

EDDA WOLFF

# Liturgical Non-Sense

*Religion in  
Philosophy and Theology*

---

**Mohr Siebeck**

# Religion in Philosophy and Theology

Editors

HELEN DE CRUZ (St. Louis, MO) · ASLE EIKREM (Oslo)

THOMAS RENTSCH (Dresden) · HARTMUT VON SASS (Berlin)

HEIKO SCHULZ (Frankfurt a. M.) · JUDITH WOLFE (St Andrews)

114





Edda Wolff

# Liturgical Non-Sense

Negative Hermeneutics as a Method for  
Liturgical Studies Based on Liturgical Case Studies of  
Holy Saturday

Mohr Siebeck

*Edda Wolff*, born 1986; studied Theology and Philosophy in Germany, Italy, and Switzerland; PhD at the University of Durham; ordained minister in the Church of England; priest in the Convocation of Episcopal Churches in Europe (Frankfurt and Paris); currently working at Boston College and the University of Cologne, for a postdoctoral fellowship on Mysticism and Political Activism.  
orcid.org/0000-0002-5208-7270

ISBN 978-3-16-159952-1 / eISBN 978-3-16-159953-8  
DOI 10.1628/978-3-16-159953-8

ISSN 1616-346X / eISSN 2568-7425 (Religion in Philosophy and Theology)

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2021 Mohr Siebeck Tübingen, Germany. [www.mohrsiebeck.com](http://www.mohrsiebeck.com)

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was printed on non-aging paper by Laupp & Göbel in Gomaringen, and bound by Buchbinderei Nädle in Nehren.

Printed in Germany.

*Viatoribus.*



## Acknowledgements

This book is based on my PhD thesis, which I completed at the University of Durham, UK, in 2019. The process of writing a PhD thesis and committing to a large piece of academic work is a unique opportunity for intellectual and personal development. In the case of my project, the engagement with liturgical questions has, additionally, had a significant impact on my spiritual life and my understanding of my vocation to ordained ministry in the Church.

I am enormously thankful for all the support I have received during this journey.

First, I would like to thank my supervisors, Professor Marcus Pound and Professor Chris Insole, for their encouragement and regular feedback. I am also very grateful for the input and support of Professor Emil Angehrn, whose foundational approach to negative hermeneutics inspired this thesis.

I would also like to thank my Westcott House tutors, Drs Paul Dominiak, Eeva Johns, and Jeff Phillips for their support. I would like to thank Dr Alison Grey for her commitment in the early stages of my project.

My sincere thanks go to Drs Earl Collins and Ayla Lepin for their profound feedback and inspiring conversations.

Also, I would like to thank everybody who supported me with proofreading, translating or practical advice, in particular Dr Jenny Harris, and to Senan Furlong OSB for his support with the section on the liturgy in Glenstal Abby.

Last but not least, I would like to thank Charles Damian Ledbetter for his patience and encouragement in the last stages of the project.

I am very grateful to the anonymous donor who covered the printing costs of this project.

Victoria, 28<sup>th</sup> of March, Palm Sunday, 2021 - *I acknowledge with respect the Lekwungen peoples on whose traditional territory the University of Victoria stands and the Songhees, Esquimalt and WSÁNEĆ peoples whose historical relationships with the land continue to this day.*

Edda Wolff





# Contents

Chapter I: Introduction.....	1
Chapter II: Liturgy and Negative Hermeneutics.....	5
1 Starting Points for a Hermeneutic of Liturgy – A Methodology .....	5
1.1 Liturgy as Object of Research .....	5
1.2 Hermeneutics of Liturgy.....	15
1.3 Methodological Deepening – The Dialectical Criticism of Andrea Grillo .....	24
2 Negative Hermeneutics.....	31
2.1 Constellation of Negative Hermeneutics .....	31
2.1.1 Place Within the Philosophical-Hermeneutical Discussion .....	31
2.1.1.1 Rootedness in Classical Hermeneutics .....	31
2.1.1.2 Specificity of Negative Hermeneutics .....	34
2.1.2 Critique and Impulses from other Disciplines .....	35
2.2 Basic Concepts – The Dynamic of Understanding .....	38
2.2.1 The Place of Understanding .....	44
2.2.1.1 Understanding of Sense (Subject-Relatedness of Sense) .....	44
2.2.1.2 Self-Communication (Sense-Relatedness of the Subject) ....	48
2.2.2 Limitations of Understanding .....	50
2.2.2.1 Formal .....	52
2.2.2.2 Content -Related .....	54
2.2.2.3 Dealing with Negativity .....	56
2.3 Status of Negative Hermeneutics – The Sense of Self-Communication .....	58
2.3.1 Object .....	58
2.3.2 Method.....	60
2.3.3 Critique .....	61
3 Negative Hermeneutics of Liturgy: Theory and Potential .....	65
3.1 Methodological Pre-Thoughts .....	65

3.1.1 Givenness.....	68
3.1.2 Transformation.....	71
3.2 Conceptual Unfolding .....	76
3.2.1 Language .....	77
3.2.2 Subject.....	79
3.2.3 Sense.....	80
3.3 Liturgical Hyperbole?.....	83
Chapter III: Liturgy of Holy Saturday.....	89
1 Methodological Preliminaries.....	89
2 Holy Saturday as an Object of Study .....	93
2.1 Theological Framework.....	93
2.2 Liturgical Framework.....	96
2.2.1 Historical .....	98
2.2.2 Systematic-Theological.....	102
2.2.3 Practical/Pastoral .....	105
2.3 Negative Hermeneutic of Holy Saturday .....	108
2.3.1 Language/Writing .....	109
2.3.2 Subject.....	111
2.3.3 Sense.....	113
2.4 The Dynamic of Reading Liturgy .....	115
3 Case Studies .....	116
3.1 Holy Saturday with the Iona Community .....	120
3.1.1 Setting.....	120
3.1.2 Liturgy .....	125
3.1.2.1 Framework.....	127
3.1.2.2 Analysis .....	129
3.1.3 Conclusions .....	133
3.2 The Liturgy of Holy Saturday in the Church of England .....	137
3.2.1 Framework.....	137
3.2.2 Text Hermeneutics .....	142
3.2.2.1 Principal Service.....	142
3.2.2.2 Offices .....	145
3.2.3 Conclusions .....	149
3.3 Holy Saturday at Glenstal Abbey.....	153
3.3.1 Framework.....	153
3.3.1.1 Background.....	153
3.3.1.2 Context.....	156

3.3.2 Text Hermeneutics .....	158
3.3.2.1 Morning Prayer.....	160
3.3.2.2 Midday Prayer .....	162
3.3.2.3 Evening Prayer .....	163
3.3.3 Conclusions .....	164
3.4 Holy Saturday in the Orthodox Church in America .....	169
3.4.1 Basis .....	169
3.4.2 Liturgy .....	175
3.4.2.1 Matins.....	177
3.4.2.2 Vespers .....	180
3.4.3 Conclusions .....	183
3.5 Conclusions and Evaluation of the Case Studies .....	187
Chapter IV: Conclusion and Outlook .....	191
1 Anthropological – A Utopic Void.....	198
2 Theological – A Messianic Hyperbole .....	202
Bibliography .....	208
Index of Ancient Sources .....	225
Index of Authors .....	228
Index of Subjects .....	231



## Chapter I

# Introduction

“In the beginning was the nonsense and the nonsense was with God, and the nonsense was God.”<sup>1</sup>

“Ob der Nichtsinn nur als logische Negation des Sinns fungiert oder als Gegenmacht zu diesem – oder gar umgekehrt der Sinn als bloße Variante von Unsinn – fungiert, betrifft menschliches Sein und Verstehen in seinem Kern.”<sup>2</sup>

Nietzsche’s twist on the opening verses of John’s Gospel substitutes ‘logos’ for ‘nonsense’. This is a powerful reversal of what we are used to reading in John’s Gospel as the ‘word’, the ‘sense’, and ‘God’ Himself. However, far from the radical atheistic framework of Nietzsche’s work, this study will look at nonsense as a starting point for the study of liturgy and at its theological potential. At first glance, this seems counterintuitive for a theological study. How could it be anything but provocative, if not blasphemous, to talk about the ‘non-sense’ of liturgy?

