

Prof. Helmut Hoping
Professor of Dogmatic Theology and Liturgical Science
at the Faculty of Theology at the University of Freiburg,
professor of dogmatic theology at the University
of Lucerne, guest lecturer at Boston College
Permanent Deacon



THE SACRED, THE EUCHARIST
AND THE SACRAMENTALITY OF THE CHURCH

Introduction

At the end of *Shabbat*, the ceremony of *hawdala* (separation, distinction) takes place, which marks the transition into the working week as a kind of *rite de passage*. The following *berakah* is intoned: “*Blessed are You, Eternal One, our God; You rule the world. You separate the holy from the profane, the light from the darkness, Israel from the nations, the seventh day from the other six working days. Blessed are you, Eternal One. You separate the holy from the profane.*”¹ Even after the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem, Judaism maintained the distinction between the holy and the profane. The great sanctuary of the Temple was replaced by the little sanctuary of the synagogue, with which a number of family religious rites are associated. In addition to the weekly *Shabbat*, the major Jewish holy feasts, including above all *Passover* and *Yom Kippur*, move people into another world, distinct from the world of everyday life.

The distinction between *holy* or *sacred* and *profane* also determines the liturgy of the Church.² The Second Vatican Council (1962–1965) calls the liturgy “*an act sacred in the most excellent sense (actio sacra praeexcellenter), the reality of which is unequalled in rank and measure by any other action of the Church.*”³ With few exceptions, the liturgy of the Church is celebrated in a space dedicated to God as a “*place of presence of the sacred*”.⁴ The liturgy, especially the celebration of the Eucharist,

which the Churches of the East call “*divine liturgy*“, is both the “*culmination*” (*culmen*) and the “*source*” (*fons*) of the whole life of the Church.⁵ In the liturgy, “*from the mystical body of Jesus Christ, that is, the head and the members, the entire public worship (cultus publicus) is performed*”⁶ and through “*sensuous signs (signa sensibilia) [...] the sanctification of man (sanctificatio hominis) is signified and brought about in each case in its own way*”.⁷ *A fortiori*, this is done through the Eucharist, which the priest offers as the *sacer minister* in the person of Christ and in the name of the Church, together with the gathered people of God.

The “*renewal of the liturgy (instauratio liturgiae)*”, initiated by the Constitution “*Sacrosanctum Concilium*” (1963) on the sacred liturgy (*sacra liturgia*),⁸ had as its goal that the rites “*express more clearly the holy things (Sancta) which they signify*”.⁹ According to Kurt Cardinal Koch, the Council thus placed “*transparency for the holy*” before the *actuosa participatio*, which was the formal principle of the liturgical reform. In doing so, the Council made clear that the “*easiest possible comprehension of the liturgy and the enabling of the active and communal participation of the People of God in the liturgy derive from its transparency for the holy, and by no means vice versa*”.¹⁰

From the quoted passages of the first Constitution of the last Council, four central concepts for the proper understanding of the liturgy of the Church can be gathered: In addition to the two terms *actio sacra* and *cultus publicus*, on the one hand these are the terms *signa sensibilia* and *sancta*, which are used specifically to designate the sacramental dimension of the liturgy, and on the other hand the term *sanctificatio*, which raises the importance of the liturgy for life in Christ.

In my presentation at the Theological Symposium of the 52nd International Eucharistic Congress, I would like to focus on the sacredness of Christian liturgy as well as the sacramental reality of the Eucharist and the Church, in order to draw attention to the inner connection between Sacredness and sacramentality.

The Holy and the Christian Cult

The Latin word *sacer*, from which *sacral* is derived, has the primary meaning of dedicated or consecrated; *sancire* means to delimit or designate something as sacred. *Sacer*, however, can also mean cursed, as in the figure of *homo sacer*, who in Roman law was considered both sacred and cursed and could be killed with impunity, and with whom the Italian philosopher Giorgio Agamben has dealt intensively.¹¹ For the liturgy as a sacred act, *sacer* is constitutive in the first meaning. The Latin word *religio* does not go back to *religare*, to bind together, but to *relegere*, to reread, which originally meant the care to be taken in the performance of a sacred act.¹² The Latin word *profanum* refers to the area in front of the *fanum*, the holy realm, the place of the sacred action. *Profane* can also refer to something that was previously sacred and has been returned to ordinary use through profanation.

