Proceedings

of the
North American Academy of Liturgy

Annual Meeting

Montreal, Quebec, Canada
5–8 January 2012

The North American Academy of Liturgy (NAAL) (http://www.naal-liturgy.org/) is an ecumenical and interreligious association of liturgical scholars who collaborate in research concerning public worship. The Academy's purpose is to promote liturgical scholarship among its members through opportunities for exchange of ideas and to extend the benefits of this scholarship to the worshiping communities to which its members belong.

The *Proceedings* of the North American Academy of Liturgy is published annually by the Academy for its membership and for scholars, libraries, and religious communities and organizations that would benefit from the research and collaboration of the Academy.

Articles published in Part Three–Select Seminar Papers have been peer reviewed. Only papers presented at the annual meeting are eligible for review. Authors are responsible for the content of their submissions.

Subscription (i.e., standing order) price at $12.00 per year; individual copies are $15.00 each. Agency discount available. For information on standing orders or individual volumes, contact the NAAL subscription manager, Dr. Troy Messenger. Address: Union Theological Seminary, 3041 Broadway, New York NY 10027; tel.: (212) 280-1523; e-mail: tmesseng@uts.columbia.edu.

This periodical is indexed in the *ATLA Religion Database®*, published by the American Theological Library Association, 300 S. Wacker Dr., Suite 2100, Chicago, IL 60606; e-mail: atla@atla.com; http://www.atla.com/. This periodical is included in the products distributed by EBSCO Publishing, Inc., 10 Estes Street, Ipswich, MA, 01938-0682; http://www.ebscohost .com.

Publication Number: ISSN 1055-338X

Contents

PART 3 – SELECT SEMINAR PAPERS

Foreword

The North American Academy of Liturgy gathered in Montreal, Canada, 5–8 January 2012 for our thirty-eighth annual meeting. Members and visitors delighted in the sights and sounds of wintry Montreal as they engaged in rich and lively discussion of liturgical scholarship and ministry. As a complement and extension of the rich fare of the meeting, members were able to tour local churches and sample the fine food of this wonderful city. There were one hundred ninety members and sixty-five visitors in attendance. The academy welcomed nineteen new members at the business meeting.

Proceedings opens with Vice President Craig Satterlee's address. He challenged us liturgists to ensure people hear a "hospitable word by speaking and embodying it through good liturgical guesting." Our *Berakah* Laureate Louis Weil explored four key invitations he had received in his career and how "God often challenges us to move in faith into areas that are not necessarily very comfortable." The twenty-one seminar reports offer a glimpse of the thought-provoking exchange at the heart of the academy's work. Part Three contains juried papers from the seminars.

I begin my service to the academy as the new editor of *Proceedings* with this issue. On behalf of the academy, I thank Joyce Ann Zimmerman, C.PP.S., for her decade of service as editor of *Proceedings*. Her organization, professionalism, attention to detail, and acumen established *Proceedings* as a publication of record and made for a smooth transition. Thanks, too, are due to the editorial board for their commitment of time and expertise: Ron Anderson, who begins a three-year term; Julia Upton; and Robin Knowles Wallace, who completes her service this year. I also thank Courtney Murtaugh, who is managing the printing and mailing details of *Proceedings*.

The success of the annual meeting is due to the vision and efforts of the Academy Committee: Catherine Vincie (president), Craig Satterlee (vice president), Martin Seltz (treasurer), Troy Messenger (secretary), Martha Moore-Keish (delegate for membership), Jennifer Lord (delegate for seminars), Jill Crainshaw (past president), Richard Rutherford (past-past president), and Courtney Murtaugh (administrative assistant). The academy is grateful as well for the work of this year's local committee: Gaetan Baillargeon, Margaret Bick, David Buley, Bill Burke, Brian Butcher, Glenn Byer, Bernadette Gasslein, Fred Graham, Nancy Hardy, John Hill, Ken Hull, Hye Ran Kim-Cragg, Bill Kervin, Richard Leggett, Charles Pottie-Pâté, and Susan Roll.

The 2013 meeting of the academy will be held in Albuquerque, New Mexico, 3–6 January.

Richard E. McCarron
Proceedings Editor

Plenary Sessions

Part 1

Speaking a Hospitable Word in Worship: Becoming Good Liturgical Guests

Craig A. Satterlee

Craig A. Satterlee is Axel Jacob and Gerda Maria (Swanson) Carlson Professor of Homiletics at the Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago, dean of the ACTS Doctor of Ministry in Preaching Program, and adjunct professor in the Department of Theology at the University of Notre Dame.

How do we speak a hospitable word in worship? The answer depends in part on the word; the answer depends in part on the worship. So, when I preach the same sermon in two different places, I must change some words the congregation I preach to on Sunday finds hospitable, if I want to speak a hospitable word in worship at my seminary on Wednesday. Regardless of what the author of John's Gospel intended, the words *slave* and *free* sound different in worship in suburban Chicago from the way they sound on the south side of Chicago; and the words *slave* and *free* sound different in Richmond, Virginia, from the way they sound anywhere in Chicago. So, to figure out how to speak a hospitable word in worship—a word that says something truthful and meaningful about God, God's will for the world, and our place in it *and* makes everyone feel welcome and comfortable and like they belong—we need to get particular. We need to be specific. We need to start small. How do we speak a hospitable word, say, in *academy worship*?

Speaking a Hospitable Word in Academy Worship

Our president entrusted me with two tasks for this meeting, in addition to giving this talk. Both concern speaking hospitable words in academy worship. First, I prepared a table prayer for Sunday's *Berakah* Breakfast; second, I put together the closing liturgy. Say grace and lead a sending rite—no big deal. And yet, with every word I wrote, I found myself second-guessing as I kept asking myself the same question: "Whom will I offend?"

We of the North American Academy of Liturgy know the power of words, and so we are attentive to words, particular about words, and easily offended by words, especially words spoken in worship. It seems we've always been this way. In the spirit of Max Johnson—who reminds us that experience must be grounded in a rite's history and evolution[1]—and as part of preparing for next year's annual meeting in Albuquerque, I spent an afternoon in Ed Foley's archives looking back at NAAL's last annual meeting in Albuquerque, nineteen years ago. I found some old friends lurking there, questions—and opinions—I've heard bandied about this academy concerning words spoken in worship, like (1) whether the language used in academy liturgies should reflect accepted practice or push an envelope; (2) how we ought and ought not name God; and (3) whether the language of a given liturgy should be guided by syncretism or a particular faith tradition.[2]

As a Christian preacher and teacher of Christian preaching, I counsel students, "If you don't, as Paul says, 'proclaim Christ crucified,'[3] you haven't preached." Yet, I came away from the archives genuinely wondering whether it's ever appropriate to mention Jesus in academy worship and, if so, how to do that without giving offense. You see, one of the things that I've come to appreciate this year while serving on the Academy Committee is that the last thing those whom you honor by electing them to host an annual meeting want to do is offend you. So they do their best to speak a hospitable word in worship.

Hospitality vs. Proclamation

And lest you conclude I am talking about an intra-academy issue rather than something central to the study of liturgy, the time I spend with worship planners and leaders of many stripes convinces me that negotiating the tension between *hospitality*—making everyone feel welcome and comfortable and like they belong—and *word* or *proclamation*—saying something truthful and meaningful about God, God's will for the world, and our place in it—is an issue at the heart of every assembly's worship today. Lean too far one way and you offend and exclude; lean too far the other way and you find yourself worshiping a watered-down, lowest-common-denominator deity who doesn't really stand for or against anything. "How do we speak a hospitable word in worship?" is a question worship planners and leaders are asking. So an academy dedicated to extending the benefits of liturgical scholarship to worshiping communities[4] might do well to reflect on how we speak a word in worship that is both welcoming and truthful. And, in fact, we do.

For those who desire the vice-presidential address to be a purely scholarly paper, this would be the "review of the literature" section. I'd recite a litany of important books, articles, and academy papers on language in worship—I assign my preaching students Ruth Duck's *Finding Words for Worship*, so I know at least one. [5] If this were a purely scholarly paper, I'd review the literature and some of you could listen closely to make certain I mention your name. But this is an address, a spoken rather than a written word, and reciting the literature feels to me a bit like giving a eulogy, not that the issue is dead. Rather, reviewing the literature aloud is like telling people about a life they love and live and share and serve and have been part of longer than me. You see, while I have spent a quarter century reflecting

on the language of disability in worship,[6] I wasn't in Albuquerque in 1993 when the Feminist Liturgy group led worship that is described for posterity as inviting, moving, wonderful, powerful, and raising questions of appropriateness[7]—but some of you were! At this meeting, I won't sit in on the Liturgical Language seminar that will, among other things, help us to find language with which to confess mortality, injustice, disease, and meaninglessness, as well as sin[8]—but some of you will.

So, rather than reviewing the literature, I thank you that, in both seminar and liturgy, scholarship and practice, examining the tension in public worship between *hospitality*—making everyone feel welcome and comfortable and like they belong—and *word* or *proclamation*—saying something truthful and meaningful about God, God's will for the world, and our place in it—is not new to this academy. It's certainly not new to those who have taken a turn planning and leading academy worship. But all of us, whether we've felt enfolded in the language of academy liturgy or offended by it, have come away knowing in our bones that the words spoken in worship are powerful. The words spoken in worship are *powerful*. And academy worship wonderfully brings home the reason that fussing with words in any liturgy is akin to playing with dynamite. For we dare to believe that the words uttered in worship are divine as well as human speech, and somehow possess the power of God.

God's Powerful Word

All three Abrahamic traditions agree that ours is a God of powerful words.[9] The Torah tells us that God *said*, "Let there be," and there was.[10] To Noah, God said, "Never again shall there be a flood to destroy the earth."[11] God spoke a word of promise to make great nations of both Hagar's and Sarah's sons. God issued a word of command to Moses, "Lift up your staff, and stretch out your hand over the sea and divide it," and God created a way when there was none.[12] And God wrote ten words on two stone tablets that Moses brought down from Mount Sinai.[13] In the New Testament, the Gospel of John identifies Jesus, saying, "the Word became flesh and lived among us . . . full of grace and truth."[14] Intersecting the human plane of existence and the transcendent word of God, the "power of Qur'an is reflected in one *ayah* (verse) which says, 'Had We bestowed this Qur'an from on high upon a mountain, you would see it [the mountain] humbling itself, breaking asunder for awe of God' (59.21)."[15]

All three Abrahamic traditions agree that ours is a God of powerful words—words powerful enough to form the world and us. And all three Abrahamic traditions celebrate God's powerful word in worship. The ceremony of the Torah Service of Shabbat honors the Torah as "a manifestation of the presence of the Holy One, the shape of the divine—yes, even, as it were, 'the body of God.'"[16] Speaking from my particular Christian tradition, Luther calls preaching the *viva vox evangeli* and the *viva vox Christi*—the living voice of the Gospel and the living voice of Christ.[17] Ambrose, the fourth-century bishop of Milan, declared of the Eucharist, "The word of Christ consecrates this sacrament."[18] One Muslim scholar says reciting the Qur'an is more than prayer and an act of virtue; reciting the Qur'an is a source of God's healing, comfort, mercy, and protection.[19]

As someone who cannot read words when leading worship but must commit them to memory, Islam's understanding of reciting words in worship resonates with me, though I express it in biblical terms. Speaking through the prophet Jeremiah, God declares, "I will write [my law] on their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people."[20] Over the years, God wrote both law and gospel on my heart as I memorized the words of the liturgy. Even when I support changes in liturgical language, every time my denomination and its publishing house fuss with the words, frequently changing them just enough to make them different, I experience the change as its own sort of heart surgery. So I am grateful for congregations that allow me to intone, "It is indeed right and salutary," and I empathize with friends who find themselves tongue-tied by simple phrases like, "And with your Spirit," "that I have greatly sinned," and "consubstantial with the Father."[21] No matter what we *think* of changes in liturgical language, they mess with our hearts. Sometimes we feel embraced. Sometimes we feel offended. And, usually, the same words that embrace us offend someone sitting nearby.

Things become more complex when the worshipping community is an ecumenical and interfaith academy of liturgical scholars who gather annually to, at best, secondarily worship. After all, "The Academy Seminars are at the heart of our annual meetings."[22] Assemblies of a single faith tradition that worship together more regularly can better discover, negotiate, and determine what language does and does not work in that context. So, for example, when the congregation where, until recently, I served as consulting pastor wanted to be a field education site, my colleague and I explained that, if we want to train our church's pastors, we need to use our church's worship book, and *Lutheran Book of Worship* gave way to *Evangelical Lutheran Worship*. For months the people hated it, and when one of their pastors had even a small hand in creating the new hymnal, parishioners can express their disdain up close and personal. Finally, at an adult forum, we asked why they did not like the book. Those present were univocal in their response: "Blessed be the holy Trinity, one God, who forgives all our sin, whose mercy endures forever."[23] The problem was not so much with the language; the problem was they didn't know when to make the sign of the cross or, more precisely, making the sign of the cross didn't feel right. So we agreed not to exercise that option. Expansive language flourishes elsewhere in worship, complaints about the new hymnal ceased, and every service begins, "In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit."[24]

Conversation about the words we use in *our* worship continues in our academy. I learned this year how seriously the Academy Committee takes the evaluations we fill out after each annual meeting. As I said, the last thing those whom you honor by electing them to host an annual meeting want to do is offend you. Yet, despite the Academy Committee's best efforts, our liturgies are too few and far between, with different leadership and a different location each year, to truly discover, negotiate, and determine what language does and does not work for us. So what do we do?

Better Hosts

We could use academy worship to come up with some "rules of etiquette" that govern the use of language in worship to help those who plan and lead be better hosts. We could, for example, (1) eliminate all economic, militaristic, and hierarchical language from academy worship. We might (2) embrace language that is expansive without being fleeting, drawn from sacred texts but varied in our usage. We might (3) commit to balancing language that is known by heart or easily repeatable with language that requires reliance on printed or projected worship materials. Yes, we could use academy liturgies to test "rules of etiquette" that help worship planners and leaders to be better hosts.

After all, emphasizing hosting is understandable since it's something we share in common. Throughout the centuries, all three Abrahamic traditions have considered the account of Abraham and Sarah welcoming the three visitors and preparing and serving a sumptuous meal for them to be a model of hospitality.[25] From Abraham and Sarah we learn that we are to seek out the opportunity to welcome guests, be sensitive to the feelings and needs of our guests, and not cause discomfort or embarrassment to our guests. Perhaps most helpfully, the Talmud teaches:

> It is written, "And I will fetch a morsel of bread"; but it is also written, "And Abraham ran to the herd." Said R. Eliezer: This teaches that righteous men promise little and perform much; whereas the wicked promise much and do not perform even little.[26]

The Qur'an emphasizes that, as soon as Abraham saw the messengers, he brought them a "roasted calf without delay."[27] Scholars interpret this action as exemplary, saying that it symbolizes Abraham's exceedingly high morality and so provides a model for how men should act in a similar situation. In the New Testament, the Letter to the Hebrews alludes to the grace and blessing Abraham and Sarah received through hospitality: "Do not neglect to show hospitality to strangers, for by doing that some have entertained angels without knowing it."[28] So providing hosts some "rules of etiquette" for speaking a hospitable word in worship makes sense—until you try it.

Several years ago, a few professors in Chicago tried to help those who plan and lead the annual worship life of the ecumenical Association of Chicago Theological Schools (ACTS) Doctor of Ministry in Preaching Program, where I serve as dean, to be more hospitable with the words they choose and speak by formulating some "rules of etiquette." "Limit masculine names for God" was one of the things we directed, to the praise of the program's faculty and leadership. Then some students complained that the program was being racist, because naming God "Father" is essential to African American worship. Younger women, including my daughter, looked at me blankly and found our directive patriarchal. "Who are you to tell us how to name God?" As only a daughter can, Chelsey regularly chides me for avoiding masculine pronouns for God in my preaching and writing, reminding me Jesus was a man, the Bible calls God "Father," and the world has more pressing

concerns. As I listen to sermons of younger women from whom I genuinely receive the Gospel, I find that, once they are away from the seminary where I teach, these preachers refer to God as "he." One former student even sent an article to the journal I edit with a note warning me not to fuss with her masculine pronouns and change the way she names God.

Something similar happened when the adult Sunday School class in an African American congregation read an article I'd written that begins, "I shudder when I'm reminded that it is painful for someone with dark skin to hear that 'God is light, and in God there is no darkness at all' (1 John 1:5)."[29] I received a very pastoral letter from a lady writing on behalf of the class who wanted me to know that people of color understand metaphor and have no problem with the language, so I need not worry myself. Then there are people like me, who live with a disability; we do not agree on whether we are *handicapped*, *disabled*, *differently abled*, or *definitely abled*. Personally, I prefer descriptive language: I am legally blind.

So how do we arrive at "rules of etiquette" that help us speak a hospitable word in worship? Even if we could, the result would be that we place the burden of responsibility for speaking something true and meaningful about God, God's will for the world, and our place in it, that is also hospitable to everyone, solely and squarely on those planning and leading worship. The rest of us could sit back, fold our arms, and wait to see whether we will feel embraced or offended. Speaking a hospitable word in worship, negotiating the tension between hospitality and proclamation, becomes the sole responsibility of the host.

Good Guests

Therein lies a problem. The host cannot do it all. For, while by showing hospitality to strangers, we *may* be entertaining angels unaware, more often we're not. Have you ever been to a dinner party where someone at the table was simply a lousy guest? I once attended a dinner party at which one of the guests spent the evening commenting and complaining about the way the couple giving the dinner divided up their hosting duties. At another dinner, a guest arrived late, refused to eat what was served, and loudly dominated the table. No matter what the hosts tried to do, including quickly preparing a different dinner for this guest, the evening was ruined. The room filled with tension as joy departed. The other guests grew quiet, and we quickly marched on to dessert and coffee so everyone could be on their way.

Contrast that with a dinner party where the guests are really good at being guests. They're glad to be there. They're eager to taste what is served. They look for something to appreciate and they find a way to express their appreciation. A thumbs-up toward the kitchen or a request for just one more bite of cheese can make the night. A chef once told me that his vocation is to give people joy. No matter how technically perfect a meal is, if those eating aren't enjoying themselves, he failed at his job. This of course means that the chef, the host, and the liturgist only have so much control.

I contend that it's only possible to speak a hospitable word in worship when those who receive it are good guests. The problem, of course, is that many of us who worship in communities where we "belong," who devote our lives to studying

liturgy and know how it "should" be done, lose any understanding of ourselves as guests in worship. Rather than as invited guests at a dinner party, we arrive as food critics at a restaurant. We know what we're looking for, and we're looking to find it. When we don't find it, when we don't hear the words we need or expect or think ought to be spoken, we feel uncomfortable, we feel disconnected; we feel discounted; we feel like we don't belong. We feel the words uttered in worship don't speak for or to us. The words feel inhospitable and we find ourselves offended.

At least that's what happens to me when, in worship, the word *blind* is used to describe negative behaviors, characteristics, and situations, particularly in liturgies where one must be able to physically see to participate. The appointed lectionary reading was John's account of the man born blind,[30] for me a very real person who the preacher quickly allegorized away into a character representing all of us:

> . . . blind to true love and to true relationship offered to us; blind to deep caring by another human being; blind to the demands of justice and equality; blind to the wide distribution of wealth between the rich and the poor; blind to anyone and anything outside the interests of our little group, and especially blind to our own faults and shortcomings.[31]

The sermon's message was clear: *blind* is bad. And this from a reading where the man born blind is the hero! And this in a community where I "belong." I cringed as I recited that sermon just now, and I certainly cringed as I heard those words in worship.

Then we gathered around the table, singing "Open My Eyes, to celebrate the Eucharist.[32] It was crowded and chaotic and, as a "man born blind," I needed to be led around—yuck! As I was being led, sighted people singing "Open My Eyes" added insult to injury. Ministers passed through the crowd with bread and cup, people reaching out their hands to receive them. But as a "man born blind," I couldn't tell when Jesus was passing by and where to reach. Then, with the cantor calling us to watch him, to do what he did, and not to be one of the "frozen chosen," the assembly danced its way out of worship. But since I couldn't see the cantor or other people dancing, I couldn't figure out the steps and I was, in fact, frozen.

It occurred to me in that moment that if this were the way my church worshipped, I would find it really hard to receive the Eucharist. I wouldn't be able to distribute the sacrament, so I couldn't be ordained. I'd feel bad about being blind, something I generally don't feel. The appointed pericope came to life for me as I felt like "the man born blind" excluded from the faith community.

Standing there frozen as the assembly began to dance, my friend Barbara said something to me; at first I didn't hear it. But as her words sank in, I admitted to myself that, as much as I wanted to "belong," this particular worship experience did not speak to me. It certainly didn't speak for me. I could stand there and fume or I could decide that I didn't have to "belong" here. I could be a guest. In that moment, when I realized my role in this worship was as a "liturgical guest," I experienced *shalom*, grace, *rahma*. So, if I was going to be a liturgical guest, I was going to be a *good* liturgical guest. Suddenly, I stopped resenting that I needed to be led around the worship space and helped to receive Communion. This community didn't get it,

or they didn't think of it, or they were trying to do or share something else. When I started looking for what that something else might be, I recognized that the sermon was powerful for others, who also found the liturgy enjoyable and joyous. And I found something to appreciate. I felt truly grateful that my friend Barbara was standing next to me. She'd spent the liturgy patting my hand and making corrective commentary through all the blind talk of the sermon. She kept me from tripping and falling as we made our way to the table and made sure I received the sacrament. Most important, she felt uncomfortable *along with* me. So, as the dancing started, Barbara spoke hospitable words that unfroze me. "We don't have to stay," Barbara said. Then, "It's time for us to leave," and together we *walked* out. By becoming a good liturgical guest, I was free to hear Barbara's hospitable words, which spoke truth about God, God's will for the world, and my place in it. In essence, Barbara said, "God doesn't expect you to put up with this." If I hadn't decided to be a good liturgical guest, I suspect I wouldn't have heard those words.

It's only possible to speak a hospitable word in worship when those who receive it are good guests. So maybe the task is not only helping liturgical hosts to *speak* a hospitable word in worship but also teaching liturgical guests to *hear* a hospitable word in worship. And maybe learning to hear a hospitable word in academy worship is a place to start as we who are so often hosts give up that role and even surrender our sense of "belonging," and regard ourselves instead as guests of the Divine and the assembly. And, if we're going to be guests, we can strive to be good guests. Then, if we can figure out how to be good liturgical guests here, we can go and model good liturgical guesting in the worshiping communities where we live, serve, and belong.

Liturgical Guesting

So what are some "rules of etiquette" for being good liturgical guests? Since my aim in this talk is to hear—and speak—words in worship that convey both hospitality and proclamation, we might do well to look to words we deem sacred—the Hebrew Bible, the New Testament, and the Qur'an. When I looked, I could name six "rules of etiquette" for "liturgical guesting," which, while not new, merit this academy's renewed consideration in seminar and liturgy, in scholarship and practice.

1. Leave the Last Word to God

Let's begin where liturgy often ends, with evaluation, particularly evaluation concerning our differences. My colleague, Mark Swanson, who teaches interfaith relations, pointed me to one of the "verses of tolerance" in the Qur'an, which speaks of "the God-willed character of human diversity."[33] It goes something like this:

> If God had willed He could have made you one community. However, He has willed to test you by what He has given you. So compete with one another in doing good. You will all return to God, and He will give you to know about the things in which you differed.[34]

From this perspective, rather than evaluating worship according to their own

standards, good guests embrace alternative criteria. According to Dr. Swanson, those who have listened to this verse from the Qur'an, people both inside and outside the Muslim community

> have been led to ponder: the mystery of the one human family; our God-willed diversity; the way God tests us through what God has given us; the human task of coming to know one another and, if there is to be competition, that it be competition in *goodness*; and the reality of our return to God, who alone has the Last Word—which means we can *leave* the Last Word about our differences to God.[35]

Contemplating the human task of coming to know one another leads me to contemporary homiletic theory, which understands sermons as testimony rather than teaching, as proposals rather than pronouncements, as conversation-starters rather than conversation-stoppers, as first words rather than last words.[36] Reflecting on our God-willed diversity compels me to distinguish essential words from words that are not. Considering the reality of our return to God, who alone has the Last Word, during the Christian season of Advent, also cautioned me that waiting for the end of time—when God reveals all things—is not a passive process, and competing in goodness is not polite acceptance. Sometimes we simply must gently and honestly give voice to our concerns and objections, particularly when words spoken in worship harm others. Yet, trusting God to have the last word in the end makes me a better guest by checking my need to fix, correct, and have the last word on every word right now.

2. Take a Little and Give a Lot

Closely related to evaluation is benefit. "What did I get out of worship?" The Talmud teaches that good guests take only a little and give a lot. "One who wants to derive benefit from his host," the Talmud instructs, "should do so as Elisha the Prophet benefited."[37] The Tanakh describes a certain woman who urged the prophet Elisha (not knowing at the time that he was a prophet) to accept her hospitality. The prophet agreed to eat bread and from then on would turn in to his hosts' home when passing by. Eventually, the woman told her husband that this seems to be a holy man, and that they should prepare a special room for him to use while on his journeys in which they placed a bed, table, chair, and lamp. Later, the prophet was told that the couple had no children. In appreciation of their hospitality, he blessed them, and after many years of barrenness, they had a son. Elisha took special interest in the boy, and, after he suddenly died, Elisha made a special journey to their home and miraculously brought the boy back to life.

The Talmud infers that the woman had to press Elisha to accept her hospitality, and even once he did, he only ate bread. This shows that Elisha went out of his way to avoid burdening his hosts. Similarly, the fact that they prepared for him a small room, which was only sparsely furnished, also suggests that they realized this was all Elisha would accept and offering any more might make him uncomfortable. On the other hand, while Elisha took little, he gave a lot. Not only did Elisha affect the couple having a child, he saved the boy's life.

From here the Talmud teaches that those who derive benefit from their hosts should only do so sparingly, and avoid doing or saying anything that might make their hosts go out of their way for them. In fact, good guests lessen the burden of hosting them as much as possible. So, rather than going to worship to get their needs met, good liturgical guests go to worship intending to take only a little and to give a lot.