This study will show how a more subtle and nuanced understanding of ‘non-sense’ can enhance our knowledge of liturgy and how, in a sense, it lies at the very centre of liturgical studies and its contribution to a wider theological interest. For this purpose, this study takes ‘negative hermeneutics’, a philosophical concept developed by Emil Angehrn, as a starting point for a methodological deepening of systematic liturgical studies. Negative hermeneutics is a philosophical method that focuses on the role of non-sense and a lack of meaning in the process of understanding and communication. This study will analyse the methodological implications and practical impact of negative hermeneutics for liturgical studies. It builds on the tradition of a dialogue between liturgical studies and the philosophical disciplines,<sup>3</sup> and more specifically, its engagement with hermeneutics.<sup>4</sup> The original contribution of this work consists in its application of negative hermeneutics to liturgical studies and its implementation through case studies. This study will present to

---

<sup>1</sup> Friedrich Nietzsche. *Human, all too human*. Translated by Reginald Hollingdale; with an introduction by Richard Schacht (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), aphorism 22.

<sup>2</sup> Emil Angehrn, “Hermeneutik und Kritik,” in Jaeggi; Wesche, *Was ist Kritik?*, 338.

<sup>3</sup> E.g. Andrea Grillo, “Filosofia e Liturgia: Quale rapporto? Prospettive filosofiche nella svolta tardo-moderna del pensiero liturgico,” *Rivista Liturgica* 101, no. 2 (2014).

<sup>4</sup> E.g. Bridget Nichols, *Liturgical hermeneutics: Interpreting liturgical rites in performance* (Frankfurt am Main et al.: Lang, 1996).

the reader a specific philosophical method and, on this basis, outline its potential for a more comprehensive interdisciplinary dialogue between liturgical studies and other academic subjects.

This approach is based on the presuppositions of explicitly Christian theology and liturgy celebrated in the context of Christian communities. Some of its methods and questions will, however, build an exciting basis for further studies within an interfaith context. It will prove that applying a negative hermeneutics' perspective helps to deepen the systematic-theological understanding of liturgical methods and develop a unique and significant perspective on liturgical commentaries and case studies. It will go beyond a simple 'application' of a method by asking what liturgical studies can contribute to the undertaking of hermeneutics and what this shows about their fundamental theological potential.

This study understands itself as a venture in methodological hybridity, which explores the resonant silence of Holy Saturday through the lens of a negative hermeneutic. It is based on two main pillars: a theoretical groundwork and an application of the liturgy of Holy Saturday through four case studies. The first part gives a detailed outline of the liturgical starting point for a dialogue with philosophical concepts. This preparatory work is necessary to build a shared understanding with the reader while drawing from the Anglo-American as well as the Continental-European tradition of liturgical studies. As a specific source for (meta-)liturgical methods and terminology, Andrea Grillo's work on systematic perspectives on liturgical studies will be consulted. His studies on the dynamics of mediation and immediacy build a suitable liturgical link for the focus of hermeneutic studies and their rootedness in dialectic philosophy and social sciences.<sup>5</sup> Since the works of Angehrn are not available in English, the presentation of his arguments will be detailed and provide context for a further application and critique of his methods. This two-pillar approach will deliberately create some tension and a potential gap between methodological expectations and the concrete reality of case studies. Including case studies as an established method of liturgical studies is significant for the scope of this work as this study understands itself as a liturgical study, i.e. as an attempt to hold theological questions and concrete liturgical expression together. Thus, it draws on traditional liturgical methods attempting to sharpen the perspective and to show new and unexpected layers through the dialogue with a non-theological discipline. It will open a unique perspective on the importance of gaps and the significance of imperfection, and the importance of laughter in the liturgy.<sup>6</sup> The iterative character of liturgy aims

---

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Robert Schurz, *Negative Hermeneutik: Zur sozialen Anthropologie des Nicht-Verstehens* (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1995).

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Gordon Lathrop, *Holy things: A liturgical theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 172.

at the next celebration and is thus an interpretative challenge. The paradox of every liturgical study, as a non-literary approach to texts, will be intensified by the (meta-)hermeneutic consequences of this approach. On this basis, this study will analyse the potential of negative hermeneutics to articulate the dynamic of anabatic and katabatic elements in the liturgical act more clearly.

From a theological point of view, it will present specific material on Holy Saturday and its adaption in different liturgical traditions, and at the same time, reflect on the potential theological implications of liturgical studies as an 'in-between' discipline that analyses the positive ritual expression of the Church. The choice of Holy Saturday as an example for liturgical application represents the wider interest of this work in the 'in-between'; something that from a negative hermeneutics perspective is reflected in the liturgical gap, the negative and the paradox of the im-mediate. Holy Saturday will, therefore, be a paradigm for the liturgical engagement with the experience of a loss of sense, as well as the formal lack of pre-given structures and concepts to frame this loss.

It is, therefore, part of the methodological approach of this study to give a detailed philosophical and theological analysis of context, methods, and traditions, but at the same time to encourage the reader to reflect on how the dynamic of theological mediation and liturgical immediacy plays out in the details of each layer. It intends to give a reliable and profound basis for theological creativity and a playful engagement with texts ('homo ludens' and 'Deus ludens'<sup>7</sup>). The negative hermeneutics approach of rediscovery and re-creation of sense, through the experiences of gaps and immediacy, becomes a starting point for the methodical introduction of the reader to profound reflection and a process of wrestling with the experience of non-sense.

The challenge is not to simplify and reconcile the language and philosophical depth of the philosophical-methodological aspects, nor to pass over the concrete and confrontational immediacy of the liturgical question (i.e. the question of how liturgy can be a function of theology). So, for whose 'gaze' is the study written? Its methodological hybridity draws from different sources and engages with a variety of traditions. While it is rooted in the tradition of liturgical studies, it intends to encourage a dialogue between disciplines and so to raise different questions for different readers.

The selection of case studies will illustrate different approaches to Holy Saturday and its representation in the concrete liturgical celebrations. All liturgical examples are taken from an English-speaking context, while the theoretical background (in hermeneutics as well as in liturgical studies) of this study is deeply rooted in the continental academic tradition. On the one hand, this reflects the experience of the author, and on the other hand, it is the

---

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Richard Kearney, *The God who may be: A hermeneutics of religion*, Indiana series in the philosophy of religion (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001), 107.



expression of interest in the process of a ‘translation’ or ‘transliteration’ of academic methods in diverse fields and language contexts and the potential this might open. At the same time, the reality of a text (in contrast to video analysis of the celebration or detailed interviews with participants) shapes a formidable counterpoint to a purely theoretical approach on the one side and the desire for purely ‘empirical data’ on the other side. It is not simply a further explanation of the ‘use’ of a negative hermeneutic approach but its application and exposition in this wrestling with the specific text and its gaps. The case studies provide a frame and a starting point for a deeper understanding of continuity and discontinuity in the liturgy and broader theological reflection on Holy Saturday. Thus, the exploration of the text will be primarily descriptive, nevertheless critical, as it aims to highlight gaps and hidden layers in the text. This project does not attempt to provide a comparative liturgical study that contrasts different liturgical traditions with each other but rather engage their gaps and tensions in a playful and creative dialogue.

Finally, this study will show how the gaps and tensions between liturgical mediation and immediacy reveal a layer of theological desire and hope for reconciliation and resurrection of sense beyond the loss of liturgical meaning. It will adopt the framework of a katabatic and anabatic dynamic articulated at the beginning and use it to explore the wider implications of the theological contributions of negative hermeneutics and liturgy. The goal is not to fully integrate the methodological framework and the case studies but to deliberately make room for the possibility of gaps and disaccord and to weigh their implications for an interdenominational work. At the same time, this opening and allowing of tension must not be taken as a dismissal of intellectual sincerity but as an encouragement of creativity and the appearance of unexpected and potential meaning. Herein lies the creative and refreshing potential of negative hermeneutics for liturgical studies: it is not merely a tool to develop and refine more coherent answers but a starting point to raise new and unexpected questions.