Through sacralization, places, objects, times, actions, and persons are moved into God's sphere.¹³ While *sacer* corresponds to *ιερός* in Greek, *sanctus*, participle of *sancire*, is *ἅγιος* in Greek, and *קדוש*/*kadosh* in Hebrew.¹⁴ *Sacer* and *sancire* point to the cultic realm, while the meaning of *sanctus* is much broader. In the biblical tradition, *sacer* and *sanctus* are used in different ways. Thus, the one God, insofar as he is not an impersonal *Numinosum* but the Exalted and Mighty Lord, the living God who freely and sovereignly faces his creation, is called holy, but not *sacral*.

The opening work of modern discourse on the Holy were "*Les formes élémentaires de la vie religieuse*" (1912) written by Émile Durkheim (1858–1917).¹⁵ With it, the French sociologist and ethnologist laid the foundations for a sociology of religion whose function was seen in social identity formation with the help of ultimate beliefs and ritual actions. Before Durkheim, the psychologist and philosopher William James (1842–1910) had made religious experience the starting point of his understanding of religion in his classic work "*The Varieties of Religious Experiences*" (1901/1902).¹⁶ The German Protestant theologian and religious scholar Rudolf Otto (1869–1937) founded with "*Das Heilige*" (1917/1936)¹⁷ the 20th century phenomenology of religion developed by the Dutch scholar Gerardus van der Leeuw (1890–1950) and others.¹⁸

The German sociologist of religion Hans Joas considers the discovery of a divine transcendence, which he calls “*reflexivity of the Holy*”¹⁹ – because it goes beyond a purely innerworldly “*Sacredness*” of places, things, times, actions, and human persons – to be the basic characteristic of that epochal period that Karl Jaspers (1883–1969) called the “*Axial Age*”.²⁰ An important anthropological prerequisite for the experience of the Holy as human selftranscendence.²¹ In Israel, the faith in the one and only God experienced as holy became established, starting from mono-latry in the time of the exile and the period after, which saw the break-through of strict monotheism. The “*Holy One of Israel*” as a designation for God is especially frequent in the book of Isaiah, besides twice in Jeremiah (50:29; 51:5) and in Ps 71:22 and 89:19. In the hymn of the Seraphim, transmitted by Isa 6:3, God is praised as holy three times. In two places in the New Testament Jesus is addressed by the title the “*Holy One of God*” (ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ) at the beginning of his public proclamation in the synagogue of Capernaum by a demon speaking through a possessed man (Mk 1:24) and by Simon Peter (Jn 6:69).

Although Jesus of Nazareth did not belong to the tribe of Levi and was not a priest at the sanctuary of the Jerusalem temple, the Letter to the Hebrews speaks of the priesthood of Christ. This would not have been possible without a cultic understanding of the death of Jesus on the cross, as we also find in the Apostle Paul, and the Gospel and the Revelation of John. But Jesus did not sacrifice a sacrificial matter distinct from himself like things, food, animals, but himself in the “*totality of his existence*”.²² The priestly ministry of Jesus Christ consists in his offering to the Father (Heb 7:27; 10:11-14) and “*for many*” (Mk 10:45; 14:24 and al.). In Jesus Christ, his suffering and death for the sin of the world, priesthood and offering are one. Christ, the High Priest empathizing with us, has passed through the Sanctuary once and for all, opening access to God for all (Heb 5:1-10; 7:11-28; 8:1-6). There is no other High Priest (χιερεὺς) than Christ, according to the Letter to the Hebrews (Heb 8:6; 9:15; 12:24). Christ, the one mediator between God and man, is the true High Priest of the New Covenant, with whom the previous cult priesthood has come to its end.²³

God has sanctified all who are united to Christ through baptism and faith and he calls them to a life of holiness (1 Thess 4:3; Rom 6:19; 1 Pet

1:15; Rev 22:11). Therefore, those who belong to Christ are called “*Saints*”. In this meaning, we confess the holy church (*sancta ecclesia*), not because it is without sinners, but because Christ has sanctified it and made it pure by surrendering his life (Eph 5:25f). In 1 Pet 2:5 the church of Christi is called a “*holy priesthood* (ἱεράτευμα ἁγίων)”. The New Testament has not superseded the Holy, but has lifted it up into the worshipful presence of the exalted Lord whose return we are awaiting. Heinz Schürmann (1913–1999) spoke of an *eschatologization* of the sacred concepts in the New Testament.²⁴

In the pro-existence of Christ’s life and death, the pastoral ministry and priesthood of Christ are inseparable.²⁵ For Thomas Aquinas (1224/5–1274), Christ’s royal priesthood is completed in his suffering: “*Sacerdotium Christi eius regnum praecipue consummatum est in eius passione.*”²⁶ Since shepherding ministry, according to Scripture, involves a willingness to lay down one’s life for one’s sheep, it does not simply coincide with leadership ministry insofar as it is associated with the kingship of Christ. Apart from Christ’s priesthood there is no longer an independent priesthood; the ministerial priesthood of the *sacer minister* in the Church is therefore a vicarial priesthood.

