor screening and blind refereeing by two anonymous referees.

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

eISBN 978-3-7917-7100-7 (PDF)
© 2015 by Verlag Friedrich Pustet, Regensburg
Umschlag: Martin Veicht, Regensburg
eBook-Produktion: Friedrich Pustet, Regensburg

Diese Publikation ist auch als Printprodukt erhältlich:
ISBN 978-3-7917-2741-7

Weitere Publikationen aus unserem Programm finden Sie unter www.verlag-pustet.de.

Contents

Joris Geldhof
Foreword.....7

Trevor Maine and Daniel Minch
Liturgy, Theology, and the Crisis of History
Clearing Space for Liturgical Theology.....9

1. Liturgical Spaces: On the Edge of the Sacred and the Secular

Bert Daelemans, S.J.
Fifty Shades of Grey?
Contemporary Churches as Lived Liturgies that Mediate Mysteries 25

Philip J. Rossi, S.J.
Liturgy as Sacramental Mystery
Incarnating Grace in the Space of Wordly Vulnerability 44

2. The Liturgical Mediation of the *totus Christus*

Kevin G. Grove, C.S.C.
The “Whole Christ” and the Mediation of Mystery within the Liturgy 61

Walter Knowles
“Becoming What You See”
Augustin’s Mystagogia of Deification 74

3. The Eucharistic Center of the Liturgical Field

Samuel Goyvaerts
„Das große Sakrament der Vereinigung“
Franz Anton Staudenmaier’s Eucharistic Theology 89

Daniel Minch

Language, Structure, and Sacrament

Reconsidering the Eucharistic Theology of Edward Schillebeeckx..... 98

4. Looking Beyond the West and the Roman Rite*Unnatba Kavuvila*

Mediating the Mystery of Forgiveness and Reconciliation

Subukkono, the Service of Peace in the Malankara Rite 123*Elochukwu Uzukwu*

Recapturing the Mystery – Captured by the Mystery

African Eucharistic Prayers in the Roman Rite 137

5. Liturgical Commotion in Eastern Europe*Katerina Bauerova*

The Mystery of Divine-Human Cooperation in Freedom and Creativity

An Example of Liturgical Life from the Russian Diaspora in France 155

Jitka Jonová

Attempts to Use the Vernacular Language in the Catholic Liturgy

in the Czech Lands in the 1920s 166

6. The Liturgy Enters Society**Exploring its Social Relevance and Existential Value***Thomas M. Kelly*

When Liturgy Empowers

Rutilio Grande, S.J. and the Church of El Salvador 185

Christopher McMabon

Cruciform Salvation and Emergent Probability

The Liturgical Significance of Lonergan's Precept 198

Personalia 213

Foreword

The present volume is the offspring of a successful academic theological conference, which was organized in Leuven, Belgium, from 23–26 October 2013. It was the ninth in the series of Leuven Encounters in Systematic Theology (LEST) and had set itself the goal of bringing together liturgy and systematic theology. The title of the conference was *Mediating Mysteries, Understanding Liturgies*. The idea behind it was that there is still a great amount of work to do at the intersection of liturgy and systematic theology.¹ Many systematic theologians – dogmaticians as well as fundamental theologians – still tend to look down upon liturgy, as if it is merely the ritual and practical expression of the contents of belief, which they can study with more conceptual precision. Many liturgists, for their part, often fear or refrain from entering into the area of speculation and thinking, thereby leaving aside many interesting opportunities for theological reflection unexplored.

This mentality, however, whereby liturgy and systematic theology are treated as separate disciplines is not advantageous for either partner. Liturgy is probably more than just a topic or a resource of references for theology; it can be considered as a kind of theologizing in its own right. Its performative disposition, ritual character, festive embedding, and celebratory dimensions are not stumbling blocks for theory, but rather motivations and inspirations for deeper soundings. This primary action-nature of liturgy requires of course more innovative methodologies than the ones that have prevailed the discipline of theology in bygone centuries. The articles gathered in this volume offer beautiful examples of doing liturgical theology in the early twenty-first century. A co-inherence of liturgy and systematic reflection is what binds all of them, even though they deal with many diverse issues.

The present book is also part of a work-in-progress, which is currently being carried out by the Liturgical Institute in Leuven. The Liturgical Institute emerged out of a convergence of interests and forces in the late 1960s, when the renowned Benedictine abbey of Keizersberg and the Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies of the Catholic University of Leuven decided to formally cooperate in the field of liturgical studies – which they had formerly undertaken only informally. In addition to many research initiatives, the Liturgical Institute has ever since edited the journal *Questions Liturgiques/Studies in Liturgy*, which was founded by Dom

¹ Joris Geldhof (ed.), *Mediating Mysteries, Understanding Liturgies: On Bridging the Gap Between Liturgy and Systematic Theology*, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium (Leuven: Peeters, 2015).

