



UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS

The Intellectual Tasks of the New Evangelization

Liturgy as Mediated Immediacy: Sacramentality and Enacted Words

Msgr. Kevin W. Irwin

The Catholic University of America

Introduction

I want to speak today about something which we Catholics bring to the table, in terms of “evangelism” and “evangelization” derived from the Catholic intellectual tradition and from Catholicism as “a sacramental church.” It bears on a good bit of background from my own recent research in liturgy and sacraments, specifically liturgical theology (*lex orandi, lex credenda, lex vivendi*) understanding the liturgy as a theological action and event.

I do this in the light of some questions which have arisen for me in the light of three recent Vatican documents.

1. CDF document “Responses to Some Questions Regarding Certain Aspects of the Doctrine on the Church,” CDF, June 29, 2007, specifically question five:

According to Catholic doctrine, these Communities do not enjoy apostolic succession in the sacrament of Orders, and are, therefore, deprived of a constitutive element of the Church. These ecclesial Communities which, specifically because of the absence of the sacramental priesthood, have not preserved the genuine and integral substance of the Eucharistic Mystery cannot, according to Catholic doctrine, be called “Churches” in the proper sense.

2. CDF: “Doctrinal Note on Some Aspects of Evangelization” Dec. 3, 2007:

In its precise sense, *evangelization* is the *missio ad gentes* directed to those who do not know Christ. In a wider sense, it is used to describe ordinary pastoral work, while the phrase “new evangelization” designates pastoral outreach to those who no longer practice the Christian faith.

3. Synod of Bishops, *Lineamenta* “The New Evangelization for the Transmission of the Christian Faith,” Feb. 2, 2011.

Since this document was prepared “for discussion and comment.” dare I weigh in and suggest that the references to the liturgy and sacraments are scant in a document for the new evangelization in the Catholic Church It does state in n. 13 “finds its full expression in the celebration of the Eucharist....” yet the preponderance is on personal encounter and the Word of God.

Especially as the new Evangelization is to be undertaken in the context of what I call “A Sacramental Church in a Postmodern World” I judge that we need to explore the anthropological and ecclesiological underpinnings of the celebration of liturgy and sacraments, especially as we face what we sometimes (too) loosely call “believers, not belongers” and those who “spiritual but not religious” We need to be both! By its very nature Catholicism is both! When it comes to exploring what liturgy and sacraments mean and do I find the phrases “mediated immediacy” and “sacramentality” very helpful.

Through the liturgy we experience an *immediate and direct* engagement with and participation in the mystery of salvation through Christ's paschal mystery. But we always experience that immediate encounter through two important tenets of Catholicism – namely *mediation* and *sacramentality*. At the present moment we are engaged in a consciousness of the importance of texts and their translation. This consciousness leads me to add another principle which guides what I want to say – the principle of *multivalence* and that words in the liturgy often have more than one meaning.

Hence the precise topic of my presentation is *Mediated Immediacyⁱ: Sacramentality and Textual Multivalence in the Catholic Liturgy*

The more I reflect on the liturgy as reformed and celebrated since Vatican II I regard *mediation, sacramentality* and *enacted words* as paramount *Catholic* principles which we proudly bring to the table in discussions about the liturgy.

Part One: Mediation through Sacramentality.

Lest the liturgy be perceived as concerned only with words, or too concerned with words alone, I want to place this consideration of the use of words in worship in the context of everything that is used in worship. In essence I want to start by reminding ourselves that liturgy is fundamentally about “gestural speech” and “symbolic action.” Or to adapt St. Augustine I would like to suggest that sacraments are indeed “visible words” and “audible symbols.” The principle and premise of *sacramentality* is the foundation for the celebration of all liturgy and sacraments. It is often said, especially today when we look for chief characteristics of Catholicism, that we belong to a “sacramental church.” This is quite correct. But some commentaries on this phrase misfire when they turn immediately to the celebration of the liturgy and the seven sacraments as external expressions of Catholicism’s uniqueness. Rather, I want to argue that it is the principle of sacramentality in general that undergirds Catholicism’s uniqueness and which also undergirds the celebration of the liturgy. Sacramentality is a principle which is based on the goodness of creation, the value of human labor and productivity and the engagement of humans in the act of worship. Sacramentality is a world view, it is a way of looking at life, it is a way of thinking and acting in the world. It is a world view that invites us to be immersed more and more fully in the here and now, on this good earth, and not to shun the things of this earth and on this good earth. It is a world view that asks us not to avoid the challenges which such earthiness will require of us. We do need to recover the paradigm of