This project wishes not only to introduce its readers to a specific method and its applications but also to stretch their theological and liturgical preconceptions. For this purpose, different levels of analysis open the potential for a critical and creative engagement with texts and methods by adding the dynamic of liturgical non-sense and disaccord.

## Chapter II

# Liturgy and Negative Hermeneutics

## 1 Starting Points for a Hermeneutic of Liturgy – A Methodology

### *1.1 Liturgy as Object of Research*

Before we look at the more specific question of the potential of negative hermeneutics as a methodical approach to liturgy, it is necessary to clarify some of the basic concepts and constellations of liturgical studies as a theological subject, to situate negative hermeneutics within it. The following outline is shaped by continental European approaches (particularly the tradition of the Roman Catholic liturgical movement) but also takes influences from the Anglo-American tradition into account.

The project is particularly interested in methods that do not only offer a systematic approach in writing ‘about’ liturgical studies as a discipline but consider the reach and potential of philosophical and fundamental theological engagement with liturgical texts. A leading dialogue partner will be the Italian scholar Andrea Grillo who, with concepts of postmodern philosophy, rethinks the creative and challenging potential of liturgical studies. His methodology builds a starting point for establishing a fundamental hermeneutics of liturgy.

Initially, it is necessary to give some preliminary clarification on the concept of ‘liturgy’ and its study as an academic subject. For a study like this, which works at the borders of established liturgical concepts and seeks to create a dialogue that also incorporates philosophical hermeneutics, it is essential to give a clear outline of its basic concepts and perspective. This cannot, however, be an attempt to cover the rather complex and controversial history of liturgical studies completely but rather an effort to provide a ‘context’ for the following work; some insight on where it is situated within the current state of the academic liturgical discussion; and how it can enrich a traditional theological approach to liturgy.

First of all, it is not at all obvious how and why liturgy should be the *object of theology rather than of social sciences*,<sup>1</sup> nor why it needs a separate discipline among the traditional theological core subjects (‘Fächerkanon’) rather than leaving its study to other disciplines such as church history or

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Nathan Mitchell, *Liturgy and the social sciences, American essays in liturgy* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1999) and Kieran Flanagan, *Sociology and liturgy: Representations of the holy* (London: Macmillan, 1991).

pastoral theology. What does theology have to ‘gain’ from an engagement with liturgy? How is a theological interest in liturgy shaped by a more general perspective on the relationship between theology and other academic, scientific and cultural studies? The methodological framework for this dialogue, which underlies this study, and the justification of choices of methods and concepts will be developed in chapter II.2 and given as a résumé in chapter II.3 after critical concepts and methodological principles have been established.

Etymologically, the word ‘liturgy’ comes from the Greek word *leiturgia* (λειτουργία), a term used in the context of the ancient Greek polity to describe the public and cultic work and service of citizens. It found its way into the Septuagint as a specific term for the cult in the temple (Hebrew: שֶׁרֶת / עֲבֹדָה). Subsequently, it is used 15 times in the Second Testament; it is used for the worship of the First Covenant (e.g. Luke 1:23) but also for the ‘service’ which Christ and his angels perform (e.g. Hebrews 8:2 and 1:17). Nevertheless, only in Acts 13:2 is the term used to talk about the worship of the Christian community<sup>2</sup>.

In the Eastern Orthodox and Byzantine Church, it continued to be used as a term for sacred rites and especially the Eucharist, whereas in the West, it reappeared only in the 16<sup>th</sup> century as a synonym for the Mass. Under Pope Gregory XVI, the term was used only for other forms of worship.<sup>3</sup> Even today, the understanding of the word ‘liturgy’ is not at all homogeneous among different schools and writers. It instead reflects a complex of themes and aspects, from traditional questions of a ‘correct’, ‘faithful’ celebration of liturgical rites to critical studies on the sociology of worship.<sup>4</sup> The mutual mediation of an externally mediated cult and the theological postulate of a transcendent faith in the liturgical celebration will thus be the basis for a liturgical hermeneutic.

---

<sup>2</sup> For the Christian cult the word *λατρεία* is usually used.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Benjamin Gordon-Taylor, “Liturgy,” in Day, *The study of liturgy and worship*, 13; Anscar J. Chupungco, “A definition of liturgy,” in Chupungco, *Handbook for liturgical studies*. Volume 1. Introduction to the liturgy, 3; and Karl-Heinrich Bieritz, *Liturgik* (Berlin, New York: De Gruyter, 2004), 1–7. In an English-speaking context some writers use the distinction between ‘worship’ and ‘liturgy’. However, both those words imply an intentional act targeted towards God, whereas the expression ‘church service’ tries to give a descriptive determination of an outward activity (similar ‘descriptions’ are used in other Western European languages like German ‘Gottesdienst’) or Dutch ‘Kerkdienst’). Often, they are associated with different church traditions (‘liturgy’ for Orthodox, Catholic, and High Anglican services, ‘worship’ for reformed churches). A more systematic distinction is drawn by Irvine and Bergquist, who describe worship, the “response of the whole person towards God”, as a prerequisite for liturgy as the “structured set of words and movements that enables worship to happen” (Christopher Irvine and Anders Bergquist, “Thinking about liturgy,” *Anaphora* 5, no. 2 [2011]: 45). The following study will use both concepts synonymously since it aims to be in dialogue with different denominational and linguistic traditions.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Kieran Flanagan, *Sociology and liturgy*.

Liturgical studies are the theological discipline that studies these texts and movements insofar as they are expressions of the Church as a praying community.<sup>5</sup> For the historical development of liturgical studies as an original theological subject, the ‘crisis of faith’ and a growing estrangement from church traditions at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century was a crucial impulse. The term ‘liturgical studies’ (‘scienza liturgica’, ‘Liturgiewissenschaft’) was first used in a German-speaking context by Romano Guardini to describe the purpose and method of an emerging theological discipline in relation to the humanities (‘Geisteswissenschaften’).<sup>6</sup>

This new discipline was distinguished from the traditional study of ‘rubrics’ (‘Rubrizistik’) which explains the normative ‘meaning’ of liturgical texts based on a purely historical or canonical understanding. Whereas a purely ‘rubrical’ approach to the liturgy was interested mainly in the question of ‘how’, celebrated liturgical studies rediscovered the aspects of ‘why’ and ‘what’.<sup>7</sup> From the very beginning, these were situated between historical-systematic studies, social and cultural sciences, and pastoral studies.

A certain ambivalence between the visible expression of liturgy and its understanding as a ‘spiritual’ reality is displayed in the broad and heterogeneous views on the *purpose and method* of liturgical studies. Its first and most general inquiry is whether a view on Christian worship as a cultural and ritual praxis is legitimate and, therefore, to what extent the study of it can draw on concepts and methods of anthropology and cultural studies. A ‘Christian’ view on liturgy can either stress the difference between divine salvation and creation and oppose the human ‘ritualisation’ faith based on the principles of revelation and conversion or focus on the incarnational dimension of human expressions and needs as an integral part of salvation. In the context

---

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Benjamin Gordon-Taylor, “Liturgy,” in Day, *The study of liturgy and worship*, 14.

<sup>6</sup> Romano Guardini and Franz Henrich, *Vom Geist der Liturgie* (Mainz et al.: Grünewald, 2007).

