Berakah Response

Imagining the Future: How do We Teach the Teachers for the Whole Church?

Lizette Larson-Miller

The Rev. Lizette Larson-Miller is Professor of Liturgy and Sacramental Theology at Bexley Seabury Seminary in Chicago, Illinois, and canon precentor for the Diocese of Huron (Anglican Church of Canada).

Thank you to President Glenn Byer for graciously fulfilling my request for a short introduction, to the Academy Committee for bestowing this honor on me, and to all of you for being here in the room this evening!

This coming Tuesday, January ninth, I begin teaching an intensive course, Introduction to Homiletics. Teaching preaching is not my primary field or focus, but there was a need, and I was trained to both preach and teach preaching (with many thanks to the Benedictines of Collegeville and the Society of Jesus in both California and Massachusetts). Teaching homiletics from time to time I've reflected on what is the most important aspect of preaching: Is it the skills of exegetical preparation for the sermon? Is it the rhetorical design of the homily? Is it knowing the community with which one preaches? Is it knowledge of very current events? I've probably gone through each of those as an emphasis in various iterations of preaching classes, but I've arrived at a different place in the past few years—exegesis, rhetoric, context, and preparation are all important—but what do people want to hear/need to hear? I think to hear a person of faith, ok, most likely a person of faith, preach well!

Perhaps this is why teaching preaching is both central and appealing—there is the necessary background understanding, preparation and execution, but it focuses on this preaching event—it seems refreshingly logical when I actually get to creating a syllabus. What is the focus of homiletics? Well, to preach!

So, transfer that distillation of intent and focus to liturgical studies, which is, I suspect, the primary academic field of many of us here in this room. What is it we do? And especially to those of us who teach (in many different contexts and to many different communities): What are we teaching (content, method) and to what end? Every time I try to articulate this in a way similar to homiletics, I find myself caught up in the multi-faceted interdisciplinarity of liturgical studies—there's just so much! There is the essential ground floor of sacramental and liturgical theolo-

gy, and the ever-expanding insights of historiography, ritual studies, postcolonial studies, massive numbers of essential cultural considerations, music, liturgical preaching, visual art, architecture, spirituality and prayer, linguistics, ecumenism, interreligious study and work, and so many other conversations. It's not that homiletics doesn't also build on a web of contributing conversations, but where exactly are we going when teaching liturgy and how much of all these contributing arenas are in the circle of essential elements? And yes, of course, the context of where, with whom, to whom, and for whom we teach matters greatly.

What I would like to do in light of this breadth and complexity (and disarray) is look first at the reality of academic liturgical studies in North America at this point in time, what is almost the quarter century mark of the 21st century. There is much here that is neither encouraging nor uplifting. But, as one learns in preaching to recognize and name the grace, the good news, having perhaps challenged your cheerful table fellowship on this Thursday evening we'll end with reminding ourselves of some of the reasons why we do this and why it matters.

First, the World of University Teaching

The bad news comes toward and from many ecumenical directions … at the end of this past October CTSA (The Catholic Theological Society of America) presented a webinar titled "The End of the Golden Era: Theology in the Age of Academic Precarity"[1] (and, as an aside, "precarity" led me to the dictionary, where one of the definitions is a "state of persistent insecurity with regard to employment or income"). The webinar followed on conversations at the CTSA gathering last June where the repercussions resulting from a number of college and university closings were still being processed, as well as what some perceived as the specific targeting of theology departments with regard to finances and numbers of students.

The webinar featured four panelists in four different settings and stages of employment and unemployment followed by conversation, but it was the larger context that was, for me, more compelling. It reflected a list of Roman Catholic universities and colleges in the US who were cutting humanities and re-inventing themselves through better-selling options for study in order to stay afloat. In a plea to rethink this approach, Jonathan Malesic wrote in the July 19th issue of *America* magazine that cutting liberal arts majors, cutting the humanities, may not actually help keep universities afloat. He continued "when every small Catholic school has shifted resources from its traditional academic base in the arts and sciences to newer programs in business, engineering, nursing and cybersecurity, they become indistinguishable. Why should any student enroll at *this college*, as opposed to the next one over?"[2] In other words, turning the chapel into labs or basketball courts may not yield the result for which one is hoping.