sacramentality, not only for the sake of liturgy and sacrament, but even more for the sake of sustaining one of Catholicism's chief tenets and ways of looking at and living in the world.

Sacramentality deals with and reveres the things of this earth – earth, air, fire, water -- these natural symbols, as reflective of God and revelatory of God. They are constantly used in worship as means of experiencing God, naming God, worshiping God. But they are used in worship in relation to words and texts, lest their use be perceived to be pantheism of any sort. The God of creation, of the covenant, of revelation and of redemption is the very same God we worship through the liturgy. One needs all of these dimensions of sacramentality to try to be grasped by God and to attempt to “grasp” God. Liturgical prayers and texts help to keep that focus before us. But so do things of this world, things made by human hands, and the use of our bodies in worship – gestures, processions, seeing, listening, responding and (yes) singing.

Sacramentality reflects Catholic liturgical practice that has always been connected to and rooted in the earth. There is a primalness to Catholic worship that stands alongside our use of prayers which contain concepts, images and metaphors about God and our very human condition. But to lose, or even to eclipse the primalness of liturgy is to cut ourselves loose from what is a characteristic mooring for the way we have always worshipped God – through things from this earth, which earth was termed “good” in the book of Genesis.

For example, in baptism we use creation's gift of water. Why? Certainly for cleansing and washing. But I would argue also because water is the only element without which we cannot live. Why all the (appropriate) attention given to water and hydration? (As a runner and gym type this has immediate implications. And for the dying why else are we involved in issues about nutrition and hydration?) Part and parcel of the church's *lex orandi* of baptism is water.

The value of its use is obviously maximized when we immerse for baptism. But immersion is rich in symbolic and theological content – it is a multivalent act. Baptism is about entrance to eternal life through the elements that sustains us in human life, and much more besides.

At the same time if we extend *lex orandi* and *lex credendi* to include and involve *lex vivendi* then I think we need to look at human actions that pollute water and political machinations what limit access to water. (I often wonder to that extent the issues in the ever volatile Middle East are about water rights and access to water.) And for anyone of us who have ever travelled to the Holy Land how much more poignant is our praying the Psalms about “a dry weary land without water,” and “hungering and thirsting for the living God?” The theology of baptism is as much about water as it is about the words we use to describe what water is and does in the sacrament. (Hence the value of the blessing prayers we have used in the reformed liturgy over water pools and over water itself.)

Sacramentality also respects human ingenuity in the way human beings work to manufacture some of the symbols used in worship. The process of making such symbols reflects and respects humanity’s ingenuity and ability to work. Humanity’s work is offered back to God in worship. The reminder that all that we do and are comes from God insures that what we do in worship not be perceived to be Pelagian in any way. Human work is initiated by God and sustained by him. And humans respond by producing what is needed to return thanks back to God. For example the manufacture of bread and wine are paschal processes of dying and rising in order to provide the material elements for the bread and wine to become the sacrament of the paschal mystery. “The work of our redemption” is enacted through “the work of human hands.”

In this regard I find myself asking the question: Are our post Vatican II liturgies too wordy? Have we lost this primalness, earthiness, symbolic?