3. Wear Your Wedding Robe

Third, we come to attitude. The New Testament invites us to wear our wedding robe. Today, many who are passionate about Christian evangelism look to Jesus's parable, which compares the kingdom of heaven to a king who gave a wedding banquet for his son, as the model of Christian worship.[38] When the invited guests would not come, the king sent servants to gather all whom they found, both good and bad, so the wedding hall was filled with guests. Those who use this story as an image of worship argue that worship planners and leaders should be this kind of host, particularly when it comes to the Eucharistic table. But then the story turns from hosting to guesting:

> But when the king came in to see the guests, he noticed a man there who was not wearing a wedding robe, and he said to him, "Friend, how did you get in here without a wedding robe?" And he was speechless. Then the king said to the attendants, "Bind him hand and foot, and throw him into the outer darkness, where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth."[39]

So if the wedding banquet is the model of worship, what does it mean for a worshiper—a guest—to show up with or without a wedding robe? Perhaps it has something to do with the attitude with which guests enter worship—grateful to be there, eager to share the king's joy, gladly entering into the celebration, expecting God to say and do something—or not. Perhaps wearing a wedding robe means remaining attentive, even anticipant; worshiping with heart and body as well as mind and voice, and asking not what we like and dislike or how we feel but what God is saying and doing.[40] My friend Mary Catherine Hilkert, who teaches theology at the University of Notre Dame, describes the task as "naming grace found in the depths of human experience."[41]

4. Take the Lowest Place

Fourth, let's talk about location. Where one sits in worship reflects and shapes our relationship to the community, the liturgy, and the sermon.[42] In the New Testament, Luke's Gospel tells us to take the lowest place: "When you are invited by someone to a wedding banquet, do not sit down at the place of honor . . . go and sit down at the lowest place."[43] While Luke is providing a strategy for being exalted rather than humbled, taking the lowest place requires good guests to check their egos and their expertise at the door. Good liturgical guests enter worship with humility. When I go to worship, I do my best to leave my "sermon critic" behind

and consciously cultivate my hunger to receive God's hospitable and life-giving word. I admit that, at times, doing this is truly a "spiritual discipline." That's a pious way of saying it's hard!

5. Eat and Drink What Is Provided

Fifth, good guests eat and drink what is provided. Two of the gospels report that Jesus sent his disciples out with instructions on how to be guests. "Remain in the same house, eating and drinking whatever they provide. Do not move about from house to house."[44] For liturgical guests, remaining in the same house and not moving about suggests investing time and giving the liturgy a chance. Eating and drinking what is provided implies that good liturgical guests seek to be nourished by what is offered rather than going hungry because of what is not. Good liturgical guests also distinguish and respond differently to words *they* find distasteful and to which *they* are allergic, and words that may be tainted and are definitely poisonous.

6. First Say, "Peace!"

Yet, I am struck most by the sixth rule of etiquette, again from the New Testament: "Whatever house you enter, first say, 'Peace to this house!" First say, "Peace!" Now here is a hospitable word that conveys truth and meaning about God, God's will for the world, and our place in it—peace. If we follow this "rule of etiquette," we have a liturgical guest bringing a hospitable word to a liturgical host. As in Abraham and Sarah's story, the guests turn out to be ones sent by God. Commenting on similar reversal dynamics in Jesus sending the seventy to proclaim God's reign by being guests, Jennifer Lord writes, "We are sent out with words of peace and a declaration of the kingdom and told this will be sufficient."[45]

A guest bringing a hospitable word to worship is counterintuitive. It's *juxtaposition*.[46] It's *liturgy*—God "'doing' the world the way the world was meant to be done."[47] From God's perspective, when a host fails to speak a hospitable word, the guest makes certain one is heard. So, in worship, when a liturgical host fails to speak a hospitable word, a liturgical guest makes certain one is heard. Perhaps the North American Academy of Liturgy could study this, practice it, and extend any benefits we discover to worshiping communities. "Peace to this house!"

Conclusion

I don't know how it is for you, but people pay attention to what kind of guest I am in worship. For example, students tell me that, when I forget myself, they know what I think of a sermon without asking. It seems, when I lower my head, the sermon is in trouble. When I take off my glasses, the preacher might as well sit down. Once in worship, when a creative Eucharistic prayer eliminated the institution narrative—a deal breaker for Lutherans—I could feel everybody in the place watching to see how I would respond, specifically whether I would or would not go to Communion. People pay attention to what kind of guests we are in worship. So maybe we can try out some liturgical guesting in academy worship, and when we get the "rules of etiquette" down, take them home and share them—better yet, model them—in the worshiping communities where we teach and serve, where

we worship and "belong." With so many word changes in worship these days, we liturgists can ensure people hear a hospitable word by speaking and embodying it through good liturgical guesting.

Notes

1 Maxwell E. Johnson, *The Rites of Christian Initiation: Their Evolution and Interpretation* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1999), xix.

2 "1993 NAAL Evaluations," Compilation of Evaluations of the 1993 Annual Meeting of the North American Academy of Liturgy, Albuquerque, New Mexico, 2–5 January 1993.

3 1 Cor 1:22.

4 North American Academy of Liturgy, "About NAAL," http://www.naal-liturgy.org/about-naal (accessed 17 March 2012).

5 Ruth Duck, *Finding Words for Worship: A Guide for Leaders* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995).

6 See, for example, Craig A. Satterlee, "Learning to Picture God from Those Who Cannot See," *Homiletic* 36, no. 1 (2011) [Online] http://ejournals.library.vanderbilt.edu/homiletic/viewarticle.php?id=157 (accessed 17 March 2012).

7 "1993 NAAL Evaluations."

8 Gail Ramshaw, "Mortality, Injustice, Disease, Meaninglessness: Texts For Confessing More Than Sin," (paper, Liturgical Language Seminar, North American Academy of Liturgy, Montreal, QC, Canada, 5–8 January 2012).

9 This paragraph is adapted from Craig A. Satterlee, "Wordless Words in Worship," *Currents in Theology and Mission* 38, no. 4 (August 2011): 236–244.

10 Gen 1:3, 6, 14.

11 Gen 9:11.

12 Exod 14:16.

13 Exod 31:18.

14 John 1:14.

15 Farid Esack, *The Qur'an: A User's Guide* (Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 2005), 17.

16 Lawrence A. Hoffman, *My People's Prayer Book*, vol. 4, *Traditional Prayers, Modern Commentaries—Seder K'riyat Hatorah (Shabbat Torah Service)* (Woodstock, VT: Jewish Lights Publishing, 2000), 60.

17 LW 52, 206; WA 12, 259, 8–13; WA 10, I, 1, 265 ff.; WA 12, 259; WA 12, 275. LW=Helmut Lehmann and Jaroslav Pelikan, eds., *Luther's Works*, 55 vols. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press; St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1955–1986). WA=*D. Martin Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, 69 vols. (Weimar: H. Böhlaus Nachfolger, 1883–1985).

18 Ambrose, *On the Sacraments* 4.14, in T. Thompson, *On the Sacraments and On the Mysteries*, rev. ed. (London: S.P.C.K, 1950), 86.

19 Esack, *The Qur'an: A User's Guide*, 18–19.

20 Jer 31:33.

21 *The Order of Mass* from *The Roman Missal for Use in the Dioceses of the United States of America* ©2010, International Committee on English in the Liturgy, Inc. (Washington, DC: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2011).

22 http://www.naal-liturgy.org/

23 Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, *Evangelical Lutheran Worship*, pew edition (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2006), 94.

24 Ibid.

25 Gen 18:1–16; Qur'an 11:69–74, 15:51–56, 37:102–109, 51:24–30.

26 b. B. Meṣiʿa 87a

27 Qur'an 11:69.

28 Heb 13:2.

29 Craig A. Satterlee, "Living by the Word: Groping in Darkness," *The Christian Century* 123, no. 8 (April 18, 2006): 20.

30 John 9:1–41.

31 Frank A. Thomas, "Amazing Grace: John 9:24–25," *Currents in Theology and Mission* 38, no. 4 (August 2011): 284.

32 I regret that, during the oral presentation, my attempt to describe this worship experience and to acknowledge the model from which it was adapted caused some listeners to conclude that it occurred at an institution other than my own and resulted in understandable offense.

33 Mark Swanson, "Us and Them . . . and toward the Greater We," (paper, Gülen Institute, University of Houston, Houston, Texas, 23 September 2011), 9.

34 Qur'an 5:48; Swanson, "Us and Them," 9.

35 Mark Swanson, "Us and Them," 9–10.

36 For a brief summary of the homiletic theories I refer to, see Craig A. Satterlee, *When God Speaks through You: How Faith Convictions Shape Preaching and Mission* (Herndon, VA: The Alban Institute, 2007), 55–76.

37 Ber. 10b; 2 Kgs 4:8–37. Ber. 10b; 2 Kgs 4:8–37. In this discussion, I am indebted to Rabbi Yirmiyahu Ullman, "Guest Etiquette" (25 July 2009) at "Ask the Rabbi" http://ohr.edu/explore_judaism/ask_the_rabbi/ask_the_rabbi/3993 (accessed 17 March 2012).

38 Mt 22:1–14.

39 Mt 22:11–13.

40 Craig A. Satterlee, *When God Speaks through Worship: Stories Congregations Live By* (Herndon, VA: The Alban Institute, 2009), 12–13.

41 Mary Catherine Hilkert, *Naming Grace: Preaching and the Sacramental Imagination* (New York: Continuum, 2000), 44.

42 See Satterlee, *When God Speaks through You*, 115–132.

43 Luke 14:8–11.

44 Luke 10:5–7.

45 Jennifer L. Lord, "Living By the Word: Reflections on the Lectionary (July 4, 2010)," *The Christian Century* 127, 13 (29 June 2010): 18.

46 Gordon W. Lathrop, *Holy Things: A Liturgical Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998), 101–102.

47 Aidan Kavanagh, as quoted by David W. Fagerberg, *Theologia Prima: What is Liturgical Theology?* (Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications, 2003), 87. This exact phrasing is the way Kavanagh said it often in class. The closest it appears in print is in *On Liturgical Theology* (New York: Pueblo Publishing, 1984), 100: "A liturgy of Christians is thus nothing less than the way a redeemed world is, so to speak, done."

Introduction of *Berakah* Recipient

David R. Holeton

David Holeton is a professor at The Charles University in Prague. A former president of Societas Liturgica, chair of the Consultation on Common Texts, and a founder of the International Anglican Liturgical Consultation, he is a member of the Issues in Medieval Liturgy seminar at the NAAL.

C'est un grand honneur et un plaisir d'être invité à présenter Louis Weil, un des membres fondateurs de cette académie et récipiendaire cette année de son Prix *Berakah*.

I have known Louis Weil for a little over forty years. One might think that would make introducing him relatively easy; in fact it has made it rather difficult. I know too much! I will mention just a few aspects of his rich life.

I was beginning my second year of seminary studies when Louis arrived as the youngest member of the faculty. I had more or less given up on liturgy after our required introduction to the history of the liturgy taught by someone whom I later came to respect as a very great liturgical scholar. During the course, our heads and notebooks had been filled with liturgical facts that seemed completely irrelevant to anything that would face us in our immediate future as liturgical leaders in parishes—notably an overly generous amount of time devoted to Chrodegang of Metz. More useful, perhaps, was the very detailed and recurring account of how to negotiate with Hortense, the dragon-like keeper of MS Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 12048—the Gellone—for we all knew that every parish came with at least one dragon! We all remembered Hortense; few of us remembered Chrodegang.

Louis's arrival transformed the teaching of liturgy at the seminary and, as a consequence, the lives of many students—including mine. It quickly became clear that it was possible (no, necessary) to be both *wissenschaftlich* and pastoral. Lectures were captivating—filled, as they were, with allusions to great works of literature, music, and remarkable personal anecdotes which both made the point at hand and enlivened our minds. If the liturgy was to embrace all of this, we wanted more.

Étudiant à l'Institut Catholique de Paris pendant et juste après le Concile Vatican II, Louis a été amené en contact immédiat avec ceux qui, par leurs travaux, contribuaient alors à la réforme liturgique du Concile. Des grands personnages comme Pierre-Marie Gy, Pierre Jounel, Aimé-Georges Martimort, Louis Bouyer, et Yves Congar entre autres, insistaient alors, dans leur enseignement, sur l'importance

d'une connaissance profonde des sources liturgiques pour le renouvellement de la vie liturgique de l'église.

As a teacher, the spirit of *aggiornamento* and *ressourcement* imbued Louis's lectures. We were to know the sources and the evolution of the liturgy (as well as its periods of devolution) not as an end in itself but for the renewal of the life of the church in which we lived. Teaching in a church where cold water is not regularly poured on those who still burn with a passion for liturgical renewal, that passion has never died in Louis and it imbues his teaching to this day.

Alors que nous célébrons ces jours-ci le cinquantième anniversaire de l'ordination de Louis au presbytérat, on ne peut que se réjouir d'un ministère ordonné consacré à la pastorale dans des paroisses aussi éloignées que Porto Rico et Paris. Il a dirigé des programmes liturgiques dans presque tous les diocèses de l'Église épiscopale ainsi qu'en Amérique latine, aux Philippines, à Hong Kong, et au Royaume Uni.

For many of us, it would not be possible to honour Louis without also remembering his mother, LaRue, for whom he was the primary care giver for many years. A formidable woman whose opinions were held passionately and which often seemed chosen explicitly to provoke Louis's liberal views on politics and life, she was given time that would otherwise have been devoted to the world of scholarship. For many of us, these years of care are held in great respect and admiration.

And Louis today? Two years ago, at the age of 74, Louis retired . . . allegedly. But every time I communicate with him, he is just off to or back from leading another diocesan program. He continues to undertake writing commissions which will be fulfilled only if he lives to be a hundred.

New in his life is a return to his early studies both in piano performance and musicology. In his new home, his grand piano has been restored to its rightful place as musical instrument rather than as the book shelf as which it served for decades, and Louis now plays for a few hours a day. I hope that you will join me in the wish that he may play forever.

The North American Academy of Liturgy

presents the

2012 BERAKAH AWARD

to

LOUIS WEIL

Texas born, Harvard, General & Paris trained
with Caribbean seasoning: priest, musician and scholar,
exemplary teacher from Paris to San Juan,
from Nashotah to Berkeley, with South America between,
you lavishly open the heart of Anglican traditions,
teaching "liturgy for living" with elegance and love.

Relishing the Feast, you know the taste and fragrance of Christ
in many cultures, sounding the deep waters of Baptism.
The world has been your classroom,
the ecumenical Church your care,
the surprise of God your idiom,
the gracious cadence of prayer your music,
wit and good theology for worshiping assemblies, your style.

Intrepid Traveler,
Sagacious Servant,
Loving Critic,
Faithful Friend.

For your life and work, this Academy gives thanks and praise.

Invitation into a Larger Room

Louis Weil

Louis Weil has served as a priest in the Episcopal Church for fifty years and during that time also taught at three Episcopal seminaries: in Puerto Rico; in Wisconsin; and last at the Church Divinity School of the Pacific (CDSP) in Berkeley, California. He is now the Hodges-Haynes Professor Emeritus of Liturgics at CDSP and continues to teach seminars in sacramental theology.

I want to begin with a public confession: I never intended to be a liturgist, and I never thought that I would ever do any advanced work in liturgical studies—at least not during my years in seminary. During our final year, a classmate asked me if I had thought about doing some graduate study. I told him that I might, but only after a few years of pastoral experience. He then asked, "In what field?" I said, "Probably in theology." After a pause I said, "It certainly will not be liturgy!"

The reason for this was not the liturgy itself. The rector at my home parish in Texas had a fine liturgical sense and a great love for the liturgy, and he had begun to communicate this to me. The problem was the one basic course I had taken in seminary: I found it excruciatingly boring. I referred to it as "footnotes on the evolution of the Book of Common Prayer." And that is really what the course was: minutiae upon minutiae, as we studied each successive revision of the prayer book and were told what had changed and why. I can remember asking a friend, "Is this all they think there is to liturgy?"

I had presumed up until the middle of that final year that I would return home after seminary, be ordained a deacon and then a priest, and become a curate at one of the parishes. In other words, I expected to do what almost all seminary graduates would do. But during the summer before my final year, I had met the bishop of Puerto Rico; and then late in the fall term, I received a letter from him asking if I would consider working in his diocese, for, perhaps, a three-year term. I thought it would be a great experience—and after that I would return home, and keep to the normal formula. I had no idea that with that decision to go to Puerto Rico, my entire life was going to change.

In this presentation, I want to talk about four moments in my life where unexpected changes—changes which I had not planned at all—would move me into areas where I would be forced to change, sometimes reluctantly, and to see things in a new way. Each of these moments is related to some aspect of the

liturgical-sacramental life of the church. Looking back, I see each of these moments as an invitation to move into a larger room—to find myself on new and unfamiliar terrain. Only later did I come to realize that these invitations in my life were but a small mirror of much more extensive invitations which God was offering to the church as a whole.

The First Invitation

The first invitation was that which came from the bishop of Puerto Rico. I arrived there three days after my ordination to the diaconate. At that point, the only model for parish ministry I knew was the one I had observed in the United States. Nothing in seminary had awakened me to the implications of a different cultural context—and I soon learned that most of the clergy, even the Latinos, presumed that the model of the "mother church"—that is, the USA—would be the expected model.

The first thing that aroused doubts in me came very quickly. During that same summer, the Episcopal Church published a new hymnal in Spanish. Because of my background in music, I was anxious to see what it contained. Among many problems, the main one was that the book was an almost slavish copy of the American Hymnal of 1940. This meant that the overwhelming majority of the hymns were of English or Continental origin. For these hymns, Spanish translations had been imposed which—even with my recent learning of the Spanish language—brutally distorted the language to make them fit the hymn tune. There were a few hymns of Spanish and Latin-American origin, but to a great extent this was what we might call a 'transliteration' of the American hymnal.

As my knowledge of Spanish developed, I realized that the translation of the American *Book of Common Prayer* (1928) suffered from essentially the same problem. The liturgical language of Archbishop Thomas Cranmer, although archaic, was at least beautiful. When Cranmer's texts were recast in literal Spanish, the results were at times incomprehensible and, even at best, lacked the beauty and rhythm of the Spanish language.

It was several years later that I learned the word for the problem I had encountered, the word *inculturation*. But even without the word, I recognized the problem: By adhering to the rites and music of the "mother church" as the defining source, the authentic voice of Hispanic and Latino culture had been suffocated.

This first room of inculturation forced me to see the consequences of insisting that English language and culture were the required norms for liturgical rites to be authentically Anglican. I learned eventually that the same mindset had been at work also in Anglican provinces in Asia and in Africa. I realized that I could not accept so narrow a cultural model for the church around the world.

The Second Invitation

The second room into which I was invited was that of authentic liturgical scholarship. When the time came for my first vacation while in Puerto Rico, I decided to take advantage of my time back in the United States to look into options

for graduate study. I had thought of working on the theology of the arts. On my way to visit family, I stopped off in New York City and spent a few days at the General Seminary, the seminary I had attended. A good friend of mine, our beloved colleague Tom Talley, was doing his doctoral study there with Boone Porter.

When I told him that I was thinking of doctoral study, he said words which in the end changed my life: Tom said, "Why don't you study the liturgy? Everything you love comes together there." Back in Puerto Rico, I had been asked to give a very basic introductory course in liturgy at the new Episcopal Seminary of the Caribbean. In giving that course, I realized that I really did not know very much. When I asked Tom where I might go to study, he said, "If I could go any place in the world, it would be the Institut Catholique in Paris." (This conversation took place in October 1962, when the Roman Catholic Church was moving toward the opening of the Second Vatican Council.) Tom thought that in the then-improving ecumenical atmosphere, they might be willing to accept an Anglican into the program. I wrote to inquire and received an answer by return mail from Father Pierre Jounel, who said that they would be happy to welcome an Anglican.

I did not know that I was about to enter a second room when I began my studies at the Institut Catholique exactly two years later. In looking back over so many years, I am not sure what I expected the program in Paris would give me. I had been shaped in the Catholic tradition of Anglicanism—fortunately in a spiritually and intellectually substantial form of that High Church tradition. I may have hoped that my earlier formation would be polished up and given a stronger academic foundation. I did not think it would radically change me in unexpected ways.

Remember that this was 1964. The Second Vatican Council had begun only the previous year. A revolution was taking place which I could not have imagined. That revolution changed me profoundly. Here, today, I want to focus on the second larger room into which the program invited me: It was the room of serious academic scholarship. Our various teachers had been leaders in liturgical scholarship for the previous forty years, and now some of them were the *periti* of the council, commuting to Rome as consultants on the days they were not scheduled to teach. Their names are legendary: Bernard Botte, Antoine Chavasse, Yves Congar, Balthasar Fischer, Pierre-Marie Gy, Pierre Jounel, André Liégé, Aimé-Georges Martimort, and many others.

I want to speak to you about only one of our teachers: the great Dominican theologian Marie-Dominique Chenu. Chenu was not only a distinguished Thomist scholar and specialist on the twelfth cenutry, but also the theologian for what was called *La Mission de France*—commonly known as the worker priests—which was looked on with some suspicion by Rome. Chenu was committed to an understanding of the church as rooted in history, and thus constantly developing and changing.

My class was the first that Father Chenu was permitted to teach after a silence of ten years. His subject for a series of lectures was, "The Anthropology of the Liturgy." In addition to the extraordinary depth of his presentations to us—his consummate scholarship—what I saw was a man rooted in serenity. He had used his ten years of silence simply to reflect more deeply on the theological issues to which he was committed. He revealed not a trace of anger.

Perhaps some of you know the story of Luis de León (1527–1591), the

sixteenth-century Augustinian friar who was a professor of theology at the University of Salamanca. In 1571, some of his fellow professors accused him of holding heretical opinions. Luis de León was imprisoned, during which time he simply continued to study. In 1576, he was exonerated and permitted to return to the classroom. The story is that at his first lecture, he began with the words, "As we were saying yesterday. . . . "

Those of us who had the privilege of hearing Fr. Chenu, shared a similar experience. He revealed a depth of knowledge that permitted him to speak with an amazing authority, and yet with the greatest humility. It was in Fr. Chenu above all that I saw the human face of authentic scholarship. It was through him above all that I came to understand the service that such scholarship could offer to the people of God.

The Third Invitation

The third larger room had to do with ordination. Given my Anglo-Catholic background, when the question of the ordination of women emerged, and above all at the time of the non-canonical ordinations of eleven women which took place in Philadelphia (29 July 1974), my initial reaction was negative. Obviously, this could not be!

But since I was a teacher of sacramental theology, and as the debate continued, I felt that I should give the question serious study—in order, of course, to show that the ordination of women was wrong. I read everything I could get my hands on, and very gradually I came to realize that the arguments against the ordination of women were, at least for me, increasingly unconvincing. But I had not yet moved into the larger room.

At some point, I was in the Diocese of Iowa to give a program. I had an appointment at the bishop's office, but I arrived early. I found a young woman sitting there—not wearing clerical dress. Providentially for me, we had time for a long conversation, and at one point I asked, "Are you a priest?" She replied that she was and had been among the first women to be ordained after our canon law had been changed in 1976.

To focus on only one thing from that day: As I talked with her and heard her speak of her sense of vocation, I realized that I could not take her call any less seriously than I had in conversations with male candidates over the previous twenty years. The authenticity which I saw in her could not be denied. I had been catapulted into a larger room.

My reversal on the ordination of women cost me, not surprisingly, the support of some of my fellow Anglo-Catholics: I had become a traitor. One priest, who had been a friend for years, called me "Judas." But I soon discovered that many of my fellow Anglo-Catholics were beginning to recognize the leading of the Holy Spirit in the affirmation of the ordination of women as a legitimate development in the life of our Communion. I had not moved into this larger room alone.

The Fourth Invitation

The fourth invitation is one with which the Episcopal Church is engaged at the present time. First, I must give you a little background. For more than three decades, in our official legislation, "the Episcopal Church has been responding to the challenge to seek and serve Christ in its members who are gay and lesbian." In a resolution of the General Convention of 1976 (A069), it was affirmed that "homosexual persons are children of God who have a full and equal claim with all other persons upon the love, acceptance, and pastoral concern and care of the Church." During the years since then, the Episcopal Church has been seeking to discern how we can live out that resolution.

It will surprise no one in this room that this has been a complex and emotionally charged process. As is true in all of our religious communities, there is a wide range of views on issues of human sexuality, and certainly this is the case with regard to homosexuality. At our most recent General Convention in 2009, a new resolution directed the Standing Commission on Liturgy and Music "to collect and develop theological and liturgical resources" for the blessing of same-gender relationships (C056). This work was not to be undertaken as a private project of the commission, but rather, as the resolution goes on to say, "to devise an open process for the conduct of its work, inviting participation from provinces, dioceses, congregations and individuals who are engaged in such theological work, and inviting theological reflection from throughout the Anglican Communion." This process is, of course, critically important if the work of the commission is to be genuinely productive.

In the almost three years since that convention, the commission has undertaken this work. Throughout the process, the commission has sought to respect the diversity of the members of the church with regard to issues of human sexuality, and yet also to complete the work which the commission was asked to do. The documents that are the fruit of this process will be presented at our next General Convention in July of this year.

This is not the appropriate occasion to discuss in detail the biblical, theological, and liturgical documentation which the process has produced for the convention. Rather, I want to conclude this fourth invitation into a larger room with a personal experience which opened up these questions for me in an unexpected way. Since I am currently a member of the Standing Commission on Liturgy and Music, I, along with all the members of the commission, have been involved at various stages of the process. Several of us, however, have been primarily occupied with other tasks which were assigned to the commission.

On one occasion, the importance of this project became very clear to me. In October 2010, one of the regular meetings of the commission took place in New Hampshire. A special hearing was added to our agenda for that meeting—a hearing at which more than thirty people from our seven dioceses in New England spoke to us quite simply and directly of their experience. The group included individuals and same-gender couples, as well as deacons, priests, and bishops from those dioceses.

Quite unexpectedly for me, their testimony moved me to the depths. It was the witness of people of profound faith with a great love for the church, but who, out of

that faith and love, are asking the church to bless them in their real lives rather than in their closeted lives. The authenticity of their faith and of their appeal was abundantly clear that day to the members of our commission who were gathered there.

I saw that day that the people who had testified to us had, to use my metaphor yet one more time, invited us into a larger room—a room in which much is unfamiliar and thus still a cause of anxiety for many members of the church. Yet we of the commission believe we have come this far through a faithful attempt to discern God's will.

In my own response to these four invitations, I have learned that God often challenges us to move in faith into areas that are not necessarily very comfortable. But in the end, these invitations do not undermine that faith but enable us to see that faith deepened and strengthened as we see God at work in unexpected ways. That means we need to be ready: we do not know when the next invitation will come.

Seminar Reports

Part 2

The Advent Project

Convener: The Very Reverend William H. Petersen *(emeritus dean and professor of Bexley Hall Episcopal Seminary)*

Seminar Participants: Jill B. Comings, Elise A. Feyerherm, Laura E. Moore, William H. Petersen

Visitors: Nancy Bryan, Suzanne Duchesne, Michael Jordan, Leif Nordenstorm

Description of Work

Besides presentation and discussion of the papers listed below, the seminar: (1) enjoyed a joint session with the Ecology and Liturgy Seminar for a presentation by Lisa Dahill on the O Antiphons; (2) received evaluations from an ecumenical array of congregations in the United States and Canada participating in the trial use of an expanded Advent in 2011; (3) made plans for the further development of our website: www.theadventproject.org; (4) focused on what resources need to be developed before our next meeting in regard to a Year C lectionary-based ecumenical musical index to an expanded season; and (5) considered the focus and shape of the opportunity given to us by the Consultation on Common Texts to present their 2012 meeting forum on 26 March for clergy and seminarians in the greater New York City metro area.