The idea of a sacramental representation of Christ through the ordained priest goes back to the patristic tradition in East and West, which early on speaks of the bishop and then also of the presbyter as the image of Christ the High Priest. For justification, statements of the New Testament are used. The Apostle Paul says of himself that in his ministry of the gospel and reconciliation he acts “*in Christ’s stead*” (2 Cor 5:20); in the face of Christ (ἐν προσώπῳ Χριστοῦ) Paul pronounces forgiveness (2 Cor 2:10). The Vulgate translates ἐν προσώπῳ Χριστοῦ as *in persona Christi*.

Although the Second Vatican Council refers several times to the priesthood of Christ,²⁷ it has hardly played a role in Christology and ministerial theology since the 1960s. According to the accurate observation of Leo Cardinal Scheffczyk (1920–2005), the priesthood of Christ, like the ministerial priest hood, became a kind of “sacral, cultic and religious-historical relic that “*allegedly stands there like a foreign body*”²⁸ in the secular world. The distinction between *sacred* and *profane*, it was often heard, no longer had any meaning for the Christian

religion, since the whole world was sanctified by the incarnation of Christ.²⁹ The thesis that the distinction between *sacred* and *profane* has become obsolete with Christianity is still held today, especially in Protestant theology.³⁰

In the time of the Second Vatican Council the demand was made to desacralize the liturgy, to adapt it to everyday life. The service could be solemn, but it should not be sacred. Instead of a holy Eucharist, a fraternal meal should be celebrated.³¹ Even before the Council, Louis Cardinal Bouyer (1913–2004) in his work *“Le rite et l’homme”* (1962) criticized the theological secularism with the help of the incarnation-theological thought of the new creation in Christ.³² It is well known that the theological secularism was in many respects unfavorable for the implementation of the liturgical reform. The British theologian David Torevell, in his books on sacrality and esacralisation, criticises the domination of the everyday in liturgy, which has stunted the sense of its mystery among the faithful.³³ For access to the sacred liturgy presupposes a sense of signs in which we experience a reality that transcends the merely secular and that we can call the *“Holy”* by the central defining characteristic of religion in the 20th century.

According to Josef Pieper (1904–1997), experiences of the Holy belong to the *“praeambula sacramenti”*³⁴ by which the Catholic philosopher means phenomena that precede the sacramental in a narrower sense. In our largely secular culture, symbolic experiences of the Holy no longer can be granted. What prevails is an economy of things in which signs are based on arbitrary convention. Where spiritual or religious experiences are still had, they would hardly be experienced as experiences of the Holy. French religious phenomenologist Louis Dupré calls it a desacralization of religion.³⁵ The request for desacralization of the liturgy had partly fatal consequences. In liturgical studies, the concept of cult was abandoned for a long time, and the term *“worship”* or *“service”* was used instead, while Josef Pieper, who was deeply concerned about the desacralization of the liturgy, strongly advocated holding on to the concept of Christian cult. Pieper shared this concern with Joseph Ratzinger, who was his colleague at the University of Münster during the Second Vatican Council (1962–1965).³⁶

The Sacrament and the Eucharist

As a human performance, the liturgy serves the *cultus Dei*. The liturgical concept of *actio sacra* often overlooks the fact that it is first and foremost an *actio Dei* that makes possible and sustains what we call the liturgy of the Church, since the Son who was given for us is the primary agent in the liturgy. Even in the early Sacramentaries, for example in the “*Sacramentarium Veronense/Leonianum*” (6/7th C.) and the “*Sacramentarium Gregorianum*” (7/8th C.), the offering of the Eucharistic sacrifice is primarily referred to as *agere* or *actio*.³⁷ The predecessors of the Missals refer to the mystery of divine life, which the liturgy conveys, as well as to the body of Christ, which is offered to us, and to the altar, feast times and rituals.³⁸