Sacramentality deals with human beings as the pinnacle of God's creation, with intelligence and an instinct for communal living. It relies on humans' ability to think about God, and to experience the living God as he comes in word and worship. Human intelligence and capacity for rational thought is presumed in the act of worship, lest good feelings and intense emotions be seen to be the litmus test for experiencing God. The craft of deriving theology from the prayers of the liturgy, again *lex orandi, lex credendi*, mitigates against such an emotionalistic criteriology. In fact it presumes the opposite. Namely, that the church's theology about God as revealed in worship is crucial for us to have correct concepts about God derived from the church's wisdom and tradition. The very things which humans use in everyday life are used in the worship of God: speech and gesture for the sake of communication and communion. The substratum of liturgy is gestural speech and symbolic communication. These "languages" in the liturgy are anthropologically fitting. What we use inside and outside of worship are the same. If we can repeat Tertullian's important adage that "the flesh is the instrument of salvation"ⁱⁱ then the symbolic gestures of the liturgy, postures and processions, are all part of the anthropological fittingness and substratum of the liturgy. They are all part of its sacramentality.

At the same time, however, sacramentality means that our experience of God this side of the veil is, in fact, always veiled. It will never be a totally satisfying or a full and complete experience of God. That happens in the kingdom when we see God face to face. But in the meantime we use the things of the earth to worship God, revealed, disclosed and incarnate, as well as not fully revealed, totally other and utterly transcendent. Thus, by using the terms "sacramental" and "sacramentality" I mean to underscore that the things we use in "worldly

worship” both reveal and at the same time do not disclose the whole of what they symbolize. Sacramentality means that humans on this good earth use this good earth to worship God. The sacramentality of the world means that the world’s works can be invested with worth, but that their ultimate worth as expressions of God’s creation and presence will always be inadequately achieved and expressed.ⁱⁱⁱ In effect, then, the celebration of liturgy and sacrament is an action that symbolizes, expresses and accomplishes the interaction between God and the human person, as mediated by the things of this world or which are the result of human manufacture and productivity, expressed through human words and interactions which are nothing less than actions of divine and human activity at the same time. Such celebrations have meaning and consequences beyond what we can ever immediately grasp or measure. And any individual act of liturgy can never fully express the totality of this reality and interaction.^{iv}

Another questions I am asking myself of late: Is there a theology of (Catholic) sacraments that can be articulated from a theology of creation and today’s concern for the environment that uses sacramentality as its basis?

Part Two -- Mediation through Enacted Words

Allow me now to turn to the issue of the translation of words in the revised Roman Missal. But again allow me to do it from a wider angle lens than “just” the Missal. That wider angle lens comes from the heart of the Catholic theological tradition. The study of theology and religion is a matter of words (among other things). But words matter very much in Catholicism which by definition and example is a premier *theological tradition*.

Recalling what I said above about St. Augustine I would like to suggest that words matter in the liturgy because words do something. In the liturgy we are dealing with *enacted words*.

I often say to the faculty and graduate students in the School of Theology and Religious Studies at CUA that for what we are engaged in words matter a great deal. In fact crafting the right words – or shall I really say crafting *the least inadequate words* -- to describe God and the things of God is a primary part of our craft. Our professors never tire of encouraging (especially) our graduate students to do research in original languages, both classical and modern for a variety of reasons, not least of which is to determine the shades of meaning and nuance sustained by the original language but which may not be sustained by a translation. This is especially true for me when it comes to the scriptures proclaimed in the liturgy. A few months ago I was preparing to celebrate the evening Mass at the Basilica of the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception next to the campus of CUA. The first reading was from Genesis chapter 2:24 with the phrase that a man “clings to his wife.” I consulted three biblical commentaries and decided I needed to know more about this concept especially when some former translations said “cleave” and a relatively recent one says “is united” (*New English Bible*). So I emailed my biblical studies faculty colleagues to gain their wisdom on the subject. Within an hour I had five very insightful email replies and was able to reflect those insights in my homily that afternoon. But I also will say that their responses were not uniform and raised up a number of possibilities for understanding and reflection.