This is not just an issue in the U.S. but also in Canada. I left a university college (part of a larger university) because it looked like the Faculty of Theology was go-

ing to be pushed to fold. I hope it will survive, but the clear emphasis of the school is now on pre-business school studies, entrepreneurship with a nod to ethics, and all this in spite of the foundation of the whole university as an Anglican divinity school. I know many of our academy members are from outside North America and work in university situations which are quite different because of government funding and long-standing benefice arrangements, but I also know many of you working on other continents do a lot to apply for grants and to recruit graduate students in order to sustain the funding and the programs.

This is the broader academic concern—the diminishing of the humanities in universities and colleges which house theology departments. But surely, they would never get rid of the liturgists, right?! Based on personal experience, the last two jobs I have resigned from have not replaced me with liturgical scholars in the same way, and actually the Canadian position was quite clear that the endowed chair I held will not go to a liturgical and/or sacramental theology scholar. Regarding these types of experiences and statistics I cannot speak with any confidence outside of the Christian spectrum, and actually within that, outside of those schools and traditions which have had long-standing programs in liturgical studies. But, within Roman Catholic and Anglican circles this movement is sufficiently common to qualify as a trend.

In addition, we probably need to mention that there've been a few other things going on in the world in recent years. A worldwide pandemic impacted and continues to affect higher education, student enrollment, and the very ways we teach. In North America we might add the anticipated enrollment drop coming because of population shifts, which when combined with trying to recover from the pandemic has contributed to some schools not being able to continue while others have adapted to a completely online education that may result in increased student populations. It's early days to see the long-term effects of COVID at the university level on this continent, and always good to remember that in other parts of the world, notably China and India, university enrollment is numerically exploding.[3]

Second, from the University to the Seminary

Many of us in the room who teach do so not at universities but at seminaries or graduate consortia which are often in more fragile situations than university theology departments. For many seminaries funding (from sponsoring churches, tuition, alumni) is a constant concern, as are sufficient numbers of students and continuing support from their ecclesial institutions. Episcopalians and Anglicans in North America have done a lot of writing and reflecting on seminaries in the last two years, often about simply surviving, the reality that seminaries have been more competitive sport than cooperative exercise, the ongoing debate of residential versus dispersed student bodies, the challenges of online formation, and maintaining a core curriculum versus "electives that often align with current cultural debates" as one author described the tension.[4]

In the U.S. Episcopal seminary conversation, the last decade has seen a drop from eleven to nine seminaries (with more changes likely to come). While many have pointed out that this is perhaps still too many seminaries for a small church, I was amazed to learn in preparing to give a talk to the Association of Anglican Musicians in 2016 (so, eight years ago now) that close to half of those preparing for ordination to the priesthood in the US were not even going to the official seminaries, but rather to "houses of study" at universities, to ecumenical seminaries, or local study centers of diocesan or other sponsorship. Half of "not many students" is not a lot of students to begin with.

Now, I am also aware that many people in the room here do not primarily exercise their ministry and training in liturgy in the "classroom," or perhaps teach as adjuncts or affiliated faculty, coming in to teach a class in addition to other responsibilities in parishes, religious communities, hospitals, or other means of employment. This may be a personal choice, or it may be what was possible and available—teaching with "precarity" as CTSA called it—without the security of tenure, contract, pension, or support to attend a meeting like this (and, in the US, without health insurance). Whether we consider ourselves as academics in the classic sense or academics in the broader sense of independent scholars engaged in alternative arenas of teaching and writing, I trust all of us in this Academy of Liturgy are concerned with how the teaching of liturgy will continue, both in the teaching of the teachers and for the good of our broader religious communities.

Third, the Challenges of the World of Liturgy in Academia

When you are immersed in something like fulltime teaching—with its multiple and increasing demands—it's easy to miss the dramatic changes in your own field that are happening all around you. By about 2010 I could no longer miss (or try to ignore) the reality that things had changed, a realization that came primarily through teaching and directing PhD students. Graduate students in liturgy (PhD students) were not finding fulltime teaching positions—or were doing the post-doc scramble of various fellowships and adjunct positions, parish and diocesan ministry positions while waiting for openings in the field and in their ecclesial affiliations. Many did eventually find positions, but often after a gap of several years of cobbling multiple part-time positions together. When I look back at this shift from where we are now, I'm appalled at how clueless I was regarding changes in our field. I graduated in the 90s—now pretty much classified as prehistoric. This is how it went: I had a baby on New Year's Eve, defended my dissertation three weeks later, and the next week interviewed for a tenure-track position in liturgy and sacramental theology at Loyola Marymount University (and got it—beginning fulltime in the summer to follow). I thought I was normal, and perhaps at that time I was. LMU was a wonderful place to begin a teaching career—full of gracious mentoring, enthusiastic students, and a growing MA in theology program—and I look back on that experience through the lenses of four subsequent teaching posts with gratitude.