The Latin word *sacramentum* derives from *sacer*. Originally, *sacramentum* meant the sacred oath to the gods or a deposited pledge that was lost when a promise was broken or a court case was lost. The deposited pledge was used to finance public rites. *Sacramentum militiae* was the oath of allegiance of the Roman legionaries. Giorgio Agamben therefore gave his archaeology of the sacred oath, which forms part of his *homo sacer* project, the title “*Il Sacramento del linguaggio*”.³⁹ In the Latin translation of the Bible, *sacramentum* serves as a translation of the Greek word *mysthlon*, which, however, can equally be rendered with the Latinized word *mysterium*, where *sacramentum* on the other hand referred increasingly to the sign-like revelation of the divine Secret. In the New Testament, the term *mysthlon* designates the “*mystery of the kingdom of God*” (Mk 4:11) or the mystery of its revelation in the incarnate Son (1 Cor 2; Eph 3). Since the second century, baptism and Eucharist have been called “*mysteria*” or “*sacraments*” of faith. This laid the foundation for the subsequent concept of sacrament. Augustine (354–430) calls the sacraments *signa sacra*, sacred signs, since they are signs of the Holy. The theological concept of sacrament underwent a development up to the doctrine of the seven sacraments and an analogous application of the concept of sacrament to the Church.

The Constitution “*Sacrosanctum Concilium*” speaks of the “*miraculous mystery of the whole Church (totius Ecclesiae mirabile sacramentum)*”⁴⁰ emerging from the side wound of the resurrected Crucified.

The Dogmatic Constitution “*Lumen gentium*” (1964) says of the Church, which we confess in the apostolic creed as “*sancta Ecclesia catholica*” and “*communio Sanctorum*”, that in Christ, the light of the nations, she is “*as it were the sacrament (veluti sacramentum), that is, sign and instrument of the most intimate union with God as well as of the unity of the whole Mankind*”.⁴¹ The Pastoral Constitution “*Gaudium et spes*” (1965) about the Church in the Modern World quotes “*Lumen gentium*” verbatim.⁴² Already in the Dogmatic Constitution “*Dei Filius*” on the Catholic Faith of the First Vatican Council (1869/1970), the Church is described as a sacramental sign (*veluti signum*) “*erected for the nations*”⁴³ with regard to its universal mission of salvation. When Otto Hermann Pesch (1931–2014) speaks of the church as a “*sacramental mystery*”,⁴⁴ this is not a pleonasm, as the conceptual history of *mysterium* and *sacramentum* shows.

Already Cyprian of Carthage (200/210–258) refers to the term *unitatis sacramentum* as a designation of the church. But in the following centuries the understanding of the church as *corpus Christi* dominates. Until the early Middle Ages, *corpus Christi verum* was understood to mean the Church, and *corpus Christi mysticum* the Eucharist. In the wake of the medieval Eucharistic controversies, the language use reversed. Now the Eucharistic body was called *corpus verum* and the Church *corpus mysticum*. The encyclical “*Mystici corporis*” (1943) of Pius XII. (1939–1958) forms the magisterial conclusion of this development. The understanding of the church as a sacrament (*sacramentum*) has been encountered since the 1830s in the writings of Johann Adam Möhler (1796–1838) and Johannes Evangelist Kuhn (1806–1887), probably the most important representatives of the Catholic Tübingen School. The idea of a sacramentality of the church was taken up by Henry de Lubac (1896–1991), Otto Semmelroth (1912–1979) and Karl Rahner (1904–1984).

If the Second Vatican Council calls the Church *veluti sacramentum*, it is because, as the body of Christ with its members, it is a visible sign of an invisible reality in no small analogy to the incarnation of Christ.⁴⁵ From Christ, the Church has an inherent sacramental structure. Just as Christ is the sacrament of God, so the Church is in a similar, not the same way, the sacrament of Christ. The Constitution “*Lumen gentium*” places

the image of the Body of Christ at its beginning and connects it with the concept of mystery and sacrament. When referring to the Church as the “*People of God*” in the second chapter of the Constitution, it should be noted that the Church is not an ordinary people that gives itself a constitution, but that she is the “*People of God from the Body of Christ*” and that this is her “*sacramental nature*”.⁴⁶ The Church is formed into the mystery of Christ and the economy of salvation of God. As the body of Christ, the risen Lord, the Church has a basic sacramental structure, which is expressed especially in the celebration of the mysteries of Christ.⁴⁷