That is my point. Words matter and some words matter a great deal. But the kind of words we use and language in which we are engaged in theology and religious studies, spanning bible, liturgy, patristics, medievals, modern theologians, sociologists of religion and over two thousand years of magisterium (among many other sources) are precious and need attention and reflection as much as they invite comprehension and understanding. In what theologians do for a living is often a matter of finding the right word and of explaining and exploring why it is *the*

right word or term. And then we also need to admit that there may well be other important and appropriate terms to use to describe the same thing. In fact crafting the best terminology possible is a major part of what Catholic theology is all about. To repeat a term or a phrase from a former age often requires that we explain what it meant then and might mean now. The very fact that we repeat a well worn phrase or term does not guarantee that simply to use them insures accuracy or comprehension.

The new translation we are primarily concerned with these days is of the Mass, the Eucharist, taking part in which is “the fount and apex of the church’s life,” as *Lumen Gentium* n. 11 describes it. Such questions deserve great care and respect. At the same time there is an Italian proverb which I have used lately to help me work through some of the words and texts of the new translation. It states “every translator is a traitor.” And when it comes to liturgical translations where two or three are gathered there are at least three opinions!

The more we know the original language and usage for a term in the liturgy the better off we are at trying to explain what is really never explainable -- even after the new translation of the Missal is implemented. But allow me to suggest that the liturgy itself and the words of the liturgy are really less about understanding and comprehension than they are our being drawn into the very mysterious presence and action of God among us in an event that uses words, gestures, signs, symbols, music and art, not all of which are easily (or even?) fully comprehended or understood. Because of its very nature the words in liturgy are among many other “languages” at work in the liturgy such as silence and reflection, movement and processing, and yes listening to words which are familiar but which for a while may be unfamiliar given the new texts.

It is to be admitted that an enormous amount of time and energy has gone into the crafting of the revised *Roman Missal*. Not everyone is totally happy with the result. In the US we have watched the texts in process being debated in weekly and biweekly Catholic journals such as *America* and *Commonweal*. And from afar I have read with interest the articles in *The Tablet* pro and con (mostly con) with the letters to the editor evidencing great interest, not to say passion, about this project.

Among the skills which we need to bring to the new translation is knowledge of the history of a text and the theological meanings which a text or word is attempting to convey. Notice that I said “meanings” in the plural. One of the features of most prayer texts in the liturgy is that they are in fact multivalent and have several meanings. Liturgical language is unlike the language of “Breaking News” on CNN on the TV or the Internet, and even from other kinds of theological or religious documents, for example magisterial texts. Liturgical language is decidedly and purposefully multivalent. Liturgical terms convey pluriform (many) meanings. Sometimes those meanings are ambiguous. And as we try to find out what a term meant originally we can also discover that sometimes we lack the historical detail to understand exactly where a part of the Mass came from or why it exists as it does. Much of what comprises the contents of the Mass today is the result of decisions made in the 1960’s about what should remain in the Mass as codified in 1570 after the Council of Trent and which should be eliminated in the post Vatican II Missal of 1970. But even there debates occurred about what should remain, what should change and why.^v

The reality is no less real but it is through a language that is theologically rich and precise. But because they are prayers we need to allow them to impress our minds and hearts but not require that they define or “nail down” the exact or one precise understanding of what is

celebrated. The last thing that our catechesis on the Missal should do – or try to do – is to offer a definition or a one to one correspondence about what a liturgical term says or means. Liturgy and sacraments are like jewels that should be viewed from many and different perspectives and in many and different lights.

No one text and say all that can or should be said about the liturgy. Liturgical texts describe the attributes of the God we worship and why we need to worship this God. Liturgical texts never define what is occurring or what should result from worship. Liturgical texts “tether the imagination” simply because in the end one’s imagination in worship can never be controlled.

Allow me to note four principles about liturgical language used in the new vernacular translation of *The Roman Missal* and to offer examples of each.

1. Multivalence.

a. *Kyrie eleison* illustrates multivalence.