Papers and Presentations

Jill Burnett Comings, "End and Beginning: Strategies for Navigating the Coincidence of All Saints' Sunday and the First Sunday of Advent." This paper addressed the problem facing congregations when All Saints' Sunday and the first Sunday of a seven-week Advent collide (in years when Christmas falls on a Saturday or Sunday, as it did in 2010 and 2011 and will again in 2016) and included suggestions for handling the situation without compromising the major feast of All Saints. In addition, it reported results of a survey included on the Advent Project

website asking participating congregations to share how they solved this problem.

Carol A. Doran, "The Key Role of Music in Introducing an Expanded Advent." This presentation engaged seminar members in singing together. The paper also discussed the potential of a number of hymns and songs from ecumenical sources both to draw the interest of members of a congregation to the extended season and to introduce and teach theological, biblical, and historical concepts with which the congregation may be unfamiliar. A discussion of the implications of the musical language in the fifteenth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans concluded the presentation.

Laura E. Moore, "What to Do about the Advent Wreath, or, Not Letting the Tail Wag the Dog." Almost invariably when parish worship committees and congregations are presented with the opportunity for observing an expanded Advent, the question is: "But what do we do about the Advent wreath?" This paper briefly investigated the origins of this devotional aid and provided resources for using the Advent wreath in home and church, including a brief form for the lighting of the Advent wreath specifically intended for use with small children.

Elise A. Feyerherm, "Changed from Glory into Glory: Nativity, Theophany, and Eschatology in the Christian East." The Advent Project Seminar has as one of its aims the recovery of the eschatological character of the pre-nativity season. This paper continued her work from NAAL 2011 on "Advent as Winter Pascha" and explored the ways in which the Eastern churches approach Christ's nativity through the dual lens of Christ's return in glory and the deification of humanity in Christ.

William H. Petersen, "From *Dies Irae* to *Day of God*: Re-Imaging Advent in Hymns from Three Periods." This paper addressed one stated goal of the Advent Project Seminar: the re-imaging of Advent in our time. As a principal theme of the season's eschatological focus, "judgment" is analyzed through the medium of three hymns, two from previous periods and one from the present. It is argued that the first two hymns (*Dies Irae* from the Medieval-Reformation period; *Joy to the World* from the Enlightenment-Modern period) encapsulate and present the dominant image of the Advent theme of "judgment" in their respective ages. The third hymn (*O Day of God*) is set forth as apt for carrying a renewed and balanced observance of Advent with special emphasis on implications for the church's life and mission, now and in the future.

Plans for the Future

- To present *What Are We Waiting For? Reclaiming Advent for Time to Come* at the Consultation at Common Texts annual meeting forum for clergy and seminarians, this year in the greater New York City metro area, 26 March 2012.
- To post on our web site by late August 2012 completed work on an ecumenical index of a lectionary-based hymns and music resource for the coming Year C Advent season.

African American Liturgical Traditions

Editor's Note: *This seminar did not meet in 2012.*

Christian Initiation

Convener: Timothy Fitzgerald *(pastor, Sts. John and Paul Catholic Church, Altoona, Iowa)*

Seminar participants: Alan Barthel, Margaret Bick, Robert Brooks, Dennis Chriszt, Eileen Crowley, Nicholas Denysenko, Timothy Fitzgerald, John Hill, Jay Koyle, Peter McGrail, Lawrence Mick, Margaret Schreiber, Eileen Scully, Teresa Stricklen, Todd Townshend, Victoria Tufano, Paul Turner, Catherine Vincie, Stephen Wilbricht, Michael Woods

Visitor: Eileen Scully

Description of Work

For the Christian feast of 6 January, seminar members participated in the liturgy of Theophany and the Blessing of Waters at The Sign of the Theotokos Orthodox Church. The members discussed the scripture readings filled with water imagery; the modes and levels of participation in the liturgy; and the hospitality extended to the visitors.

Papers and Presentations

Stephen Wilbricht ("'The Work of Bees and Your Servants' Hands': A 'New' Exsultet with Ancient Cosmic Imagery") examined the newest translation of the Exsultet in light of the history of the text. This translation highlights the cosmic remembering and giving thanks—the bees and wax, the alignment of the sun and moon, the stars, the night, the fire, and the water. The candle and the wax—"the work of bees"—are spent, part of the offering of thanks for the renewal of all creation in Christ.

Nicholas Denysenko further addressed initiation in the Eastern tradition ("Chrismation in the Byzantine Rite: Historical Development and Liturgical Theology"). The pastoral experience (chrismation only once) and the historical

record (a very consistent practice since the eighth century) point to the close identity of the risen Christ and the baptized and anointed ones. The accompanying prayers became a litany of expressed meanings of the anointing and of names for the newly baptized (e.g., "Christs" as used by Cyril). How does this compare to Western theology of chrismation?

With three presentations, the seminar continued to examine the practice and meaning of Christian initiation in a changing church and a skeptical age. John Hill presented the framework of a workshop ("Strengthening the Celebration of Baptism") for presiders and catechists. Can insights from catechumenal initiation assist with the particular challenges of infant baptism? The discussion also centered on a more robust catechesis about baptism for the initiating community, as well as for the parents seeking baptism.

Margaret Bick considered the Roman Catholic disjunction of sacramental practice with children ("Can Roman Catholics Ever Fully Initiate in Infancy? An Ontario Perspective"). What would be necessary to recover the sequence of baptism-confirmation-Eucharist? What would be problematic with such a move? What would the sacramental catechesis for families and parish communities be like? Is there wisdom to be gained from the Eastern experience—regular participation in the liturgy as primary formation, a more communal and liturgy-based approach to formation? Would adult formation and community-wide formation become more central?

Jay Koyle led seminar discussion on "open baptism." This follows consideration of the "open table" in 2009 with Mark Stamm's book on the Methodist experience of open table and in 2010 with pastoral leaders from St. Gregory of Nyssa Episcopal Church, San Francisco. Is open baptism a worthy approach for a time when the rationale for infant baptism is considered weak or unconvincing? What does baptism mean, in this practice of open baptism? Does open baptism equate with 'no-cost discipleship'? Does it empty baptism of the paschal dimension and a sense of growth in faith leading to baptism?

Eileen Crowley explored the penitential service provided in the Roman Catholic *Rite of Penance* ("Penitential Services: An Invitation to Conversion, A Celebration of Resurrection, A Call to Action")—a Word service expressing the call to conversion and renewal, Christians' freedom from sin. The penitential service can be flexible, be adapted to various settings and assemblies, and serve as a model for ecumenical prayer.

Peter McGrail continued his study of Roman Catholic communities where both the "new rites" (post–Vatican II) and the "old rites"(post-Trent) are in use ("Twin Track Rites, Twin Track Ecclesiologies? Structural Implications of Parallel Rites of Adult Initiation in the RC Church"). Will Roman Catholic practice increasingly reflect parallel patterns of adult initiation? The two rites for adult initiation are grounded in different interpretations of faith and life: countercultural, "the church *and* the world" vs. "*Gaudium et Spes,*" "the church *in* the world."

Seminar members also read and discussed the book *From the Beginning to Baptism* by Linda Gibler (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2010).

The new convener for the Christian Initiation seminar will be Eileen Crowley.

Ecology and Liturgy

Convener: Mary E. McGann, RSCJ *(associate professor of liturgy and music, Franciscan School of Theology/Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley, Calif.)*

Seminar Participants: Lawrence Mick, Lisa Dahill, Doug Cullum, Mary McGann, David Buley, Susan Smith, Mark Torgerson, Benjamin Stewart, Bill Cieslak, Paul Galbreath

Visitors: Christopher Willcock

Description of Work

The seminar discussed Benjamin M. Stewart's *A Watered Garden: Christian Worship and Earth's Ecology* (Augsburg Fortress, 2011). Situated in an era in which ecological discoveries have challenged both scientific and theological/liturgical cosmologies, this book makes a case for ecological reform of worship that is grounded in a deep appreciation of the incarnational and sacramental core of Christian worship. It identifies the connections between water ecology and baptism; between Earth's relationship to the cycles of sun and moon in liturgical seasons and the daily cycle of prayer; between care for the land and the just distribution of food at holy communion; and between planet Earth itself and the very earth of human bodies, especially as ritualized in healing and funeral rites.

Papers and Presentations

Paul Galbreath, "Lingering in Nairobi: An Eco-liturgical Experiment in Contextuality." Using the schema of the Nairobi Statement, this paper examined the balance of power between universal and contextual elements in worship, arguing that ecological attentiveness underscores the importance of the contextual. It proposed a liturgy that accounts for local environmental concerns and included a service for the commissioning of "earth stewards" for those in a congregation engaged in ongoing works of creation care as a part of their life of discipleship.

Mary E. McGann, RSCJ, "A Theopolitics of Water: Celebrating Baptism in a Time of Global Water Crisis." After first identifying the scope of global water issues, this paper contended that the sacramental use of water in baptism commits us to the care and protection of Earth's waters and to solidarity with all who share them. It explored (1) how the baptized are called to follow Jesus, who in his "deep incarnation" embraced the waters of the Earth and through his resurrection claimed them as part of God's redemptive future; (2) how a community's baptismal formation as the body of Christ involves social/ecological responsibilities for those who suffer most from the global water crisis; and (3) how the practice of baptism brings an ethical imperative that invites communities to embrace four restorative virtues: social equity, bioresponsibility, sustainability, and frugality. Examples of how these virtues can be lived were included.

Mark A. Torgerson, "Common Ground for Creation Care: Insights from Jewish and Christian Sources." This paper interpreted biblical texts within Judaism that reference human responsibility for the natural world, highlighting emerging concepts such as *bal tashchit* and *shalom* and demonstrating a "God-centered" vision of creation in which non-human and human creation are equally important to God. This "God-centered" vision is corroborated in Christian New Testament texts, which speak as well of the anticipated restoration of the natural world. The paper explored Jewish and Christian organizations that are responding with deeper care for creation. Jewish responses, based in concept of *tikkun olam,* include the Shalom Center, *Shomrei Adamah*, and Teva Learning Center. Christian responses include networks such as the Evangelical Environmental Network, the National Council of Churches of Christ Eco-Justice Programs, and the National Religious Partnership for the Environment.

Lisa Dahill, "The Advent 'O Antiphons' and Communal Prayer for the Earth." Lisa's presentation centered on an Advent project she conducted in December 2011 at Holden Village, a Lutheran retreat center in the remote Cascade Mountains of Washington, which focused on the Great O Antiphons. The project (involving teaching, making art, writing poetry, and leading worship/preaching) invited participants into Advent prayer with the O Antiphons, situating them within the broader context of the wilderness surrounding the village *and* of the deepening ecological urgency of our time. Lisa wrote seven new poems refracting their insights—one for each antiphon in the seven days preceding Christmas. She presented these poems, along with a sketch of the project and Holden's ecological/liturgical context, to members of both the Ecology and Liturgy Seminar and the Advent Seminar.

Other Work and Plans for the Future

In addition to discussion of the above texts, members of the seminar prepared and led Epiphany Morning Prayer on 6 January and met jointly with the Advent Seminar for Lisa Dahill's presentation. They also shared information about projects in which they are involved, and developed an online system for gathering resources on ecology and liturgy that can be of use to members in their own scholarly/pastoral work, as well as to others. Many possibilities for the 2013 meeting of the seminar emerged and will be refined in the months ahead.

Emerging Critical Resources for Liturgical Studies

Convener: Sharon R. Fennema (*lecturer in liturgy, ritual, and preaching, Harvard Divinity School*)

Seminar Participants: Kimberly Belcher, Cláudio Carvalhaes, Sharon Fennema, Christopher Grundy, Gerald Liu, Richard McCarron, Bruce Morrill, Kari Veiteberg

Visitors: Nancy Bryan, Thomas Burke, Ben Durheim, Megan Macdonald, Timothy O'Malley, Joél Schmidt, Rebecca Spurrier, Kristine Suna-Koro, Tom Trinidad

Description of Work

This year, the seminar focused on the consideration of critical theories in practice: describing and analyzing concrete ritual practices using the tools of ritual criticism in conversation with critical discourses. To ground our work together, we read essays by F. Staal, B. Kapferer, D. Seeman, R. Grimes, and C. Bell that each addressed how human ritual behavior changes beyond and/or beneath the perception of meaning.

Papers and Presentations

After fulsome introductions to each other and our work, the seminar's second session began with a discussion of three chapters from seminar member Kimberly Hope Belcher's recently published book, *Efficacious Engagement: Sacramental Participation in the Trinitarian Mystery* (Liturgical Press, 2011) as an example of a work that utilized both ritual criticism and critical theories in the analysis of an actual ritual practice: infant baptism. Participants found much to discuss in Kim's argument that infant baptism provides an effective experiential back drop for the development of particular skills and cultural understandings, initiating a ritual process oriented to the formation of infants as Christian people (Belcher, 105).

We discussed Bruce Morrill's "Performing the Rite of Marriage: Agency, Identity, and Ecclesiology." In it, he utilized the theories of Bell, Grimes, Kapferer,

and others, to describe and analyze the dissonance between the theology (meaning) intended in the post–Vatican II *Rite of Marriage* (in the specifics of the ritual) and the kinesthetic and imaginal priorities of American Catholic couples in their preparation and performance of their weddings. In his analysis, he highlighted the degrees of ideological negotiation entailed in the practice of the marriage rite, finding Kapferer's theory of "ritual virtuality" especially helpful in understanding the complex interactions of official meaning and cultural constructions of the "fairytale" wedding.

A discussion of Christopher Grundy's paper, "A Body for Us: Strategic Misrecognition and Practices of Objectification in Holy Communion," followed. His paper examined the role that objectification practices play in normalizing violence, especially against women, in American culture. Utilizing Bell's concept of strategic misrecognition, Christopher foregrounded the role that objectifying practices play in the production of Jesus's body as a ritual object. He argued that our communion rites may rehearse us in a ritualized process of objectification each time we celebrate the Christian meal, which effects how we are shaped by our participation in it.

Seminar participants engaged with Kari Veiteberg's paper, "We Just Had to Do Something." The work in progress she presented investigated patterns of ritualization in the aftermath of the terror attacks on 22 July in Oslo and the island Utøya. Specifically, it discussed the ritualized patterns used to address individual and communal mourning, with the construction of collective ritual actions, symbols and places. This paper was the beginning of a larger project which Kari will oversee in the coming year as the director of the Liturgical Center of the Church of Norway.

The last paper our seminar discussed was Gerald Liu's "Generosity of Ritual for a Taiwanese Centenarian: A Plural Funeral?" In it, he explored Seeman's Levinasian explication of ritual practice through reflection on a funeral service that combined United Methodist liturgy and elements of Taiwanese funerary rites in an evangelical reformed context. Liu argued that what Seeman via Levinas identified as the uselessness of suffering requires more than phenomenological and ethnographic investigation of intersubjective gestures of transcendence in ritual. It also requires consideration of how collective attempts to treat the irreducibility of pain apart from reductionistic understandings of meaning paradoxically rely upon an elusive yet detectable opening and instance of the beyond, that is, a theologically-oriented expanse.

Other Work and Plans for the Future

During our final session of the 2012 meeting, seminar participants evaluated our work together, celebrating our increased numbers while noting the navigations of discussion that they required and the absence of several key contributors—Andrea Bieler, Dirk Lange, Jim Farwell, and Siobhán Garrigan in particular. Visitors were especially thanked for their contributions, and presenters were applauded for offering many thought-provoking ideas for us to explore. The seminar entertained the idea of returning to a presenter/responder model for next year's meeting, allowing for a more extensive engagement with the papers presented, and the seminar agreed by consensus to do so.

At the suggestion of Tim O'Malley, the seminar decided to focus our conversations at the 2013 meeting on Regina Schwarz's book *Sacramental Poetics at the Dawn of Secularism: When God Left the World* and its implications for our understanding and interpretation of worship. Other topics and books that were suggested and may be pursued at future meetings were: *Is Critique Secular?: Blasphemy, Injury, and Free Speech* by Talal Asad, Judith Butler, Saba Mahmood, and Wendy Brown; Jacques Rancière's *The Emancipated Spectator*; body theory (especially on apophatic and virtual bodies); intersections with queer studies; power and ritual; and engagement with the critical discourses of womanism. Several participants tentatively offered to serve as presenters and respondents in 2013.

Environment and Art

Convener: Martin V. Rambusch (*chairman, Rambusch Decorating Company*)

Seminar Participants: Richard Butler; Peter C. Bower; David Caron, OP; William Graham; Philip Horrigan; Martin Rambusch; Jan Robitscher; Richard Vosko

Description of Work

The seminar continued to reconsider and refine its objectives during the yearly gathering in January. Following our agenda of 2011, we tried to balance personal experiences of significant importance with scholarly presentations. One modification to our meetings this year was that one day was set aside for presentations and discussions and one day was allowed for a conducted tour.

Papers and Presentations

Presentations were made on a book that was then used a reference point as the buildings on the tour were experienced and then discussed. This book, *Turning Towards the Lord: Orientation in Liturgical Prayer* (Uwe Michael Lang; Ignatius Press, 2009) was reviewed and digested for the seminar by Peter C. Bower.

Additionally, a presentation was submitted to the seminar for commentary by David Caron, OP. The thesis is concerned with creating a system for taking the four movements/principles of *Lectio Divina* that deal with a printed text [Scripture] and applying them not to a text, but to sacred or liturgical art. This would allow for a fifth movement/principle. The thesis was of interest to the group, and Dave will endeavor to expand on this idea and hopes to have a further refined submission for the group next year.

This year's on-site visit was to the Canadian Centre of Architecture (CCA). We were greeted by the head of communications for the CCA and were given a behind-the-scenes tour of the buildings, how they were renovated and why, as well as the function of the CCA and its mission. We then had the pleasure of reviewing examples from some of the collections. These examples were models of buildings,

plans for churches built and un-built, sketch books from the Grand Tour, and the highlight of a Palladio elevation from 1576. Upon the completion of our tour, we gathered for lunch and discussion as to how this collection and the mission of this institute was relevant to the study of environment and art as well as providing support for many of the skills and artistic endeavors that can be found in vital and alive environments. It was our conclusion that, by having a small leadership group directing the CCA, it did seem to continue to help direct and shape architecture to be more than just buildings, but artistry, with consideration of the people who reside and work within buildings and understanding of how these various environments impact the people within them.

Plans for the Future

The agenda for 2013 for our "in-house" day will include: a revised presentation by David Caron on his thesis mentioned above, a presentation on accessibility, and presentations on current work by other members. Our other day will tentatively be spent visiting sites north and west of Santa Fe. The sites currently being considered are in Abique, Espanola, and perhaps Santa Fe itself. The hope is to delve into the history of Santa Fe and its vernacular art, a combination of colonial Spanish and native cultures, yet created with vernacular materials and styles that are out of the ordinary.

Eucharistic Prayer and Theology

Convener: Charles S. Pottie-Pâté, SJ (*National Ecclesial Assistant for Christian Life Community–Canada; pastoral work in Ignatian spirituality and resident priest at St. Mary's Cathedral in Calgary, AB*)

Seminar Participants: John Laurance, SJ; Brent Peterson; Robert Daly, SJ; Gabriel Pivarnik, OP; Robert Congdon; Richard Hilgartner; John Barry Ryan; Charles Pottie-Pâté, SJ

Visitors: Jeanette Ryan, John Rempel, Sebastian Madathummuriyil

Description of Work

We had a rich, engaging and lively discussion together in our sessions, with open reflection and dialogue on each of the five presentations. These had been sent ahead of time to read, so that our time in the sessions was a time of responding to these presentations and offering questions for further development and possible publication of these papers. Our assessment of these seminar sessions was very positive. As one member put it: "Isn't talking and reflecting on the Eucharist the most interesting thing in the world?"

Papers and Presentations

John Barry Ryan, "The Eucharist at Kahnawake: 1676–1691." Sketching the prehistory of present day Kahnawake, a First Nations Reserve across from Montreal, and drawing on seventeenth-century Jesuit sources, Ryan detailed how the Jesuit missionaries enacted the Eucharist for what was essentially an Iroquoized reduction in the period 1676–1691. Blessed Kateri Tekakwitha's life was used to illustrate places and events in Mohawk history during the period. Discussion included questions as to what constituted frequent communion in seventeenth-century New France; what can be learned also from the 1640's Jesuit mission at Midland, Canada; and how the reforms of the Council of Trent influenced the mission.

John D. Laurance, "The Saving Events of Christ in the Eucharist." With K. Rahner, E. Kilmartin, and L.-M. Chauvet as guides, two questions were discussed: (1) how could Jesus in the course of a single lifetime bring about universal salvation; and (2) how is this salvation made available to us through the church as Christ's body in the world? The centrality of Christ to Christian faith raised a corollary proposition: how can this be true as stated without at the same time undercutting universal salvation? Can apparent Christian exclusivity be related to what is common to everyone, Christian or non-Christian? Discussion followed on the nature of the spiritual offering made at the Eucharist in the form of thanksgiving and on how to respond actively to the gift of Christ by offering to God the gift of love received from God. The discussion closed with the pastoral concern of how to communicate these concepts to worshippers and how to put them into an effective catechesis.

Robert Daly, English translation of his article "Opfer" for the *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum,* plus an appendix of his original "Methodological and Hermeneutical Issues" text and a second appendix that more fully presents his "A Trinitarian View of Sacrifice." Given the huge amount of detail of cult and religious practices in antiquity, and that nineteenth-century scholars placed modern ideas back into antiquity with a mistaken idea of sacrifice, i.e., that the primary sacrifice was bloody. Christian elites in antiquity were able to take over critiques of sacrifice from non-Christian elites and make them their own. Bob wanted to receive suggestions for a book in English that would expand the article and make it more reader friendly. His present working title is *Sacrifice: Pagan and Christian.* Discussion affirmed the contribution Bob continues to make to an authentic understanding of the Christian idea of sacrifice, both in terms of the history of scholarship on it and in particular to the Christian theological discourse on it, and raised many suggestions for his continuing work.

Brent Peterson, "The Eschatological Imagination: Being Released from Fear by Encountering the Hope of What Is and What Will Be." Two concerns were raised: (1) the recent theological movement called "open theism" and (2) the fixation of church members on their own individual salvation ("Am I going to heaven?) without being concerned about all creation being redeemed. With mentors A. Schmemann, G. Wainwright, and others, the paper invited readers "into the robust eschatological imagination of the Eucharistic divine-human event." With Schmemann, the paper insisted that the centrality of the Last Supper, more than a one-sided emphasis on Calvary, could help provide the eschatological memory required for an ethic of responsibility to the marginalized.

R. Gabriel Pivarnik, in "That You Should Enter under My Roof: Eucharistic Indwelling and the Trinitarian Life," argued that a small change in the invitation before communion has deep theological implications. The newly translated prayer has raised questions both from priests and from lay people. Gabriel put the biblical text, adapted to use in the liturgy, into a larger context in order to elaborate a rich and serious catechesis on the indwelling of Christ and the eschatological perspective of the invitation to communion, "Blessed are those called to the supper of the Lamb." The paper in dialogue with W. Hill, E. Kilmartin, and H. Mühlen, suggested an anamnetic presence of the Spirit and an epicletic presence that gives authenticity to the believer's response to the invitation to communion. Gabriel sees the invitation

to communion reminding us of what we are not and simultaneously beckoning us to what we eat, "the Body of Christ, the grace of the Spirit, the love of the Father made manifest in the heavenly banquet." Further discussion that centered on the manifold presences of the Holy Spirit in the community, in liturgical actions and materialities, and the human body.

Charles Pottie-Pâté highlighted the Roman Catholic Eucharistic Prayer preface for Canada's Thanksgiving Day. It was composed from an ecological perspective and as far as Charles could determine was unique in the euchology of the Roman Missal.

Plans for the Future

Do a review of the new translations of Eucharistic Prayers; explore meaning of "my sacrifice and yours"; develop more on the trinitarian theology of participation; look at Brent Peterson's book on theology of worship; revisit pneumatology in Eucharistic prayers; ecological dimensions of Eucharistic prayers.

Exploring Contemporary and Alternative Worship

Convener: The Reverend Taylor W. Burton-Edwards (*director of worship resources, General Board of Discipleship of The United Methodist Church*)

Seminar Participants: Susan Blain, Brenda Grauer, Taylor Burton-Edwards, Deok-Weon Ahn

Visitors: Suzanne Castle, Jae-Weon Woo, Haejung Park, Nicholas Zork, Heidi Miller, Dawn Chesser, David Lemley

Papers and Presentations

Susan Blain, "'Creedish' Manifestations in Contemporary and Alternative Worship: Prologue." A presentation about the parameters for identifying "creedish" elements in worship in the United Church of Christ as prelude to a case study exploring the varieties of ways such elements are embodied in contemporary/emergent/alternative worshipping communities to be presented in 2013.

David Lemley, "We Worshipped with People Who Were not Here: Virtual Worshiping Communities" (presented via Skype). An exploration of the realities and limits of interaction and worship in online settings, with particular focus on Second Life, AlphaChurch, and @Virtual_Abbey (on Twitter).

Brenda Grauer and Suzanne Castle, "What Art Does in Contemporary Worship and What Contemporary Worship Does with Art." Case studies from two different kinds of worship settings. Brenda Grauer's presentation explored particular ways in which helping persons in "traditional" worship settings claim and enhance artistic expression opens the worshiping community toward more contemporary and emergent expressions and ministry. Suzanne Castle presented a case study of the emergent congregation in Fort Worth, Texas, where she serves as pastor and art curator. As part of her leadership, she encourages worship that actively incorporates the work of artists in the wider community and the congregation in multiple ways: prayer stations, space design, video, and collaborative art creation.

Dawn Chesser, "When the Table Is Online" (presented via Skype). An examination of the ecclesiological and sacramental theological assumptions that inform whether and how five different communities or individuals with online presence have discerned if the experience of the Eucharist online differs from actual physical worshiping community.

Plans for Future

Heidi Miller,"Becoming God's Gesture to the World: How Contemporary Worship Involves Worshiping with Our Bodies." It has become commonplace in some circles to say that "contemporary worship" is primarily performance embodied by persons "on stage" that may not substantially involve the body or the congregation as a body. This paper will document instances of congregational embodiment in such settings, both individual and corporate.

Jae Weon Yoo, "Contemporary and Alternative Worship in the Korean Presbyterian Church." Yoo will present findings from her research on trends in contemporary and alternative worship in Korea, particularly within the Korean Presbyterian Church.

Haejong Park, "Manna Church: Changing Leaders/Changing Worship." This paper will present a case study of fairly dramatic transformation in the worship life of a significant Korean congregation when its leaders changed and those leaders began to alter the "traditional/received tradition" worship of the congregation.

Susan Blain, "Still Confessing: Case Studies of Creedish Manifestations in Contemporary and Alternative Worship." This paper will reflect travel, research, and case studies of ways in which a variety of congregations whose worship would be identified as contemporary, alternative, or emergent confess their faith in worship, with or without the use of formal "creeds" or "confessional statements."