Lambert Beauduin in the early twentieth century. It was one of the major channels by which the famous monk and founder of the abbey of Chevetogne aimed at promoting the Liturgical Movement in Belgium and beyond.

It was one of Dom Beauduin's fellow monks and a good friend of his, Dom Maïeul Cappuyens, who wrote the first article about the intrinsic relation between liturgy and theology. It appeared in one of the first volumes of our beloved journal.² The text itself has a classical structure and typically takes its point of departure from scholasticism, as was customary – and probably also necessary – at that time. Nevertheless, its prophetic value consists in the way in which it problematizes the lack of attention for the liturgy in dogmatic theology. Cappuyens demonstrates how dogmatic theologians – and even official doctrinal documents of the Church's teaching authorities – systematically neglect the liturgy, even if it is obvious how overwhelming its importance and influence are for any doctrinal development.

This book is yet another step in the attempts to think not only *about* liturgy, i.e. as a topic among others which one can isolate, circumscribe, study and defend opinions about, but also *from* liturgy. There is definitely something to say in favor of granting liturgy, sacraments and worship at large a much more prominent place in contemporary theological thought. The 'location' of liturgy deserves, and needs, to be reevaluated and accordingly appreciated. The liturgy opens theological worlds, which have hitherto received insufficient attention, both content-wise and methodologically. The investigation of a sheer infinite amount of dimensions of mystery and their liturgical mediations continues to constitute a challenging theological program for the years to come. We may have only approached the threshold.

Joris Geldhof
Feast of Corpus Christi
June 2015

² Dom Maïeul J. Cappuyens, "Liturgie et théologie," in *Les Questions Liturgiques et paroissiales* 9 (1934): 249–272.

Liturgy, Theology, and the Crisis of History

Clearing Space for Liturgical Theology

Trevor Maine and Daniel Minch

Both in practice and as an object of study, the liturgy today is contested ground. Since the outset of the Liturgical Movement, but especially over the past 50 years, the themes of liturgy and liturgical reform have received increased attention within both Catholic and Protestant circles, especially regarding the complex and often nebulous relationships between liturgical forms, theology, and practicing Christian communities. There are today numerous approaches to liturgy, numerous views of its purpose and place within Christianity, how one should study it, what it is, and what its message. And though the vast majority of liturgical scholars would grant many of the oft-stated maxims regarding liturgy, that it is the life of the church in action, that it is the location in which “the work of our redemption is enacted,”¹ that it is the “collective memory of the Church,”² or Prosper of Aquitaine’s *lex orandi, lex credendi* [the rule of prayer dictates the rule of faith],³ there is disagreement as to what these messages mean for the church, for ecumenism, and for theology. These disputes have important implications beyond academic theo-

¹ Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, Part III, Question 83, Art. 1, The Rite of This Sacrament, also cited in Sacrosanctum Concilium, 2.

² Wendelin Köster S.J., “Recovering Collective Memory in the Context of Postmodernism,” in *Liturgy in a Postmodern World*, ed. K. Pecklers S.J. (New York: Continuum 2003), 32. If the Church is a corporate body or personality, says Köster, then it also has a memory – “an instrument that is collecting all that is necessary to know about who she is” – and this faculty or memory is liturgy.

³ Prosper’s original phrase, “*ut legem credendi lex statuat supplicandi*” [the order of supplication determines the rule of faith], appears in an exhortation of Christian liturgical practice as formative for doctrine, against Pelagianism. For further discussions of the historical meaning of this text and its interpretation, see among others, Paul De Clerk, “Lex orandi, lex credendi: The original sense and historical avatars of an equivocal adage.” trans. Thomas M. Winger. *Studia Liturgica* 24 (1994): 178–200; Geoffrey Wainwright, *Doxology: The Praise of God in Worship, Doctrine and Life. A Systematic Theology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980); and David W. Fagerberg, *Theologia Prima: What is Liturgical Theology?* (Chicago: Hillenbrand Books, 2003). This definition of the phrase, however, has come under question, with some scholars believing it to be overly-broad and historically inaccurate. See here: Paul Bradshaw, “Difficulties in Doing Liturgical Theology,” *Pacifica* 11 (1998): 181–194.

logical circles as well. The liturgy, after all, must always be enacted, experienced, and embodied by actual people and communities who come to liturgical space to worship – people who must navigate the traffic of Christian identity and redemption not only in their own lives but also between life and liturgy. These people and communities cannot be separated from their personal contexts, identities, or places in history – many of which may be experienced as ‘in tension’ with the words said or the beliefs professed in the liturgy.⁴ At issue is whether the liturgy is fundamentally a *method* (*mystagogia*), a location, or whether it is a *message*, and the answers to these questions will fundamentally affect how individuals, cultures, and communities relate to liturgy itself. This crisis of what the liturgy represents, how best to approach it, and how best to make sense of its history can be seen as parallel, perhaps even formative of, the crisis of history now felt in modernity.