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Andrea Grillo, “‘Intellectus fidei’ und ‘intellectus ritus’: Die Überraschende Konvergenz von Liturgiethologie, Sakramententheologie und Fundamentaltheologie,” *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 50 (2000): 149, Andrea Grillo and Michael Meyer-Blanck, *Einführung in die liturgische Theologie: Zur Theorie des Gottesdienstes und der christlichen Sakramente* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006), 27 and 222. Andrea Grillo compares, in this context, the crisis which the emerging liturgical studies caused in theology at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century with the radical challenge which the developing human sciences posed to philosophy, cf. Andrea Grillo, “Aspetti della ricerca filosofica e agire liturgica: Consonanze e dissonanze tra due campi del sapere (e tra due esperienze) del XX secolo,” in *Liturgia e scienze umane: Itinerari di ricerca atti della XXIX Settimana di studio dell’Associazione professori di liturgia Santuario di Vicoforte*, 26–31 agosto 2001 (Roma: Edizioni Liturgiche, 2002), 85s. The distinction between liturgical studies and liturgics is sometimes based on a similar demarcation between the academic study of liturgy and the application and exercise in a concrete Church context. More recent publications tend, though, to use both terms synonymously, cf. Louis Weil, “Worship,” in Day, *The study of liturgy and worship*.

of Catholic liturgical studies, a possible answer is given based on *Sacrosanctum Concilium*,<sup>8</sup> describing liturgy and its ritual character as part of the ‘economy’ of salvation; not only as a legitimate expression but as *culmen et fons* in the life of the Church. The fact that the paschal mystery as liturgical key event presents itself as a ‘ritual’ urges theological consideration to enter a phenomenological-hermeneutic inquiry discerning the fundamental unity and tension between anthropology and theology.<sup>9</sup> The understanding of liturgy as a revelation in the form of a celebration (*sub specie celebrationis*)<sup>10</sup> therefore opens up a perspective on the relation of faith to its ritual expression that will serve as the starting point for this study.

In the context of liturgical studies, the question of the dynamic between *cultural anthropology and theology*, considered in a theoretical way by a fundamental theological inquiry, is articulated in an even more radical way since these must justify their existence as a genuine theological subject.<sup>11</sup> An ‘objective’ concept of liturgy, as presupposed by the Catholic and Anglican liturgical movement in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century,<sup>12</sup> cannot be assumed anymore, neither as a basis for critique nor a source of theological dogmatic.

It is, therefore, an inevitable task for current liturgical studies not only to think through the modern assumption of a subjective and personal faith but also to further engage with a postmodern inquiry towards a possible reintegration of exterior bodily practices and experiences in the theological discourse.<sup>13</sup> The concept of ‘anthropology’ in this context cannot be reduced to a positive scientific project but instead needs to be in dialogue with a cultural and phenomenological-descriptive definition of the human nature that is open to

---

<sup>8</sup> Second Vatican Council. Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy *Sacrosanctum Concilium* (4<sup>th</sup> December 1963). In *The Sixteen Documents of Vatican II*, ed. Marianne L. Trouve, 47–83 (Boston: Pauline Books, 1999).

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Alceste Catella, “Theology of the liturgy,” in Chupungco, *Handbook for liturgical studies*. Volume 2. *Fundamental liturgy*, 16.

<sup>10</sup> Alceste Catella, “Theology of the liturgy,” in Chupungco, *Handbook for liturgical studies*. Volume 2. *Fundamental liturgy*, 17.

<sup>11</sup> The different approaches to the understanding of liturgy, from a primarily anthropological point of view to a primarily theological point of view, are already present in the very early stages of the liturgical movement, especially in the dialogue between Guardini and Casel; cf. Martin Klöckener, Benedikt Kranemann, and Angelus A.O. Häußling, “Liturgie verstehen. Die Herausgeber des Archivs für Liturgiewissenschaft im Gespräch,” in Klöckener; Kranemann; Häußling, *Liturgie verstehen*, 17.

<sup>12</sup> Bryan D. Spinks, “The Liturgical Movement: 2. United Kingdom,” in Bradshaw, *The new SCM Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship*.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Albert Gerhards, “Gottesdienst und Menschwerdung: Vom Subjekt liturgischer Feier,” in *Markierungen: Theologie in den Zeichen der Zeit*, ed. Mariano Delgado and Andreas Lob-Hüdepohl (Berlin: Morus, 1995), 283–86.

engaging with a symbolic dimension.<sup>14</sup> The hermeneutical interest in the concrete human experience builds the bridge to the ritual and symbolic aspect of liturgy.

A key area for the dialogue between liturgical studies and humanities is, therefore, the dimension of ‘ritual’ and ‘symbolic’, a concept that began to attract academic focus in the 19<sup>th</sup> century through the development of ritual studies, which was based on the rising interest in religious and cultural rites. In dialogue with ritual studies, liturgical studies started to rediscover the principle of ‘rite’, which supplanted the concepts of ‘symbol’, and ‘sign’, which had been predominant in liturgical discourse since the Middle Ages. The understanding of sacraments as signs (*in genere signi*) had shaped the dogmatic debate as well as the dialogue of fundamental theology with epistemology or hermeneutics.

The reference of symbols to a ritual context shifts the focus from a merely theoretical understanding of ‘meaning’ to the decentred analysis of ‘bodily’ and ‘collective’ expressions.<sup>15</sup> Thus, symbols become an authentic expression of an oscillating phenomenon between ‘meaningful’ language and an ontology of the ‘ineffable’. This perspective emphasises that the human being is the image of God even in its brokenness; on this basis, the ‘theological potential’ of critical anthropological disciplines can be explored; e.g. the dialogue with modern analytical psychology<sup>16</sup> shows the potential of using a language of ritual experience that leaves space for an interpretation of a ‘symbolic difference’.

This project is interested in the hermeneutical implications of the ritual and symbolic dimensions of liturgy, as it is, for example, laid out in Andrea Grillo’s

---

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Aldo Natale Terrin, “Antropologia culturale,” in *Nuovo Dizionario di Liturgia*, ed. Domenico Sartore and Achille M. Triacca (Roma: Edizioni Paoline, 1984), 72–74.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Stephen Buckland, “Ritual, Körper und ‘kulturelles Gedächtnis,’” *Concilium* 31, no. 3 (1995): 215. Therefore the distinction between ‘sign’ and ‘symbol’ varies among different traditions: traditionally ‘sign’ was understood as a conventional element representing an instruction, operation, or concept, cf. Maurice Waite, “Symbol,” in *Paperback Oxford English Dictionary*, ed. Maurice Waite, 7<sup>th</sup> edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012). Today the concept ‘sign’ is often understood as pictorial stand-in for words (e.g. no smoking), whereas ‘symbol’ has a surplus that cannot be identified or described with precision; at the same time, the symbol does not refer only to a fixed unit but rather makes it present in a mediated fashion. In the context of liturgy, the celebration can be described as the process of symbolisation; accordingly, symbols come into view rather as an act of ‘placing together’ (συνβάλλειν) than a ‘simple’ signifier, i.e. as verb rather than as noun; cf. George Guiver C.R., “Sign and symbol,” in Day, *The study of liturgy and worship*, 33; and Crispino Valenziano, “Liturgy and symbolism,” in Chupungco, *Handbook for liturgical studies. Volume 2. Fundamental liturgy*.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. for example Andreas Odenthal’s liturgical studies based on self-psychology in Heribert Wahl: Andreas Odenthal, *Liturgie als Ritual: Theologische und psychoanalytische Überlegungen zu einer praktisch-theologischen Theorie des Gottesdienstes als Symbolgeschehen* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2002); and Heribert Wahl, *Narzissmus? Von Freuds Narzissmustheorie zur Selbstpsychologie* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1985).

analysis of the ‘second anthropological turn’. The ability to communicate and understand through symbols provides an essential skill for the individual as well as for any community. The understanding of humans as ‘symbolic beings’ (*animalia symbolica*) forms the basis for a dialogue with ritual studies as well as contemporary philosophical approaches to anthropology. This perspective on liturgy as a process of symbolisation turns even more radical as it is applied to the idea of *ritual action*.