Fast forward to another generation of those prepared to teach the teachers. Anne McGowan undertook a 2013 survey within the North American Academy of Liturgy on how much things had changed by asking those who had graduated a while ago and had been teaching liturgy if they would do it all again.[5] I think the results were pretty unanimous—yes, this was and has been a very good thing to do. Then she asked the same questions of those who had graduated more recently as well as those who were still in graduate studies—they were not so sure. Some would do it all again, others maybe not. But the really interesting question was: would you recommend to others that they pursue a PhD in liturgy with the goal of teaching liturgy? The answers were much more negative. The playing field of job opportunities had changed, the availability of spots in doctoral programs in liturgy had changed with some programs closing, others providing fewer slots and a lot less financial support, and it's a lot of time, perseverance, work, and money for the increasing gamble of getting a job at the end.[6]

Anne's survey is now a decade old—where are we at this starting point of 2024? I think without benefit of her standardized survey I might informally summarize that, while fewer in number, there are still excellent students going through PhD programs in liturgy who will take up teaching posts and excel at both teaching the teachers and writing the studies that will change our minds about many things. I would love to say that those students represent a much broader scope of students, meaning a greater variety of ecclesial and cultural backgrounds (and beyond ecumenism, remembering our Jewish members of the academy and your unique and parallel issues in continuing to teach the teachers). The good news is that this broader scope of students shows up here in the Academy of Liturgy through our newer members. In my own seminar group Problems in the Early History of Liturgy it has been exciting to see so many talented, young, engaged Eastern Christians joining the ecumenical conversation.

Continue on this tangent for a minute; I went back and read Karen Westerfield Tucker's seminar talk for this academy gathering in 2007 titled "The State of North American Liturgical Scholarship: A Report Card"[7] in which she reviewed a decade-long development of Protestant liturgical study through the lenses of denominational and pan-denominational histories in both the US and in Canada, as well as the focal points of liturgy and justice, music in worship, and the insights of particular cultural contributions on liturgical development. It was both a wonderful summary and a helpful launching spot for how much has changed since then, and yes, we have expanded the conversations to include other voices from different perspectives, different churches, and different cultures.

But I also just read a chapter of Scott Haldeman's book *Towards Liturgies that Reconcile: Race and Ritual among African-American and European-American Protestants* with students this fall, and, while also published in 2007, I realized 2024 has arrived and we still have a ways to go. One conversation in his book that

stands out is the need to recognize some substantial differences between assumptions of a common (and correct) "ordo" and the reality of substantially different ways of ordering the worship of God. In drawing on Gordon Lathrop, Scott reminds his readers that "there are other juxtapositions and other ritual means to facilitate the encounter of God and God's people. African-American traditions provide testimony that other authentic "shapes" exist."[8] I might add to Scott's careful and still relevant study of the need to remember that not all African-American Christians worship one way or the other, that the same is the case with countless other expressions of inculturated and multicultural liturgies, many of which are now the meeting place of cultures deeply grounded in non-Christian religions juxtaposed with faithful practitioners of Christianity.[9]

We also have other areas in need of attention regarding whom we raise up to teach the teachers. I had a rather frustrating experience in the last few years with several extremely talented Canadian MA students who were applying to PhD programs in liturgy but where their sexual orientation (gay and married, bisexual, and trans) became a stumbling block to acceptance (in addition to financial support). It is not just the individual students applying who lose in these situations, but the whole academy and future students.

Deeply related to issues within the teaching of the teachers of liturgy is the phenomenon of preparing to teach in different ways than being in one of the very few PhD programs in liturgical studies. There are wonderful teachers and scholars in this room who did not study in one of "the programs" in the US but chose to study in a theology program where there was an individual (or two) with expertise in liturgy. In other words, how do we teach the teachers of liturgy: through a program that immerses us in the "traditional" subfields of liturgical history, liturgical theology, and ritual studies, or through programs intentionally interdisciplinary (study liturgy, study another theological emphasis, and then add to that another discipline outside of theology)? Or, not through a program but through a mentor in a broad theological program at a university without a named degree in liturgical studies? And what role does a solid MA program in liturgy—one with both breadth and depth—play in taking the pressure off of a focused PhD in liturgy, allowing for alternatives in undertaking this next step? And, in any of these approaches, how does not only the omnipresent age of search engines such as Google but also increasingly AI and its role in education raise the urgent question: Is being prepared to teach primarily about breadth of content, or a deep and narrow expertise whose tools can be applied more broadly, or a methodology, or knowing where to look for the answers?

