

A COMMENTARY ON THE ORDER OF THE MASS OF THE ROMAN MISSAL: NEW ENGLISH TRANSLATION. By Edward Foley et al. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 2011. Pp. xxviii + 694. \$59.95.

The new commentary on the *Ordo Missae* of the new Roman Missal, published in 2011, is voluminous. Besides the main editor of the volume, Edward Foley, many prolific researchers such as John Baldovin, Mary Collins, Joanne Pierce (who are also coeditors), Anscar Chupungco, David Power, Patrick Regan, Dominic Serra, Joyce Ann Zimmermann, and many others contributed to the commentary. To evaluate the importance of this work in its context, it is sensible to shed some light on recent developments of liturgical issues in the United States.

The introduction of the new Roman Missal on the first Sunday of Advent 2011 changed the shape of celebration of the Roman Catholic liturgy of the Eucharist. Following *Liturgiam authenticam* (2001), the Vatican Congregation of Divine Worship's instruction On the Use of Vernacular Languages in the Publication of the Books of the Roman Liturgy, the Roman Missal of 2011 is a new translation of the *editio tertia* of the Latin *Missale Romanum* of 2002. Many complaints about the quality of the translation have been raised. Web forums such as "What If We Just Said Wait?" (<http://www.whatifwejustsaidwait.org/readcomments.htm>) and blogs such as "PrayTell" (<http://www.praytellblog.com>) offer many discussions about the new translation.

After a year of implementation, the new English translation has been severely criticized because of the changes to the texts spoken by the presider and to the responses of the congregation. Texts that have been known for four decades were suddenly changed, a situation that leads to the question why a new translation was necessary at all.

Precisely at this point the commentary under review comes into play. Similar to the *Commentary on the General Instruction of the Roman Missal* (2007), this one comments on the euchology of the *Ordo Missae*. The methodology itself is outstanding and exemplary. Following the setting of the liturgy, it first offers a synopsis of the Latin and English texts. There follows a historical abstract on the origin of both texts of prayers and rites, then a theological explanation of the *lex orandi* (3). Finally the new translation (ICEL 2010) is presented and rounded off by an explanation of the mystagogical implication.

This neat structure makes the commentary useful as a reference book. Not every user will be delighted by the work's philological precision or the details provided; more practical persons will work only with the mystagogical references; others will look more closely at the historical information on liturgy in order to understand the origin and genesis of individual rites and prayers of the Eucharist. It is exactly this variety of

possible approaches that makes this commentary a wonderful reference work for all who want to find out more on the status quo of vernacular translations of the liturgical texts for the Eucharist after Vatican II.

The commentary also offers a rationale for the changes that many English-speaking Catholics find offensive. For instance, someone who wants to know why the response to “the Lord be with you” was changed to “and also with your spirit” can now turn to the entry on introductory rites in the liturgy and there find Dominic Serra’s explanation of the theological background of the change (128–29). This little example shows how the references in this new commentary are helpful for explaining the elements of the liturgical celebration. While each author’s theology is discernible and each interpretation debatable, the commentary offers a level of research and methodology heretofore unavailable. This alone is reason enough to wish this volume wide distribution.

The commentary also provides background for discussions and debates that are frequently emotionally charged. The scholarship will be useful for future reasonably accurate and more pleasing vernacular translations for post-Vatican II sacramental celebrations, by which the faithful should be led to that fully conscious, active participation demanded by the very nature of the liturgy (see, e.g., *Sacrosanctum concilium* nos. 14, 48). In this respect, the new commentary marks a new milestone in the recent discussions on the shape of the liturgical celebration in the vernacular.

Universität Würzburg

MARTIN STUFLESSER

STANDING TOGETHER IN THE COMMUNITY OF GOD: LITURGICAL SPIRITUALITY AND THE PRESENCE OF CHRIST. By Paul A. Janowiak, S.J. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 2011. Pp. xii + 235. \$29.95.

It is not often that the title of a book captures so completely and accurately the ideas expressed within its cover. Yet this is the case with Janowiak’s book. Using the four modes of Christ’s presence in the Eucharist (*Sacrosanctum concilium* no. 7) as the book’s organizing structure, J. explores the implications of an appropriation of this insight for a liturgical spirituality. Because God is at the heart of human desire and religious hunger, J. argues, it is important to situate the relational, dialogical, and participative character of the liturgy within the dynamism of the triune life itself. This trinitarian starting point enables J. to explore the intersection of theology, ritual practice, and spirituality in a way that holds the metaphors of abundance and presence in creative tension. The book asks in fresh ways how the sacred intimacy of the Eucharist shapes the way the assembly as primary celebrant prays together in thanks and praise to God for Christ’s saving deeds. Throughout the