Feminist Studies in Liturgy

Convener: Deborah Sokolove (director, Center for the Arts and Religion at Wesley Theological Seminary)

Seminar Participants: Kathleen Black, Jill Crainshaw, Ruth Duck, Heather Murray Elkins, Myung-Sil Kim, Martha Ann Kirk, Susan Roll, Deborah Sokolove, Sylvia Sweeney, Janet Walton

Visitors: HyeRan Kim-Cragg, Martha McAfee, Elizabeth (Sue) Moore

Papers and Presentations

Elizabeth (Sue) Moore, "Lifting Up Our Hearts: Weekly Eucharist for a Reluctant Congregation." Reflecting on the experience of instituting weekly Eucharist in small, rural Protestant congregations, Moore suggested that to overcome parishioners' resistance to frequent Communion, it is not enough to change the words of Eucharistic prayers. Rather, she writes, "both remorseful words and ineffective ritual practice must be replaced if we want to move from penitence to love. . . . [The Communion table] is a place where we find ourselves; a place where we are assured that we are indeed worthy of being loved. It is a special place—and will remain special no matter how many times we come here."

Heather Murray Elkins, "Genesis of Sacrament." "Remember your baptism." How do we immerse our students and through them the wider communities of faith in transformative narratives and rituals? How does this active remembrance restore missing connections to the Christian community? Elkins' presentation addressed these questions through three narrative lectures that traced the baptismal identity of those whose lives are connected by water rites to our own. Her thesis was that this communal "telling" of a sacrament enables us to resist being dismembered, stripped of identity as humans born of water and Word. We bear the mark of discipleship, a baptismal integrity of body, spirit, and community. This narrative sustains the knowledge we live out our ministries as the baptized, in life, in struggle, in death, and in the life to come.

Other Work and Plans for Future

Susan Roll reported on the implementation and reception of the new Roman Missal, pointing out that the new language elevates the role of the priest; emphasizes the unworthiness of the faithful; and blurs the distinction between the use of the word "man" to mean generic humanity and its specific meaning of adult, male humans. Since it has been only a few weeks since the implementation of the new texts, it is too soon to tell whether initial resistance found in some congregations will continue.

Sylvia Sweeney reported on a project from Bloy House, the Episcopal Theological School at Claremont, titled, "Claiming the Vision: Baptismal Identity in the Episcopal Church" and led a discussion on the connection between baptismal identity and ordination. She asked what a church with ordained clergy, but without clericalism, might look like; and, if one is still struggling to have clergy women accepted in one's church, can one be about the work of deconstructing clericalism at the same time, or are these necessarily sequential steps.

Martha Ann Kirk shared stories of reconciliation in Iraq. She interviewed more than 140 people associated with schools inspired by the Turkish Muslim Fethullah Gülen, who emphasizes reconciliation, respect for diversity, justice, charity, and peace. Persons speaking Kurdish, Turkmen, Arabic, and Syriani who had often been separated are learning to work together. The stories give glimpses of hope, forgiveness, and a better future.

Janet Walton led a discussion about understanding authority, power, and agency in congregational worship in ways that honor each person and help them to know God as all-inclusive relatedness. Positing that when we honor each person's worth, then we are worshipping God, she asked how it might be possible to have worshipping congregations in which we expect each person to claim his or her own agency. How do we refresh the understanding of authority? How do we become human together?

Ruth Duck presented a project by one of her Korean students, who suggests adapting the rite of reaffirmation of baptism to address *han*, the shame connected with sin done to, rather than by, an individual. Focusing on the story of a member of a group of ethnic Koreans who do not have citizenship in either Russia (where they live) or Korea, the student draws on Andrew Sung Park's work to speak of how our rituals must release *han* as well as addressing sin. As part of her project, she designed a baptismal reaffirmation ritual that included some Korean cultural elements as a way to help to establish a sense of belonging and human dignity.

Martha McAfee led a discussion on creating rituals for women as they heal from PTSD resulting from domestic violence, childhood sexual abuse, or rape. Women in support groups naturally create leave-taking rituals when one of their number exits the group in order to relocate geographically. It is more difficult to finding ways ritually to release someone from a support group when she has healed enough that she no longer needs that kind of support.

Susan Roll retold the story of the sixty wounded and fourteen women killed at the Montreal École Polytechnique on 6 December 1989, and HyeRan Kim-Cragg led a closing ritual in their memory.

Since several of the presentations and papers seemed to revolve around the connection between baptism and the frequently-encountered desire to remove the "stain" of being sinned against, we plan to devote a significant block of time at our next meeting to explore this issue further.

Formation for Liturgical Prayer

Convener: Anne C. McGuire, Ph.D. (*director of programs and ministries, Maria Stein Shrine of the Holy Relics, Maria Stein, Ohio*)

Seminar Participants: Gaëtan Baillargeon; Simone Brosig; Jerry Chinchar, SM; Joseph Dougherty, FSC; Ken Hannon, OMI; Paul Janowiak, SJ; Anne C. McGuire; Roc O'Connor, SJ; Michael Prendergast; Joyce Ann Zimmerman, C.PP.S.

Visitor: Hans Christoffersen

Description of Work

The seminar focused on how well we have implemented the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* (CSL) as we approach its fiftieth anniversary in 2013. There is a renewed interest in the basic thrust of CSL as underpinning the formative nature of liturgical prayer, and in both evaluating how we have accomplished the initial understanding of the goals of CSL and in reframing those goals in light of all we have learned over the past five decades.

The seminar began with a discussion of Ladislas Orsy's *Receiving the Council: Theological and Canonical Insights and Debates* (Liturgical Press, 2009). The seminar members had a particular interest in how well Orsy wove *communio* and liturgy together. The organic development of liturgical renewal, pastoral sensitivity to the entire *communio*, and incorporating Orsy's theological method rooted in the working of the Spirit prepared the members for our continued discussions and work.

Papers and Presentations

Bill Johnston joined the seminar to present "Pope Benedict XVI: Friend or Foe of the Liturgical Reform?" A lively discussion on Pope Benedict's teachings and liturgical practice followed. Bill gave a few hermeneutical guidelines for "reading" Joseph Ratzinger, in particular noting that the many negatives regarding liturgy that

are highlighted in his writings are not always present as he celebrates the liturgy. The discussion, including both critiques and praises, demonstrated the complexity of the pope and his own teachings and reception of the liturgy of Vatican II.

The discussions rooted in Vatican II continued with Joyce Ann Zimmerman, C.PP.S., who presented a framework for reexamining the vision of CSL. Two questions framed the discussion: How far have we come? and Where do we still need to go? Joyce Ann drew from the document, particularly from the introductory paragraphs, those emphases that have grounded liturgical reform for the last fifty years, and then challenged those very emphases by expanding or approaching them from new perspectives. Part of the discussion focused on the presence of Christ in the liturgy as articulated in no. 7, with the challenge to remember that Christ is present in more ways than those four. The role of the Spirit, Eucharist as a sign of unity, opening the fullness of "participation," and the renewal of the liturgy as an unending task again drove home the need for continued reexamination of the constitution and deepening of the spirit that enlivened both the council and the subsequent liturgical reforms.

Joe Dougherty, Gaëtan Baillargeon, and Roc O'Connor gave updates of liturgical work with which they had each been involved over the last few years. The Philadelphia Liturgical Institute, of which Joe is a part, has had several projects that have been successful, rooted in a vision to equip and energize the people of God through quality worship. Roc reflected on "Participation: Connecting Liturgy and Mission" as raising a new sense of *missio* as *martyria* and incarnational. Formation in the French sector of the Canadian Catholic Church has been a focus since 2003, when the forty-ninth anniversary of CSL was remembered. The positive outcomes of the work of formation, along with some of the challenges, were highlighted by Gaëtan.

The remainder of the time was spent with the seminar's ongoing project on liturgical catechesis. After reviewing what has been completed in Cycle B, and what is expected to be turned in and reviewed in Cycle C, we spent quite a bit of time determining the best avenue for publishing our work. The Federation of Diocesan Liturgical Commissions (FDLC) has agreed to make the project available through their website. The project will provide weekly Sunday liturgical and homiletic tools to connect the emphasis in the readings with specific parts of the liturgy—taken from the richness found in prayer texts, music, environment, liturgical action. It was determined that we need to solidify Cycles B and C, since not all assigned work has been completed. The plan is to complete the work on all three cycles by fall 2012.

Historical Research: 16th Century to the Present

Convener: Jim Turrell (*associate professor of liturgy, School of Theology, University of the South, Sewanee, Tennessee*).

Seminar Participants: J. Neil Alexander, Rychie Bridenstein, Kent Burreson, Martin Connell, Arlo Duba, Kevin Moroney, Jonathan Riches, Kyle Schiefelbein, Beth Spaulding, Jim Turrell

Visitors: Sarah Blair, Glen Segger

Description of Work

The seminar discussed several papers presented by members and heard oral reports of work in progress. In addition, the seminar discussed Nicholas M. Beasley, *Christian Ritual and the Creation of British Slave Societies, 1650–1780* (Athens, GA: Univ. of Georgia Press, 2009).

Papers and Presentations

Kyle Schiefelbein, "The Concept of 'Worship' in the Reformation." Schiefelbein offered a brief survey of the concept of worship in the writings of Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin.

Kent Burreson and Jonathan Riches, "A Comparison of the Eucharistic Liturgy and Doctrine of the Lutheran Church Missouri Synod and the Reformed Episcopal Church." Burreson and Riches discussed their project, which emerges in the context of ecumenical dialogue between the REC and the LCMS.

Kevin J. Moroney, "Rudolf Otto and Art and Architecture." Moroney presented a paper on Rudolf Otto's concept of the numinous in relation to liturgical art and architecture.

Martin Connell, "Chronometry Chasm of the Late Sixteenth-Century Church: Elizabeth, Gregory XIII, and Will." Connell discussed the resistance of the English authorities to the reforms of the calendar by Pope Gregory XIII, a resistance

animated by virulent anti-Catholicism, even as they recognized that the Gregorian calendar was more accurate than their own (Julian) calendar. The absurdity of the situation appears to have been wryly noted by Shakespeare in his play *Julius Caesar*.

Jonathan Riches, "*Lex Orandi, Lex Credendi, Lex Vivendi*." Riches shared two dissertation chapters and discussed his project, which examines the interplay of worship and doctrine in cultural context.

Issues in Medieval Liturgy

Convener: Susan Boynton (associate professor, Columbia University)

Seminar Participants: Susan Boynton, Michael Driscoll, James Hentges, David Holeton, Peter Jeffery, Heather Josselyn-Cranson, Gary Macy**,** Keith Pecklers, Joanne Pierce, Anthony Ruff, Richard Rutherford, Michael Witczak

Visitors: Simone Brosig, Michael Curschmann, Julian Hendrix, Andrew Irving, Daniel Merz, Janet Sorrentino, Steven Vanderputten

Papers and Presentations

Steven Vanderputten, "Abbatial Obedience, Liturgical Reform, and the Threat of Monastic Autonomy at the Turn of the Twelfth Century." The introduction of the written promise of obedience made by abbots to the local bishop, as recorded in liturgical manuals of the late twelfth century, was the result of a process that had begun at least a century earlier. By looking at an exceptional set of liturgical and archival sources from the Northern French bishopric of Arras and putting them in their canonical, liturgical, and political contexts, Vanderputten demonstrated how reformist bishops of the late eleventh and early twelfth century experimented with a ritual repertoire that included references—be they intended or inferred—to secular homage.

Michael Curschmann, "Integrating Anselm." In the manuscript Admont 289 (twelfth century, second quarter), Anselm of Canterbury's *Orationes sive meditationes* are accompanied by a picture program that reflects a deliberate process of creative adaptation. It depicts the metaphorical transfer of a text dedicated originally to a noble laywoman, the Countess Matilda of Tuscany, to a (yet unidentified) Austrian convent of Benedictine nuns. Through iconographic choices and numerous inscribed quotations accompanied by musical notation, it showcases the liturgy as the primary vehicle of devotion for this community.

Peter Jeffery, "The Roman Liturgical Year and the Early Liturgy of St. Peter's." An early state of the liturgical year, divided into four seasons and centered on St. Peter's Basilica, seems to underlie the arrangement of readings in *Ordo Romanus* (*OR)* XIV, *OR* XVI, and the newly identified *OR* XIVB*, representing the period when the great Roman basilicas were staffed by monastic communities, and when St. Peter's seems to have been something of a model for the other churches of the city.

Gary Macy undertook an analysis of the surviving rites for the ordination of women deacons in the West, comparing them to the surviving rites for male deacons. The rites for women were found to have many similar elements, including the bestowal of a stole. The same rites, however, included elements from the veiling of a widow that are not found in the rites for males.

Janet Sorrentino, "Coordinating Customary with Ordinal in the Gilbertine Liturgy." Both the Ecclesiastical Offices and the Institutes of the Order of Sempringham contain liturgical material important for the order's history. Comparing the seasonal schedule for performing the Office of the Dead in both manuscripts seems to date passages in the ordinal to the thirteenth century. The presence of incipits for the Rule of St. Augustine (read during the chapter office) identifies it as the Rule used by the order.

Andrew Irving, "*Parvulam, sed competentem plane*: The Spatial Contexts of Gospel Books at Montecassino." Asking "What can the history of spatial contexts tell us about medieval liturgical books?" Irving explored how features peculiar to the Cassinese environment (such as vulnerability to storms, seismic activity, and attacks), and alterations to the architectural spaces and the furnishings may have had an impact on the books' condition and use.

Julian Hendrix, "The Early History of the Office of the Dead." This paper reassessed the early history of the Office of the Dead in light of the evidence from three rediscovered sources from the eleventh century and earlier. Although responsories for the Office of the Dead vary according to location in the central and late medieval witnesses, she argued that prior to the eleventh century a range of other factors are just as, if not more, important than location in shaping the development of the Office of the Dead.

Mike Witczak and Dan Merz shared some pages of the rough text of their edition of the fourth and last in a series on the order of the Latin Mass as contained in manuscripts in the Stiftsbibliothek St. Gallen. The introduction will highlight the different context for Sangall. 354, which includes the order of Mass with a series of benedictions (as opposed to being bound between a Gradual and Sacramentary as the other three were).

Richard Rutherford presented his work in progress on a baptistery in Mazotos, Cyprus, with a well-preserved piscina, recently rescued from bulldozers. Potentially an annex to a larger early Byzantine basilica, it appears unique in Cyprus. None of the other excavated baptisteries on the island follow this precise architectural pattern, similar to episcopal sees elsewhere in the Eastern Mediterranean. He seeks to compare Mazotos with other early Christian settlements along the south coast of the island, particularly in view of relationships with the Egyptian church.

Liturgical Hermeneutics

Convener: Ron Anderson (*Styberg Professor of Worship, Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary, Evanston, Illinois)*

Seminar Participants: Ron Anderson, Michelle Baker-Wright, Brian Butcher, Ninna Edgardh, Ed Foley, Walter Knowles, Jennifer Lord, James O'Regan, Gil Ostdiek, Melinda Quivik, Mark Wedig

Visitors: Samuel Barth, Irma Fust Dureck, Joris Geldhof, Aaron Panken, David Pereyra, Mark Stanger

Description of Work

The seminar discussed Robert Neville's *The Truth of Broken Symbols* (SUNY, 1996) as part of its continued discussion of Peircean semiotics as a resource in our work. Ron Anderson and Brian Butcher offered prepared responses. Joris Geldhof presented "Hermeneutics and Metaphysics in Liturgical Theology," an expansion of his discussion concerning the intersection of postmodern thought/postmodernism, metaphysics, and baptism in a paper he had presented at the 2012 congress of *Societas Liturgica*. Walter Knowles and Ed Foley provided brief responses to his presentation. Ninna Edgardh presented an overview of her work tracing forty years of liturgical development in the Church of Sweden (currently only available in Swedish: *Gudstjänst i tiden. Gudstjänstliv i Svenska kyrkan 1968–2008* [Worship in Time: Worship Life in the Church of Sweden 1968–2008]). Walter Knowles provided a paper surveying the historical (or, more accurately, ahistorical) sources of the *theologia prima/secunda* distinction in liturgical theology. Both Melinda Quivik and Jennifer Lord presented work in progress, seeking conversation and feedback from the seminar. Quivik's paper focused on the ways in which we engage space as a theological act. Lord's paper focused on the development of a liturgical hermeneutic for preaching.

Plans for Future

At the 2013 meeting we intend to continue our conversation with Neville's *The Truth of Broken Symbols*, especially the second half of the book, and to begin a conversation with Daniel Levitin's *This Is Your Brain on Music* (Dutton, 2006; Plume/Penguin, 2007). Members and visitors are encouraged to read both in the coming year.

Liturgical Language

Convener: J. Barrington Bates (*interim rector, Grace Church Van Vorst, Jersey City, New Jersey*)

Seminar Participants: David Gambrell, Gail Ramshaw, Martin Seltz, Nancy Hale, Barrie Bates, Patrick Evans, Chip Andrus, Bob Farlee

Visitors: Allison Werner Hoenen

Papers and Presentations

Brian Wren, *in absentia*: Discussion of textual revision in new hymnals, based on shared reading of "'To Me, to All, Thy Bowels Move': Why Do They Keep Changing the Good Old Hymns?" from his *Praying Twice* (Westminster John Knox, 2000).

David Gambrell, "Common Worship in the Next Presbyterian Hymnal." Liturgical texts and rites (Service for the Lord's Day, Baptism, and Daily Prayer) for the forthcoming hymnal *Glory to God,* of the Presbyterian Church USA.

Gail Ramshaw, "Mortality, Injustice, Disease, Meaninglessness: Texts for Confessing More than Sin." Discussion of a series of originally composed laments on meaningless, dread of death, injustice, disease, and sin.

Martin Seltz: Recently created confession/forgiveness texts within the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America that attempt to incorporate a broader understanding of "captivity to sin" beyond personal iniquity.

Kim Long, *in absentia:* Presentation on her work for a forthcoming liturgical companion to the *Feasting on the Word* commentary series from Westminster John Knox Press. Discussion of theological questions arising from creating such an ecumenical resource.

Robert Farlee: Discussion on good and bad liturgical language and authenticity based on a brief quote of Chris Abani (b. 1966).

Allison Werner Hoenen, "How Do We Renew Language for Worship?" based on her doctoral work at the Friedrich-Alexander-University of Erlangen-Nuremberg, Germany, and for the Gottesdienst Institut of the Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirche in Bayern (ELKB/ Evangelical Lutheran Church of Bavaria), of which she is a pastor.

J. Barrington Bates, "On the Search for the Authentic Liturgy of the Apostles: The Early Church as Normative for Anglicans." Discussion of the recent phenomenon of liturgical nostalgia, debunking the notions of a supposedly "authentic" past, the simplicity of liturgy in apostolic times, and the "one root, many branches" theory of liturgical development.

Nancy Hale, "A Sacramental Ecclesiology of Disability," with discussion of metaphors of disability, preliminary work at the Boston University School of Theology. Disability issues must go beyond building ramps and planning accessible ministries. Bringing theories about disability into conversation with ecclesiology can help the church reconceptualize its nature, its mission, and its relationship with the world. And by characterizing the church as the Body of Christ, as a disabled body, we can confront aspects of ecclesiology that are oppressive to the church's ability to function both within itself and in its relation to God and to the world.

Plans for the Future

Under consideration for 2013, papers on and discussion of: liturgical language and technology (PowerPoint, text messaging, social media, etc.); open source liturgy; collaboratively constructed texts vs. individual artistry; texts for pilgrimage; possible collaborative work with another seminar group.

Liturgical Music

Convener: Alan J. Hommerding (*senior liturgy publications editor, World Library Publications*)

Seminar Participants: Anthony Ruff, Scott Weidler, Carol Doran, Heather Josselyn-Cranson, Steve Janco, Ken Hull, Alan Hommerding, Emily Brink, Jason McFarland, James Ross, Virgil Funk, Cynthia Wilson, Fred Graham

Visitors: Carl Bear, Nicholas Zork, Kim Harris

Papers and Presentations

Steven Janco, "A Composer's Perspective on Writing Music for a New Mass Translation." Steve presented a variety of his Mass settings, including samples of older settings that had been revised to accommodate a new Mass translation as well as new settings written expressly for the new translation. He gave practical illustrations of changes of rhythm and larger structure necessitated by the new texts.

Carl F. Bear, "Sacred Harp Singing as Liturgy." The gatherings known as "Sacred Harp Sings" are not intentionally meant to be worship services, but the ways in which their structures and the nature of their communities function do manifest aspects of ritual and denominational liturgy. Carl Bear's methodology took as its starting point Mary McGann's *Exploring Music as Worship and Theology* (Liturgical Press, 2002).

Virgil C. Funk, "Musical Boundaries and Their Gatekeepers—Why They Are Changing." A sociological approach to both the use of music in worship and the way in which that music is chosen (and by whom) was the focus of this paper. In particular, Funk offered the influence of growing technologies (downloads, YouTube, church websites) as a driving force behind the increasing diversity of liturgical music known by or accessible to church members, and how this force is influencing, particularly according to categories of taste, the role of music in corporate worship.

Jason McFarland, "Mass Antiphons and the Dialectic of Liturgical Genre and Translation." McFarland gave a brief presentation on the history of the texts for the entrance antiphon of the Roman Rite liturgy, followed by a more thorough consideration of the most recent translation of Roman Missal antiphons following the principles of the liturgical translation document *Liturgiam Authenticam*. He gave several examples of recent translations that moved the text further away from its function of introducing the liturgy of the day.

Heather Josselyn, "The Reason Why We Sing: Musical Function in Worship." Josselyn looked at the place of music in the corporate prayer or worship of different denominations, as well as its specific functions (uniting an assembly, responding to God's Word), as well as examples of the ways in which different traditions will identify particular pieces of music in their ritual contexts.

Other Work and Plans for the Future

Emily Brink presented a new resource, *Psalms for All Seasons*. This new musical resource—a joint product of the Christian Reformed Church and the American Reformed Church—was given out to music seminar members. Brink offered the history of psalm singing in Reformed worship, as well as the various considerations behind the selection process for this new resource. The issues of diversity both in genre and musical style were focused upon. The seminar also got to sing a number of selections from the new resource.

For the Albuquerque 2013 meeting, the seminar hopes to have a guest speaker or pursue a field trip opportunity that will relate to the issue of musical inculturation.

Liturgical Theology

Convener: Judith M. Kubicki (a*ssociate professor of theology, Fordham University, New York*)

Seminar Participants: Lorraine Brugh, Timothy Brunk, Doris Donnelly, Irma F. Dueck, Nina Edgardh, Deborah L. Gewere, Melissa Hartley, Todd E. Johnson, William H. Johnston, Gordon Lathrop, Jack McKenna, Martha Moore-Keish, Judith M. Kubicki, Neal Presa, Ann Riggs, Melanie Ross, Don E. Saliers, Philip Sandstrom, Rhoda Schuler, Louis Weil, Andrew Wright

Visitors: Joris Geldhof, Jathan Jennings, Hyung Rak Kim, Robert Küernyek, Matthew L. Pierce, Jan Rippentrop, Jette Roenkilde, Mark Lloyd Taylor, Tom Trinidad

Description of Work

In preparation for the meeting, seminar participants were asked to read *What Is Liturgy: Musings and Memoir* by Anscar Cupungco (Liturgical Press, 2010). Lorraine Brugh and Neal Presa served as respondents to the book. In her response, Brugh briefly summarized each chapter. She also noted that while Chupungco's expertise is in the area of liturgical inculturation, he does not spend as much time on that topic. However, he does spend a considerable amount of time on liturgical language, emphasizing that translations need to be contextualized with each audience. The second respondent, Neal Presa, engaged the question that Chupungco set out to answer: "What, then, is liturgy?" In addition, Presa reported on a telephone conversation he had with Chupungo shortly before the meeting. Chupungco's responses further illuminated and primed the discussion that followed.

Papers and Presentations

Nathan Jennings presented "Divine Economy, Divine Liturgy: Liturgical Theology as a Retrieval of Figural Interpretation." He argued that liturgical theology

could be construed as a part of the general postcritical retrieval of traditional modes of exegesis. The paper generated lively discussion that included both general appreciation and several important points of criticism, including the following: doubts concerning the relative importance or weight of what Jennings called the "temple-mythos" of the Old Testament, the danger of slipping into a facile use of analogy, concern that typology is inherently "Platonist," the relationship of the project to critical biblical scholarship, and the need to make explicit the project's theory of history.

In "Participation in the Heavenly Liturgy: Theological Reflections on a Liturgical Theme, with a Pastoral Coda," William H. Johnston first reviewed selected relevant biblical passages and then explored the topic via four questions: How does the earthly liturgy function as an "open door" to the heavenly? What *is* the heavenly liturgy? How is it perceived and participated in? And what difference does this make—the pastoral coda (addressing justice and human dignity and music in the liturgy). Johnston also suggested that while the twentieth-century liturgical movement pursued "active participation" as its guiding goal, the twenty-first century liturgical movement might be equally zealous to foster "our participation in the heavenly liturgy"?

The seminar also discussed the first chapter of the just-published book by Gordon Lathrop, *The Four Gospels on Sunday* (Augsburg Fortress, 2011). That chapter proposes the ways in which the gospels of the New Testament are "mutually coherent" with the Christian assemblies of the late first and early second centuries of our era, including the idea of "assembly" within their purview and, in differing ways, being addressed to those assemblies within issues of communal reform as one of the concerns of the books. The gospels might thus be considered early examples of liturgical theology.

Melanie Ross presented background and a brief summary of her paper, "Evangelical vs. Liturgical? Lessons from Biblical Studies." Using the "well curve" notion introduced by Daniel Pink, Ross offered a fresh point of view on the notion of *ordo* in evangelical worship. She concluded that evangelical and liturgical Christianity are two faithful ways of embodying the shared confession of faith and that the discipline of liturgical studies ought to embrace a "both-and" approach to these different expressions of worship.

Andrew Wright offered a "work in progress" for the seminar's review and feedback. It represented a draft of a chapter of his dissertation that focuses on the difficulties of the term "real presence" as it has been used over the centuries to describe the presence of Christ in the Eucharist. Wright offers an alternate conceptual framework for the Eucharistic encounter with Christ using the concept of Eucharistic intimacy. His working title is "Eucharistic Intimacy and Real Presence: Enacting the Kingdom."

At the conclusion of the meeting, Timothy Brunk agreed to take leadership of the seminar for the next few years. Suggestions for next year's meeting, still to be confirmed, included reading Regina Schwartz's *Sacramental Poetics at the Dawn of Secularism: When God Left the World* (Stanford, 2008) and potential papers by Don Saliers, Timothy Brunk, and Todd Johnson.