I know Sister Vassa has already presented on teaching liturgy online ("Liturgizing in Cyberspace") at this Academy meeting, which is, especially since the pandemic and the explosion of AI, profoundly affecting all that we do and study. I would add to that the massive turn toward "competency-based education," which adds to the

reality that teaching is radically changing. Teaching liturgy and doing formation are changing quickly. How does that change the way we learn and teach in order to teach and form others in liturgy? From where I'm standing, the ongoing changes in the delivery of teaching are happening much faster than our opportunities to reflect on their impact on the field of liturgy.

Lastly in this relationship between liturgy as a field of knowledge and practice and the programmatic preparation for teaching the teachers, here's a question that will undoubtedly make me very unpopular in some circles: Is it time to talk about the proliferation of DMin programs in liturgy? Doctor of Ministry degrees, which generally emerged in the 1980s, began as "a kind of continuing education for ministerial professionals."[10] In some ecclesial groups and in some countries, however, having a DMin is de rigueur to achieve lead pastor positions at major Protestant churches, which is a different focus for the degree. The point I want to make though is that DMins and PhDs are not aimed at the same work nor are they the same degree. A DMin builds on an MDiv or equivalent degree and offers people with ministerial experience and expertise a way to focus on topics that will be returned to worshiping communities. PhDs are research focused.

But in an age when a bone fide PhD in liturgy is no guarantee of any teaching or ecclesial position (back to Anne McGowan's NAAL survey), how do we (or do we?) adjust our expectations in job searches and our advising of those keen to teach liturgy? None of this is to say there is anything wrong with DMin degrees. Many of those pursuing the degree take their ministerial experience and their particular question or topic and return to pastoral ministry with expansive gifts for the good of the community. And, on the other side of the argument is the reality that many parish clergy with PhDs do their liturgical work not in a classroom, but in parish ministry. How does the Academy of Liturgy understand these degrees and their different intents and pathways? What have we to say about the implications of these changes?

Fourth, the World of Liturgy Outside the University

Not all liturgy is taught in a classroom. That's stating the obvious, but I have argued in several presentations in the last few years of a growing concern that theological conversations about liturgy, what it means, where it comes from, where it is going, how it relates to scripture, ecclesiology, systematic theology, and more, are talked about in some circles but not "shared" with parishes—with the actual communities who gather to do liturgy. OK—while shocking, I am aware that not everyone in our parish communities actually cares about the implications of the West Syrian anaphoral structure, or the central theological importance of the dismissal rites for linking liturgy and ethics, or that we have a solemn blessing for the Feast of the Epiphany. But what I have become increasingly concerned about is how and why important theological conversations and decisions—liturgical, ecumenical, ecclesial—are undertaken without any catechesis outside of the univer-

sity or diocesan/national committees and conferences. At the parish level there is often a diminishing sense that theology matters at all (who cares?); what matters is how people feel. And this phenomenon is not a division between clerical and lay members of the community: I have spoken with many ordained leaders for whom theological conversations elicit only a shrug.

All of this came home in two sets of conversations at the parish where I currently serve. The first was in sharing with a small group of well-educated and articulate parishioners the document *Sisters in Hope of the Resurrection,* part of the Malines Conversations between Anglicans and Roman Catholics—this one regarding mutual study and recognition of ordination rites. I mentioned that my part of a panel discussion at *Societas Liturgica* last August had been on the clarity the document gave to ordained and lay baptized Christians: first by embracing the theological reality that all the baptized are "co-workers"—it is not the clergy alone who minister to passive receivers, and also because the document does not allow for a sloppy approach such that there is no differentiation in orders or ministries—both churches have a hierarchy with charisms hoped for and gifts bestowed. Back at coffee hour, my conversation partners were pretty much shocked by the thought that baptism had anything to do with ministry.

The second was a more formal gathering after the Sunday liturgy in which parishioners could ask about and discuss the upcoming diocesan election of a new bishop. I was not running the meeting, which gave me a bit more freedom to really listen to the comments and questions. I was stunned. "So, what is a bishop again?" What does the bishop have to do with our church? What does a bishop do? Are we paying for this bishop? It was fantastic to have this conversation in that without it, I certainly would not have understood what a poor job of catechesis we have done (churchwide), but it was also sobering to realize that these were not the questions we expected. We assumed people knew both polity and ecclesiology—that was not the case.