Since the Eucharist is founded in the Last Supper, John Paul II. (1978–2005), in his testamentary encyclical “*Ecclesia de Eucharistia*”⁴⁸ (2003), says that the Church receives herself from the Eucharist.⁴⁹ The Eucharist is the “*nucleus of the mystery of the Church*”⁵⁰ because in it “*Christ, through his flesh which lives and gives life through the Holy Spirit*”,⁵¹ gives “*life to men*”.⁵² “*The Church lives from the Eucharistic Christ*”.⁵³ This is made especially clear on the one hand in the Last Supper of Jesus with the Twelve, who form the origin of the ecclesiastical hierarchy,⁵⁴ and on the other hand in the appearance of the Risen Christ to the disciples of Emmaus.⁵⁵ According to John Paul II “*a causal influence of the Eucharist can be seen at the origin of the Church itself*”.⁵⁶ The Eucharist could therefore be called *forma Ecclesiae*, the formative form of the Church, as the source, the way and the goal of the Church of Christ, which finds its fulfillment in the heavenly banquet.

Benedict XVI (2005–2013) has repeatedly reaffirmed the causal importance of the Eucharist for the Church, as highlighted by his predecessor. Already in the homily of the Mass of his inauguration he declared that “*thanks to the Eucharist [...] the Church is born again and again*”.⁵⁷ In the Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation “*Sacramentum caritatis*” (2007),⁵⁸ Benedict XVI writes that the Church accepted the life sacrifice of the resurrected Crucified One and, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, developed the “*liturgical form*”⁵⁹ of the Eucharist. Following John Paul II, Benedict XVI speaks of a “*causal link between Christ’s sacrifice, the Eucharist and the Church*”.⁶⁰ He calls the Eucharist the “*causal principle of the Church*”⁶¹ because it represents the mystery of Christ present in her, “*who gives himself to us and thus continually builds*

us up as his body".⁶² "The Church's possibility of 'realizing' the Eucharist is entirely rooted in Christ's gift of himself to her."⁶³ The "causal influence of the Eucharist on the origin of the Church"⁶⁴ is not solely chronological, but above all ontological. The Eucharist is the causal principle of the Church not as an external cause of action, but as a cause of form or goal.

Pope Francis also considers the Eucharist as the life principle of the Church, he sees in it "*the pulsating heart of the church, which begets it and begets it again and again and gives it strength*".⁶⁵ Indeed, nowhere is the Church more at herself than in the celebration of the Eucharist. Without the Eucharist we cannot live, confessed already the martyrs of Abitene in the 4th century. In the Eucharist, the Church carries out in the most intense way what she is and what she should become again and again: *Corpus Christi*, Body of Christ. While the Church does not merge into its liturgy (leitourgia), constitutive for the Church of Christ as a community (koinonia) are at the same time the basic acts of proclamation (martyria) and caritas (diakonia). As *Corpus Christi*, the church is, of course, essentially a eucharistic community.

The celebration of the Eucharist is directed toward union with the Risen Lord. A union with Christ is expressed not only in the *sacrum convivium* of sacramental communion, in which we receive the Body and Blood of Christ, but also in spiritual communion, yes indeed in the whole active participation in the Eucharist. To receive the Body of Christ sacramentally presupposes not only that we are disposed accordingly, but that we believe and have previously worshipped. In his commentary on the Psalms, Augustine writes: "*And because he [Christ] lived in this flesh here on earth, he gave us this flesh as the food of salvation. Now no one eats of this flesh without first having worshiped.*"⁶⁶ Veneration of the exposed Blessed Sacrament (*Sanctissimum Sacramentum*) is a continuation of adoration in the Eucharist.

In the sacrament of the Eucharist we share the unique life which Jesus, who was the Son of God, gave up for us on the cross and which, through his raising from the dead, is perfected forever with God. Therefore, it is fitting that we receive the Holy Bread of Life as the last of the Sacraments of Death. In the Eucharist we receive Christ in his gift of life for us, to whom we are profoundly conformed, where we ourselves

become a gift, giving ourselves to God in our dying.⁶⁷ In this we ratify our life in Christ, founded in Baptism.