The liturgist Paul Bradshaw defines rituals as actions performed for their symbolic value and repeated in a social group.<sup>17</sup> Between transformation and stabilisation, ritual facilitates the experience of ‘community’ in everyday life as well as in an exceptional moment. For this study, the understanding of ritualisation as a fundamental human reaction to the experience of lack and abyss, and at the same time, the possibility of understanding the nature of the symbol as deeply allocentric, is the most significant aspect of this dynamic.<sup>18</sup> The human reaction to the experience of lack and negativity is, as we will see in section II.2.2.2c “Dealing with Negativity,” a key area of negative hermeneutics. On this basis, the following study will explore how a fundamental-hermeneutical approach to liturgy can help to understand the theological potential of a second anthropological turn.

After these considerations of the relationship between liturgical studies and non-theological disciplines (*ad extra*), the question needs to be asked: How does liturgical studies justify its existence as an original and independent *theological subject* (*ad intra*)? How does it relate to the overall dynamic and the systematics among the traditional theological core subjects?<sup>19</sup> What is its original contribution to the study of theology as a whole?

The way different scholars view liturgical studies and its relationship to other disciplines are linked to their general understanding of its purpose and scope.<sup>20</sup> A schematic comparison of more ‘systematic’ and more ‘practical’ approaches will help clarify underlying dynamics and outline the potential of liturgical studies as a theological core subject as well as the envisioned contributions and challenges of a negative hermeneutical approach.

---

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Paul F. Bradshaw and Katharine E. Harmon, “Ritual,” in Day, *The study of liturgy and worship*, 21.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Gerard Lukken, “L’“autre côté” du rituel humain: Reconsidération à partir de la phénoménologie et la sémiotique sur des couches anthropologiques et théologiques dans le rituel chrétien,” *Questions Liturgiques* 83, no. 1 (2002): 81–86.

<sup>19</sup> A certain scepticism towards the ‘locus’ of liturgical studies within theology seems to exist, especially in the context of ‘continental’ theology, and it’s often a more systematic and traditional perspective on the theological core subjects, cf. Robert S. Taft, “Holy Week in the Byzantine tradition,” in *The celebration of Holy Week in ancient Jerusalem and its development in the rites of East and West*, ed. Kidane Habtemichael and Antony G. Kollampampil (Roma: Centro Liturgico Vincenziano – Edizioni Liturgiche, 1997), 244.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Andreas Odenthal, *Liturgie als Ritual*, 27.

# Index of Ancient Sources

## First Testament

Genesis		63	161, 163, 167s, 177
1:1–13	181	65	182
22:1–18	181	68	179
		75	163
Exodus		76	164
5:3	99	82	182, 186
12:1–11	181	87	161
13:20–15:1	181	88	277
13–14	103	94	160
		103	177
Joshua		104	180
5:10–15	181	115	163
		116	148
1. Kings or 3. Kings LXX		116:1	148
17:8–24	181	116:9	148
		116:13, 17	148
2. Kings or 4. Kings LXX		116:14, 18s	148
4:8–27	181	116–117	180
		119	163, 177, 185
Job		120	163
14:1–14	143, 144	121	163
19:21–27	149	122	163
19:21s	149	123	163
19:25s	149	124	163
		129–130	180
Psalms		140	163
3	177	140–141	180
9	179	141	163, 168, 180
14	177	141–142	180
15	160, 167	142	147, 148, 163
23	160, 167	142:5	148
26	163	142:6	147
27	132	142:7	148
29	161, 163	148	179
31	144	149	162, 167, 179
31:1–4, 15, 16,	143	150	162, 167, 179
38	177		
44	179	Isaiah	
51	178	38:10–14; 17–20	162
56	161, 163, 167	60:1–6	181



61:1–19	181	Ezekiel	
61:10–62:5	181	37:1–14	179
63:11–64:5	181	37:1	176
Jeremiah		Daniel	
29:11–14	133	3:1–57	181
31:31–34	131, 181	Hosea	
32:1–2, 6–7, 9–15	131	6	148
32:6–7, 9a, 13–15	131	6:1–6	148
32:26–38, 42–44	131	6:1–3a	162, 164
32:36–38:42–44	131	6:1	164
32:37	135	6:2	148
33:14–16	131	13:14	161, 166
Lamentations		Jonah	
3:1–3, 22–28	161	1:1–17, 2:1–10	181
3:1–9	161	3:1–10, 4:1–11	181
3:1–9, 19–24	143s	2:2–7,9	148
3:22–30	144, 161	Zephaniah	
4:1–6	154	3:8–15	181
5:1–11	154		

## Second Testament

Matthew		2:19,21	148
12:40	101, 161	2:19–22	148
21:12–17	103	18:1–19:42	144
27:52–53	101	18–19	144
27:55–66	144	19:38–42	143s
27:57–66	144	Acts	
27:62–66	179	2:22–24, 29–32	101
27:66	143	13:2	6
28:1–20	182	Romans	
28:62–66	101	4:24,25;5:1–5,8,9,11	149
Mark		6	145
11:15–19	103	6:3–11	182
Luke		8:31–39	129
1:23	6	15:13	133
19:45–48	103	1. Corinthians	
23:56b	101	5:6–8	179
John		12:27	132
2:13–16	103	Galatians	
2:19–22	148, 152	3:13–14	179
2:19	148	3:27	186

Philippians		4:6	101
2	168		
2:6–11	159, 164	1. John	
2:8s	149	2:8b–10	163
		5:5–12	149
1. Timothy		Hebrews	
2:1.2	11	1:17	6
		4:1–13	160
1. Peter		8:2	6
1:18–21	164		
4:4–8	144		
4:1–8	144		

### Ancient and Early Christian Authors

Augustine		Plato	
<i>Epistula 55</i>		<i>Phaedo</i>	
Chapter 9	99	89d–e	57
Prosper of Aquitaine		<i>Symposium</i>	
<i>Praetertorum sedis apostolicae</i>		190a–193a	54
<i>episcoporum auctoritates, de gratia</i>			
<i>dei et libero voluntatis arbitrio</i>			
Chapter 8, PL 51, 0209c.	11		

## Index of Authors

- Adorno, Theodor Wiesengrund 192  
Alfeyev, Hilarion 101, 181, 184, 203  
Ambrose, of Milane 70, 99  
Angehrn, Emil 18, 31, 34–69, 75–77,  
80–82, 87, 89, 108, 111, 151, 192,  
197–204  
auf der Maur, Hansjörg 92, 100  
Augé, Matias 100s.  
Augustine, Saint 99
- Baldovin, John 99  
Basil, Saint 172s, 177, 182  
Bell, John 123  
Bieritz, Karl–Heinrich 21s, 107  
Boeve, Lieven 76, 83, 203s  
Bogner, Daniel 111  
Bradshaw, Paul 10, 98s, 138, 171  
Broom, Dave 126–130, 134–136  
Brüske, Gunda 15, 74  
Buchinger, Harald 99–101  
Buckland, Stephen 9, 20, 86  
Bux, Nicola 172
- Caputo, John 76  
Casel, Odo 8  
Catella, Alceste 8  
Certeau, Michel de 79, 85, 97, 111, 201  
Chauvet, Louis–Marie 22, 26, 67, 70s,  
78, 80, 192, 194  
Chenu, Marie Dominique 19s.  
Chupungco, Anscar 16  
Columba, Saint 120, 124, 129  
Connell, Martin 12, 103, 105  
Constantine, the Great 98  
Cremoni, Andreas 35, 59
- Dalferth, Ingolf 15, 192, 196s  
Day, Juliette 19, 73  
de Clerck, Paul 11  
Derrida, Jacque 43, 46, 48, 74  
Dilthey, Wilhelm 40, 66  
Dondelinger, Patrick 19s
- Egeria 99s, 174, 176  
Erdmann, Martin 105, 113s
- Fagerberg, David 28  
Figal, Günter 34, 36, 57, 59s  
Fischer, Balthasar 161, 213, 217, 219–21  
Fischer, Ingrid 96s, 100, 106, 115, 154,  
160, 165, 167  
Flanagan, Kieran 5s, 71, 86, 194, 197  
Flügge, Manfred 73  
Foucault, Michel 77s, 214  
Freyer, Thomas 28, 84  
Furlong, Senan 157, 159, 161s
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg 32s, 35, 38, 41s,  
45, 50, 59, 62, 68, 72–74, 78, 87, 90,  
196s, 199  
Galloway, Kathy 121–124  
Garrigan, Siobhan 79, 86, 116  
Gerhards, Albert 8, 11, 13, 21, 65  
Glenn, Ambrose 25, 71s  
Green, André 112, 199s  
Gregory XVI, Pope 6  
Grillo, Andrea 2, 5, 7, 9, 15, 16, 20, 23–  
29, 65, 68, 70s, 77, 82–84, 192–196,  
199, 200, 202, 205  
Guardini, Romano 7, 70, 74, 215  
Guiver, George 9, 11, 87
- Häußling, Angelus 14, 23  
Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich 38, 56,  
98  
Heidegger, Martin 38, 74, 228  
Hoff, Johannes 85, 88, 196  
Hunziker, Andreas 83s
- Innocent I, Pope 99  
Irwin, Kevin 12
- Jacques, Francis 46, 68s, 74, 86  
Janicaud, Dominique 29  
Jeggle-Merz, Birgit 23, 65