Though the effects of these tensions and conflicts can be acutely felt today, it cannot be said that these conflicts are particularly *new* or novel. Debating what liturgy and sacraments *say*, what sorts of theologies might lie behind their expression, and how best to interpret their meaning as passed down through history has been a primary task (or preoccupation) of Christian thought from the beginning. It is perhaps uncontroversial to state that there are and *should* be multiple ways to approach the liturgy as an object of study. That different researchers do and should seek to explore the theological riches of historical liturgical practice with different goals in mind, and to illuminate different aspects of its mysterious character, is both right and necessary. It is therefore important to realize straight away that a diversity of approaches and “perspectives as well as a certain fluidity with regard to its scope, goal, and research results are intrinsic to [liturgical theology as a] reflexive and outstandingly theological discipline.”⁵ In this volume, we seek to do justice to these diverse methods and goals as well as to the history of the liturgy and of Christians’ contextual, historical experience of it.

One of the core insights of the Second Vatican Council was the degree to which the Council Fathers recognized the full impact of history and its role in the development of tradition. *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, was the first constitution to be promulgated and was the product of a long and difficult confrontation of the faithful with the problem of history and their efforts at retrieval and renewal of the public prayer of the church. Religion,

⁴ Because of the complex interplay between individual and corporate identities, between those identities, the beliefs of the church, and society more broadly, Teresa Berger suggests that liturgy is the most politicized ecclesial site of our times. Teresa Berger, “The Contemporary Church and the Real Presence of Women: Of Liturgy, Labor, and Gendered Lives,” *Yale Institute of Sacred Music Colloquium: Music, Worship, Arts* 1, no. 1 (2004): 95–103.

⁵ Joris Geldhof, “Liturgical Theology,” in *Religion: Oxford Research Encyclopedias*. 12 Jun. 2015. <http://religion.oxfordre.com/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780199340378.001.0001/acrefore-9780199340378-e-14>.

and especially the Christian religion, is always a historical phenomenon, inseparable from its context and narrative historicity without substantial alterations to the narrative itself. Christianity must maintain a special awareness of this historicity, no less in the liturgy, because it claims its foundation in a historical event: the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth identified as the Christ and Son of God. The Incarnation is the symbol of God's salvation in human form and the manifestation of that salvific power in history. The very power of God shines forth in the weakness of the human man Jesus, who was rejected by religious authorities and painfully executed by an occupying power.

History is the site of God's activity – even in events we see as terrible and meaningless, filled with human suffering. As Christians it is our duty to be conscious of our limitations and historicity in a very special way, but not merely as a sign of human impotence, but as the very condition of human action in the world and the conduit of God's grace to and for others. We point this out because contemporary society is very much *afflicted* by historicity, precisely in its attempts to escape from it. Political narratives in Europe and the United States have relied recently on more and more skewed versions of the past, and nationalistic narratives rooted in an ultimately mythological history. This is especially true of many right-wing movements in European governments, with the sentiment being that increased toleration and diversity in society has diluted what used to be 'pure' national populations, values, and religious traditions. This trend is disturbing, especially when it is applied to religious narratives, as though the inclusion of a new minority community could, almost automatically, destabilize centuries of 'stable' tradition. When has tradition been purely stable? When has European, or American, or Canadian, or Indian identity been homogenous? As religious people we have a duty to unmask these false narratives of the past, and to recover elements of suffering in that past that will help us to deal with the suffering that is in our midst today.

Public Acts, Symbolic Resonance

It is from these historical considerations and, indeed, difficulties that we now turn to the liturgy. The liturgy is not merely an interior exercise, and it is not something purely intellectual for scholars to write technical treatises over, although one may expect from scholars a great deal of technical expertise and sophistication. What we must recognize is the degree to which 'history' and 'liturgy' are intertwined, and how this very fact contributes to the essential nature of liturgy as a public act. The focus on history must not be forgotten, especially as we celebrate the fifty-year jubilees of Vatican II and its documents, which did so much to establish the

role of history in the Christian tradition. In service of that point, we cannot merely think that Vatican II and its documents emerged fully formed from the Council sessions. Each document has its own history.