In his commentary on John, Augustine writes about the sacrament of the Eucharist: “*O sacrament of God’s love! [...] He who wants to live has a place where he can live and has something by which he can live. Let him come near, believe, and partake of the Body, so that he may come to life.*”⁶⁸ Since in the *sacrum convivium* of the Eucharist we receive nothing less than the Body of Christ given to death for us out of divine love (Lk 22:19), Thomas Aquinas calls the Eucharist the “*sacrament of greatest love (sacramentum maximae caritatis)*”.⁶⁹ The Eucharist is “*the ‘completion of the other sacraments’ (Dionysius Areopagita), which participate in the power of Christ (perfectivum omnium aliorum sacramentorum), in quibus virtus Christi participatur*”.⁷⁰ From the recipient of the Eucharist, Thomas demands not only faith in the Real Presence of Christ in the signs of bread and wine, but a personal love for Christ, as is proper to the *fides caritate formata*.⁷¹ What we need today is a new Eucharistic culture of receiving.

Conclusion

The request for the desacralization of the liturgy, as it was raised after the Council, had partly fatal consequences, above all the loss of sacramental thinking⁷² as well as in some local Churches a not infrequently widespread formlessness of the celebrated liturgy. If the liturgy of the Church is to have a future, it must remain recognizable as a sacred event in the rigor of its form. The true *ars celebrandi* consists in bringing out the beauty of the liturgy in the given structure of its rite. The Eucharist is the most precious treasure the Church possesses; it is a treasure in a fragile vessel, and the vessel of treasure is the form of the liturgy.⁷³ A liturgy trimmed for modernity destroys in the long run its character as a sacred act.

Many today no longer have access to the beauty of the Eucharist and the other sacramental celebrations of the Church. Reawakening the longing for the Church’s liturgy must therefore define our pastoral and liturgical ministry. A new evangelization that does not aim at the eucharistic

center of the living faith is not enough. There improving a catechesis of faith focused on proclamation is no sufficient. The living faith, including its liturgical practice, must be rehearsed. But there is no better introduction to the living faith than the celebration of the Eucharist, since it is “*the sum and summary of our faith*”.⁷⁴ Only those who understand its symbolism and master its ritual pragmatics can celebrate the Eucharist in active participation (*participatio actiosa*). Therefore, mystagogical and liturgical catechesis of the Eucharist, too, are necessary.

Notes

1. פלוה ך Das jüdische Gebetbuch, hg. von Jonathan Magonet in Zusammenarbeit mit Walter Homolka. Gebet für Schabbat und Wochentage. Übersetzung aus dem Hebräischen von Annette Böckler, Berlin 2001, 147–146.
2. Cf. JEAN-PAUL AUDET, *Le sacré et le profane. Leur situation en christianisme*, in: Nouvelle Revue Théologique 79 (1957), 33–61.
3. SC 7.
4. Anna Minta, *Heilige Räume und das Raumerlebnis. Über die Notwendigkeit gesellschaftlicher Kultorte und ihre Wandlungsfähigkeit*, in: Theologisch-Praktische Quartalschrift 165 (2017), 132–140:134.
5. Cf. SC 10; LG 11.
6. Ibid.
7. Ibid.
8. SC 21.
9. Ibid.
10. KURT KARDINAL KOCH, *Die Konstitution über die Heilige Liturgie und die nachkonziliare Liturgieentwicklung*. Innovation und Kontinuität im Licht der Hermeneutik der Reform, in: Benedict XVI. und sein Schülerkreis. Kurt Kardinal Koch, hg. von Stephan Horn und Siegfried Wiedenhofer, Augsburg 2012, 69–98: 74.
11. Cf. GIORGIO AGAMBEN, *Homo sacer. Die souveräne Macht und das nackte Leben*. Aus dem Italienischen übersetzt von Hubert Thüring, Frankfurt/Main 2002.
12. Cf. GIORGIO AGAMBEN, *Profanierungen*. Aus dem Italienischen übersetzt von Marianne Schneider, Frankfurt/Main 2015, 70-90: 71f.
13. Cf. MANFRED HUTTER, *Sakralisierung, Sakralität*, in: Lexikon für Theologie Kirche 8 (2017), 1437.
14. Cf. HANS-PETER MÜLLER, שׁוּדֵק/qdš, in: Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament II, München–Zürich ⁵1995, 589–609