- Johnson, Maxwell 171  
 Jungmann, Josef Andreas 100
- Kant, Immanuel 38  
 Kavanagh, Aidan 65  
 Kearney, Richard 83, 86, 194s, 205  
 Klöckener, Martin 19  
 Korsakov, Ruisky 162  
 Kosmas, of the Holy City 178  
 Koumarios, Pavlos 174s, 186  
 Kranemann, Benedikt 16  
 Krause, Cyprian 23, 58, 73, 83, 86  
 Küchenhoff, Joachim 49, 59, 61, 112s, 200
- Lacan, Jacques 54, 69, 85, 193, 200  
 Lathrop, Gordon 23, 88, 96, 112  
 Lefsrud, Sigurd 104, 115  
 Leikam, Rubén 153–155, 162, 168  
 Leonhard, Clemens 97, 107  
 Lévinas, Emmanuel 43, 52, 63  
 Lewis, Alan 93  
 Liebisch, Burkhardt 63  
 Lukken, Gerard 10, 12, 15, 21, 78s  
 Lupini, Silvia 72, 74
- MacLeod, Donald 120  
 MacLeod, George 121, 124, 128  
 Maeseneer, Yves de 96, 102, 114  
 Maggiani, Silvio 70  
 Marion, Jean-Luc 28s, 97, 204  
 Mark, the Monk 178  
 Mazzocchi, Giuseppe 21  
 McCall, Richard 114  
 McDowell, Maria 71, 183, 202  
 McLauchlan, Richard 98, 110, 115  
 Mendelssohn Bartholdy, Felix 121  
 Merleau-Ponty, Maurice 28, 41  
 Mersch, Dieter 38, 41, 45  
 Messner, Reinhard 12, 18, 29, 89, 117  
 Meyer-Blanck, Michael 13, 26, 28, 202  
 Milbank, John 71, 194  
 Moine, de l'Eglise d'Orient 176, 183, 185  
 Morgan, John 138  
 Mother Mary, nun 170  
 Moyaert, Marianne 49, 88
- Nancy, Jean-Luc 63  
 Nichols, Aidan 102  
 Nichols, Bridget 12, 17, 65s, 117, 194, 195s, 202
- Nietzsche, Friedrich 1
- Oakes, Edward 103  
 Odenthal, Andreas 9, 14, 19, 21, 24, 30, 80, 82, 97, 106  
 Osterholt-Kootz, Birgit 11, 13, 65
- Paul VI, Pope 157  
 Perham, Michael 105, 144, 150  
 Pfatteicher, Philip 93–96, 106, 151  
 Philippart, David 105, 143  
 Pickstock, Catherine 25, 70s  
 Piil, Mary 93, 100  
 Pitstick, Alyssa 103  
 Pius V., Pope 100  
 Pius XII., Pope 100  
 Plato 54, 57  
 Pound, Marcus 61, 69–71, 82, 88, 193  
 Prétot, Patrick 13s  
 Prosper, of Aquitaine 11
- Quartier, Thomas 112s
- Rahner, Karl 13  
 Ratzinger, Joseph 106  
 Regan, Patrick 98  
 Renaud-Chamska, Isabelle 86  
 Rentel, Alexander 30, 171, 174  
 Rentsch, Thomas 75, 81, 193, 196, 198  
 Ricœur, Paul 16, 26, 37, 39, 46s, 49, 52s, 55, 74s, 80, 84s, 89  
 Rooney, Marcel 109, 155, 165, 167
- Savas, Savas 176, 178  
 Schillebeeckx, Edward 21, 72  
 Schilson, Arno 24, 98  
 Schmemmann, Alexander 171, 176–178, 185, 201s  
 Schneider, Gerhard 51, 116  
 Schurz, Robert 31, 34, 37, 38, 39, 64, 65, 81, 90, 92, 107, 193, 198, 200  
 Shanks, Norman 122–125  
 Socrates 57  
 Steiner, George 107s  
 Stoellger, Philipp 75  
 Storck, Timo 50, 61  
 Stosur, David 75  
 Stringer, Martin 65s, 86  
 Stuflesser, Martin 11
- Taft, Robert 10, 69, 99, 175s, 178, 180, 182

- Talley, Thomas 100, 174  
Terrin, Aldo Natale 26, 28, 155  
Tertullian 20  
Thiselton, Anthony 18, 70  
Tillich, Paul 23, 87  
Tippelskirch-Eissinger, Dorothee von 88  
Tolstoy, Leo 60
- Valenziano, Crispino 9, 22s, 79s, 198,  
201  
Velkovska, Elena 172, 177  
von Balthasar, Hans Urs 100–104, 115,  
191
- Waldenfels, Bernhard 32, 35, 43, 63, 197  
Ware, Kallistos 170–172  
Wellmer, Albrecht 62s  
Wiese, Hans-Ulrich 93, 100, 102–104,  
108, 112, 134, 153, 160s, 168  
Wilvliet, John 67  
Wintersig, Anthanasius 16  
Wybrew, Hugh 94, 170–174
- Zeillinger, Peter 74, 192, 194, 196  
Zimmerman, Joyce Ann 16, 24

## Index of Subjects

- absence of God 24, 103, 108, 112s  
absurdity 53, 56, 58, 71, 106  
aesthetic 28, 70, 73s, 88, 114  
anabasis 19, 80, 92, 103, 117, 188s,  
192, 195, 198–204, 206  
analytical psychology  
  *see psychoanalysis*  
anamnesis 18, 69, 75, 185, 200, 205  
anthropological turn  
  *see turn, anthropological*  
anthropology  
  cultural 8  
  liturgical 202  
  negative 55, 89, 114  
  philosophical 8–10, 13, 20, 26, 45,  
  48s, 57, 77, 79, 82s, 87, 198s, 202  
  social 37  
anticipation 18, 50, 66, 74, 185s, 188,  
195, 197, 199, 202, 205  
anti-Semitism 142, 152  
Arian struggle 103  
art 74, 102, 107s, 114, 179, 218  
asceticism 99, 101, 107, 146, 171, 184s,  
188, 193  
authority 33s, 64, 65, 68, 71, 85s, 200s,  
223  
  
bad infinity 197, 199  
bisociation 110  
blank space 112s  
bodiliness  
  *see body*  
bodily practices 8  
  *see also body*  
body 8s, 20s, 23, 29, 41, 49, 52, 68,  
78–80, 85, 144, 151, 194, 197, 205  
Book of Common Prayer 137s, 144–146  
Book of Common Worship 118, 137,  
153  
  