The Council itself, has its genesis partially in a public, symbolic (and beautifully subversive) act made by St. John XXIII. He made a brief pilgrimage by train to the Marian shrine in Loreto in 1962, shortly before the opening of the Council. This was the very rail line that had been built in the former Papal States under Pius IX, but which was never used by a sitting pope at the time of their completion in the nineteenth century.⁶ The unification of Italy in 1870, and the abolition of the Papal States made this ‘impossible,’ when Pius IX declared himself a ‘prisoner of the Vatican,’ and refused to acknowledge the authority of the state of Italy.⁷ This state continued formally until 1929, but the true end of papal ‘captivity,’ captivity to the past, should be seen as John XXIII’s journey north on the very railroad that his predecessor had built, now under state control. This was a clear sign of acknowledgement of the world outside the walls of the Vatican, “without any nostalgia for the Papal States, John XXIII proclaimed the Church’s new freedom from the burdens of the past.”⁸ It was a symbolic reorientation of the Bishop of Rome’s attention towards his flock. The church would come out to the people, and John was stating it publicly. This was a deeply liturgical action: active participation in the holy mystery of God’s mercy and forgiveness, and the public prayer of the church was present in his journey north. Much like his *public* removal of the word ‘perfidious’ from the Good Friday prayers for the Jewish people, prayer and action were united in a liturgical state of being. He acknowledged the painful realities of the past in a way that released the tension and demonstrated that neither he nor his church would remain captives of the past, but neither could it be forgotten entirely. The law that was performed and prayed was also the one which we believe in, and was formative of that belief: *lex orandi, lex credendi*.

For the liturgy, the deeper renewal experienced in the twentieth century began earlier than the council, and its history is relevant for us. The Liturgical Movement, widely regarded as a twentieth-century phenomenon, began in the nineteenth century as a child of the Ultramontanist Benedictine monk, Prosper Guéranger (1805–1875).⁹ His model of the ideal community as a liturgical, wor-

⁶ Bernard P. Prusak, *The Church Unfinished: Ecclesiology Through the Centuries* (New York: Paulist Press, 2004), 271–273.

⁷ John W. O’Malley, *What Happened at Vatican II* (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press, 2010), 61.

⁸ Prusak, *The Church Unfinished*, 271.

⁹ Aleuin Deutsch, O.S.B., “Preface to the First Edition,” in *Liturgy the Life of the Church*, Lambert Beauduin O.S.B., trans. Virgil Michel, O.S.B., 2nd ed. (Collegeville MN: Liturgical Press, 1929), iii.

shipping Christian community was meant to bring the official liturgy of the church into direct, centralized focus.¹⁰ His efforts directed people away from other types of devotions and popular piety, replacing them with the ‘official’ alternatives, and introducing the medieval ideal of the scholar-monk. The monasteries founded on this ideal throughout Europe then turned their attentions, in large part, to study of the Patristic authors, leading to a renewed sense of ecclesiology: “how one understood liturgy was key to how one understood church, and vice versa.”¹¹

Liturgy of the Church, Liturgy of the World

This insight is at the heart of Dom Lambert Beauduin’s (1873–1960) lecture from 23 September 1909 given in Mechelen/Malines, Belgium, the text of which became the programmatic document for the Liturgical Movement.¹² His booklet, *Liturgy the Life of the Church* (originally published in 1914 as, *La Piété de l’Église, Principes et faits*) absolutely has an ecclesiology at work within it, and it is a remarkably rich document, just as we should expect of the ‘grandfather’ of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*. As a monk of the Benedictine abbey of Keizersberg/Mont César in Leuven, there is a historical connection between this movement, and the university, KU Leuven, where the ninth edition of the Leuven Encounters in Systematic Theology (LEST) conference was held on 23–26 October 2013.

Prof. Joris Geldhof of the research unit of Pastoral and Empirical Theology convened the conference in conjunction with the research unit of Systematic Theology and the Study of Religions, with the intent of bridging the perceived gap between liturgical and systematic-fundamental theology. The scholars who attended LEST IX more than rose to this challenge, presenting papers from a variety of different sub-disciplines of what was once a unified *sacra doctrina* or *sacra pagina*. This volume represents the results of two years of editing and continued work after the conference to solidify the contributions that our participants have made to theology as a whole, and not merely to Catholic theology, liturgical studies, liturgical theology, or fundamental theology. What is called for more and more in our fragmented world, and our fragmented discipline, is a kind of *synoptic* theology, one that sees the disciplines as belonging together and as examining different aspects of the mystery of God revealed in history. The theologians of Leuven, past and present, have taken an active role in this historically embedded theology.

¹⁰ John O’Malley, *What Happened at Vatican II*, 71–72.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 73.