Liturgy and Culture

Convener: Joseph A. Donnella (*chaplain of the college; adjunct associate professor, religious studies, Gettysburg College, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania*)

Seminar Participants: Stephen Burns, Bill Burke, Joseph Donnella, Mark Francis, Bernadette Gasslein, Paul Huh, Troy Messenger, Ruth Meyers, Katharine Harmon, Hyuk Seonwoo

Visitors: Kim Harris, Ricky Klee, Sebastian Madathummuriyil, Matthew Pierce, Rémi LePage, Willy MaCarcher

Papers and Presentations

We began with a discussion of the relationship between technology and authentic spiritual practices and liturgy. The work of Richard Gaillardetz, *Transforming Our Days: Finding God Amid the Noise of Modern Life* (Liguori, 2007) provided both insight and grounding for our discussion. As we considered the manner in which technology now shapes and governs the interactions and circumstances of daily existence, we were also led to more meaningful ways to incorporate technology as a tool for recovery of grace-filled human lifestyles.

Stephen Burns then launched us into the interweaving of the pattern of worship and traditional ecological consideration in Australia's worship resource *Uniting in Worship 2*. This 2005 publication has much to commend it, as it grapples with expansive language, Aboriginal and Asian cultural understandings, maintaining the *ordo* while experiencing cultural fragmentation.

Paul Huh then moved us to Korea, sharing developments from his opus on Korean (Protestant) worship based on the 1996 Nairobi Statement on worship and culture. Paying close attention to Korean appropriations of bathing, washing, meal practices, and the cult of ancestors, this work should add to intensified dialogue on inculturation.

Sebastian Madathummuriyil then took us to India by providing us with a historical overview of the issue of inculturation within India. He explored seventeenth-century initiatives; the climate after independence and prior to Vatican II; points of adaptations, including use of *arati,* postures, gestures, and bodily actions. Discussion of s*affronization* led us into asking why inculturation in India seems to be at a standstill.

Troy Messenger and Kim Harris then vibrantly led us to the liturgy of the street. Using the Occupy Wall Street movement as a basis, we were asked to explore the characteristics and rituals of protest, claiming presence, using permeable space, amplification, and what it means to have a vision, shared communal life, and assembly in the public square. What fires and claims our hearts?

Hyuk Seenwoo had us put liturgy into action as he explored with us the rhythms of tai chi and the corollaries between this rhythm and worship in the search of Christian unity. Having the group engage in the bodily actions of *Tai Chi* gave experiential impetus to understanding the *ordo* through Asian communal practice.

Ruth Meyers shared insights and developments from her continuing work on a book connecting missional identity and understanding with worship. She shared chapter titles and the current state of the work.

Ricky Klee presented a draft of his work comparing insights and interpretations of Gustavo Guttiérez and Joseph Ratzinger. Differences between Guttiérez and Ratzinger regarding the significance of the incarnation and life experiences led to an animated and lively discussion. Baptism, the Gospel's stated preferential option for the poor, and questions about the significance of Eucharist in base communities were considered.

Plans for Future

As we look to Alburquerque in 2013, the seminar desires to share part of its time with the Christian Initiation seminar, exploring the relationship between catechesis and marketing as we look to understand the increasing commercialization and consumerism that holds much of our world captive.

Liturgy and Spirituality

Convener: Diane Stephens (*spiritual director, affiliate faculty at Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary, and consultant in spiritual formation*)

Seminar Participants: Willy Malarcher, Betty Lynn Schwab, Diane Stephens

Visitors: Brad Berglund, Jennifer Davidson, Heidi Miller

Papers and Presentations

In "Liturgy and Spirituality: The Odd Couple?" Betty Lynn Schwab discussed how and why liturgy and spirituality seem separate and often at odds, and wondered if reconciliation in the near future is possible. Schwab reviewed several models for how liturgy and spirituality might relate and intertwine, concluding that "liturgy must be grounded in spirituality and spirituality must be grounded in liturgy and both must be grounded in daily human life." Similarly, "the heart of liturgy then is the heart of God which is the heart of spirituality which in turn is the heart of humankind."

Willy Malarcher presented "Change in the Climate of Worship," noting that design of worship space is intended to support the human climate and vision of the community. As worship has become more participatory in recent history, particularly since 1970, seating patterns in sanctuaries have changed. Sight lines, direction of seats (e.g., all in one direction, in the round, fan shape), number and location of aisles, accessibility, and graduated elevation of seats are indicators of the climate of the gathered community's participation.

In "Constructing Theologies of Prayer in the Midst of Worship," Jennifer Davidson presented an overview, along with interview highlights and insights, from her study of a Pennsylvania congregation's practice of sharing "concerns and celebrations" as a pastoral prayer form during worship. Davidson noted how church members understand the practice in constructing new images of God, disrupting confining/childhood images of God, being attentive and knowing when to speak,

requesting intercessions and petitions, and claiming the rights and responsibilities of belonging to a community of faith.

Plans for Future

"Beauty, Mess, and Experience: Reconciling 'Liturgy and Spirituality'" will be our theme for 2013 as we seek to identify and clarify what makes spirituality essential to liturgy. We are particularly interested in exploring what contributes to a meaningful experience of worship; the role of vulnerability and trust; liturgy and spirituality legacies we have inherited; and how to advance spiritual literacy in the liturgy. Our time together will include discussion about spiritual direction as a resource for worship.

Problems in the Early History of Liturgy

Convener: Stephanie Perdew VanSlyke (senior pastor, First Congregational Church, UCC)

Seminar Members: Paul Bradshaw, Harald Buchinger, Glenn Byer, Ephrem Carr, Richard Fabian, Tom Fisch, Peter Galadza, Robin Jensen, Peter Jeffrey, Maxwell Johnson, Lizette Larson-Miller, Clemens Leonhard, Annie McGowan, Christian McConnell, David Pitt, Patrick Regan, Nicholas Russo, Robert Taft, Stephanie Perdew VanSlyke, Fritz West

Visitors: Daniel Galadza, Basilius Groen, Vassa Larin, Vitaly Permiakov, Jim Sabak

Papers and Presentations

Paul Bradshaw, "Women and Baptism in the *Didascalia Apostolorum*," briefly considered three issues: first, whether the preference for women deacons anointing female baptismal candidates was a later change from women in general performing this anointing; second, whether women were baptized naked or not; and third, whether the distinction between head and body anointing was only made at first in relation to female candidates.

Harald Buchinger offered a short paper on his current work on Pascha and Pentecost, discussing questions of origins and early development of the Easter cycle.

In "An Arian Holy Week? Well, at least not Manichaean . . . ," Richard Fabian asked: Can renewed Christian Holy Week observance possibly conserve a shadow inheritance of popular Arian piety? Though ancient Arian liturgical documents are lost now, both movements originated at once. Moreover, Holy Week differs oddly from other Christian and Jewish liturgy by employing *mimesis* above *anamnesis* for salvation memorials. Arianism's popular success was too vigorous to disappear without a trace. Indeed, modern liturgical renewal of Holy Week may be redoubling our Arian heritage today. Far from implying some purgation now, this likelihood

should open modern liturgists to share knowingly with faithful folk in other places and other eras as our religious peers.

Daniel Galadaza's paper, "Some Methodological Considerations Regarding Liturgy in Jerusalem after the Arab Conquest (638 CE)," considered that the identification of hagiopolite liturgical sources authentic to the period after the Arab conquest has concerned liturgical scholars for over a century. Using codicological and palaeographical approaches, closer examination of Greek, Syriac, Arabic, and Georgian liturgical manuscripts directly connected to the Jerusalem Patriarchate reveals the presence of pericopes of the Jerusalem lectionary in liturgical books of various types, which can be used as a liturgical criterion to determine the hagiopolite provenance of a liturgical book. The historical context in which these books were copied and used shows that previous attempts at liturgical periodization , study of liturgical development during the Studite-Sabaite synthesis, and the phenomenon of Jerusalem's liturgical "Byzantinization," need to be nuanced.

Robin M. Jensen's paper "Material and Documentary Evidence for Early Christian Baptismal Practice" responded to the recent book, *Baptism in the Early Church* (Eerdmans, 2009), in which Everett Ferguson provides an extensive survey of early documents pertaining to baptism. Ferguson offers an interpretation of the material evidence (especially fonts) to prove that baptism was universally (and normatively) accomplished by submersion of the both head and body. Reconsidering the depths and design of fonts, Jensen argued against any universal practice, particularly of submersion, and expanded the study to include the development of baptismal practices from outdoor to indoor venues and the long-standing practice of both infant and adult baptism from the third through seventh centuries. Archaeological and iconographic records are not easily deployed as proof of general adherence to any single practice or tradition and therefore are not, as such, easily adapted to contemporary arguments about a specific "right" place, way, or age at which to administer or receive the ritual.

Vassa Larin presented a paper entitled, "The Opening Formula of the Byzantine Divine Liturgy, 'Blessed is the Kingdom,' among Other Liturgical Beginnings." Larin explored various "beginnings" of liturgical celebrations found in liturgical sources from the first millennium, revealing the elements both common with, and different from, the present-day opening of the Byzantine Divine Liturgy.

Lizette Larson-Miller presented an outline for an upcoming article, "Plurality in All Things: Ritual as Care for the Sick and Dying."

Clemens Leonhard's paper "Morning Salutations and the End of Sympotic Eucharists," explored the way the texts of the medieval mass refer to Jesus's Last Supper as its antecedent, model, and source of dignity and legitimation. Based on a reconstruction of the Last Supper according to the New Testament as a formal meal and the observation of the shape of the combination of a liturgy of the word with the celebration of the Eucharist, one can look for the missing link between these two highly different clusters of ritualized acts. This essay suggests considering the Roman morning *salutatio* as a background for this transition.

Jim Sabak presented a paper "A Postscript to a Postscript on the Embertide Vigils in Roman Practice."

Robert Taft's paper, entitled "Were There Once Old Testament Readings in the Byzantine Divine Liturgy? Apropos of an Article by Sysse Gudrun Engberg," [BBGG series 3, 3 (2006): 67–92], indicts Engberg's article for severe defects of tone, method, and argumentation. Engberg begins backwards, stating first her preconceived conclusion, then treating dismissively all evidence to the contrary. A proper use of the extensive evidence shows that throughout the entire area of the original Patriarchate of Antioch from which the liturgy of Byzantium-become-Constantinople derives, the evidence for Old Testament lections in the Eucharist is massive. So Byzantine liturgiololgists ask whether the same might not have been true of Byzantine usage because the question was staring them in the face. An unbiased look at that evidence supports a positive answer to that question.

Patrick Regan offered a report on "The Easter Season in Ancient Roman Liturgical Books." In the earliest Roman liturgical books of the seventh and eighth centuries, the original fifty-day Pentecost is already reduced to Easter Week, called *White Week* not *Octave*. Sundays following this week are Sundays after the Close of Easter. Proper Masses for each day of White Week binds it to the forty days of Lent but reveals Ascension and Pentecost and its Octave as independent feasts unconnected to each other, Easter Sunday, or the Easter season.

Nicholas Russo offered a report on the dating of Cyril of Jerusalem's baptismal catecheses.

Fritz West reported that his work on a biography of Anton Baumstark led him to the papers of Hieronymus Engberding (1899–1969), which he intentionally organized and left for perusal. Since the organization Engberding gave these papers has been lost over time, West organized and catalogued them for easier use. Papers of particular interest relate to the Eucharistic Prayer of Basil and "particles" of liturgical speech (acclamations, doxologies, etc.).

Queering Liturgy

Convener: W. Scott Haldeman (*associate professor of worship, Chicago Theological Seminary*)

Seminar Participants: Susan Blain, Sharon Fennema, Scott Haldeman, Don LaSalle

Visitors: Stephen Burns

Description of Work

In 2012, the queering liturgy seminar convened Friday at breakfast time, Saturday at lunch, and Sunday when all else was concluded. This alternative schedule allows for the participation of members who have commitments to other seminars and benefits the academy because we do not need a room designated for our use.

On Friday, we discussed Patrick Cheng's *Radical Love: An Introduction to Queer Theology* (Seabury, 2011). Scott Haldeman provided a brief introduction to (and assessment of) the book, and Stephen Burns led us in discussion of possible implications of Cheng's work for liturgical studies. During our conversation, we concluded that there is a need for an introduction to "queer liturgy" and that we may be the group to produce it. Four of us committed to draft short descriptions of the shape of such a book for further discussion as we contemplate the viability of this joint project and begin to identify potential contributors.

On Saturday, we continued our discussion of Sharon Fennema's dissertation that we had begun last year. Then, we looked at her methodology chapter. Now that Sharon has both completed and successfully defended the thesis, we looked at her narrative chapter on the worship life of the Metropolitan Community Church of San Francisco (MCCSF) and her analytical concluding chapter. Two major themes structure the final chapter: the concepts of "relational solidarity" and "liturgical simultaneity." The former serves as a description of the experience of God of those suffering disease, those dying and those grieving while burying hundreds of

dying brothers and sisters. A central claim of the leaders and members of MCCSF (and elsewhere) was that, in fact, the Body of Christ has AIDS. AIDS is not apart from the Body of Chirst. This assertion goes beyond a sense of chronological juxtaposition in the *ordo* so well described by Gordon Lathrop, pointing to the way, in this community at least, that expressions of need and hope, grief and joy, healing and suffering, intimacy and transcendence all happen at the same time. Sharon is looking forward to publication of her dissertation in book form. The working title is *"Falling All around Me": Worship Performing Theodicy in the Midst of San Francisco's AIDS Crisis.*

On Sunday we considered what it means to pray in a queer mode. Sharon and Scott brought prayer texts that they had written, as well as one by a student of Sharon's. Tentatively and preliminarily, we propose that praying queerly involves:

1. Naming explicitly the range of experiences in life, love, faith, and doubt among LGBTQ folk;
2. A hermeneutics of recovery to tap neglected metaphors in both Scripture and tradition;
3. "Replication with critical difference" (as Elizabeth Stuart would put it) in which traditional forms yield new images—sometimes subtly, sometimes outrageously;
4. Coded language—modes of expression that mean one thing in mainstream society but something quite different, perhaps subversive or "parodic," to queer ears.

We will continue to test and revise this list in future work, both together and individually.

Plans for Future

Tentative plans for next year include: (a) discussion of the sacred music of LGBTQ folk—both what is currently sung and what might still need to be written; (b) discussion of Susannah Cornwall's *Controversies in Queer Theology* (SCM Press, 2011) and/or Mark Jordan's *Recruiting Young Love* (University of Chicago, 2011) that we would read in common and, as with Cheng's work, look for implications for queer ritualizing; and (c) as we will be in Albuquerque, to consider the intersection of heterosexism and racism. We will continue to meet outside of the regular seminar schedule so that participants in our conversations can also be involved in the work of other seminars. The seminar is discussing the viability of producing a volume of essays on "queering liturgy."

Ritual Theory and Performance

Convener: Tom Splain, SJ (*Kino Border Initiative, Nogales, Arizona*)

Members: David Hogue, Tom Splain

Visitors: Rémi Lepage, David Pereyra, Mark Stanger

Papers and Presentations

David Hogue presented "The Ritualizing Mind: Recent Evolutionary and Neuroscientific Insights into Doing Religion." Hogue pointed out that ritual practices constitute a central feature of religious traditions and that two discrete but related features of ritual are memory and attachment: remembering and relating to others. Here, ritual plays a significant role in encoding, retrieval, and consolidation. Ritual shapes memories in ways that narrative and language by themselves cannot. Ritual also bonds people. These processes are not unique to religious experience per se.

Meditation is a "top-down" practice within religious traditions. Images in the brain influence the brain and the body and proceed through the limbic system and the brain stem. Ritual is a "bottom-up" experience in which participants physically experience fast or slow rhythms that follow a path through the body to the higher cognitive functions. Much has to do with the function of the brain's left posterior superior parietal lobe, which is responsible for our sense of separation between self and others and constituting personal boundaries. During ritual and meditation, input into that area of the brain decreases, resulting in a breakdown of the sense of separation between self and others. Catherine Bell points out that ritualizations call attention to themselves as distinct from other human behaviors. This distinction gives ritual its power. Doing is more important than believing.

Memory

Memory relies on the brain's synaptic connections between neurons. When two neurons fire repeatedly, they increase the likelihood that they will fire again.

Memory is crucial to developing and maintaining a sense of self. There are different categories for memory: working memory (immediate), short-term memory, long-term memory, semantic memory (concepts and facts), procedural memory (skills and habits), and autobiographical memory. Personal identity relies on all of these.

Memory is not a template that is activated, but a reconstructive process. We never remember exactly the same event twice. At the moment of recall, the mind draws together visual and auditory memories to create the subjective experience of a seamless memory.

Wilder Penfield (1960) suggested that memories are never lost, but stored in perpetuity in the recesses of the brain. More recent research suggests that forgetting is, in fact, an adaptive response. Intentional recall and repetition of memories appear to be critical to their being maintained. The brain's ability to "re-wire" itself, to be reshaped by repeated practices (neuroplasticity), underscores the importance of ritual practices.

It seems likely that engaged ritual practice both encodes and recalls procedural, semantic, and autobiographical memory. In doing so, renewal of personal identity and corporate belonging are both maintained and, at least at times, made available for transformation.

In settings in which emotional arousal is increased (as in ritual), evidence suggests those events are recorded more reliably and with greater vividness than events experienced under neutral emotional stimulation. Such encoding has been called "flashbulb" memory.

When similar experiences are encountered frequently, the brain collapses multiple repetitions of events into a limited number of recollections, or into a single template for all such experiences. In this way, memories of regularly repeated events become part of semantic memory, and it becomes less likely that a single event will be recalled as such. Maintenance of communal memories is a central function of ritual. Rituals need to be distinguished from habit because ritual requires high cognitive input and attention to detail and is anything but automatic.

Attachment

"Emotional contagion" describes the global affective processes that shape the infant's early emotional life. This early emotional responsiveness serves as the foundation for more mature empathic competences, particularly as cognitive skills develop into adulthood. The caregiver strengthens and consolidates the child's awareness of his own feelings by amplifying them and by mirroring the child's feelings. She helps bring order to them but also helps make them a safe part of the child's emerging sense of self. This emerging capacity for "affect regulation" correlates with the very specific circuits in the right frontal lobe of the brain.

While correlations between attachment styles and ritual practices have yet to be fully developed, the link between the child's fear of separation and pleasure in reunion play a critically affective role and may well account for the "attachment-like" behavior that ritual embodies. The roots of faith may grow from the experience of separation as infants.

Visual Arts and Liturgy

Editor's Note: *This seminar did not meet in 2012.*

Word in Worship

Convener: Gennifer Brooks (*Ernest and Bernice Styberg Associate Professor of Homiletics, Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary*)

Seminar Participants: Gennifer Brooks, Brian Hartley, Nam Joong Kim, Timothy Leitzke, Jennifer Ollikainen, Timothy Ralston, Craig Satterlee

Visitors: Karla Bellinger, Michael Jordan, Stacy R. Minger, Michael Pasquarello

Description of Work

Continuation of the seminar project "Media and Preaching" involved presentation and review of eight papers and development of the process for its completion and publication. A new convener for the seminar was named.

Papers and Presentations

Media and Preaching

Timothy Ralston, "Imagination, Motivation, and Media." Included identification and connection of five types of audiences, based on H. L. Hollingsworth's grouping and determining the possible response of each to the use of media. Also included the connection between the preacher's imagination and the use of media in preaching and worship.

Brian T. Hartley, "Media, Mystery, and Audience Myths." Looked at myths associated with media use with respect to their impact on the life of the church in juxtaposition with the possibilities afforded by the appropriate use of electronic media.

Craig Satterlee, "What About People Who Cannot See the Screen?" Addressed the issue of persons who are excluded by the use of media because of their inability to see the screen and offered suggestions to make the use of media more inclusive to all members of the congregation.

Michael Pasquarello, "The Beauty of the Word: Media and Pastoral Ministry." Framed the theological underpinning that provides the foundation for the church's situation with respect to the use of media in worship and preaching. The paper identified some underlying issues that have led pastors to focus on the desire for technological responses to the issue of church decline.

Timothy Leitzke, "Media and the Disembodiment of the Preacher." Focused on the challenge of embodiment faced by the preacher when the use of technology subverts the event of preaching, in part by replacing physical presence with imagery.

Gennifer Brooks, "Socioeconomics and Media." Looked at the implications of economics on the selection and use of media in worship, particularly the advantages and disadvantages to the congregation by the addition of technology to the church.

Jennifer Ollikainen, "Technology in Worship: Building on a Solid Foundation." Named some of the issues that drive churches to the use of electronic media and discussed the appropriateness of such decisions based on goals of the church or pastor. Juxtaposed appropriate criteria for the choice of advanced communications technology.

Jennifer Lord, "The Creative Process in a Gadget World." Described a possible process by which pastors may approach the decision to use electronic media in worship and preaching. Called for both a top-down and a bottom-up approach to the issue in order to make a more informed decision.

Preaching and Media Use—Next Steps: Development of the timeline and procedures for finalizing the project. Decisions were made regarding the length of the text, the number of papers, the procedures for final editing and submission. The editing team is: Gennifer Brooks, Brian Hartley, and Tim Ralston.

Other Papers

Timothy Leitzke, "Bultmann: The 'How' of a Sermon." Part two of the second chapter of the dissertation, "Kerygma and Anarchy: Bultmann's Homiletic and Levinas' Ethic as Partners in a Postmodern Homiletical Theory," which argues that R. Bultmann offers much of value in a postmodern attempt to build a homiletic that is faithful to Augustine's famous demand that a sermon "increase love of God and love of neighbor." The author partners Bultmann with Jewish theologian E. Levinas.

Karla Bellinger, "Are You Talking to Me? Homiletic Take-Away as *Theologia Prima*." Based on focus groups of teenagers, the author looks at the question of what the connection with preaching means to the generation of young people who have grown up in a world that is so "connected."

Plans for the Future

Brian Hartley was selected as the new convener. The following agenda was created for the 2013 meeting with the following papers to be presented:

- Tim Leitzke: Final dissertation chapter on Bultmann and Levinas
- Nam Joong Kim: Dissertation chapter on preaching and social justice

- Karla Bellinger: Chapter from D.Min. thesis, "Are You Talking to Me? Homiletic Take-Away as *Theologia Prima*"
- Gennifer Brooks: Summary from new book, *Unexpected Grace: Preaching Good News from Difficult Texts*
- Mike Pasquarello: Summary from new book, *The Beauty of Preaching*

Select Seminar Papers

Part 3

Performing the Rite of Marriage: Agency, Identity, and Ideology

Bruce T. Morrill

Jesuit Father Bruce Morrill, the Edward A. Malloy Professor of Catholic Studies at Vanderbilt University Divinity School, has lectured widely in North America, Europe, and Australia and published scores of articles, chapters, and reviews, as well as a number of books, including the recent Encountering Christ in the Eucharist: The Paschal Mystery in Assembly, Word, and Sacrament *(Paulist Press, 2012).*

Theorizing Ritual: The Priority of Practice

Defining ritual—even delimiting the scope of its practices—has proven highly evasive and contested over the past few decades, no less than has the definition of religion among anthropologists for well more than a century. Current writings in ritual studies and performance theory bespeak the debates about religion that the nascent, then burgeoning, yet still methodologically eclectic discipline of anthropology has waged. The elusive phenomenon of religion has exerted no small measure of power over the best minds in their pursuits of functionalist, structuralist, processual, materialist, or other more recent emergent methodologies. Characteristic of current theories is the conceptual disentanglement of ritual from religion and, moreover, even in cases of religious ritual, rejection of the cross-disciplinary assumption that religion is primarily a matter of ideas, "meaning," for which ritual serves a merely expressive function.

In her widely read *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*, Catherine Bell summarized what theorists are arguing against as they press to make the particular activity of a given ritual understandable (to use a phrase more recently coined by Don Handelman[1]) *in its own right*:

> In sum, it is a major reversal of traditional theory to hypothesize that ritual activity is not the 'instrument' of more basic purposes, such as power, politics, or social control, which are usually seen as existing before or outside the activities of the rite. It puts interpretive analysis on a new footing to suggest that ritual practices are themselves the very

> production and negotiation of power relations. . . . In the . . . alternative position . . . ritualization as a strategic mode of practice produces nuanced relationships of power, relationships characterized by acceptance and resistance, negotiated appropriation, and redemptive reinterpretation of the hegemonic order.[2]

Evident in the continuing arguments over ritual among anthropologists and performance theorists (the latter comprising a still more eclectic [anti-] genre) is their almost urgent need to disassociate themselves from "religion" as ideological belief system in ways that strike me as reaching beyond the specific peoples and practices a particular researcher may be studying in a given case. Still, such efforts have yielded a fulsome range of sophisticated insights—if not in some cases comprehensive theories—about ritual, or better yet, *ritualizing*,[3] and, in some instances, about the possibilities and limits for such theorizing.

The question for the liturgical scholar (whether theologian or "liturgiologist," to use Ronald Grimes's nomenclature[4]) is one of location vis-à-vis all these theories. Some fifteen years ago, Mary Collins astutely queried as to whether and when sacramental and liturgical theologians would not only study and apply ritual theories from the philosophical and social sciences, but also so come of age as to proffer their own theories and methods as viable with and, indeed, valuable to other academic theorists of ritual.[5] For his part, Grimes clearly places theologians and liturgiologists on equal footing with the whole host of other scholars interested in ritual, fully expecting to learn from what liturgical theologians have to offer by their ways of being ritual critics. Collins's (typically) wise and astute challenge, of course, entails the liturgical theologian's availing oneself of insights from theorists across the whole range of scientific disciplines. What I hear in her exhortation, as well as in Grimes's invitation, nonetheless, is the disqualification of any defensiveness or unnecessary apologetics on the part of the liturgical theologian in his or her contextual practice of what Grimes broadly calls ritual criticism. Grimes essays a theory of the ritual critic as one who evaluates the efficaciousness of a particular ritual practice, doing so while reflexively aware that any act of criticism is itself "judgment-laden" and, thus, "must systematically attend to the politics of critique." For both "anthropologists and religiologists" studying ritual, Grimes argues, "Criticism is inescapable, though one can minimize, disguise, or try to subdue it. There is no possibility of fully disengaging normative and critical intentions from descriptive ones."[6] My point at the outset, then, is to acknowledge both the flexibility in theory that the range of ritual studies affords and my own reflexivity as one type of ritual critic, namely, a liturgical theologian and Roman Catholic priest, in the following consideration of the rite of marriage in contemporary U.S. Catholicism.

The Contemporary Rite of Marriage as Ideology in Practice

If ever there were a particular ceremony in Roman Catholicism demonstrative of how ritual does not simply express or symbolize a presumed, established, univocal religious ideology, it is the rite of marriage. In this present exercise of

ritual criticism, I adopt Bell's rejections of both (1) the long-regnant modern "ideology-as-worldview perspective," with "its 'totalistic fallacy,' the assumption that a group is dominated by a single, holistic set of ideas, which acts as the cement for [a given] society," and (2) ideology "as dominant class interest," which "simultaneously casts ideology as self-conscious and articulate, but also 'false' and able to dominate through mystification."[7] The society in this case is the Roman Catholic Church in the USA, and the dominant class, the local clergy (priests and deacons) to whom the laity would be seen as the passively obliging underclass, with said clergy likewise viewed as obediently subservient to the official rites and ongoing directives (canonical and otherwise) issued by the Vatican hierarchy and executed by the bishops they appoint across the globe.