case studies 1–4, 53, 87, 89s, **116–120**,  
187–191, 196  
  
catechesis 13s, 107  
celebration  
  individual 13, 15, 77, 82, 86, 203  
Christological model  
  of prayer 104  
Christology  
  of Holy Saturday 114  
Church of England **118s**, 137, 139, 141,  
145, 149, 153, 188s  
commentary  
  in liturgy 77, 89, 117, 119, 171  
conditio humana 39, 54s, 57s, 193, 199  
confessions 149, 158, 172  
critique 35–37, 42, 44s, 51, 58, 61–68,  
74s, 86, 102, 108, 112  
  of Holy Saturday 106  
culmen et fons 8, 26  
  
date *see Easter, date of*  
death of God 24, 92, 94–107, 104s,  
112, 114, 129, 179, 203  
deconstruction 26, 36–38, 44, 47, 53,  
62, 189, 199, 203  
descent of Jesus 71, 91s, 101–104, 115,  
193, 195, 198, 203s, 216  
desire for  
  a lost transcendent 83  
  communication 81  
  future 88, 113, 202  
  language 42s, 48  
  self-communication 50  
  sense 22s, 28, 39s, 43, 47, 54–60,  
  66s, 71, 73, 82s, 189, 191, 204  
  understanding 22, 35, 51, 57, 75, 195  
detour in hermeneutics 25, 33, 39, 50,  
53, 55, 66s, 80, 103, 108, 187  
discipline  
  ancillary 25  
  critical 67, 91  
  non-theological 10  
  philosophical 1, 18, 35–37  
  theological 5–7, 10–13, 15, 28, 88

- 202
- Easter 91–100, **103s**, 127, 142, 197,  
201, 203, 210s, 213, 223s  
date of 94s, 118s, 141, 171
- empty church building 97, 130, 141
- empty tomb 82, 97, 182
- epiclesis 75
- epistemology 9, 31
- Epitaphion 173, 177–179
- eschatology 12, 16, 69, 75, 83, 86, 103,  
205
- etsi Deus daretur 76, 83, 202–204
- etsi Deus non daretur 20
- Eucharist 6, 26, 101, 128, 141, 153,  
158s, 164, 220  
abstinence from 101  
non-Eucharistic liturgy 101, 106,  
139, 141s, 150, 154, 164, 188
- evil **53–56**, 60, 186, 192, 221  
privatio boni 55
- exegesis 74, 84, 99, 119
- experience of loss *see* loss, experience  
of
- failing of understanding *see non-  
understanding*
- fasting 29, 94, 97, 107, 110, 171, 184,  
197  
homiletic 107
- fellowship 112, 123, 201
- finiteness 53  
of dialogue 34  
of understanding 51
- game 22, 72, 74, **80–82**, 87, 194, 197,  
200, 204s
- gender roles 113, 183
- givenness 27, 65, 67–70, 74, 77, 82, 98,  
192  
donum 29
- Glenstal iii, 118s, 125, 153, **156–168**
- Good Friday 69, 91–95, 102, 132, 142,  
161–163, 201, 203
- guilt 53–55, 106
- hamartiology 70, 84
- happiness 57, 68s
- hell 101, 161s, 192s  
harrowing of 103, 161  
*see also* descent of Jesus
- hermeneutical circle 32s, 66
- hermeneutics 1, 9, 16, 18, 21, 27, 32,  
33, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 52, 54, 57, 58,  
59, 65, 71, 76, 77, 82, 84, 88, 89, 108,  
116, 205, 211, 216, 219, 221, 224  
anti-hermeneutic turn 196  
classical 31, 33, 35, 42  
general 17, 32  
history of 15  
liturgical 5, 15, 23s, 54, 70, 117, 120,  
198, 203  
*see also: of liturgy*  
of liturgy 13, **16, 18, 20–23**, 26, 34,  
50, 58, 65, 67, 70s, 76, 79, 83–85,  
105, 192, 194, 198, 203s  
of religion 76, 216  
of suspicion 37, 53, 60  
philosophical 5, 16–18, 21, 32, 35  
*see also meta-hermeneutics*
- Holy Saturday **93–115**, 217–223  
as example 93  
as object of study 93  
history of 98  
in practical theology 105–107  
in systematic theology 102–105  
liturgical framework 96–98  
pastoral dimension of 105–107  
spirituality of 114
- Holy Week 93–97, 99, 118s, 126s, 132,  
170, 177, 211, 213s, 217, 219, 221–  
224
- homo liturgicus 79
- hope 195  
of the liturgical celebration 202  
of resurrection 108  
of salvation 188
- humanities 7, 9, 32
- hyperbole 61, 63, 65, 83, 88, 91  
philosophical 65  
liturgical 195, 205  
messianic 202–205
- iconic distance 97s, 189
- identity 17, 20, 43, 46s, 49, 58, 69, 73,  
84, 196, 199, 220  
and difference 73
- image of God 9, 103
- immanence 13, 37, 198, 205  
of community 112  
of the rite 27  
psychological 69
- immediacy  
anthropological 27

- liturgical 4, 13s, 18, 23, 25–27, 30, 47, 68, 88, 115, 190–196  
of faith 13, 25, 30, 79  
and mediation 18, 25s, 27, 44, 46, 50, 65, 77, 115, 193  
incarnation 13, 19, 76, 88, 114, 196, 203s, 206  
Institutio Generalis Liturgia Horarum 153  
Iona Community **120–127**, 134, 136, 213s, 219, 221, 223  
irony 11, 20, 87, 97, 110
- katabasis 19, 80, 91, 109, 117, 188s, 192, 194, 198s, 202–206  
kingdom 17, 83, 194, 196, 202, 205  
*see also eschatology*
- language 9, 17s, 40s, 45s, 49, 52, 67, 72, 73, 77s, 117, 119, 187, 221, 224  
in liturgy 22  
liturgical 18, 19, 46, 77, 156, 188  
of Holy Saturday 109–111  
*see also silence*  
*see also verbal*
- language, subject and sense 18, 34, 40, 119 134, 149  
laughter in liturgy 2, 110  
leiturgia 6, 12  
Lent 94, 97s, 101, 126, 180, 211, 219, 221, 224  
lex 11s, 14, 29, 82, 86, 103, 198, 200s  
agendi 12  
credendi 11, 82, 103  
orandi 11, 14, 82, 103, 192  
linguistic 18, 36, 41, 44s, 51, 69, 72  
approach to liturgy 16  
liturgia semper reformanda 15, 195  
liturgical movement 5, 8, 19, 204  
question 3, 15, 25, 28, 68, 197  
reform 106, 109, 137, 153s  
studies **5–15**, 202–205, 206, 219, 224  
liturgy as expression of faith 12, 83, 88  
liturgy-free day 92, 95  
loss  
of a body 82, 111, 189, 196  
experience of 82, 106, 108, 113, 189, 201  
ludens  
Deus 3, 205  
homo 3, 205
- malum *see evil*  
material presence *see materiality*  
materiality 41, 45, 52, 79  
mediation  
liturgical 4, 24s, 30, 68  
of language 42  
theological 13, 26  
mediation and immediacy *see*  
immediacy and mediation  
Mediator Dei 100  
memory 69, 81, 109, 142, 205  
*see also remembrance*  
messianic 114, 195, 203s  
meta-hermeneutics 30, 60, 75, 84, 206  
metanoia 201  
metaphor 18s, 69, 102, 110, 188s, 197  
metaphysics 40s, 53, 58, 60, 74, 111  
mimesis 69, 101, 135, 152, 172, 174, 176, 184  
misunderstanding *see non-*  
understanding  
mystagogy 14, 22, 29, 110s, 136, 171, 175, 177, 186s, 189, 205  
mystery 21, 57s, 88, 183, 206  
mysticism 27, 42, 75, 85, 110, 193, 196, 200
- negative hermeneutics **31–38**, 202–206  
of Holy Saturday 108–115  
of liturgy 39, 83, 90s  
negativism  
hermeneutical 51  
practical 44  
theoretical 44, 63  
negativity 85  
dealing with 63  
dialectical 56  
of the world 54s  
ontological 38, 51  
non-rational 27, 79  
non-sense 21, 23, 51–53, 56, 67, 80, 84, 114, 191, 193, 198–199, 202–206  
integration of 56  
meaningful relation to 56  
opaque 52s, 60  
non-understanding 34, 37–39, 50, 56, 58s, 83s, 90, 193, 204  
non-verbal *see verbal*
- ontology 9, 24, 66, 74, 82, 84  
of the ineffable 9, 24  
organon