¹² Republished in 2010 as, “La vraie prière de l’Église: Rapport présenté par le R.P. Dom Lambert Beaudoin (sic) o.s.b.,” *Questions Liturgiques / Studies in Liturgy* 91, no. 1–2 (2010): 37–41.

The diversity of Leuven's history and its theologians, monks and professors, pastors and lay men and women, all contribute to the task of the church in society. The key connection between ecclesiology and liturgy, which was explored at LEST IX, and which can be found in the pages of the present volume, opens the door even wider to increased speculation and meditation. Before our authors make their specific contributions, we would do well to explore the intrinsic connection, so well expressed in the ancient maxim, *lex orandi, lex credendi*, a bit further.

Beauduin's ecclesiology is certainly of the nineteenth century. We might associate the Liturgical Movement with a more 'progressive' tendency within Catholic theology in the twentieth century, but in a time before Vatican II, before *Humani Generis*, and above all, before the First World War, our contemporary expectations need to be corrected. There is, throughout *Liturgy the Life of the Church*, an 'us'/'them' dichotomy that is clearly drawn, between the laity and the clergy. Beauduin clearly laments the state in which he finds the laity, even in the staunchly Catholic pre-war Belgium. The "people are cold in our churches," they seem forced to attend, they are bored, and strongest of all, the assessment is that "they no longer pray."¹³ The modern tendency of 'individualism' is clearly to blame for this problem, at least to a certain extent. We could easily see the 'clergy-laity' dualism as an example of an out of touch clergy, looking to blame the laity for the conditions created by society, or even by the hierarchy themselves. We could decontextualize this dichotomy, and say that all 'dividing' is illegitimate as an exercise of sovereign violence, but this would not be a fair treatment of the document whose goals are so noble.

Beauduin's trendsetting booklet is a document that, in fact, shows great care for 'the people,' it does not merely accuse them and belittle them. Far from it. It comes from a person who feels a sense of personal responsibility: Beauduin is a pastor, certainly of souls, but not just 'souls' as some abstract, intangible spiritual essence. He is a pastor of human beings, and he feels responsible for those he loves. What is his answer? How does he want the people to return to God and prayer? He makes it *their task* and he brings it to them. "It is they, especially, who by their zeal, their active participation in the singing, by the sacrifice of their individual preferences, must restore full vitality to the liturgical gatherings of the parish. The can well be called a spiritual work of mercy of the first order."¹⁴ He stresses not the separation and privilege of the hierarchy, but the bond between both the clergy and the laity.¹⁵ Prayer and worship are sources of this unity, and so the liturgy is the core of a healthy ecclesiology.

¹³ Beauduin, *Liturgy the Life of the Church*, 25.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 25.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 32.

There is something wonderfully organic to Beauduin's theology. He conceives of the cycles of the liturgical year as being in tune with the natural world, and as a unifying factor for nature and supernature (a rare insight for the time). This 'organic' view has nothing of the neo-scholastic obsession with propositions and the increased sense of notional clarity that they can provide: the more doctrines, propositions, and statements of authority that we know, the more we really know about the Truth of God. Rather, for Beauduin,

Every child of the Church is a saint in the making. Hence this piety is not reserved exclusively for an ascetical aristocracy, and is not placed beyond the reach of ordinary Christians. All without distinction, from the Pope to the smallest child learning the catechism, live the same liturgy in different degrees, participate in the same feasts, move in the same cycle.¹⁶

There is an organic growth, but not in a merely progressivistic way. It is a matter of practice, celebration, and prayer. It is, however, distinct from personal prayer in the sense that it is not merely interior. The liturgy provides an important foundation for personal prayer because of its hierarchical, public nature.¹⁷ In this way, the liturgy forms how people are who they are: "[it] not merely places us *in* the Church, but makes us to be *of* the Church."¹⁸

Quoting Godfrey Kurth C.S.G., church historian, and professor in Liège and later in Rome, "one of the causes of religious ignorance, if not the greatest, is *ignorance of the liturgy ...*"¹⁹ What is meant in this context, of course, is formal ignorance of the church's liturgy. Following this line of argumentation, however, we can arrive at another type of religious ignorance, which is the further result of contemporary ignorance of the liturgy. The historical liturgy is embedded in the wider liturgical movement of creation. It is a symbol of God's salvation in the world, but it does not exhaust that mystery, nor is it a self-standing entity with objective value. The history of the world is itself a liturgy, and the Christian should not attempt to merely "explain history in terms of liturgy, but liturgy in terms of history."²⁰ As Karl Rahner says, "[t]he world and its history are the terrible and sublime liturgy, breathing of death and sacrifice, which God celebrates and causes to be celebrated in and through human history in its freedom, this being something which he in turn sustains in grace."²¹ The history of God's salvific work appears fragmentarily in our remembered and recorded histories. It

¹⁶ Beauduin, *Liturgy the Life of the Church*, 44.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 34–35.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 39.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 49.