These sound like negative examples of a screaming need for ongoing catechesis at the parish level. Actually, while a bit surprising, I found them exciting, rewarding—this is teaching where it really matters. Whether in conversations, or, best of all, in the doing of liturgy—in serving with lay ministers and the whole worshiping community—this is the application and the point of all those courses taken and taught, of all those articles written and talks given. This is at the heart of what makes me so grateful to also be a parish priest: to be a part of peoples' lives sacramentally, spiritually, and catechetically.

Not all of us here use the language of diocese and parish, of deanery and bishop, but I do have to remain with Anglican-speak for just a bit longer to rejoice in another circle of liturgical learning and engagement outside of the university. I want to mention how good it is when bishops engage in theological education. The Rt.

Rev'd Dr. Todd Townshend is the bishop of the Anglican Diocese of Huron in Ontario, Canada, and the bishop I have served as Canon Precentor for several years. He has led wonderful diocesan theological conversations that become enfleshed in shaping the liturgy. We also have an amazing group of people who serve on the diocesan committee for doctrine and worship in which the link between the communities who do the liturgy—and reflect on what it means, what is needed, and what needs to be adjusted—is the focus. The application of liturgical and sacramental theology in this company of people who care deeply, the episcopal call to be a catechumenal church throughout the diocese—not just in the doing of the ritual, temporal, and sacramental cycles of initiation, but in calling the whole diocese to be on the move in drawing ever nearer to God—has been wonderful, and I hope continues to draw in and enthuse others.

Fifth and Last, What Is It to Liturgize?

I suspect I'm not the only one who has this experience—you board the airplane, find your seat, sit down, and someone next to you says "hi" and "what do you do?" What do you say? Or, more to the point, what do they hear? I'm still waiting for the perfect response: "Oh liturgy, how fantastic!" My personal favorite, however, was not one of these "plane conversations" but being introduced at a small local presentation on death and burial. The designers of the workshop wanted different talks on green burial, how to do it, legal issues, ritual suggestions, and more. I had agreed because a friend was involved and when someone introduced me to speak a bit about Christian funerals, I was introduced as a geologist! I think in mentioning that I was a liturgist, and that ringing no bells at all, they just filled in with "geologist" as something a bit more logical.

So, in turning to the joys of our field—to what gives us life in spite of the challenges academically, pastorally, financially, and numerically—articulating what we do as "liturgists" or as people who "liturgize" is important. I did take a couple minutes at the funeral talk several years ago to explain that I was not a geologist but rather a liturgist, and stumbled through some vague definition of the importance of ritual that was probably not very helpful. But I have stopped trying to ignore my seat companions on flights who want to know what I teach and what I do by taking the complexity of our field—not only in the breadth of content, but also in its multiple settings—and trying to answer their question from a particular perspective that I hope might make sense based on comments my travelling partner has already shared.

a. History still makes sense as a category to some people. In addressing liturgy from the historical perspective I think of John Baldovin's *Berakah* address from 2007 plus many conversations in our academy seminar over the years which have helped differentiate between "liturgical history as an exercise in antiquarianism" and liturgical history, in Robert Taft's words, as being not so much about recovering "the past (which is impossible), much less to imitate it (which would be fatuous), but to understand liturgy…which can only be understood in motion."[11] We learn about ourselves and what we do today by what we value in our studies of the past. This conversation can help make sense of one dimension of liturgical studies for some people.

b. Conversely, I've found starting the conversation with liturgical and sacramental theology works less well because, quite simply, "theology" is not common parlance. In interesting ways those outside of organized religion (or who used to be this or that) are more interested in engaging sometimes because the assumption of meaning and something pointing beyond itself is so removed from their daily lives it is not threatening at all. But, in the hands of observant religious people theology often turns to competing doctrine rather quickly, and has frequently ended in a lecture for my benefit about things like the wrongness of women in ordained ministry.

c. Talking about rituals (especially popular rituals) is a way in for more people. Popular manifestations of rituals with contemporary meaning (slow food, family dinners on certain occasions, what's changing with weddings, etc.) have provided a helpful way into the conversation. But still, liturgy as an orchestration of music, rites, rituals, people, place, and more is far beyond descriptions of curated household patterns.