As a liturgical term *Kyrie eleison* retains all the breadth and ambiguity of the Greek “you are the merciful one,” or “ the risen one who can grant mercy.” Its use is much less about feeling sorrow or remorseful about our failures. It is about the confident hope we have that the Lord does and will grant us mercy and peace. Historical data indicate that its first use in the liturgy occurred at the end of the fourth century wither during intercessory prayers in the Liturgy of the Hours (Egeria) or in the Eucharist (*Apostolic Constitutions*).^{vi} That it was expanded in the Eucharist as part of a litany at the entrance seems clear when the liturgy saw an expansion as the rite was now

celebrated in larger churches. By the sixth century Gregory the Great simplified the entrance rite for non festal days by dropping the litany and leaving only the response *Kyrie eleison* on its own. In sum the Roman rite has used the *Kyrie* as a response to intercessions and in the revised Mass of Paul VI as part of the penitential rite. These references to its use at the Hours came back to me last month when I participated at a monastic sung vespers. There were only three intercessions with the response *Kyrie eleison, Christe eleison, Kyrie eleison*. For me this was welcome for two reasons: the number of intercessions was few and the contents were short. Second the *Kyrie* was taken out of the penitential rite and the acclamation was (again?) a response to the intercessions. Here multivalence is at work in appreciating what the Greek *Kyrie eleison* means literally as well as contextually in terms of where it is used liturgically.

- b. *Behold the Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world* will now be used at the invitation to Communion.

This is a more literal rendering of John 1:36 “Behold...” than the now familiar “this is....” Placed here at the invitation to Communion it offers a rich theological statement about our present participation in the sacrificial death and resurrection of Christ. The difficulty with "This is..." language was that it did not reflect mediation. It was too direct, too immediate. What is at stake here is the fundamental principle of mediation through the use of a biblically inspired phrase.

Now I want to tread lightly when I offer a word of advice for presiding priests and bishops. Be careful, then, of the temptation to adjust the text to say "this is Jesus...." In point of fact all of the prayers of the Roman liturgy never address "Jesus" without the important theological modifiers “Lord” and “Christ.” E.g. we ask this through Christ our Lord...” and “Lord Jesus Christ, you said to your apostles....” In fact to use the term “Jesus” without a

modifier places us back in Palestine of the early first century. To couple “Jesus” with “Christ,” or “Lord” or another similar post resurrection and ascension term places us where we are and should be, somewhere between what has “already” happened to and through Christ for our sakes and our salvation and the “not yet” of final and complete fulfillment of that salvation in the kingdom of heaven.

The balance of the invitation to communion will now be: *Blessed are they called to the supper of the Lamb* (Rev. 19:9) as opposed to "happy." The text itself refers to the eschatological banquet – the already and the not yet-- and the text is specific “Blessed are they...” and .not “we.” This is principally an eschatological text but its contextual use here is also as an invitation to communion. Hence this is multivalence at work, more than one meaning, literal and contextual.

- c. The text at the end of the Roman Canon will now read: *"Through whom you continue to make all these good things, O Lord, you sanctify them, fill them with life, bless them and bestow them upon us...."*

What are these “good things?” The first, contextual and obvious meaning is the consecrated bread and wine, Christ himself. From evidence as early as the fifth century we know that foodstuffs were presented at the presentation of the gifts in the Eucharistic liturgy to be shared with the poor. And the texts of the ending to the Roman Canon often did contain specific references to this food to be shared, often by the ministry of deacons (they who knew who was poor and ill was the one who brought them food and the Eucharist.) That is why to this day at the Chrism Mass the blessing of the oil for the sick takes place at the end of the eucharstic prayer.

I would argue that this is a classical, but often neglected text, that underscores the relationship of the celebration of the Eucharist to the daily lives of worshippers.

2. Biblical references.

In what is perhaps the greatest advantage in the revised translation of *The Roman Missal* is that they contain more obvious references to the scripture texts which lie behind or are embedded in the prayers of the liturgy.