²⁰ Michael Skelley, S.J., *The Liturgy of the World: Karl Rahner's Theology of Worship* (Collegeville, MN: Pueblo, 1991), 86.

²¹ Rahner, "Considerations on the Active Role of the Person in the Sacramental Event," *Theological Investigations*, vol. 14 (New York: Seabury 1976), 169.

penetrates and accents these histories, especially when we are particularly attuned to them through our Christian understanding of the world precisely as *created*. Looking back at that history offers an opportunity to rediscover the theological *richesse* of the liturgy and of its coming to be.

God appears in our histories in our positive moments of triumph and healing, as well as in the negative and refractory experiences of suffering. We find God with us in the resistance that we throw up against injustice in history.²² This is not something that occurs automatically for humanity. There is no ‘general religiosity’ that will automatically lead us to the Christian God. Kurth’s observation about the ignorance of the liturgy is apt, especially if we point to the intrinsic and necessary connection between the *lex orandi* and the *lex credendi*. Learning to pray and to worship together in a way that is oriented towards God and embedded in the Christian tradition helps us to believe and it attunes us to God’s presence in the world as already there ahead of us, waiting for us and inviting us to partake more fully in creation. Christians experience God’s condemnation of human suffering within suffering itself because this is one of the core elements of our experience of reality: the faithfulness of God and God’s universal salvific will. The narrative ‘attunement’ to the work of God is one of effects of the visible liturgy. The church’s liturgy allows humanity to consciously, or rather, ‘unconsciously,’ partake in the liturgy of the world that is already there before we look for it. The whole tradition of mystical prayer and ascetic training also has this goal: “[t]o have one’s daily life become an act of worship is the greatest human achievement.”²³

As the sacrament of the world, the church is responsible for propagating and continuing its own, historical liturgy. The church is responsible for being and becoming the visible body of Christ in the world, and it does this most concretely by acting out its own identity and bringing the people of God into union with Christ, in whom the church finds its head. At no point, however, can we confuse the historical liturgy with the liturgy of the world in an absolute manner. To raise it to the level of universal history would subvert the human-divine relationship, just as human beings have done with countless other narratives and customs throughout history. If the historical liturgy, or rather, historical *liturgies* – and in this volume we will see that there are and have been many – are “seen as the one and only liturgy,” then they lose their eschatological function as a real symbol of the primordial and transcendent *liturgy of the world*.²⁴

²² Edward Schillebeeckx, “Correlation Between Human Question and Christian Answer,” *The Understanding of Faith*, Collected Works of Edward Schillebeeckx, vol. 5 (London et al.: Bloomsbury, 2014), 80–88 [91–101].

²³ Skelley, *The Liturgy of the World*, 92.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 102–103.

Liturgical and Systematic Perspectives: Our Common Task

The sections of this volume follow on the idea of liturgical spaces, mental, physical, and historical, which make up our collective past and inform our understanding of tradition. These studies are not just historical, or ‘backward’ looking, however. These maintain the attempt begun at LEST IX to move the dialogue between systematic theology and liturgical theology forward such that the two disciplines can, in light of their common task, grow together and serve the cultivation of the church as the sacrament of Christ’s presence in the world. The salvific function of church makes this cooperation necessary, especially in the form that it has taken here. We will proceed in six sections, each dealing with a particular theological and liturgical ‘space’ that demands the attention of our scholarship.

Our first section, *Liturgical Spaces: On the Edge of the Sacred and Secular*, begins with Bert Daelemans, S.J. (Universidad Pontificia Comillas) who opens the issue of ‘space’ very concretely in his article, “Fifty Shades of Grey? Contemporary Churches as Lived Liturgies that Mediate Mysteries.” Here, Daelemans addresses the massive problem of aesthetics in contemporary church structures, especially what he identifies as the ‘beigeification’ of liturgical spaces. He gives us a way of thinking of church buildings not merely as structures that we pray in, but as structures that are actively designed to pray with us, to help us to worship and pray in a deeper way. The theological and liturgical aspects of contemporary architecture should make us reflect on what it is to worship, and how it is that we worship in the world. Further, he utilizes the concept of *heterotopia* as a vehicle for an eschatological experience of God in the world. Philip Rossi S.J. (Marquette University) follows on this theme in a slightly different manner, through his discussion of secularization and the role of ‘vulnerability’ as an invitation to worship, even within what Charles Taylor has called the ‘immanent frame’. The text, “Liturgy as Sacramental Mystery: Incarnating Grace in the Space of Worldly Vulnerability,” demonstrates Rossi’s expertise with Taylor, but also his adept way of highlighting the deficit of understanding in Western cultures when it comes to the liturgy and its connection with our collective loss of a transcendent reference point. Rossi interweaves Taylor’s analysis with his own call for a stance of open vulnerability for the worshipping Christian subject as the entry-point for grace, and ultimately ‘transformative seeing,’ a new lens for viewing the (secular) world.