As I shall attempt to demonstrate in the following descriptive and analytic work, the actual ritualizing of the sacrament of marriage provides considerable evidence to support Bell's conclusion that

> ideology is best understood as a strategy of power, a process whereby certain social practices or institutions are depicted to be 'natural' and 'right.' While such a strategy implies the existence of a group or groups whose members stand to gain in some way by an acceptance of these practices, it also implies the existence of some form of opposition. Thus, ideologization may imply an unequal distribution of power, but it also indicates a greater distribution of power than would exist in relationships defined by sheer force. It is a strategy intimately connected with legitimation, discourse, and fairly high degrees of social complicity and maneuverability.[8]

I can attest as both a Catholic priest and, earlier in my young adulthood, a church organist that many in both guilds can be heard to opine, "I'll take a dozen funerals over one wedding any day!" That lament testifies to the extent to which the lay agents of the marriage rites, typically the brides and their mothers but by no means to the exclusion (increasingly) of the principal male agents, exercise robustly (often aggressively) their own power in negotiating the ideology of Christian marriage through their particular ritualizing thereof.

The following narrative plots an itinerary of sorts, whereby my practical work as a professor and pastoral minister has brought home for me just how great indeed are the degrees of ideological negotiation entailed in the practice of the marriage rite (and thus, the "institution" of marriage) in white, middle-class sectors of U.S. Catholicism. I begin from my experience in the undergraduate core-theology classroom, a venue felicitous to my rehearsing something of the current Roman Catholic theology (meaning) of marriage within a sacramental anthropology and ecclesiology that, nonetheless, inevitably encounters contestation in ritual practice.

The Sacramentality of Marriage: Agreement in Principle, Contestation in Ritual

During my recently concluded fifteen-year tenure on the faculty of a large, national, Catholic university, I regularly taught a section of the theology department's yearlong core course, "Exploring Catholicism: Tradition and Transition," to a class of approximately forty undergraduates. The mandate for the second semester was for ecclesiology, sacramental theology, and spirituality. I rearranged the order and took some liberty of interpretation, such that I began with sacramental-liturgical theology, moved on to ecclesiology, and concluded with moral theology, as I remained convinced college-age students are more interested in ethical issues and case studies than discussions of lofty, often abstract spiritualities. That practical angle[9] was paramount in my approach from the semester's start with sacraments, for which I had the students read in tandem a work in systematic theology, Bernard Cooke's *Sacraments and Sacramentality*, and a thematically edited collection in practical-liturgical theology, *Bodies of Worship: Explorations in Theory and Practice*.

To follow Cooke's original (indeed, controversial) appropriation of Rahner and Schillebeeckx in his phenomenology of symbol and communication, personhood and community, is to arrive at marriage (not baptism or Eucharist) as the starting point for discussing the seven official sacraments in the Roman Catholic Church. Cooke meets still-adolescent college students where they are, namely, in the process of discovering their senses of identity by growing in their capacity to think reflexively, to recognize that all experience is interpreted experience, and that interpretation takes place only through symbolizing (for which word is fundamental). Sacrament is the term for any symbol or symbolic process revelatory of the (totally other) God beyond our sensing who, biblical tradition attests, communes with humanity personally, that is, through the limited but powerful reality of intersubjective and communal life. Cooke arrives at this summary statement:

> If we restrict 'sacrament' to certain liturgical rituals, it is logical to think of baptism as the initial sacrament. If, however, we realize the fundamental sacramentality of all human experience and the way Jesus transformed this sacramentality, there is good reason for seeing human friendship as the most basic sacrament of God's saving presence among us. Human friendship reflects and makes credible the reality of God's love for humans. . . . Within human friendship there is a paradigmatic role played by the love between a Christian wife and husband. Building on the transformation of marriage's meaning that began with the Israelitic prophets, Christianity sees the love relationship of a Christian couple as sacramentalizing the relationship between Christ and the church, between God and humankind. God's saving action consists essentially in the divine self-giving [grace]. This is expressed by and present in the couple's self-gift to each other; they are sacrament to each other, to their children, and to their fellow Christians. This sacramentality, though specifically instanced in Christian marriage, extends to all genuine human friendship.[10]

Cooke's theology creatively builds on the official theology of the church, as presented in the Introduction to the *Rite of Marriage*, which reiterates the Second Vatican Council's bold advance in asserting that the couple are, together and to each other, God's offer of salvation and working out of their sanctification, and in that a living, personal sign of God's love to the world.[11] The reformed rite of marriage itself, in its various ritual elements, serves to bring this about, that is, to actualize this union through the virtual space the ritual creates for the couple to reshape their identities in relation to each other.

To speak of virtual space is to profit from Bruce Kapferer's original contribution for theorizing about the "inner dynamics of rite as the potency of the capacity of ritual to alter, change, or transform the existential circumstances of persons."[12] Ritualizing enables people explicitly to negotiate what the "chaotic" character of the quotidian, non-ritual "lived word" is incapable of engaging: "[The] virtuality of ritual reality is really real, a complete and filled-out existential reality—but in its own terms. . . . By entering within the particular dynamics of life by means of the virtuality of ritual, ritualists engage with positioning and structurating processes that are otherwise impossible to address in the tempo and dynamics of ordinary lived processes as these are lived on the surface."[13] Precisely on that terrain of ritual agency is where, I discovered, contestation arises for young American Catholics as they imagine and celebrate the rite of marriage.

I found my students receptive, if not enthused, about Cooke's theology in all its concreteness and incarnational honoring of human agency and identity as exercised in friendship, broadly conceived, and marriage, specifically examined. Turning from the systematic theology of meaning to the liturgical theology of ritual, on the other hand, was another matter. For that, I availed myself of marriage-rite specialist Paul Covino's chapter in *Bodies of Worship* and his thirty-minute video, *Our Catholic Wedding*.[14] In both text and video, Covino's approach to the Catholic wedding ritual relentlessly advocates practices based on what he distills as the fundamentals in the theology (meaning) of the sacrament, namely, (1) the couple as agents of their personal union and, thus, as sacraments of the church, itself being the "sacrament of unity," the people as one in Christ; and (2) the "corporate dimension" of the marriage rite by its very nature *as liturgy*, citing "Vatican II's strong preference for 'communal celebration involving the presence and active participation of the faithful . . . to a celebration that is individual and quasi-private.'"[15] Covino rues the extent to which U.S. Catholic couples remain "uninterested in or even resistant to promoting communal participation in the wedding liturgy," thereby causing "Catholics who actively participate in Sunday Mass [to] succumb to the social custom of attending weddings as polite, but passive, observers."[16] Both book chapter and video (composed of footage from the actual, real-time wedding of a young couple, interspersed with "talking head" comments by the bride, groom, their parents, and Pastor Austin Fleming) entail Covino's commentary on the major steps of the ritual, from entrance procession forward, arguing for how (*and why*) he has shaped each element of the rite over the years: "Together, these practices have helped to overcome the cultural tendency toward passivity at weddings, and create an assembly that is ready to celebrate the wedding liturgy as a corporate body" and "a better enfleshment of the Catholic faith concerning marriage."[17]

Ah, but therein lies the rub! Is not Covino's assumption that a prior set of meanings (a totalistic, static ideology) of the marital sacrament somehow exists and needs only be ritually expressed? To my viewing of the video, the bride and groom and parents do not seem particularly articulate of anything specific about the official church theology of marriage or its rite; rather, their comments basically run along the lines of vague feelings of togetherness, welcome, and inclusivity of guests. But, my perceptions aside, what interested (and continues to interest) me the most were the students' responses to the video. Every year, as I entered the three-session marriage unit of my Catholicism core course, I began by showing the video and then opening the floor for discussion with, "So, what'd you think?" One year a particularly bright, engaged, articulate, unselfconscious young woman seated in the back of the large classroom (the type of student an undergrad professor prays for), instantly blurted out, "That ruined everything I've dreamed for my wedding since I was four years old!" "Yippee, let's go!" I thought gleefully to myself. "How so?" I replied professorially to her.

My student was readily able to list key features of the ritual, as she had been imagining them since preschool. I list them here in contrast to what Covino advocates as the logical ritual expressions of the reformed Catholic theology of marriage: the bride hidden from sight until the guests turn dramatically toward the back of the church for her dazzling epiphany at the foot of the aisle (versus the couple and both sets of parents standing in the doorway to greet the guests as they arrive for the ceremony); the bride on her proud, adoring father's arm, appearing only after a sufficient pause, and even change to heraldic music, following the procession of single bridesmaids and, even prior to that, the singular seating of the bride's mother (versus the rite of marriage's description of the procession as including all together the ministers [acolytes and lectors], priest, bride and groom and, optionally, "at least their parents and the two witnesses"[18]); the guests positioned in couples or single family units along opposite edges of the pews—"Bride or groom?" ushers ask in seating guests—all the way down the aisle, while professionally performed music wafts overhead (versus groomsmen and bridesmaids seating everybody anywhere and across entire pews, so as "to encourage people to form a cohesive assembly," while a cantor rehearses all in the ritual music prior to the start of the service[19]); bride and groom, flanked by maid of honor and best man, positioned from the start at the top step of the sanctuary, backs to the people, the maid of honor having arranged the substantial train of the bridal gown to flow down the steps (versus the couple themselves sitting in the front row of the assembly or at one side of the sanctuary, only to step to the center-front of the sanctuary at the end of the Liturgy of the Word for the exchange of consent and rings); bride and groom quietly repeating their vows after the priest, who faces them in the sanctuary, their backs to the people (versus the priest moving to the head of the aisle, between the front row of pews, while bride and groom stand front and center in the sanctuary, facing out to the assembly); and, in addition, Covino encourages the couple's ministering cups of the Eucharistic wine (the Blood of Christ) to the assembly during the communion rite (versus their typically being seated to revel reflectively or quietly smile or even gesture at their guests as they reach the front of the communion line).

Repulsed by Covino's practical interpretive implementation of the ritual details and overall theology of the reformed Roman Catholic rite of marriage, my twenty-year-old college student's priorities exuded the popular and commercial cultures' criteria for a "fairytale wedding." Indeed, that was the very title the press used for the royal nuptials of "Will and Kate" this past April and now, again, in the news and entertainment media's obligatory year-in-review exercises during the last days of 2011. My point here is not to deride the multimillion-dollar bridal industry or decades (often centuries)-long Euro-American wedding ceremonial customs and superstitions but, rather, to articulate their evident function as fundamental sources for Americans' (Catholics as much as others)—especially brides' and their mothers'—vehemently held convictions for what constitutes a suitable, if not powerfully impressive, wedding. Perhaps most notable is the fact that the bride-to-be, as early as age four, has a strong sense of her agency (power) in shaping and controlling all aspects of the ritual, with her mother expected and expecting to hold the key supporting role as critical advisor, sometimes in conflict with the bride but always allied with the bride as her advocate toward their hired service providers—photographer, florist, caterer, musicians for church and reception, *and* the officiating minister. The wedding, *pace* Covino's passionate convictions and efforts, is a private family affair and, as such, ritually actualizes the basic way in which the vast majority of late-modern U.S. Catholics practice (and *thereby* understand) their marriages as private, interpersonal commitments (expecting ongoing support from family and friends) between the couple. My impression from both classroom teaching and pastoral work with wedding couples is that they do indeed sense what Cooke theologizes as sacramentality in the marriage relationship, but with one key difference. Their practical theologies of Christian marriage lack a strong ecclesial dimension or at least an ecclesiology in which institution, including authoritative teaching and officials as well as public (Covino's "corporate") ritual, figures integrally.

Moving from the shaping of their wedding ceremonies forward into marital domesticity, the overwhelming majority of lay Catholics reject the Roman hierarchy's repeated insistences that the use of contraceptives even in marriage is grave matter for mortal sin.[20] Contraception and child rearing, they counter, is a private matter for the couple, to be worked out personally on the basis of a wide range of criteria—social, economic, and religious. Indeed, many American Catholic couples (not unlike British Anglicans Prince William and Kate Middleton) cohabitate for extended periods prior to formal marriage. This fact has, I must confess, at times sparked my incredulity over the manner and extent to which I have found couples clinging to superstitions and medieval-era symbolic conventions in the execution of their wedding ceremonies. For the last part of this essay, then, I shall turn to one detail in practice that arrested my attention when presiding over a wedding and opens the way to considering further how likely it most often is the case that people's ideologies of marriage are, as Clifford Geertz said of religion generally, not so much "well-formulated beliefs" as "collections of notions."[21]

Ideology as Ritual Activity: Practical Executions of the Marriage Rite

This is not to imply that the notions, however disjointed compared to the normative liturgical *ordo* and formal theology of marriage, do not in their cumulative execution provide the ritual actors with a feeling of well-being. No, it is just that this well-being rests not on well-formulated beliefs but, rather, in the (inchoate) promise arising from *well-doing*, that is, from the adequate if not elegant execution of the several gestures, words, and poses that are "right" or "natural" to a good and proper wedding. This affective rightness or naturalness that the performers of the rite—bride, groom, mothers, attendants—feel at various points and overall in the ceremony (and thereafter upon reflection) is what Bell is driving at in arguing for ritual as a strategic mode of practice wherein people negotiate their power and positions (their performative identities) within a social as well as, most often, a cosmic order.

Take, for example, the custom prohibiting the groom from seeing the bride on the day of the wedding prior to the opening of the ceremony, lest they bring "bad luck" down upon themselves. A performative element utterly outside the ritual frame and ideology of the current Roman Catholic rite of marriage, this superstition would also seem beyond the pale for university-educated middle-class Americans. And yet I recall how, in preparing two affluent professionals in their late twenties for their wedding, I had proposed that they together greet their guests as they arrived at the church and then process into the ceremony each on the arms of their respective parents. Surprised yet attracted by the suggestion, they seemed to adopt it warmly. Yet, on the day of the celebration, I found the groom in the entry of the church, along with the rest of the attending party, but not the bride. He explained that the couple subsequently agreed that his seeing her in her bridal dress prior to her processing down the aisle would be bad luck. I simply smiled and shrugged it off, for, after all, their happiness and peace of mind was of paramount importance.

Still, I could not help musing, both then and now years later, at how the couple renegotiated that strategy on their own—that is, apart from the priest with whom they'd made the preparations—but, moreover, at how vitally important that ritual-symbolic detail was to the two of them. The conclusion I have come to draw from this small example (which nonetheless was a truly big deal to that groom and bride) is that the archaic practice of hiding the bride from the groom, as part of the long-abandoned ideology of European arranged marriages transferring possession of a woman—and her dowry—from one man to another, has in all its strangeness retained its force in conveying how much is at stake in what is about to take place in the wedding ceremony. As Kapferer and Handelman have each argued in their own ways, it is precisely the very oddity or strangeness of many rituals in their actual contexts—their non-representational or directly causative significance—that enables them to draw their performers into a deep, self-enclosed phenomenal pocket[22] or virtual space[23] wherein the ritual-actors may realize for themselves (bodily, semiotically) something of their own singular, interpersonal, or social agency at which they could not arrive by argument or explanation. At my present

theoretical ("expert") distance, I would argue that for this couple, who had been cohabitating for several years, their careful avoidance of physically even laying eyes on each other the day of their wedding was a performance of how deeply and how much they sensed was at stake in what they were about to do with and for their relationship; how deeply they desired that their love and partnership not suffer misfortune but, on the contrary, endure and even thrive; how poignantly they knew of both the positive and negative forces—natural and supernatural—their world portended for their marriage. In this one can, to follow Bell's lead, recognize the couple ritually enacting their own ideology of marriage in a highly complex social (economic, class, religious, national, ethnic, pluralistic) context.

Were space to allow for a more fulsome treatment of my experiences of the rite of marriage in actual practice, I would similarly discuss in detail such dichotomies between the official ritual text, along with expert guidelines for performance, and the conventional middle-class American expectations for practice as I listed from my earlier classroom account.[24] Here I must simply attest that I have come to find in my practical, pastoral experiences of presiding at U.S. Catholic weddings strong evidence to support Kapferer's insightful theory of ritual virtuality, wherein he seeks "to push ritual as a radical suspension of ordinary realities" in such a direction as

> to suggest that it is the very disjunction of the world of rite from its larger context that contributes to the force of much ritual dynamics. I add to this notion the nonrepresentational character of the world of rite as this is formed in its disjunctive space. I mean by this that the processes of rites are not always to be conceived of as directly reflective of outer realities, as has been the thrust of conventional symbolic analyses. This is not to say that they do not grasp or represent meanings that are integral to broad, abstract cosmological notions. . . . They may even be metaphoric of larger processes, but this is secondary, frequently an analytic construction made by scholars who maintain themselves as being external to the phenomenon in question and committed to other rationalities. . . . The direction I take here is one that concentrates on ritual as a virtuality, a dynamic process in and of itself with no essential representational symbolic relation to external realities—that is, a coded symbolic formation whose interpretation or meaning is ultimately reducible to the sociopolitical and psychological world outside the ritual context.[25]

The very weirdness of many customary practices is often what makes the virtual space of ritual so existentially transformative for the agential identities of its performers. This theoretical insight goes a long way in helping explain why, for example, brides (as well as, at times, their grooms) hold to a processional choreography that a ritual critic might perceive as bespeaking patriarchy (that is, a father's delivery of a bride, veiled, complete with dowry).

By contrast Covino, in his analytic distancing from the popular bridal culture, exemplifies the bias of the expert when he argues the following:

> Most women today would resent the implication that they are being "given away" by one man to another, yet there is still strong emotional attachment to this form of the wedding entrance procession. "Tradition," a wise person once said, "is the living faith of the dead. Traditionalism is the dead faith of the living." The customary American form of the wedding entrance procession seems no longer to reflect what we actually believe about marriage, as Americans and as Catholics. It would be safe to say that this is a case of traditionalism, not tradition.[26]

Rather, I would proffer, it would be safe to say that Covino's essay proves to be a case of what Kapferer, along with Bell in her own way, has identified as the ideological-theoretical blinders the ritual theorist can unknowingly wear. Here, Covino is stumped in trying to explain why American Catholics persist in this type of processional practice because his (modern) insistence on a totalizing concept for the entire marriage rite fails to recognize that a given bride's notions of *her* Catholic Church ceremony most likely include the ideal of the "fairytale wedding"—a virtual ritual space that is really real, and all the more virtual, given its mediation through digital technology: the magazines, websites, movie scenes, and marketing that altogether shape the "picture-perfect wedding." That plethora of influences upon the bride and groom's imagining of the virtual space of their wedding certainly puts pressure on their ritual agency, but still most often especially on that of the bride, who senses that other women will judge her accountable for whether the "wedding went off well."[27]

The Rite of Marriage Going Forward: Indications of Creativity and Crisis

Still, middle-aged folk (such as myself) would be mistaken in thinking that contemporary American brides and wedding couples largely experience themselves as totally constricted by media culture, fairy-tale ideals, marketing campaigns, and, yes, ecclesial ritual books and clerical authorities. Not only is the construction of one's "perfect" wedding a creative project of which great numbers of brides take charge, but couples also increasingly expect to be able to negotiate together their own decisions about how to put the religious ceremony together and, indeed, whether to have such a ceremony as part of their wedding at all. One final anecdote can serve as an indicator of the still significantly changing ideologies young American Catholics are practicing as they approach and execute the rite of marriage.

A few years ago I presided over the wedding of a former student who, along with his bride, had majored in theology at the Catholic university where I had been teaching. As we three went through the official text several months in advance, the couple embraced a number of elements of the rite distinctive from the conventional "fairy tale" or industry-driven imagery, including an order of procession that included not only the ministers but also the groom with his parents, followed by the bride with hers; the couple's standing at the center of sanctuary facing out to

the assembly for the act of consent (exchange of vows); and the couple's serving the assembly as ministers of the cup during the communion rite. During the rehearsal, however, on the eve of the wedding day and with many people in attendance, the three of us came upon a ritual impasse: As I positioned them front and center in the sanctuary for the act of consent (exchange of vows and rings), the groom informed me that he and the bride had written their own vows. I was floored by this and had to reply straightforwardly that what they wanted to do was impossible for me to carry out. I explained that Roman Catholic canon and liturgical law together prescribe what constitutes the proper matter and form for a valid performance of a sacrament. In the case of marriage the matter is comprised of the couple themselves, freely entering into the marital covenant, while the form is their speaking to each the words of consent in the official ritual text (for which in the U.S. dioceses there are two options). Their pronouncing other words would not constitute their validly celebrating the sacramental rite of marriage. My explanation, I could perceive, was lost on the couple, with the groom telling me he had never heard of such rules and could not see why I was imposing them. I told him I could not negotiate this point but what I could suggest would be for them to share their words with each other and for the assembly in the concluding rite of the service, that is, after the meditation and prayer after communion. Unhappy but also able to see that such was my "final offer," the couple agreed to the compromise.

That pastoral-liturgical incident is indicative of a distinctive feature of the late-modern milieu of American weddings, namely, an assertion of the uniqueness of the couple involved that demands explicit, original expression in formal traditional and religious ritual itself. This is not to deny that traditions, including ritual traditions, always entail change; however, the degree to which the laity consciously pursue individual creativity and explicitly demand of the officials innovations in the ritual forms constitutes a new wrinkle in the overlapping folds of this and other rituals' histories of practice. In the case of Euro-American Catholicism (such is the stated limit of my study here), the marriage rate among the younger generations has been decreasing steadily, reflecting the rate within the wider population. While multiple social forces are contributing to this phenomenon, one factor surely is the dissonance many Catholic laity experience between their human agency and religious ideology and the ideology of the official, expert class of their church, namely, the bishops and clergy. The overall situation would seem to be an instance of what Bell argues can take place when leaders "on higher levels of social organization" (in this case, the clerical hierarchy of the church) ritually construct power in relation to "the microrelations of power that shape daily life on the lower levels of the society" (namely, the laity in the church): "changes in the latter level can precipitate a crisis in which the demands of ritual to conform to traditional models clash with the ability of those rites to resonate with the real experiences of the social body."[28]

The last pastoral-liturgical scenario I recounted indicates the degree to which U.S. Catholic couples increasingly expect to be able to take creative license, as it were, with the official rite of marriage, but a further alienation between hierarchy and laity seems to be accelerating as well, namely, the decision of couples to forego the sacramental rite entirely. For some this is a matter of their ideologies of

marriage or even the religion in general being at odds with the official teachings, regulations, and ritual procedures of the church, such that they would not even consider a "Catholic church wedding." For others, however, the alienation is not so comprehensive but, rather, against the specific practices and procedures the hierarchy requires for preparing and executing the rite of marriage, such as the restriction of the celebration to consecrated church spaces (e.g. churches, chapels, oratories), a specified amount of marital preparation through either classes or a retreat program, or the prohibition of substituting secular literature or sacred texts from other religious or cultural traditions for biblical readings in the marriage celebration's liturgy of the word. Across the range of alternate practices one cannot help but perceive the performances of real breaks (crises) between the official ideology of marriage for the church and the Christian agential identity many younger Catholics are forging as they construct their own ideologies of marriage with partners variably of their own or other or no religious traditions, and, with changing marital laws in a growing number of states, even with partners the church officially does not recognize.

Notes

1 See Don Handelman, "Introduction: Why Ritual in Its Own Right? How So?" in *Ritual in Its Own Right: Exploring the Dynamics of Transformation*, ed. Don Handelman and Galina Lindquist (New York: Berghahn Books, 2005), 1–32.

2 Catherine Bell, *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 196.

3 This terminology (*ritualizing* or *ritualization*, as opposed to *ritual*) indicates an epistemological shift in study, such that the subject is "a strategic *way* of acting . . . acting ritually emerges as a particular cultural strategy of differentiation linked to particular social effects and rooted in a distinctive interplay of a socialized body and the environment it structures." Bell, 7–8.

4 Ronald L. Grimes, "The Scholarly Contexts and Practices of Ritual Criticism," in *Ritual Criticism: Case Studies in Its Practice, Essays on Its Theory* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1990), 210–33. Here, 214–15.

5 Mary Collins, OSB, "The Church and the Eucharist," *Catholic Theological Society of America Proceedings* 52 (1997): 19–34, especially 30–34.

6 Grimes, 226, 216, 227.

7 Bell, 188.

8 Bell, 192–93.

9 For a description of my methodology for that course see, "Liturgical Theology as Critical Practice," *Spotlight on Theological Education* 2, no. 1 (annual supplement in *Religious Studies News,* March 2008): 9–12.

10 Bernard Cooke, *Sacraments and Sacramentality,* rev. ed. (Mystic, CT: Twenty-Third Publications, 1994), 91. Cooke himself came to address explicitly the power dimensions of symbol (word and image) and ritual, among some dozen forms of human power as these intersect with the divine ways revealed in Scripture, in his *Power and the Spirit of God: Toward an Experience-Based Pneumatology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 121–55. For a Protestant treatment of human friendship as revelatory of divine presence, the activity of the Spirit of God, see the penultimate chapter in Jürgen Moltmann, *The Spirit of Life: A Universal Affirmation*, trans. Margaret Kohl (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1992).

11 See *Rite of Marriage,* nos. 1–4, in *The Rites of the Catholic Church,* volume 1, study edition (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1990), 720. See also Vatican II, *Lumen Gentium* (*Dogmatic*

Constitution on the Church) (1964), no. 11. The fullest elaboration comes in the Vatican Council's final document: "Authentic married love is caught up into divine love and is governed and enriched by Christ's redeeming power and the saving activity of the Church, so that this love may lead the spouses to God with powerful effect and may aid and strengthen them in the sublime office of being a father or a mother." *Gaudium et Spes* (*Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World)* (1965), no. 48, http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_cons_19651207_gaudium-et spes_en.html (accessed 26 December 2011).

12 Bruce Kapferer, "Ritual Dynamics and Virtual Practice: Beyond Representation and Meaning," in *Ritual in Its Own Right: Exploring the Dynamics of Transformation*, ed. Don Handelman and Galina Lindquist (New York: Berghahn Books, 2005), 35–54. Here, 47.

13 Kapferer, 47–48.

14 See Paul Covino, "Christian Marriage: Sacramentality and Ritual Forms," in *Bodies of Worship: Explorations in Theory and Practice*, ed. Bruce T. Morrill (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1999), 107–19; and *Our Catholic Wedding*, VHS video by Paul Covino and Austin Fleming (Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications, 2001).

15 Covino, "Christian Marriage," 109. Internal citation from Vatican II, *Sacrosanctum Concilium* (*Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*) (1963), no. 27.

16 Covino, 109.

17 Covino, 111, 113.

18 *Rite of Marriage*, no. 20.

19 Covino, "Christian Marriage," 112.

20 Year after year, in teaching my concluding unit on moral theology in that core Catholicism course, taking the students through a close, historical-theologically informed reading of John Paull II's 1995 encyclical *Evangelium Vitae* (*The Gospel of Life*), I found the students dumbfounded to learn of the church's official condemnation of artificial contraception within marriage. That proved to be news to most of these cradle Catholics.