- a. At the invitation to Communion the response to “Behold the Lamb of God...” is “that you should come under my roof...” The biblical reference to the healing of the centurion's servant in the Gospel of Matthew 8:8, the reply of the centurion.

There are at least two issues at work here:

Structurally this is a reference back to *the scriptural Word* of God at the very moment we are invited to the communion banquet. This new translation is also a reference to this specific healing miracle with *healing* understood as an aspect of what the Eucharist is and does.

Again this is an example of a multivalent language as opposed to the present “to receive you” which can be said to be too direct and not mediated. Mediated language articulates the scripture references that are possible understood and brought to bear here. “To receive *you*” can make of the Eucharist an object, in itself and a way of objectifying the species without its presumed and stated scriptural reference.

- b. In this biblical context there are some texts which are less easy to explain because the change seems to be harsh. For example we will now hear the

words "for *many* so that sins may be forgiven" Commentators are nearly unanimous that the meaning of "many" here is really from the Greek, "for all."

At the same time the first reading Good Friday, Isaiah 53, the Fourth Servant Song contains the text "for the many..." in two places (Is. 53:12 and 13) which same text is referred to in the Markan account of the Last Supper "for the many" (Mk. 14:24). Therefore it can be argued that this is a more biblical term and a reference to the servant songs of Isaiah from which the NT texts are derived. I do wonder, however, since this vernacular text was already altered from "for all men" to "for all" that "for the many" will be understood to be a diminishment.

- c. Then there are phrases which will remain the same, but which may take on new meanings if we study them more fully. One of them is "Do this in memory of me" said over the cup at the Lord's words in the Eucharistic prayer.

As the eminent biblical scholar Leon Dufour argues in his very significant book *Sharing the Eucharistic Bread*ⁱⁱⁱ the command is about imitating Jesus at table, and also in self sacrificing service to others. To "do" the sacrifice is to engage in a ritual and a life if nothing less that total service of others. The sacrificial words here are not of the Eucharistic action only but of our lives lived in imitation of Christ in self sacrifice and giving.

3. Rhetoric of incorporation rather than description only.

- a. What is likely the most commonly used memorial acclamation "Christ has died, Christ is risen, Christ will come again" is now eliminated and this change has caused

no little consternation and debate. In June 2006 USCCB Committee on the (then called) Liturgy (now “Divine Worship”) discussion and approval of the Order of Mass and the American adaptations. At which meeting they voted to keep all the texts of the acclamations as we now have them. But in point of fact the acclamation “Christ has died..” is not a translation of the *Missale Romanum* at all and was adapted by ICEL from a text proposed by Father Joseph. Gelineau and the Center for Pastoral Liturgy, in Paris.

But I want to argue that something much more important theologically is going on here. The prayers of the Roman liturgy *never* describe who God is without describing how *we are incorporated* into God through the liturgy. I say to my students always check the pronouns and then the verbs. “Dying you destroyed *our* death, rising you destroyed *our* life.” The memorial acclamations underscore how we are incorporated into the mysteries we are celebrating. They do not describe them as though we were looking at them from afar. The same is true for all the presidential prayers of the Missal. They never describe God or what God has done for us without inviting God to act again among us in the here and now. Always check the pronouns “grant *us*....”

- b. The reality of incorporation is also underscored in the new translation of the doxology that ends many of the presidential prayers, “in the *unity* of the Holy Spirit...” which translation now parallels that at the end of the doxology of the Eucharistic prayer. At first glance this seems to be a reference to the Trinity only and to the three personed God in whom we believe. That meaning would be that there are three persons equal in majesty and in being.

However there is also another ecclesiological meaning operative here. In fact Jungmann will argue that “*in unitate*” refers to the community of persons that is the church incorporated into the Triune God through baptism and who together worship the triune God and are sanctified by the Trinity through the liturgy.^{viii} “In the unity of...” is a communion of persons in the church incorporated into the *communion* of the very triune God. Again the issue is how liturgical prayers presume, underscore and reflect incorporation rather than description. The former translation “we ask this through our Lord Jesus Christ who lives and reigns with you *and* the Holy Spirit...” This is a word difference. But this word contains a world of meanings (again, note the plural).