From the discussions of modernity, grace, and actual liturgical space, we move to historical reflections on the work and influence of St. Augustine of Hippo in *The Liturgical Mediation of the totus Christus*. Specifically, this concept of the ‘whole Christ,’ the *totus Christus*, is considered in terms of liturgical mediation and deification. Kevin G. Grove, C.S.C. (Notre Dame), gives us in his article, “When Christ Speaks in Us: The “*Whole Christ*” and the Mediation of Mystery within the Liturgy,” a well-rounded reception of the work of Paul Janowiak, S.J. on Augustine.

Specifically, the role of the *totus Christus* in Augustine's *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, and its potential application for contemporary liturgical theology. Grove shows the centrality of the notion of 'transfiguration,' the transfiguration of Christ, the Body of Christ, and the believer for Augustine, and the possible retrieval of this concept for today. Walter Knowles follows with a different perspective on the *totus Christus*, in relation to Augustine's mystagogical catechesis. His article, "Becoming What You See: Augustine's Mystagogia of Deification," draws from a number of different catechetical texts to show the importance of deification for Augustine, especially in its personal and communal dimensions.

Following the section on Augustine, two articles bring us into the nineteenth and twentieth centuries by analyzing two important theologians' approaches to the Eucharist: *The Eucharistic Center of the Liturgical Field*. Samuel Goyvaerts (KU Leuven) gives us a focused article, "Das große Sakrament der Vereinigung": Franz Anton Staudenmaier's Eucharistic Theology," on an important figure from the Catholic Tübinger Schule. Goyvaert's treatment of Staudenmaier provides a picture of a long-neglected part of Catholic theology from the nineteenth century. This reading is significant for refuting the idea that all Catholic theology was uniform, and strictly Thomistic prior to the twentieth century *ressourcement* of the Patristic authors. Goyvaerts places Staudenmaier at the beginning of the Liturgical Movement, by illustrating the interdependence of his Eucharistic theology and his understanding of the liturgical celebrations that are centered on the Incarnation. Staudenmaier draws connections between the feast of Corpus Christi, the celebration of the Incarnation at Christmas, and the process of deification that participation in the liturgy fosters. Daniel Minch (KU Leuven) continues the line of Eucharistic argumentation in, "Language, Structure, and Sacrament: Reconsidering the Eucharistic Theology of Edward Schillebeeckx." He examines Schillebeeckx's post-Conciliar assessment Eucharistic change, especially with regard to the hermeneutics used at Trent in navigating new and more contextually appropriate ways to explain the sacramental operation. Minch gives a critical evaluation of Schillebeeckx's work on the sacraments, and shows how the method that Schillebeeckx utilized in assessing Trent guided his own reflections on how to deal with appropriating the results of Vatican II. The article serves as both a historical evaluation of Schillebeeckx's work and a systematic appropriation of the theories developed by Schillebeeckx for contemporary use.

The focus on the Western and especially European church shifts at this point in our volume, in the section *Looking Beyond the West and the Roman Rite*. We move to two very detailed studies of Catholic, non-Roman rites and prayers. This exploration of liturgical unity-in-diversity starts with Unnatha Kavuvila (KU Leuven), whose article, "Mediating the Mystery of Forgiveness and Reconciliation: *Subuk-kono*, the Service of Peace in the Malankara Rite," gives us a view of a Syro-Malankara penitential rite. The concept of *Subuk-kono*, or 'release' is a central part

of the Syro-Malankara tradition, and Kavuvila provides a window into the theology of reconciliation that underpins the rite, as well as its actual form. Ultimately, this rite is about 'building up' the community of the faithful in a progressive way, where all are reconciled to Christ, as the Body of Christ. The excellent comparative work of Elochukwu Uzukwu (Duchesne University) in his "Recapturing the Mystery – Captured by the Mystery: African Eucharistic Prayers in the Roman Rite," provides further insight into the 'unity-in-diversity' tenet of the church. He examines relative liturgical freedom experienced by African churches after Vatican II, and the prayers and rites that were produced in that period in relation to some of the ancient liturgical texts. This is followed by the structure and content of some contemporary African prayers, and the slow reversal of the 'liturgical freedom' in recent decades with directives from Rome and the Congregation for Divine Worship.