21 See Bell, 184–85.

22 See Handelman, 10–17.

23 See Kapferer, 46–48.

24 See above, pp. 98–99.

25 Kapferer, 46.

26 Covino, 114.

27 I am indebted to members of the Emerging Critical Resources for Liturgical Studies seminar who provided me with this and other insights while discussing my first draft of this essay during one of our sessions at the annual meeting of the North American Academy of Liturgy in Montreal, 6 January 2012.

28 Bell, 213.

That You Should Enter Under My Roof: Eucharistic Indwelling and the Trinitarian Life

R. Gabriel Pivarnik

R. Gabriel Pivarnik, OP, S.T.D., is currently an assistant professor of theology at Providence College and the director of the Center for Catholic and Dominican Studies. His interests center on the development of a contemporary sacramental method that incorporates a more dynamic and more thorough expression of the action of the Trinity in the sacraments.

The recent implementation of the new translation of the Roman Missal affords liturgical and sacramental theologians within the American Catholic Church an opportunity to rethink the theology that surrounds our practice of the *lex orandi* of the church. As English-speaking Catholics begin using new words and phrases to celebrate the liturgy, we find ourselves engaged in a new round of liturgical catechesis that asks us to explain and elucidate how the new translation might be theologically different from our former practice. Such an investigation also allows us the possibility of enhancing the faithful's understanding of our participation in the Eucharistic celebration and, concomitantly, our participation in the divine life of the Trinity. This is particularly true as we consider the people's response at the invitation to Communion: "Lord I am not worthy that you should enter under my roof, but only say the word and my soul shall be healed."

Contextual Origin and Placement of the Phrase

This phrase, as we know, is a slight variation of the words uttered by the centurion in Matthew's gospel as he seeks the healing power of Christ for his ill servant (Matt 8:8).[1] As a prayer of intercession, it serves to place the centurion in the position of advocate and believer at the same time. His statement reflects his own assertion of his place before Christ as healer and Lord, a place that is marked by humility and docility. Moreover, the centurion goes on, in an uncharacteristic fashion for the gospels, to explain why he believes what he believes. Based on his own experience of command and submission to authority, the centurion makes

the implied assertion that Christ has such a command over life and death, health and illness, that he need only say the word and the forces that paralyze his servant will be subject to Christ's authoritative word. Such unwavering belief moves Jesus to proclaim that no such faith has yet been found in Israel (Matt 8:10). Knowing this context for the origin of this phrase places the modern day believer in a similar stance of humility before the Lord. It simultaneously acts as a declaration of faith as to the authority and power of Christ over the life of the individual. But, precisely because the phrase is pulled out of its context for use within the liturgy, it also takes on a deeper meaning as one interprets the supposed "roof" within the new context in which it is used. Paul's assertion in 1 Corinthians 6:19 is illuminating here: "Do you not know that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit within you, whom you have from God, and that you are not your own?" Thus, the Hebrew colloquialism of "coming under one's roof" as a sign of dwelling or abiding with another is now writ large across the declaration of the believer at the reception of communion. With such a declaration of belief, then, in the power of Christ to heal our souls, we are also asking the Lord to dwell within us.

In the context of the dialogue that happens at this point in the liturgy, we also realize that such a declaration implies an indwelling that lasts into eternal life. The invitation of the presiding presbyter makes specific reference to the eternal banquet and the heavenly liturgy: "Blessed are those who are called to the Supper of the Lamb." This eschatological reference with its overtones from the Book of Revelation places the petition of the believers not simply in the here and now, but as an ongoing supplication that lasts until the end of time. Thus, the indwelling of Christ is not meant to be a passing reality, but one that endures in the lives of believers.

A careful distinction can be made here in this invitation to Communion and the form of the Prayer of Humble Access that appears in the Anglican, Methodist, Lutheran, and Presbyterian traditions. Originally positioned immediately after the confession and absolution that had been inserted after the canon of the Mass, it found a home immediately after the *Sanctus* in Cranmer's revision of 1552. In subsequent versions and revisions in the following centuries, it would be located after the Lord's Prayer and before the *Agnus Dei*.[2] In Cranmer's *Book of Common Prayer*, this prayer overtly called for the humility of the faithful and the more direct reference to the dwelling of Christ with the believer:

> We do not presume to come to this thy Table (O merciful Lord) trusting in our own righteousness, but in thy manifold and great mercies. We be not worthy so much as to gather up the crumbs under thy Table. But thou art the same Lord, whose property is always to have mercy: Grant us therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the Flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink his Blood, in these holy Mysteries, that we may continually dwell in him, and he in us, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by his Body, and our souls washed through his most precious Blood. Amen.[3]

This prayer, while different in its scriptural origin, maintains the idea that communion is meant to provide for the *continual* dwelling of Christ with the

believer, that he might "enter under our roof" and abide with us. There are two things worthy of note here. First, the dwelling with and in Christ is viewed as a reciprocal action: The believers dwell in Christ and Christ dwells in the believers. The prefatory statements here maintain the action of God in making such a reciprocity happen—the *humble access* that is sought underscores the divine action necessary for this indwelling. Second, although it has been seen as problematic at various times, the second half of the portion of supplication maintains a reparative effect for body and soul. Regardless of the debate surrounding the separation of roles to specific Eucharistic species,[4] an anthropological assertion is clearly made here toward the healing of the whole person. Both the Invitation to Communion and the Prayer of Humble Access provide a clear belief that the indwelling of Christ provides not simply a sanctifying and redemptive moment in the life of the faithful, but an ongoing reality of grace. The supposition of Christ abiding with the faithful, of this continued dwelling of the Lord in the soul of the believer, raises a number of questions for consideration:

1. For the ecclesial community to act as *church*, is it not presumed that there is already an abiding presence of the Spirit in the liturgical assembly (in the church)? Is this abiding presence another *form* of indwelling?
2. Is it possible to speak of two presences of the Spirit—one anamnetic and one epicletic?
3. What are the implications of this indwelling of Son and Spirit for understanding our participation in the life of the Trinity?

The Dwelling of the Spirit in the Liturgical Assembly

One could argue that the indwelling of the Spirit in those that are baptized, and consequently in those who already belong to the sacramental life of the church, represents a share in the sonship of Christ. William J. Hill reminds us that such a sharing, in and of itself, automatically brings the believer into the divine life of the Trinity. He maintains that the indwelling of the Spirit has an active dimension: "The mere presence of the *Pneuma* means loving union with God because the third in God is personal love. He is himself the union of Father and Son and so if given to [human beings] makes them to be, by his very personal presence, sharers in divine trinitarian life."[5] In this sense, there is already an "indwelling" of Spirit and Son in the life of the baptized believer that precedes the gathering of the church to enact the Eucharist (one could even argue here that there is, by this same logic of argument, a presence of the Father that also dwells in the believer).

Throughout his extensive works, Edward Kilmartin underscores the communion aspect of the church in the power of the Spirit. For Kilmartin, all liturgical participation is necessarily an ecclesial participation—an action of the church that protects the faithful from an overly humanistic approach to what we do in worship. Through the indwelling of the Spirit in the church, the assembly is gathered and called forth to the Eucharistic celebration. In this sense, the Spirit is the "efficient cause of the communication of salvation through word and

sacrament."[6] But Kilmartin also notes (and this perhaps makes him unique) that the Spirit also acts, in an analogous manner, as the formal cause of triune self-communication—the Spirit determines the content of such communication and specifically ordains it within the life and action of the church, most notably in the liturgy. Sacraments are "Spirit-endowed realities of the Church"[7] and the church is a "sacrament of the Spirit."[8] Because of the presence and action of the Spirit, the person of Christ is essentially united to the church in the liturgical celebration. Sacraments then, especially the Eucharist, are simultaneously actions of Christ and the church, where the church is understood as intimately tied to the indwelling of the Spirit. To borrow Mühlen's term, it is this *mediated immediacy*[9] that is the Spirit itself that creates the vital link to understanding the connection between the finite human person and the self-communication of a triune God to the church. To elucidate this point, Hill offers that the "graced soul relates to the Trinity in inverse order (to the processions): first to the Spirit, then to the Son, and lastly to the Father. If so, this explains the preeminence given to the Spirit in all questions of God's presence."[10] The indwelling of the Spirit in both the individual and the ecclesial gathering is a *sine qua non* reality—that indwelling allows us to seek the response of the centurion to Christ: "that you should enter under my roof."

Anamnetic and Epicletic Presence

What I would like to suggest, then, is that in order to speak adequately about the action of the Spirit in the Eucharist, especially in relation to the indwelling of Christ that we seek in the Invitation to Communion, we can, in fact, demarcate an anamnetic presence of the Spirit and an epicletic presence. In his works, Kilmartin went to great lengths (sometimes redundantly so) to assert the impossibility of separating anamnesis and epiclesis in the liturgical action. To beseech the Father to send the Spirit or even to pray for the sacramental presence of the Spirit (in the confirmation rite, for example—*Veni, Sancte Spiritus*) is to assume beforehand an ecclesial reality of communion in the church where that same Spirit is already present. Every celebration of the liturgy actualizes the church and in such an actualization, the church most clearly shows its sacramental character as the visible sign (in its members) of an invisible reality (the Spirit that unites them and infuses the celebration). Every liturgical action of the church belies an anamnetic presence of the Spirit. In this sense, the anamnetic presence of the Spirit abides in the church—it calls forth the faithful into celebration; it guides and inspires the liturgy of the church; and, it allows the faithful to follow Christ's command to make memorial. The Spirit lives in the church as the corollary of the Lord's command, "Do this in memory of me." It is the Spirit that remembers.

But we also know that the epicletic action of the liturgy invokes an action of the Spirit that propels the faithful into an even more complete union with the faith and mission of Christ, or, in the case of the unbaptized, to enter into that union for the first time. The vast number of epicletic formulae in the sacraments raises a central question for the theologian: whether or not the invocation of the Spirit is also implying a call for presence. Are we simply asking the Spirit to do something for us (change this bread and wine into the Body and Blood, unite us with the Mystical

Body, etc.), or are we asking the Spirit to come and be with us, and by dwelling with us, to effect certain changes? Yves Congar suggests the latter. He argues, "The effectiveness of the grace of the sacraments has been attributed to the effectiveness of the Holy Spirit, the *virtus Spiritus Sancti*, throughout the history of the church. This means that the sacred action celebrated in the church's Eucharist calls for the complement of an active coming of the Spirit."[11] One can assert that the repeated call of the church for the Spirit to come upon baptismal water, oil and balsam, or bread and wine could imply that the Spirit is lacking, but only inasmuch as the Spirit is needed to transform these elements into something new. Once they are transformed in the epiclesis of the church, the Spirit remains. An epliclетic presence that is active and real maintains the Spirit in the waters of our baptismal fonts, affords us the opportunity to recognize the sanctity of sacred chrism, and, most assuredly, allows us to recognize the presence of Christ in both Eucharistic species and liturgical action. Is this not also true when the Spirit is invoked to transform believers into the Body of Christ, or a man and woman into a wedded couple, or an infirm body into one of health? It is not as if we ask the Spirit to come and then leave, but rather one can maintain that in this mode of epicletic presence, the Spirit is invoked and remains present to lasting effect. The Spirit comes . . . and abides.

In this sense, the active presence of the Spirit must be envisioned in association or conjunction with the active presence of Christ in the sacraments. In cannot be an "either/or" dichotomy, as if the presence and action of Christ were somehow in competition with the presence and action of the Spirit. John McKenna, in his book *Eucharist and the Holy Spirit,* describes this by stating, "We have here a double presence, a double service and mediation, a double action of Christ in the Spirit and the Spirit in Christ serving as 'two hands of the Father' in drawing [humankind] into a new life."[12] A quick word might be made to our former colleague, now deceased—Jerome Hall. At the heart of Hall's study is the determination of the Spirit's activity in the liturgical act of anamnesis—he succinctly, yet vibrantly, describes the way in which the church and the Spirit act in the liturgical action with Christ:

> Christians' reception of the Spirit, sent by the Father through Christ, is itself a sacrament of the transcendental bestowal of the Spirit on the Son as Spirit of the Father's love. Christians' actions of self-sacrificing love are, in turn, sacraments of the answering and return of the Spirit from the Son to the Father within the immanent Trinity. The entire life of the world, for Kilmartin, expresses the activity of the economic Trinity, communicating the divine life in particular human situations that are both sinful and holy.[13]

Son and Spirit are intimately wed to the life of the church. The Spirit sent to us by Christ, now abides with us, calls us together as a believing community, and instructs us in how to "put on the mind of Christ." Without the Spirit's presence, we could never ask for Christ to dwell with us—the centurion's words in our mouths would hold empty promise. But, through the anamnetic and epicletic presence of the Spirit in the life and action of the church, we can pray not only for the coming of Christ to dwell within us, but also for the effects of that dwelling: the very healing of our souls in our participation in the triune God.

Trinitarian Implications for Presence, Persons, and Missions

Once we can admit a dual nature to Eucharistic indwelling, that of Son and Spirit intimately connected, it is not difficult to see the nature of Eucharistic indwelling as inherently trinitarian. Both McKenna and Hall point to a third presence in the short excerpts I have cited. For McKenna, as the "two hands of the Father," the active presence of the Son and the Spirit reveals the presence of their source and goal in the Father. For Hall, the reception of the Spirit by the faithful is an exchange rooted in the Father's loving presence, an exchange made possible by the simple fact that the Spirit had been bestowed upon the Son as an eternal act of love of the Father. To receive the Spirit is to receive Christ and the Father as well. The church, however, at least in the West, has always had difficulty in trying to explain or understand how the Father might be present to believers.

William Hill offers a possible solution by asserting that the Father makes himself knowable through the missions of the Son and the Spirit—the Father's presence is mediated through the Son and Spirit. In this sense, if Eucharistic indwelling can be described as the abiding presence of Son and Spirit for the faithful, then it is that very indwelling that mediates the presence of the Father. This is the communication of grace at its peak. Hill maintains that the presence of the Triune persons can be explained in terms of *communication*—when the Trinity has a causal influence on the created person (the faithful), it has that influence as Trinity, but it is expressed in terms of their personal presence and self-communication of their personal identity.[14] The very missions of the Son and Spirit manifest the presence of a knowable and lovable Father. The Spirit unites the believer to the attitudes and actions of Christ who calls God "Abba, Father." The Son, through the Spirit, invites the faithful back to the Father by providing the one pathway toward sanctification and beatitude: through him, with him, and in him.

In his recent work, Paul Janowiak makes a similar assertion regarding the presence of the three Persons, but centers his discussion on how "Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, in a self-emptying love, manifest that surrender and the life in which we are called to participate, through the relationship that binds them in a dialogue of mutual self-offering."[15] The Father's presence is creative "*to, for,* and *with* the Beloved of his heart, delighting and radiating the Love that can never be for itself alone but must be shared with the Beloved." [16] Both Hill and Janowiak provide us with an understanding of the Trinity that marks that act of love as generative of both communion and participation in the divine life.

Because this essay has relied heavily on the theology of Kilmartin, there are further trinitarian implications with regard to presence that must be answered. At times, Kilmartin's systematic approach to explaining sacramental action and the work and action of the Trinity collapses persons, presence, and activity. Kilmartin often vacillates between characterizing the Spirit as primary efficient cause and quasi-formal cause, the former having the connotation of a viable acting agent and the latter having the connotation of a primary guiding principle or presence. What is clear, however, is the tension that arises when Kilmartin speaks about the action of the Spirit and the action of Christ—at every turn, the work of the Spirit and

Son are so completely and inextricably intertwined in Kilmartin's theology that it becomes difficult, at best, to ascertain how these two divine persons act in the world or how we might differentiate between an active presence of Christ and an active presence of the Spirit (if such a differentiation is desirable). The Spirit determines the content of self-communication of the Trinity, but Christ communicates in himself. The Spirit has a personal mission, but that "mission derives from Christ and has a completely Christ-ward reference."[17] The active presence of Christ in the liturgy is manifested by the mediated immediacy of the Spirit is paradoxical in both terms. And the Spirit is viewed as the "principle of sanctification in the individual and corporate life of the Church,"[18] but only in terms of an adherence to the *transitus* of the Son.

William Hill offers some clarification on the relationship of the mission of Christ to the mission of the Spirit in terms of Kilmartin's use of causal language. Hill asserts that the divine persons are present in the economy of salvation in virtue of their missions—"This is not merely a presence of God who happens to be triune, in which the trinitarian dimension is explained by appropriation. It is rather a *proper* presence of two Persons in virtue of their being sent into history; the Father is not sent, yet is present—this is demanded by the inseparability of the Three, as well as by the doctrine of *perichoresis*—as the One who sends."[19] Hill goes on to assert that the theological tradition posits that the presence of the Word can be found in the humanity of Jesus (all three are present, but the Word has a distinct presence proper to the Word that manifests itself in terms of the *persona* of that humanity) and that the Spirit is present within believers in such a way as to constitute them as the People of God. What is fascinating about Hill's description here is that he maintains that these missions are rooted in the essence of the Godhead:

> The divine presence in one mission is an incarnate one proper to the Word; that in the other mission is and ecclesial one proper to the Paraclete. The effect of the former is *manifestive* of God; the effect of the latter is rather *unitive* to God. But both effects are Trinitarian in mode. Each can be proper to the respective member of the Trinity because there is no operation *ad extra* involved. The Word's personification of Jesus' humanity is not the doing of something in the order of efficient causality, but rather an actualization in the order of personal being.[20]

In fact, Hill will note that agency in terms of efficient causality is probably not the best way to envision an act of the Godhead. But Kilmartin appears to vacillate between two different kinds of agency by the Spirit. In "A Modern Approach," Kilmartin notes that "it is ultimately the Spirit who structures word and sacrament into intelligible units, giving them unity of signification."[21] Kilmartin wants to argue that it is impossible to speak of a sacrament without its act of signification. Therefore, he posits that there is a theological identity between the action of the sacramental celebration and the action of the Spirit—they cannot be distinguished from each other. But, if one applies Hill's description of the action of Christ to the Spirit, what emerges in the sacramental celebration is the actualization of the personal being of the Spirit. The language of efficient causality does not suffice here.

Hill asserts, "What we are speaking of here can be reduced to the order of formal causality (the form actualizes by its very presence), as long as it is understood that person is not a form but actualizes in a way analogous to that of form."[22] According to Hill's description, the Spirit's action is best understood as formal causation because of the unitive aspect of its personal presence. What is more important here is that Hill can maintain the Trinitarian unity of the Godhead acting in the world, while still talking about the distinct presence of the Persons, their missions, and their effects. He avers, "The Holy Spirit's gathering together of believers is not an agent of causality but the very relating in love which constitutes his distinctive personhood."[23] In this sense the inner-trinitarian nature of the persons of the Trinity is maintained, but so is the immutability of God who transforms created reality by God's presence to it. The missions of Christ and the Spirit are viewed then, not as separate agencies, but as the presence of trinitarian persons. Moreover, Hill takes this description further by describing what the presence of the Spirit means in the life of the believer. As personal love, the Spirit is "union of Father and Son and so if given to [human beings] makes them be, by his very personal presence, sharers in divine trinitarian life."[24]

In recognizing the inherent trinitarian dimension to Eucharistic indwelling, the believer can now go back to the original declaration in the celebration of the liturgy and see how the response, "Lord, I am not worthy that you should enter under my roof . . . " is not only apt, but revelatory. Recall that the invitation to make this response comes from the declaration of the presider that we are receiving a glimpse of the eternal banquet, the Supper of the Lamb. This is our *entrée* into the trinitarian life of Father, Son, and Spirit. To pray for the healing of one's soul is, in fact, to pray for the communication of the triune gift of grace. The personal immediacy between the believers and Christ, mediated by the presence of the Spirit, forms the connection between our liturgical participation and the soteriological and ecclesiological elements of the Eucharist: through the liturgical action, enacted by the believing church in the power of the Spirit, the self-communication of God (grace) is made present. The response of believers to the dual presence of Son and Spirit in acceptance of the way of the Son moves the believer into a participation in the covenant with the Father. Such a participation in the trinitarian life does not erase the distinction between humanity and God. Kilmartin makes this point abundantly clear when he writes, "The believer grasps the faith of Christ and is thereby united to the incarnate Son, and in him with the Father. What explains both the immediacy of the believer to Christ and the distance is the Holy Spirit. As bond of unity between Christ and the believer, the Spirit provides the pneumatological link."[25] The Spirit's paradoxical distance and immediacy is maintained in the simple fact that it is not incarnate—it has not been enfleshed with humanity and so we cannot make an easy collapse into identification with it. Thus, the Invitation to Communion reminds us of what we are not—we are not worthy, we are not healed, we are not the Creator—and simultaneously beckons us to become what we eat—the Body of Christ, the grace of the Spirit, the love of the Father made manifest in the heavenly banquet.

Notes

1 The pericope also appears in Luke 7.

2 For a detailed description of the revisions of this prayer, see Karen B. Westerfield Tucker, *American Methodist Worship* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 122–137, and Katie Badie, "The Prayer of Humble Access," *Churchman* 120, no. 2 (2006): 103–117.

3 The Church of England, *The Two Liturgies, A.D. 1549 and A.D.1552* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1844), 92.

4 See Badie, 109–112.

5 William J. Hill, *The Three-Personed God: The Trinity as a Mystery of Salvation* (Washington, DC: The Catholic University Press, 1982), 291–292.

6 Edward J. Kilmartin, "A Modern Approach to the Word of God and Sacraments of Christ," in *The Sacraments: God's Love and Mercy Actualized. Proceedings of the Theological Institute II*, ed. F. A. Eigo (Villanova, PA: Villanova University Press, 1979), 71.

7 Edward J. Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy I: Theology and Practice* (Kansas City: Sheed and Ward, 1988), 232.

8 Edward J. Kilmartin, "Sacraments as Liturgy of the Church," *Theological Studies* 50 (1989): 529.

9 Heribert Mühlen, *Una mystica persona: Die Kirche als das Mysterium der heilsgeschichtliche Identität des Heiligen Geistes in Christus und den Christen: Eine Person in vielen Personen,* 2nd rev. ed. (Munich-Vienna: Schöningh, 1967), 454ff.

10 Hill, 296.

11 Yves Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit,* trans. David Smith (New York: Crossroad Publishing Co., 1999), 3:250.

12 John H. McKenna, *Eucharist and the Holy Spirit*: *The Eucharistic Epiclesis in Twentieth-Century Theology* (Great Wakering, Essex: Mayhew-McCrimmon, Ltd., 1975), 199.

13 Jerome Hall, *We Have the Mind of Christ: The Holy Spirit and Liturgical Memory in the Thought of Edward J. Kilmartin* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2001), 160.

14 Hill, 295–296.

15 Paul A. Janowiak, *Standing Together in the Community of God: Liturgical Spirituality in the Presence of Christ* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2011), 170.

16 Janowiak, 170.

17 Kilmartin, "A Modern Approach," 71.

18 Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy,* 109.

19 Hill, 287. The emphasis here is provided by Hill.

20 Hill, 287.

21 Kilmartin, "A Modern Approach," 72.

22 Hill, 287–288.

23 Hill, 288.

24 Hill, 291–292.

25 Kilmartin, "Sacraments as Liturgy of the Church," 542.

Mass Antiphons and the Dialectic of Liturgical Genre and Translation

Jason J. McFarland

Jason J. McFarland, Ph.D., is assistant editor of the Secretariat for the International Commission on English in the Liturgy; lecturer in liturgical studies, The Catholic University of America; and member of the professional choir of the Basilica of the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception (1997–2011).

The new translation of *The Roman Missal* is upon English-speaking Roman Catholics. For almost forty years, we have worshipped using the 1973 translation by the International Commission on English in the Liturgy (ICEL). This translation has started to gather dust, and we have begun to speak new words to God and to one another at Mass.

Setting aside the controversy surrounding the new translation[1] as well as the intrachurch motivations for its creation, let us take the reasons for the new translation at face value.[2] The 1973 ICEL translation followed the principles of the 1969 Instruction on liturgical translation *Comme le prévoit*, which allowed for measured freedom in translating and adapting the Latin liturgical texts and rites to a vernacular context.[3] In ICEL's 1973 translation of the Missal, one goal was an accessible and simple style of English. For sound pastoral reasons, then, some of the complexity and theological themes of the Latin text were eclipsed.[4] The new translation, on the other hand, was to follow the principles of the 2001 Instruction on liturgical translation *Liturgiam Authenticam*,[5] which requires a more literal rendering of the Latin text.[6] More of the theological imagery and biblical allusions of the Latin text comes through in the English, therefore, but the result is often a more complicated syntax.

Liturgical translation strategies had begun to evolve long before the promulgation of *Liturgiam Authenticam*. The most obvious example is the 1998 ICEL *Sacramentary*—a wholly revised translation of the Missal instigated by the promulgation of the *editio typica altera* (1985) of the *Missale Romanum*. The strategy in this project was to make use of the Latin texts of the *Missale Romanum* as the venerable core of the new translation, but then to adapt the ritual book as a whole to the particular needs and circumstances of English-speaking Roman Catholics.

Thus the translation of the Latin texts was much more formally equivalent than that of the 1973 translation, but adaptation was also taken seriously and was accomplished through pastoral rearrangement and expansion of certain parts of the Missal, the amplification of the Latin texts with newly composed English texts, and the inclusion of some additional rubrical and introductory material.

The implementation of the 2010 translation is a sea change of immense consequence. If one takes seriously the oft-quoted axiom *lex orandi*, *lex credendi*,[7] the words and other modes of language we use at worship are important, not only because they are the church's official liturgical texts, or because many of them are ancient[8] and come down to us as part of big-"T" tradition, or because they are (usually) of high rhetorical quality, but also because they reflect, shape, and establish our Christian belief.[9]

In spite of any controversy about process or product, most accept the importance of transmitting the liturgical-textual tradition of the Roman Rite to future generations of Catholics. The dispute lies mainly in the degree and manner of adaptation to local circumstances and of amplification of the tradition by means of the creative genius of our own time. If one accepts this point, then, the importance of accurate and skillful liturgical translation, by whatever set of principles,[10] is a crucial task.

The goal of this paper is to present specific reasons for this importance in terms of the antiphons of *The Roman Missal*. The translation of antiphons is particularly complex. They are unique among the Missal texts and require a particularly nuanced method of translation—even more so than other genres of liturgical texts. First, antiphons are not simply quotations from Scripture. While they are accompanied by scripture citations in the Missal, the antiphons often do not quote the citation exactly, or they draw on an earlier stratum of the biblical tradition. Thus, the faithful rendering of the Latin text is not simply a matter of excerpting the equivalent passage from a modern Bible translation, but requires consultation of the Latin and various scripture translations from different eras. Second, the antiphons are normatively sung. This characteristic relates to a poetically beautiful translation of the Latin.[11] Of course, one can say that the Roman Rite as a whole is normatively expressed through singing. Here an important distinction needs to be made between singing and chanting (or cantillating). In the Roman tradition, antiphons are sung to fairly complex melodies; they are, in a sense, songs. Other Missal texts such as the presidential prayers and prefaces are chanted to a simple formulaic tone. For the antiphons, then, translation must render the Latin text in a way that facilitates its pairing with a melody. Third, and finally, because antiphons are so concise, it is a difficult task to translate them in such a way that allows each to stand on its own as a liturgical text. An antiphon cannot read as if it is an excerpt from a larger work, but must be comprehensible in its own right and be fitting to its liturgical context.[12]

What Is an Antiphon?