15. Cf. EMIL DURKHEIM, *Die elementaren Formen des religiösen Lebens* (Verlag der Weltreligionen 2). Aus dem Französischen übersetzt von Ludwig Schmidts. Mit einem Nachwort von Bryan S. Turner, Frankfurt/Main ³2014.
16. Cf. WILLIAM JAMES, *The Varieties of Religious Experience*, in: *ders*, Writings 1902–1910, New York 1987, 1–477.
17. Cf. RUDOLF OTTO, *Das Heilige. Über das Irrationale in der Idee des Göttlichen und sein Verhältnis zum Rationalen* (1916/1936). Neuausgabe mit einer Einführung zu Leben und Werk Rudolf Ottos von Jörg Lauster und Peter Schulz und einem Nachwort von Hans Joas, München 2014.
18. Cf. GERARDUS VAN DER LEEUW, *Phänomenologie der Religion*, Tübingen 1956, 9.27f.
19. Cf. HANS JOAS, *Die Macht des Heiligen*. Eine Alternative zur Geschichte von der Entzauberung, Berlin 2017, 351.422. – On the concept of transcendence, see INGOLF U. DALFERTH, *The Idea of Transcendence*, in: *The Axial Age and Its Consequences*, ed. by Robert N. Bellah & Hans Joas, Cambridge, Mass. 2012, 146–188.
20. Cf. KARL JASPERS, *Vom Ursprung und Ziel der Geschichte*. Neuausgabe, Zürich 1983.
21. Cf. HANS JOAS, *Braucht der Mensch Religion? Über Erfahrungen der Selbsttranszendenz*, Freiburg–Basel–Wien 2015, 25; *id.*, Die Macht des Heiligen, 430–434.
22. JOSEPH RATZINGER, *Zur Frage nach dem Sinn des priesterlichen Dienstes*, in: *Gesammelte Schriften* 12, hg. von Gerhard Ludwig Müller in Verbindung mit dem Institut Papst Benedikt XVI. Regensburg, Freiburg–Basel–Wien 2010, 350–386: 353.
23. Cf. KNUT BACKHAUS, *Priester/Priestertum* II. Biblisch: 3. Neues Testament, in: *LThK* 8 (³1999), 563–564: 563.
24. Cf. HEINZ SCHÜRMAN, *Neutestamentliche Marginalien zur Frage der Entsakralisierung*. Recht und Grenzen des theologischen Säkularismus, in: *id.*, *Ursprung und Gestalt. Erörterungen und Besinnungen zum Neuen Testament*, Düsseldorf 1970, 299–325: 307.315.
25. Heinz Schürmann sees in the pastoral ministry the “center and climax” of all New Testament statements about the ministry in the succession of the apostles. Cf. *id.*, *Die Mitte des Lebens finden*, Freiburg 1979, 24.
26. THOMAS AQUINAS, *STh* III, q.35, a.7, ad1. – On the theology of the priesthood of Christ in Thomas, see *Markus Schulze*, *Das Priestertum Christi nach Thomas von Aquin*, in: *Priestertum Christi und priesterlicher Dienst*. FS Kurt Kardinal Koch, ed. by George Augustin, Freiburg–Basel–Wien 2013, 129–159; *Thomas Marschler*, *Das Hohepriestertum Christi nach dem hl. Thomas von Aquin*, in: *Doctor Angelicus* 3 (2003), 143–163.
27. Cf. SC 7.83; LG 28; PO 5.7.
28. LEO SCHEFFCZYK, *Das allgemeine und besondere Priestertum*, in: *Klerusblatt* 50 (1970), 331–334:331.
29. On the discussion of desacralization cf. HERBERT MUCK, *Abschaffung des Sakralen?*, in: *Der große Entschluß* 22 (1967) 476–490.530–535.
30. Cf. MARKUS MÜHLING, *Profanität*, in: *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* 6 (2003), 1677.