The Eastern traditions are represented by two texts from Katerina Bauerova (Protestant Theological Faculty, Charles University, Prague) and Jitka Jonová (Sts. Cyril and Methodius Faculty of Theology, Palacký University) respectively. First, Bauerova's "The Mystery of Divine-Human Cooperation in Freedom and Creativity: An Example of Liturgical Life from the Russian Diaspora in France," give a historical account of the innovative approaches taken by Russian Orthodox religious leaders in France during the inter-war period. The interaction of Catholic and Orthodox monastic spiritualities is well documented by Bauerova, and she shows the dynamic initiatives that emerged from unexpected places – the confrontation with psychoanalysis, philosophy, and art – and from unexpected people outside of the normal monastic boundaries of Russia. The "restless pilgrims" of this era have left quite a legacy to both Western and Eastern traditions, which should be retrieved. Jonová is also concerned with innovation in liturgical matters, but the context is vastly different. Her piece, "Attempts to Use the Vernacular Language in the Catholic Liturgy in the Czech Lands in the 1920s," brings us to the Czech lands in the 1920s, and the tension created by the independent Czechoslovak Church that was formed in 1920. The conflict continued between those who tried to introduce the vernacular into liturgical celebrations as a counter-response to the Czechoslovak Church, and the officials of the Vatican who wished the liturgy to remain as it had been. Jonová brings this story out in vivid detail with regard to the efforts of the Czech bishops to strike a balance between the wishes of the reformers and the Vatican.

In the final section of our volume, we travel to the Americas for two studies that are focused on the liberative function of liturgy, but in different ways. Thomas M. Kelly (Creighton University) finds inspiration in the life and work of the Jesuit, Rutilio Grande. His article, "When Liturgy Empowers: Rutilio Grande, S.J. and the Church of El Salvador," gives an overview of Grande's attempts at community-building in El Salvador based on liturgical models of close-knit, local

base communities. The liturgy itself became an instrument for transforming the entire lives of people in these communities, while Grande provided the impetus and opportunity and the people – guided by the Spirit and sanctioned by the episcopal authorities – did the rest. Christopher McMahon (Saint Vincent College) brings Bernard Lonergan in to round out the discussion in, “Cruciform Salvation and Emergent Probability: The Liturgical Significance of Lonergan’s Precept.” Lonergan’s focus on soteriology stemming from the “law of the cross,” grounds liturgical soteriology in historical and contextual conditions. The worship of the church in the liturgy, as a performance of Eucharistic sacrifice of Christ, itself a cruciform act, provides a space that orients believers towards an ‘outside’ – that is, towards the performance of liberative action in the world, in an eschatological manner. There is no absolute salvation available in history, but within the liturgy, we find a specific space where, “heaven erupts into the space and time of a fallen world, renewing human vision, and worshippers, through an active participation in the celebration.”

Conclusion

Though not all of these articles deal directly with the crises of liturgy and of history which are so prevalent today, each treats the ways in which liturgy can be seen as formative of theology, whether through architecture, through language, through culture, or through enacted Christian life and ministry. Each wrestles with the tension between whether liturgy is primarily a depository of already-held faith contents or whether its ritual enactment represents, perforce, the lived embodiment of those contents. In so doing, each in its own way offers an answer to the question of whether the liturgy is primarily the expression of a theology or whether it might be the precondition for theology – to the relationship between the *lex orandi* and *lex credendi*. The liturgy is more than the sum total of historical liturgies and rubrics or of data concerning these liturgies; it is a dynamic and living tradition which can only be treated by doing justice to complex flow of God’s katabatic action in history and creation’s anabatic response to it. As noted liturgist Adolf Adam put it, the liturgy must both retain and reaffirm the crucial importance of active cooperation between God and God’s people – the notion that liturgy “is the joint action of Jesus Christ, the high priest, and his Church for the salvation of human beings and the glorification of the Father.”²⁵ This fundamental dedication underscores the notion that liturgy is not simply an object of theological study but is also itself a theological grammar by which our inquiries into it are

²⁵ Adolf Adam, *The Foundations of the Liturgy* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1985), 5.

formed (and reformed as they return to it). Beyond treating the liturgy as a source of theological reflection – or of data – this volume, like many other such liturgical theological endeavors, treats the practice of liturgy itself as theological. We hope that in doing so, these studies of liturgical theology, form, celebration, and setting lead the reader not only to further study and reflection but also *back* to the liturgy itself with a renewed and yet critical vision of what liturgy is, can be, and of what it asks of us.