Conclusion – Pastoral Applications

I must admit that I find it an extraordinarily patronizing shot when I hear that “the average Catholic” cannot understand these new texts. To say this to and about the best educated Catholic population this country has ever seen is preposterous. And we own that population our best when it comes to a catechesis and implementation of the revised translation. (Why else would I have put in three years’ work with an international committee to produce an interactive DVD, *Become one body one spirit in Christ?*

- a. *Avoid fundamentalism.* I would urge that where possible our catechesis bring out the inherent multivalence of liturgical texts and the numberless scriptural references embedded in them. The more we catechize about the phenomenon of the liturgy and how words and phrases can have a number of possible meanings the more faithful we

are to the reality of biblically inspired liturgical language. After all these are words about God and our relationship to and with God, which relationship begins at baptism and ends when we are called from this life. In the meantime we have a lifetime to savor the words and rites of the liturgy.

- b. *Liturgy recurs.* By its very nature the liturgy recurs again and again and again. It is therefore quite unlike a textbook of theology - -despite the fact that I would argue that it contains all that is and ever could be called a textbook of Catholic theology. The nature of the prayers of the liturgy is that they recur. Please do not think that any one of us needs to appropriate every word or action that is done at a liturgy. Those words and actions will come again. To the question who really fully “hears” the entire prayer? Probably no one, even the presiding priest! But that is perfectly OK. This prayer will recur and we will come back to it again and again and again. And as we do so its incredibly rich combination of metaphors, images and scriptural references will impact on us again and again in ever new and different ways.

Liturgy matters. Liturgy matters a great deal. But what is also true is that the goal of the liturgy is that we will not need it anymore. The goal is found in the hymn text “O Lord at length when sacraments shall cease...” Sacraments will and should cease. And then we will meet the Lord face to face. No more mediated immediacy, just immediacy unveiled, unfettered, unencumbered. But in the meantime the tenet of *sacramentality* and the premise of *mediated immediacy* matter a great deal indeed.

ⁱ Edward Kilmartin, S.J. coined this insightful phrase.

ⁱⁱ See, Cipriano Vagaggini, *Caro Salutis est Cardo – Corporeta, Eucristia e Liturgia*. (Rome: Desclee, 1966).

ⁱⁱⁱ Something of a classic in this regard is the brief treatment by Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Cosmic Worship*. (Reprinted, 2003, Ignatius Press). Another way of coming to this is from some critiques of the celebration of the reformed Catholic liturgy, one of which runs through *The Spirit of the Liturgy* by the then Cardinal Ratzinger (*Einführung in den Geist der Liturgie*,] Trans. John Saward (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2000).

^{iv} See Philip J. Murnion, “A Sacramental Church in the Modern World,” *Origins* 14 (June 21, 1984): 81-90. Important insights about the anthropological foundation for liturgy and sacrament are in Carol Rochetta, *Sacramentaria fondamentale. Dal ‘mysterion’ al ‘sacramentum.’* (Bologna: Edizioni Dehoniane, 1989), 1-91.

^v See the highly technical and very important studies by Maurizio Barba, for example *La riforma conciliare, dell ‘ordo missae’. Il percorso storico redazionale dei riti d’ingresso, di offertorio e di comunio*. (Rome: Centro Liturgico Vincenziano, 2002, rev. ed. 2008).

^{vi} See, John F. Baldwin, “Kyrie eleison and the Entrance Rite Of the Roman Eucharist,” *Worship*

^{vii} Xavier Leon-Dufour, *Sharing the Eucharistic Bread, The Witness of the New Testament*. Trans., Matthew O’Connell (New York/Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1987) 236-40.

^{viii} See his revised doctoral dissertation, *The Place of Christ in Liturgical Prayer*. Trans. A. Peeler, (Staten Island, N.Y.: Alba House, 1965).