- of liturgical theology 196
- of negative hermeneutics 196
- Orthodox Church in America 118s, **169-177**, 183s
- otherness 35, 79, 84s
  - in social science 84
  - of God 80
  - of language 50
  - of liturgy 83
  - of sense 39, 43, 52s, 56, 59, 192, 199
- paradox of liturgy 21, 24, 88
- paradoxical structure of liturgy *see paradox of liturgy*
- paschal mystery 8, 24, 102, 161, 196
- Passover 96, 99
- Patripassionism 103
- perception of sense *see sense*, perception of
- performance 17, 69, 72, 74, 77, 83-86, 98, 115, 118, 203-205, 219, 222
  - and text 18, 65
- phenomenology 8, 14, 27-29, 45, 49, 67, 72, 77, 84, 216
- philosophy of interpretation 36
- play *see game*
- poetry 22, 63, 70, 73, 98, 115, 122, 134, 176, 205
- popular piety 107
- power dynamics 71
  - questioning of 106
- prejudice 33, 35, 50, 62
  - in hermeneutics 32, 33, 74
- preverbal *see verbal*
- protest 56s, 73, 83, 189
  - against absence of God 97
  - against mortality 85
  - of loss 83
- psychoanalysis 9, 49, 52, 54, 61, 71, 112, 219
- psychose blanche 112, 100
- question 10, 32, 41, 45, 48s, 89, 124, 142, 197, 199, 223
- Radical Orthodoxy 70s, 194, 219
- reception of sense *see sense*, reception of
- reconciliation 38, 57, 98, 103, 192, 202
  - of non-sense 56
  - ontological 38, 63
- reconstruction of sense *see sense*, religious experience 26, 68, 82
- remembrance 68s, 81s, 85, 97s, 136, 195
  - see also memory*
- remoto Deo 105
- repetition 73, 77s, 81, 86, 108, 110, 166, 193s
- resistance 23, 28, 40, 44, 57, 59, 60, 67, 84, 86, 189, 191, 193, 194, 200, 202, 204
  - against evil 55s, 61
  - against forgetting 68
  - against loss of sense 50
  - against non-sense 28, 56, 58, 83
  - of expressions 40
  - of text 117
- resurrection 20, 88, 99, 111, 134, 144-152, 174-187, 201, 203s, 206, 217
- rêverie 112
- ritual 6-10, 14, 18, 20-22, 26-30, 65, 68s, 71s, 82, 86, 91, 106, 127, 129, 136, 202-205, 214, 219, 222, 224
  - experience of 10, 24, 27s, 89, 191s
  - ritualization 7, 10, 56, 136
- ritual studies 9s, 18
- role in liturgy 19s, 55, **71-73**, 86, 200
- Sabbath 96, 101s, 105s, 160, 167, 176, 180
- Sacrament 9, 87, 192, 195, 217-219
- Sacratissimum 100
- Sacrosanctum Concilium 8, 156, 222
- Second Vatican Council 8, 19, 99, 100, 110, 153s, 156, 222
- self-alienation 53, 84
- self-communication 42, 46-50, 56, 58-62, 73, 84, 92, 115, 192, 195, 199, 203
- self-reflexivity 88
  - in negative hermeneutics 64
- sense 40, 80, 188
  - construction of 47, 51, 67
  - creation of 3, 52, 67, 81, 88, 113, 203
  - deconstruction of 36, 51, 71, 77, 90, 115, 120, 187, 194, 197
  - distorted 52s, 60
  - hidden 52, 60
  - insecure 22s, 43, 50, 82s, 189, 191, 196
  - of Holy Saturday 113
  - of liturgy 21

- perception of 36, 53, 60, 66s, 70s,  
 78, 90, 96, 115, 166, 197, 204, 214,  
 218  
 reception of 35, 49, 51, 66, 81, 85,  
 106, 145, 155, 189  
 reconstruction of 36, 60, 67  
 recreation of 77, 90, 115, 120, 194,  
 196  
 refusal of 53–55, 59  
*see also desire for sense*  
*see also language subject and sense*  
 Saint Vladimir's Seminary Press 170  
 sheol *see hell*  
 significare 29  
 silence 56, 75, 95, 97, 101s, 106s, 109s,  
 134, 161, 166, 175, 187, 197, 204  
*see also language*  
*see also verbal*  
 social sciences 6, 11s, 25, 67, 68, 74,  
 84, 219, 224  
 story 47, 101  
 sub specie celebrationis 8, 13  
 subject 42, 46, 49, 67s, 74, 79, 188  
 of liturgy 19  
 of the liturgy 22  
 of Holy Saturday 111  
*see also language subject and sense*  
 subjectivity 79, 106, 117  
 subversion 88, 187, 193, 197, 200  
 suffering 53–57, 60, 68s, 106s, 111,  
 126, 161  
 symbol 9–11, 16, 20, 23, 26, 53, 67, 69,  
 73, 78, 106s, 134, 192, 199s, 215  
 exploring evil through 53s  
 symbolisation 10, 85, 136, 199  
  
 Taizé 132s, 135, 213  
 Tenebrae 102, 106, 114, 143, 154, 161s,  
 166  
 text 47  
 eminent 77s  
 in hermeneutics 47  
 normativity of 47  
*see also performance and text*  
*see also resistance of text*  
 theodicy 102  
 theologia prima 15, 28  
 theology  
 apophatic 76, 83, 204  
 Christian 2, 28, 76  
 fundamental 9, 16, 25s, 68, 192  
 negative 75, 85, 116, 196, 205  
 practical 11, 13, 105  
 systematic 11s  
*see also disciplines, theological*  
 theosis 202s  
 Thesaurus Liturgiae Horarum  
 Monasticae 153–155  
 time difference in liturgy 173, 184  
 tradition 9, 14, 29s, 33, 35s, 38, 65, 66,  
 68, 71, 81, 83, 85, 106, 119, 124, 128,  
 141, 153, 155, 158, 161, 164, 192,  
 194s, 200, 203, 215, 221s  
 tragedy 54, 56  
 transcendence 82, 197s, 204s  
 experience of 13, 27  
 loss of 73  
 of language 59  
 of theology 27  
 openness towards 69  
 transformation 10, 67, 71s, 78, 81s,  
 195, 198, 202, 205  
 in liturgy 91  
 into sense 52  
 of Holy Saturday 102, 114  
 of human action 69  
 of reality 72  
 of the liturgical act 71  
 translation 19, 46–48 77, 81, 118s, 161,  
 183  
 in hermeneutics 47  
 of liturgy 170  
 of the Bible 125, 128, 156, 170  
 trauma 220  
 of God's death 112  
 Triduum **93, 95, 97**, 104, 126, 219, 222  
 history of 98–100  
 Trinity 103s, 112–115, 164  
 trust 41, 42, 57, 58, 87, 112, 133, 134,  
 163s, 194, 201  
 in sense 50  
 in the logos 57  
 insecure 64, 111  
 turn  
 anthropological, second 10, 26, 29,  
 76, 82, 193  
 theological, second 29  
 doxological 70  
  
 uncontrolled niches 30, 80, 106  
 underworld *see hell*  
 utopia 18, 57, 69, 71, 75, 83, 114, 125,  
 188, 201s, 205

- verbal 19, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, 49, 68,  
75, 78, 109, 110, 115, 151, 193, 197,  
205  
extra-verbal *see non-verbal*  
preverbal 42, 45, 78
- non-verbal 29, 45, 75, 79, 163  
verbality 41s, 47  
vernacular 16, 19, 156, 169  
vitalism 40