In its essence, the antiphon in the Latin liturgical tradition is a florid,[13] monophonic prose-text chant. Along with accompanying verses, usually from the Psalter, they accompany liturgical processions. Antiphons assigned to important

feasts and solemnities express ideas particular to the day or saint; other antiphons can be seasonally particular, while still others (especially in Ordinary Time) express basic Christian ideas such as praise or thanksgiving. A majority of the Missal antiphons derive from the Psalms, but a large number also derive from other books of the Bible.[14] There are several that are not specifically biblical at all and seem to be wholly original compositions. Still others derive from non-biblical sources such as sermons of the Fathers, writings of the saints, or early Christian poetry.[15]

Among liturgical texts, antiphons are unique. Their purpose is neither the proclamation of Scripture (as in the Lectionary), nor is it to allude to the Christian textual-theological tradition through newly composed prayer (as in the presidential prayers of the Missal). Antiphons can quote scripture directly or create a pastiche of a number of different verses and sources. Their purpose is to reappropriate the Christian scriptural/textual tradition through a liturgical-Christological lens[16] for the purpose of accompanying ritual action. Antiphons thus provide a window into how centuries of Christian liturgical experience have influenced the church's interpretation of its scriptural/textual heritage.

In terms of the antiphons, this interpretive event occurred first in their initial composition. And it continues every time the liturgy is celebrated: in the way a specific antiphon text employs the textual tradition; in how it relates to and interacts with its verses, creating a liturgical chant; in how the text of the chant reveals something about a specific day or season of the liturgical year; in how the chant interacts with the other texts of the liturgical celebration; and, finally, through the integration of the chant and the liturgical procession. It is this complex and multivalent mingling of text and context that constitutes the function of the Mass antiphon. Indeed, this interaction of contexts through antiphons is integral to the Roman Rite and, paradoxically, its noble simplicity.[17]

If not quotations or allusions, then, what are Mass antiphons? Like the presidential prayers, they are "textuum manu ecclesiastica compositorum" (texts of ecclesiastical composition) (*Liturgiam Authenticam,* no. 23)[18] and find their source in "centuries of ecclesial experience in transmitting the faith of the Church received from the Fathers" (*Liturgiam Authenticam,* no. 20). While the scripture readings of the Lectionary also exist apart from the liturgy in the Christian Bible, antiphons were written and compiled specifically *for* the liturgy.

The fact that antiphons are texts of ecclesiastical composition is especially relevant when it comes to liturgical translation. Translation is at the heart of present-day liturgical praxis because celebration of the liturgy in the vernacular is now universal. The antiphons of a vernacular edition of a liturgical book, therefore, must clearly translate the antiphon texts of the Latin *editio typica* if the tradition of interpretation is to be maintained.[19] Thus, even when their texts are clearly derived from sacred Scripture, their translation need not and probably should not simply quote a modern English translation of the Bible (see *Liturgiam Authenticam,* no. 24). To do so would be to lose sight of the line of interpretation followed in the Roman liturgical tradition.[20] In many cases, such a direct carrying over of the translation from a modern biblical translation is impossible, given the degree and manner of textual adaptation. It is also true that most modern scripture translations do not translate texts with singing or musical composition in mind.

In the case of the antiphons of the *Missale Romanum*, this principle of translation addresses a practical problem in addition to preserving liturgical tradition. Because the antiphon texts, when derived from scripture, are derived from the Latin Vulgate or an Old Latin translation,[21] a particular excerpt from a modern scripture translation, even if based upon more recent scholarship and source criticism, is not an accurate translation of the Latin text of the antiphon. Furthermore, some antiphons draw upon apocryphal books in the Vulgate that are not found in more recent scripture translations. The arrangement and numbering of chapters and verses, especially in the apocryphal books and in the psalms, sometimes varies between modern translations and that of the Vulgate and Old Latin translations as well.

These translation complexities often also apply to the verses that accompany the antiphons. "So that conformity with the Latin liturgical text may be maintained" (*Liturgiam Authenticam,* no. 37), translators should look to the ancient Latin translations of the Psalms. The first psalm verse that accompanies the Holy Thursday Evening Mass entrance antiphon *Nos autem gloriari*, for example, contains the phrase "et misereatur nostri," which is found neither in the Neo-Vulgate nor in recent English translations of the psalms, but only in Jerome's translation of the Psalms based on the Septuagint. To be sure, more recent translations more accurately reflect the earliest biblical sources. In fact, "it is often permissible that a variant reading of a verse be used, on the basis of critical editions and upon the recommendation of experts" (*Liturgiam Authenticam,* no. 38). Nevertheless, "this is not permissible in the case of a liturgical text where such a choice would affect those elements of the passage that are pertinent to its liturgical context" (*Liturgiam Authenticam,* no. 38). In order that the traditional relationship between an antiphon and its verses be maintained:

> The effort should be made to ensure that the translations be conformed to that understanding of biblical passages which has been handed down by liturgical use and by the tradition of the Fathers of the Church, especially as regards very important texts such as the Psalms . . . in these cases the greatest care is to be taken so that the translations express the traditional Christological, typological and spiritual sense, and manifest the unity and the interrelatedness of both Testaments . . . [in order to express] the manner in which a text has traditionally been read and received within the Latin liturgical tradition. (*Liturgiam Authenticam*, no. 41)[22]

These same principles apply to antiphons that derive from non-scriptural sources, even if sometimes "it is useful with the assistance of historical and other scientific tools to consult a source that may have been discovered for the same text" (*Liturgiam Authenticam*, no. 23).

In terms of how Mass antiphons make use of their source texts—usually, how they make use of Scripture—there are a variety of methods traditional to the Roman Rite. All have to do with making the antiphon appropriate for a particular celebration: direct quotation, embellishment, enhancement, omission, rearrangement, centonization,[23] substitution, and paraphrase.[24] Any one antiphon can use multiple methods of adaptation and, as a result, as James McKinnon says,

"can stand apart from its scriptural context."[25] In some instances, the adaptation is so extensive that it is impossible to ascertain the source text(s).[26]

The Significance of Mass Antiphons for Liturgical Celebration

This paper takes for granted the importance of liturgical antiphons as constituent and integral elements of the Mass of the Roman Rite.[27] Still, when it comes to antiphons, there is some need to articulate why they are important in the first place. On the one hand, the antiphons—mainly the entrance and communion antiphons, but also others—comprise approximately twenty-five percent of the Missal as a ritual book. They are official liturgical texts and an ancient and integral genre of the Roman Rite dating from at least the end of the seventh century (and likely much earlier). On the other hand, they have fallen out of use in most English-speaking Roman Catholic parishes. This latter point is exemplified by the fact that none of the texts that have caused controversy in the period leading up to the implementation of the new translation have been antiphons.

One can also argue that the antiphon texts in the Missal are mainly there for circumstances in which the "real" antiphon from the *Graduale Romanum* will not be sung. In truth, however, there is no official English translation of the *Graduale Romanum* and discrepancies between the Missal and *Graduale* are fairly easily resolved.[28] Thus, the antiphons of the Missal can and should be sung or at least serve as models in terms of seasonal and theological themes in those instances when they are replaced with other musical forms.

It is also important to note that, in contrast to the 1973 effort, the recent ICEL antiphon translation rendered the antiphons with the criterion of 'singability' in mind.[29] The assumption was that the antiphons in the Missal would be set to music alongside their accompanying psalm verses. And, furthermore, when there is no entrance or communion song, the antiphons are to be recited from the Missal during Mass. Finally, based on anecdotal evidence—mainly a renewed interest in the Mass antiphons in recent publications[30]—there seems to be a movement among liturgical musicians and scholars to restore in some way the antiphons to their traditional place in the liturgy, or at least to have the antiphons influence contemporary practice in some way.

The Process of Translating the Antiphons of the Third Edition of the Roman Missal

The translation of the Missal antiphons was part of ICEL's broader project of translating the entire Missal. Because of the unique genre of the antiphons, a separate *ad hoc* committee was assembled for the task. The committee, composed of experts in the fields of musicology, linguistics and biblical studies, met several times beginning in 2005.

Once approved by the Bishops of ICEL, the committee's translation was issued as a *green book*[31] for consultation among ICEL's member conferences of bishops. The green books were also sent to the Congregation for Divine Worship so that they

could consult with their consultative body, the *Vox Clara* committee.[32] A majority of the antiphons were substantially revised in the final emendation of the Missal prior to promulgation in 2010.

Some Examples of Particularly Complex Antiphon Texts

Issues of translation that present themselves in terms of the Mass antiphons are generally of three types:

1. Speaker or referent specificity. Antiphons often add words to the scripture text that adapt the antiphon to make Christ the "speaker" (e.g., *Dicit Dominus*) or "referent" (e.g., *ad Dominum*). Admittedly, accounting for this addition in the Latin text is a relatively simple matter. Antiphons also often add "alleluia" during the Easter season, which influences not only its text, but also its melody.
2. The adjustment or amplification of the theological force or intent of the original scriptural/textual source.
3. Festal or seasonal specificity. Antiphons often draw upon some earlier Old Latin translation or scripture, or deliberately change or adapt the scriptural text, thereby making it suitable for a particular liturgical day. Indeed, this type of adaptation helps achieve one of the primary purposes of the Mass antiphons—to announce the feast.

Speaker/Referent Specificity

For the Conferral of Confirmation, B, Communion Antiphon (cf. Ps 33:6, 9)

Accedite ad Dominum et illuminamini:
gustate et videte quoniam suavis est
(T.P. alleluia).

Here "ad Dominum" is an amplification of the scriptural text. In the antiphons, "Lord" usually refers to Christ. Both the Vulgate and Neo-Vulgate translations read "eum" rather than "Dominum," but "Dominum" appears in earlier verses of the Psalm, so, in context, would have been understood.

In addition, the Latin antiphon clearly relies upon an earlier tradition of Latin scripture translation in that, while the Neo-Vulgate begins "Respicite," the Vulgate reads "Accedite" (meaning "come to" or "draw near"), which is especially suitable to the celebration of confirmation, and was surely the reason the antiphon was chosen for this liturgy in the first place.

Adjustment or Amplification of Theological Force or Intent

Mary, the Holy Mother of God, 2nd Entrance Antiphon (cf. Is 9:1, 5; Lk 1:33)

Lux fulgebit hodie super nos, quia natus est nobis Dominus;
et vocabitur admirabilis, Deus, Princeps pacis,
Pater **futuri saeculi**: cuius regni non erit finis.

Here the Latin "futuri saeculi" (future age or world to come) is singular, in contrast to the plural of the biblical text. Thereby, the antiphon will be heard as referring to the Eschaton and amplifies the important theological claim to the eternal significance of Christ's birth.

Fourth Sunday of Lent, Entrance Antiphon (cf. Is 66:10–11)

Laetare, Ierusalem,
et conventum facite, omnes qui diligitis eam;
gaudete cum laetitia, qui in tristitia fuistis,
ut exsultetis, et satiemini ab uberibus consolationis vestrae.

This is one of the best-known antiphons of the Roman Rite. Here the Latin "et conventum facite" (and come together) reflects either an Old Latin translation of Isaiah or a deliberate adaptation of the biblical text, since the Vulgate reads "et exultate in ea." It is during this antiphon that the assembly gathers or "comes together," and so the adaptation makes the antiphon especially suitable to the entrance procession.

Festal or Seasonal Specificity or Suitability

First Week of Lent, Saturday, Entrance Antiphon (cf. Ps 26:8–9)

Lex Domini irreprehensibilis, **convertens animas**;
testimonium Domini fidele, sapientiam praestans parvulis.

While the modern/Neo-Vulgate translation reads "reficiens animas" (revives the soul), the Missal antiphon reads "convertens animas" (converting the soul). "Converting" is appropriate given the Lenten context—Lent is a time of conversion.

Second Week of Lent, Monday, Entrance Antiphon (cf. Ps 25:11–12)

Redime me, Domine, et miserere mei.
Pes enim meus stetit **in via recta**,
in ecclesiis benedicam Dominum.

Given the Lenten context, "in via recta" (on the right path or in the right direction) is extremely appropriate. Lent is a time of struggle to maintain the true path of penitence and conversion. The Neo-Vulgate, however, reads here "directo."

Holy Week, Tuesday, Entrance Antiphon (cf. Ps 26:12)

Ne **tradideris me**, Domine,
in animas **persequentium me**:
quoniam insurrexerunt in me testes iniqui,
et mentita est iniquitas sibi.

This antiphon represents an adaptation of the scriptural text, or perhaps an Old Latin translation. The Paschal thrust of Holy Week makes "tradideris me"

(hand me over) fitting, as does the text's resonance with the scriptural account of the time leading up to the crucifixion. For similar reasons, "persequentium me" (those who pursue me) is more apt than the text of the Hebrew tradition ("my foes," and instead of "hand me over," "leave me").

Fifth Week of Lent, Saturday, Entrance Antiphon (cf. Ps 21:20, 7)

Domine, ne longe facias **auxilium** tuum a me,
ad defensionem meam aspice;
quia ego sum vermis et non homo,
opprobrium hominum et **abiectio** plebis.

This antiphon, which reflects an earlier stratum of the biblical translation tradition and is quite different than the corresponding Neo-Vulgate text. Indeed, the older translation is especially appropriate on this day of the liturgical year. Saturday of the fifth week of Lent is the last day of this forty-day period of intense penance and conversion. By this time, the faithful are likely in need of "auxilium" (help) and "defensionem" (defense) after their long period of struggle with the sins and failings that preoccupy them. "Opprobrium hominum et abiectio" (a laughing-stock, rejected) resonates with the Passion of Christ, and so, as one of those unique antiphons of the liturgical year,[33] carries the weight of transitioning the faithful from Lent to Holy Week.

Ascension of the Lord, Vigil Mass, Entrance Antiphon (Ps 67:33, 35)

Regna terrae cantate Deo, psallite Domino,
qui ascendit super caelum caeli;
magnificentia et virtus eius in **nubibus**, alleluia.

Here the Missal antiphon reads "nubibus" (clouds). Modern translations of the Psalms, however, read "skies"—representing a more accurate rendering of the original text. "Nubibus," however, is found in both the Vulgate and Neo Vulgate translation of this psalm, and refers to the "cloud" in Acts 1:9—the biblical account of the Ascension.

26 July, Saints Joachim and Anne, Communion Antiphon (Ps 23:5)

Acceperunt **benedictionem** ad Domino,
et misericordiam ad Deo salutari suo.

The Latin antiphon reads the singular "benedictionem" (a blessing), even though modern translations are in the plural. The festal thrust is that Joachim's and Anne's daughter Mary is the (singular) blessing.

Antiphon Translation in Relation to Liturgical Norms

As more and more scholarly attention is paid to the new Missal translation over the coming years, and as it is viewed in light of official ecclesiastical liturgical

norms, the picture will clarify that the complexities of translating Mass antiphons are particularly important, both in terms of a beautifully rendered English text—in that liturgical translation should result in "a flowing vernacular text suitable to the rhythm of popular prayer" (*Liturgiam Authenticam,* no. 20)—and in that "translations should be characterized by a kind of language which is easily understandable . . . contributing . . . to the dignity and beauty of the liturgical celebration itself" (*Liturgiam Authenticam*, no. 25). The faithful rendering of the Latin text is also an important concern:

> The translation of the liturgical texts of the Roman Liturgy is not so much a work of creative innovation as it is of rendering the original texts faithfully and accurately into the vernacular language. . . . The original text, insofar as possible, must be translated integrally and in the most exact manner, without omission or additions in terms of their content, and without paraphrases or glosses. (*Liturgiam Authenticam*, no. 20)

In the case of translating the Mass antiphons, as compared to the rest of the texts of the Missal, the liturgical genre of antiphons requires an even higher degree of attention to liturgical norms and ecclesiastical legislation:

> In the translation of texts of ecclesiastical composition, while it is useful with the assistance of historical and other scientific tools to consult a source that may have been discovered for the same text, nevertheless it is always the text of the Latin *editio typica* itself that is to be translated. (*Liturgiam Authenticam*, no. 23)

> [When choosing a translation, it is best to choose] that one which is most suited for expressing the manner in which a text has traditionally been read and received within the Latin liturgical tradition. . . . Translators are strongly encouraged to pay close attention to the history of interpretation that may be drawn from citations of biblical texts in the writings of the Fathers of the Church, and also from those biblical images more frequently found in Christian art and hymnody. (*Liturgiam Authenticam*, no. 41)[34]

> The literary and rhetorical genres of the various texts of the Roman Liturgy are to be maintained. (*Liturgiam Authenticam*, no. 58)[35]

> The genre of the original Latin text should be preserved in translation. (*Ratio Translationis*, no. 111)[36]

> Expressions that have a particular doctrinal or spiritual importance or those that are more widely known are, insofar as possible, to be translated literally. (*Liturgiam Authenticam*, no. 59)

> Certain liturgical texts of ecclesiastical composition are associated with ritual actions. . . . Thus, in preparing appropriate translations it will be

> advantageous to consider such factors as the time required for reciting the words, their suitability for being sung or recited, or for continuous repetition. (*Liturgiam Authenticam*, no. 62)
>
> Liturgical texts should be rendered to correspond to the ritual acts they accompany. (*Ratio Translationis*, no. 99)
>
> The oral-aural dimensions of liturgical vernacular and the exigencies of the musical proclamation of a text should be respected in translation, [even if] in the translation of the Psalter or other biblical texts set to music, but also in the translation of the Latin liturgical texts of ecclesiastical composition, concerns of musical arrangement should never be used to justify any alteration, diminution or addition to the content of the original text. (*Ratio Translationis,* no. 87, 89)[37]
>
> Antiphons which in the Latin are adapted from the text of Sacred Scripture may be translated with somewhat more flexibility than texts taken directly from Sacred Scripture. . . . Poetry must be rendered somewhat more flexibly in a vernacular that intends to present such in a recognized literary form, but without losing the important link between meaning and form. (*Ratio Translationis*, no. 90)

A successful translation of the Mass antiphons must account for these principles.

Conclusion

The point of this paper has been to explore and articulate the characteristics of Mass antiphons that make them a particularly complex case when it comes to liturgical translation. To be sure, the church has the resources and competency to deal with these complexities for the good of the faithful and for the sake of safeguarding and transmitting the substantial theological riches of the antiphon tradition to future generations of Roman Catholics and perhaps even to the broader Christian communion. In translation, it important that the ancient interpretive connections between Scripture, the Roman Rite, and liturgical celebration be maintained. The church should do all it can to encourage new scholars and scholarship in the field of liturgical Latin and linguistics so that ICEL and the Congregation for Divine Worship have the resources necessary for the ongoing task of translating the liturgy into the English vernacular. *Liturgiam Authenticam*, no. 70—citing *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, no. 36, and the Code of Canon Law—states, "The task of preparing liturgical translations is to be entrusted to Bishops." In the last appraisal, then, it is up to the conferences to encourage such scholarship and to facilitate and ensure quality translation.

Notes

1 On this matter, see the chapter "A Cold Wind from Rome" in Maurice Taylor, *It's the Eucharist, Thank God* (Suffolk, UK: Decani Books, 2010). Bishop Taylor was the chairman of ICEL from 1997–2002.

2 It should be said that this "setting aside" requires one to bracket many substantial issues, but these issues are best taken up elsewhere.

3 Instruction *Comme le prévoit*, Consilium for Implementing the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, 25 January 1969. Its mode of translation is often described as dynamic equivalence, but the instruction's principles are better characterized as inculturated, literary-critical liturgical translation. The instruction presents a balanced view of the translation process, stating both that, "it is not sufficient that a liturgical translation merely reproduce the expressions and ideas of the original text. Rather it must faithfully communicate . . . that which the Church . . . originally intended," and that the here-and-now speaker/audience, "scientific methods of textual study," and "a critical text of a passage" should be considered when producing the translation (nos. 6, 7, 10).

4 The degree of this muting of the Latin texts varies between genres in the 1973 translation and is especially prevalent in the presidential prayers (opening prayer, prayer over the gifts, prayer after communion). The prefaces of the 1973 translation, on the other hand, are more florid and reflect the Latin more faithfully.

5 Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, 28 March 2001.

6 *Liturgiam Authenticam*, no. 20, states, "The translation of liturgical texts of the Roman Liturgy is not so much a work of creative innovation as it is of rendering the original texts faithfully and accurately into the vernacular language." It is interesting to note that both the 1969 and 2001 instructions spoke specifically to the English language, presumably because of its prevalence as an emerging *lingua franca*.

7 This axiom loosely translates as "what we pray is what we believe," or as stated by Prosper of Aquitaine (ca. 390–ca. 455), "Legem credendi lex statuat supplicandi" or "The rule of belief is established by the rule of prayer." See *Capitula Cœlestini* 8, in *Patrologia Latina* 51, 210.

8 Of course, a good number of the Latin prayers in the Missal are not ancient, but newly composed, drawing especially upon the documents of the Second Vatican Council, or new to the Roman Missal, drawing upon other ancient liturgical traditions.

9 As Margaret Mary Kelleher notes, the text "plays a mediating role by providing certain imagery for God, oneself, and the Christian community." Kelleher, "Liturgy and the Christian Imagination," *Worship* 66, no. 2 (March 1992): 148.

10 While both *Comme le prévoit* and *Liturgiam Authenticam* have met with criticism, each, for its time, articulates the official norms of the church and thus must be taken as normative. For an analysis of *Liturgiam Authenticam*, see Peter Jeffrey, *Translating Tradition: A Chant Historian Reads "Liturgiam Authenticam"* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2006); and John Huels "*Liturgiam Authenticam*: Canonical Observations," *Rite* 32, no. 6 (August/September 2001): 12–13. While the document contains some substantial flaws, its principles in regard to antiphon translation are sound.

11 Certain scripture translations, particularly of the Psalms, have taken this requirement of singing (and setting a text to music) very seriously. See, for example, *The Psalms: A New Translation* (1963) by The Ladies of The Grail, and the recent revision of this translation, *The Revised Grail Psalms: A Liturgical Psalter* (Chicago: GIA Publications, 2010).

12 In other words, an antiphon must be able to serve as a processional text, relate coherently to its psalm verses, and be appropriate to its assigned day of the liturgical year.

13 More or less so, depending upon the type of chant. Offertory antiphons are exceptionally florid, communion antiphons relatively simple, and introit antiphons somewhere in between.

14 Jungmann notes that non-psalmic texts are most often assigned to feasts and festive seasons. Josef A. Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite: Its Origins and Development*, trans. France A. Brunner (Benziger Bros., 1951; reprint, Allen, TX: Christian Classics, 1986), 1:329. Whether the

psalmic or non-psalmic assignments are more ancient is still a matter of scholarly debate.

15 See Peter Jeffery, *Re-Envisioning Past Musical Cultures: Ethnomusicology in the Study of Gregorian Chant* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 63.

16 As David Power says, "What we have . . . is a christological use of an Old Testament psalmodic text." Power, *The Word of the Lord: Liturgy's Use of Scripture* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 2001), 28.

17 See *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, no. 34.

18 See also Peter Finn, "Questions and Issues Related to the Translation of Antiphons" (Washington, DC: ICEL, 2004), 2.

19 See Power, *Word of the Lord*, 29.

20 Ibid.

21 "Other possible sources," Joseph Metzinger says, "are the Latin translations of scripture made during the second and third centuries by a number of anonymous translators; these are collectively referred to as the 'Old Latin Bible.' Among these pre-Hieronymian translations are more than seventeen complete or partial Psalters." Metzinger, "The Liturgical Function of the Entrance Song: An Examination of the Introits and Introit Tropes of the Manuscript Piacenza, Archivio Capitolare, 65" (D.M.A. diss., Catholic University of America, 1993), 30.

22 See also *General Instruction of the Liturgy of the Hours*, nos.100–109.

23 *Centonization* is the combination of excerpts from a variety of textual sources.

24 For a detailed explanation of these methods and for specific examples from the Missal, see Jason J. McFarland, *Announcing the Feast: The Entrance Song in the Mass of the Roman Rite* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2012), 47–50, 185–88.

25 James W. McKinnon, "Festival, Text and Melody: Chronological States in the Life of Chant?" in *Chant and Its Peripheries*, ed. Bryan Gillingham and Paul Merkley, Musicological Studies 72 (Ottawa: Institute of Medieval Music, 1998), 6.

26 Ibid., 8.

27 For more on this issue and the entrance antiphon in particular, see McFarland, *Announcing the Feast*, passim.

28 See Christoph Tietze, "Graduale or Missale: The Confusion Resolved," *Sacred Music* 133, no. 4 (Winter 2006).

29 See *General Instruction of the Roman Missal*, no. 398, which emphasizes that proclamation of a text (including singing) must be a central criterion in the process of liturgical translation.

30 See, for example, Christoph Tietze, *Hymn Introits for the Liturgical Year: The Origin and Early Development of the Latin Texts* (Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications, 2005); Tietze, *Introit Hymns for the Church Year* (Franklin Park, IL: World Library Publications, 2005); Tietze, *Communion Antiphons for the Easter Season* (Franklin Park, IL: World Library Publications, 2009); Paul Ford, *By Flowing Waters: Chant for the Liturgy. A Collection of Unaccompanied Song for Assemblies, Cantors, and Choirs* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1999); Collegeville Composers Group, *Psallite: Sacred Song for Liturgy and Life* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2008); Jan Michael Joncas, "*Ex Aetate Mediali Lux?* On the Use of Tropes for the *Cantus ad introitum*," *Pray Tell* (blog), 3 January 2011, http://www.praytellblog.com/index.php/2011/01/03/ex-aetate-mediali-lux-on-the-use-of-tropes-for-the-cantus-ad-introitum/ (accessed 11 April 2011); and McFarland, *Announcing the Feast.*

31 The green book is the first ICEL draft translation, which is submitted to the member conferences of bishops for comment.

32 This committee was established on 19 July 2001 by the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments "to give advice to the Congregation regarding matters of liturgical translations of Latin liturgical texts into the English language, and to strengthen effective cooperation with the conferences of bishops in this regard." See *Adoremus Bulletin* vol. 9, no. 2 (April 2003).

33 Another example of such an antiphon is the entrance antiphon for the Holy Thursday Evening Mass of the Lord's Supper (*Nos autem gloriari*), which transitions from the passion to the resurrection.

34 See also *Liturgiam Authenticam*, no. 46, which states, "The norms set forth above, and those regarding Sacred Scripture, should also be applied, *mutatis mutandis*, to the texts of ecclesiastical composition."

35 Citing *Varietates Legitimae,* no. 53, and the *General Instruction of the Roman Missal*, no. 392.

36 Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, "*Ratio Translationis" for the English Language* (Vatican City, 2007).

37 Citing *Liturgiam Authenticam*, nos. 42, 44, 48, 59, 60, 61.