The most successful thus far? Stories. My most common ritual stories circle around my fascination with roadside shrines—which everyone has seen, even if they've never thought about them. If they want to continue the conversation, I often describe my interest in and subsequent study of why people mark the places of death and engage with the place—hallowed by death, the ritual of visiting, the social dimension of wanting to do something to express solidarity and sorrow—and bringing and leaving items: What do they mean? What do they do? How do candles continue our presence or express another presence? In other words, what I have gradually learned in attempting to introduce this amazing spectrum of liturgy, of liturgizing, is to take an example of something familiar and then in rather sneaky ways add in history and theology and practices that mean something. I think of Elizabeth Drescher's reminder to her readers in her 2016 book *Choosing our Religion* that the "nones" are not necessarily anti-God, anti-ritual, or anti-spirituality, but rather severely nervous about the institutions which may claim to have a monopoly on the business of spiritual awareness.[12] I am convinced that continuing to make connections between popular religiosity, domestic rituals, and the liturgy of the church is crucial to argue our case for the importance of liturgical studies. But is only part of the evangelization of articulating how important what we do, what we teach, what we study, and how we study is to those who have honestly never thought about the word "liturgy," i.e., the majority of the world! How do you, the reader, engage people in the field of liturgy? What is your plane conversation—or elevator talk—to the outside world?

This outward orientation on articulating the lifestyle of liturgizing also returns us to teaching. This past September I gave a series of three lectures at Sewanee (The University of the South) on the essential nature of baptism. Here's the complexity of theology—we often don't have sufficient time to really "explain" or to get into the background of why we arrive and teach and live a particular understanding of something so core as baptism. In hindsight, I think the absolutely best part of the experience and the subsequent conversations was being able to more fully follow the threads of weaving the theological argument on why baptism is of the essence of being a Christian.

From a different setting, I have just finished teaching an MDiv introductory level course on liturgy and music at Bexley Seabury Seminary in Chicago. I was reminded again that many students are coming to seminary without much background or even experience in liturgy—we are simultaneously preparing people for ministry (ordained and lay) and doing basic catechesis. How do we balance sharing the content, encouraging the reflection and inspiring our students to love this field? Some of the best encouragement is in the responses from students—even through the less-than-ideal medium of Zoom—who blurt out, "This is so cool—I had no idea that liturgy could be so exciting!" Inspiring the "insiders" and intriguing the "outsiders" is a fairly good job description to start with in this new year.

What is it that we do as members of the Academy of Liturgy? Why do we keep doing all this in light of institutional struggles and challenges? Why do we encourage new members to be part of this group? I suspect because we love it—because it is an endlessly fascinating interdisciplinary academic field and we have the luxury of sharing what we love to do and learning from others every time we meet, as well as remembering liturgy, liturgizing, as the heart of how we live our lives as faithful Christians, as faithful Jews. In both the study of liturgy and in living liturgically we find a heart for our understanding of God, our relationship with God, and our actions for the good of the world which make sense. It is in this that we remember and imagine the future—go forth, liturgize!

Notes

1. Presented through John Carroll University, 30 October 2023.
2. https://www.americamagazine.org/politics-society/2023/07/19/catholic-colleges-universities-mission-priorities-245689
3. https://www.highereddive.com/news/fall-2023-enrollment-trends-5-charts/697999/
4. Rt. Rev. Dr. Kirk Smith, "Commendable Effort, Troubling Trends" in *The Living Church* (October 15, 2023), 15.
5. Dr. Anne McGowan is now an Associate Professor of Liturgy at CTU in Chicago.
6. With gratitude to Dr. McGowan for several conversations regarding the results of her work within the Academy of Liturgy.
7. Karen B. Westerfield Tucker, "The State of North American Liturgical Scholarship: A Report Card," *Proceedings of the North American Academy of Liturgy,* Toronto (4-7 Jan 2007): 118-136.
8. Scott Haldeman, "Discerning the Body" in *Towards Liturgies that Reconcile: Race and Ritual among African-American and European-American Protestants.* (New York: Ashgate, 2007), 131.
9. With thanks to the careful and ongoing work of Jonathan Tan, who is always helpful in questions about inculturation and syncretism in person and through his publications.
10. R. Scott Clark on the somewhat tongue-in-cheek blog "Heidelblog: Recovering the Reformed Confession" https://heidelblog.net/2018/09/a-persnickety-point-about-doctorates/
11. John Baldovin, "The Usefulness of Liturgical History," *Proceedings of the North American Academy of Liturgy* (2007), 192, citing Robert Taft, *Beyond East and West: Problems in Liturgical Understanding* (Rome: Pontifical Oriental Institute, 1997).
12. Elizabeth Drescher, *Choosing our Religion: The Spiritual Lives of America's Nones* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016).