31. Cf. NORBERT GREINACHER in: *Der Seelsorger* 36 (1966), 365; *ders.* Strukturwandel der Kirche heute und morgen, in: *Kirchen für die Zukunft bauen*, hg. von Günter Rombold, Wien–Freiburg–Basel 1969, 27–45: 29f.41f; THOMAS SARTORY, *Eine Neuinterpretation des Glaubens*, Einsiedeln 1966, 82–107.
32. Cf. LOUIS BOUYER, *Mensch und Ritus*. Aus dem Französischen übersetzt von Franz-Josef Schierse, Mainz 1964, 12–20.
33. Cf. DAVID TOREVELL, *Losing the Sacred*. Ritual, Modernity and Liturgical Reform, Edinburgh 2001; *id.*, *Liturgy and the Beauty of the Unknown: Another Place*, Aldershot 2007.
34. Cf. JOSEF PIEPER, *Die Anwesenheit des Heiligen*, hg. von Berthold Wald, Kevelaer 2017, 13.134 et al.
35. Cf. LOUIS DUPRÉ, *Religious Mystery and Rational Reflection*, Grand Rapids-Cambridge/U.K. 1998, 134; *id.*, *Symbols of the Sacred*, Grand Rapids-Cambridge/U.K. 2000.
36. Cf. JOSEPH RATZINGER, *Die sakramentale Begründung christlicher Existenz* (1965), in: *ders.*, *Gesammelte Schriften* 11, hg. von Gerhard Ludwig Müller in Verbindung mit dem Institut Papst Benedikt XVI. Regensburg, Freiburg–Basel–Wien 2008, 197–214.
37. Cf. MICHAEL KARL KINZL, *Actio sacra*. Das Mysterium der Liturgie und die Frage der Entsakralisierung, Inaugural-Dissertation, Faculty of Theology, University of Freiburg, 2021, 229–237.
38. *Ibid.* 237–241.
39. Cf. GIORGIO AGAMBEN, *Das Sakrament der Sprache*. Eine Archäologie des Eides (Homo sacer II, 3). Aus dem Italienischen übersetzt von Stefanie Günthner, Frankfurt/Main 2008
40. SC 5.
41. LG 1.
42. Cf. GS 42.
43. DH 3014.
44. OTTO HERMANN PESCH, *Katholische Dogmatik aus ökumenischer Erfahrung*, Bd. 2: Die Geschichte Gottes mit den Menschen (Ekklesiologie, Sakramentenlehre, Eschatologie), Ostfildern 2010, 71.
45. Cf. LG 8; SC 2.
46. KARL-HEINZ MENKE, *Sakramentalität*. Wesen und Wunde des Katholismus, Regensburg 2012, 126.
47. Cf. LG 3.
48. Cf. JOHN PAUL II, *Littera Encyclica “Ecclesia de Eucharistia”* (April 17, 2003): AAS 95 (2003) 433–475.
49. Cf. *ibid.* No. 1 and No. 21–25.
50. *Ibid.* No. 1 (*italics in original*).
51. *Ibid.*
52. *Ibid.*

53. Ibid. No. 6 (*italics in original*).
54. Cf. AG 5.
55. Cf. JOHN PAUL II., *Littera Encyclica "Ecclesia de Eucharistia"*, No. 6.
56. Ebd. No. 21 (*italics in original*).
57. BENEDIKT XVI., *Patriarchalis Archibasilicae Lateranensis Possessio*: Homilia (May 7, 2005), in: AAS 97 (2005), 748–752: 752.
58. Cf. BENEDIKT XVI., *Adhortatio Apostolica Postsynodalis "Sacramentum Caritatis"* (February 22, 2007), in: AAS 99 (2007) 105–180.
59. Ibid. No. 11.
60. Ibid. No. 14.
61. Ibid.
62. Ibid.
63. Ibid.
64. Ibid.
65. FRANZISKUS, *Homiliae In Sollemnitate Sanctissimi Corporis et Sanguinis Christi Ostiis* (June 3, 2018), in: AAS 110 (2018) 938–840: 939: “il cuore pulsante della Chiesa, la genera e la rigenera, la raduna e le dà forza”.
66. AUGUSTINUS, *Enarrationes in Psalmos XCVIII 9* (CCL 39, 1385): “Et quia in ipse carne hic ambulavit, et ipsam carnem nobis anducandam ad salute dedit; nemo autem illam carnem manducat, nisi prius adoravit.”
67. Cf. JOSEF WOHLMUTH, *Impulse für eine künftige Theologie der Gabe bei Jean-Luc Marion*, in: *Von der Ursprünglichkeit der Gabe*, hg. von Michael Gabel und Hans Joas, Freiburg–München 2007, 252–272: 270
68. AUGUSTINE, *In Iohannis Evangelium tractatus XXVI, 13*: “O sacramentum pietatis! [...] Qui vult vivere, habet ubi vivat, habet unde vivat. Accedat, credat, incorporetur ut vivificetur.”
69. THOMAS AQUINAS, STh III, q.75, a.1c.
70. Ibid.
71. Cf. *ibid.* q.80, a.4.
72. Cf. critically MENKE, *Sakramentalität*, 277–294.
73. Cf. CHRISTOPH CARDINAL SCHÖNBORN, *Wovon wir leben können. Das Geheimnis der Eucharistie*, hg. von Hubert Philipp Weber, Freiburg–Basel–Vienna 2005, 14.
74. Catechism of the Catholic Church No. 1327.