2009 Hovda Lectures

Sing to the Lord: Cultural Perspectives

BY RICKY MANALO, csp

What is culture? Many scholars grapple with this question in contemporary academic discourse.[1] What was once the primary lens through which cultural anthropologists came to analyze inhabitants of "other countries and territories" has become a useful tool for other social scientists working across multiple disciplinary fields. For example, in the field of sociology, interpretive approaches to cultural analysis continue to generate much interest.[2] Today, in our postmodern context, many social theorists are exploring how culture sites are marked with competing negotiations of power, dominance, and resistance.[3]

Contemporary understandings of culture may be divided into three subgroups: (1) culture as representing bounded social identity groups; (2) culture as material artifacts and special social activities; (3) culture as practice involving dynamics of power and negotiation.[4] I offer this description in order to challenge us to move beyond our conceptions of what constitutes worship practices of cultural groups. In many Roman Catholic writings about culture, as I will show, the word "culture" usually connotes specific ethnic identity groups: e.g., Filipino devotional practices, Eucharistic celebrations in the Spanish language, African American gospel services, etc. A broadened understanding of culture, therefore, will enrich and nuance our investigation of the "cultural elements" found in the USCCB document *Sing to the Lord* (hereafter STL).

With this goal in mind, the first part of this presentation provides a short overview of the three approaches to culture that currently dominate academic discourse. In the second part, these concepts of culture are the lenses through which one may read STL (and some of the achievements of STL with regard to culture will be highlighted in this section). Finally, other areas of interest with regard to culture and liturgical music will be examined—interests which

are absent from STL and which future official documents on liturgical music may want to address.

Part One: Three Approaches to Cultural Studies Today

First Approach:
Culture as Representing Bounded Social Identity Groups—
Culture in the Plural ("Cultures")

The first approach to cultural discourse is historically derived from the expansionist mindset of nineteenth century Europe, and it arose from the field of anthropology. Lyn Spillman writes:

> By that time, new reflection about differences among human populations had been prompted by European exploration and conquest across the globe. This gradually generated a *comparative way* of thinking about human society which ultimately became commonplace in modern life, and was also crucial to the formation of anthropology as a discipline . . . . *In this anthropological sense of the term, the entire way of life of a people is thought to be embedded in, and expressed by, its culture.* Cultures are thought to be evident in anything from tools to religion; and different cultures are seen as distinct units.[5]

In light of this expansionist mindset, comparative tendencies in historical and social studies, and the ongoing formation of nation-states, it was inevitable that hierarchical systems of cultural groups based on "western ideals of social progress" would emerge. Some cultural groups were classified as "civilized" while others were not. Spillman notes: "European cultures were placed at the top of a world hierarchy. But [these] explicit claims about the superiority of western cultures gradually dissipated in the twentieth century." (Although, some may argue, racial and hierarchical programs still exist.)[6]

With the rise of multiculturalism during the 1960s, it is arguable that the theoretical and academic peak of this approach to culture came with the writings of Clifford Geertz. Geertz paved the way toward an interpretive approach to cultural studies that would significantly influence other disciplines in the social sciences. In his seminal work *The Interpretation of Culture*, Geertz defines culture as "an historically transmitted pattern of meanings embodied in symbols, a system of inherited conceptions expressed in symbolic forms by means of which men communicate, perpetuate, and develop their knowledge about and attitudes toward life."[7]

The First Approach to Culture and Roman Catholic Liturgical Studies. Since the Second Vatican Council, official Roman Catholic documents and the work of liturgical theologians have promoted this first approach to culture. From the mid-1970s through to the 1980s, liturgical theologians such as Mary Collins[8], Mark Searle[9], Margaret Mary Kelleher[10], and Kevin Seasoltz[11] (among others) helped articulate dialectical parameters among liturgical theology, historical studies, and the place of the social sciences. A second stage appeared with the writings of Anscar Chupungco and his work on liturgical inculturation.[12] Mark Francis[13] and Keith Pecklers[14], both of whom studied under Chupungco, may fall within this line of inquiry. More recent analyses of liturgical inculturation include the writings of Peter Phan, particularly his interest in the relationship between liturgy and popu-

lar piety[15] and postmodernity.[16] Finally, the field of liturgical ethnography (as exemplified by the work of Mary McGann) continues to influence how scholars describe and record the practices of worshiping communities.[17]

For the most part, these theologians often view culture as "ethnic identity groups." Specifically, they take their lead from the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, in which the question of cultural adaptation was placed alongside the missionary activities of the Church. Liturgical theologians engaged in these questions naturally look to the writings of social theorists, cultural anthropologists, and missiologists for starting points.[18] Other theologians have taken the Constitution's call for liturgical adaptation as an academic calling card with which to pursue questions of how cultural adaptations may be applied to specific ethnic communities.

If Clifford Geertz ushered in a semiotic approach to cultural analysis (that is, the study of meaning and its modes of communication) at the social science level, then it should come as no surprise that a number of Roman Catholic theologians, who themselves are equally engaged in questions about meaning, symbols, and rituals, would eventually promote a "Geertzian approach" to cultural analysis with respect to the growing ethnic diversity that is becoming apparent in worship contexts.[19]

SECOND APPROACH:
CULTURE AS MATERIAL ARTIFACTS AND SPECIAL SOCIAL ACTIVITIES—
CULTURE IN THE SINGULAR ("CULTURE")

The second approach to culture can also be traced back to nineteenth century Europe. Rather than being grounded in Western nationalism and expansionist motivations, this subgroup of cultural studies emerged from the Industrial Revolution. In this approach to culture, the practices and material artifacts that stem from the Industrial Revolution raise their own academic concerns. This transitional time period "from premodern to modern social organization," Lyn Spillman notes, accentuated "a new contrast between the mundane, pragmatic, and conflict-ridden realms of economics and politics—the new worlds of capitalism, industry, democracy, and revolution [on the one hand]—and [on the other hand] an ideally purer realm of art and morality expressing higher human capabilities and values than could be seen in modern economic and political life."[20] "Culture" through this lens was viewed as material artifacts ("cultural products") and special social activities that allowed people to escape the cold and industrialized reality of the world, particularly as this phenomenon was occurring in growing urban centers.

Unlike the prior approach to culture which examined "culture in the plural" (cultures/cultural groups) this approach often uses the word "culture" in the singular: e.g., modern culture, pop culture, and the like.[21] With its origins in the Industrial Revolution, these numerous strands of academic concern have evolved, usually under the interested eyes of sociologists. Two sociological disciplines have emerged that connect social products and practices with cultural interests: sociology of culture and cultural sociology.

Sociology of Culture. The discipline sociology of culture includes interest in the production of social products (e.g., a painting, a CD, fashion accessories) and social practices (consumerism, artistic acquisitions, media

studies). Some would tie these products and practices to the dynamics of social stratification by examining the phenomena known as "high brow" and "low brow" art.[22] Scholars may become interested in how material cultural artifacts ("cultural products") come to be produced and distributed (e.g. "pop culture," mass production, consumerism).[23] As William Sewell writes, this approach to culture studies how institutional spheres become devoted to the making of meaning: These institutional spheres "are devoted specifically to the production, circulation, and use of meanings . . . the study of activities that take place within these institutionally defined spheres and of the meanings produced in them."[24]

Social cultural products and practices are not always made or performed by one particular social cultural group (as in the first approach to culture), but, like the marketing enterprises of cultural products, they are often made and performed across diverse cultural groups. For example, in the texts of Roman Catholic social teaching and moral theology one may find reference to the ills and challenges of "modern culture," and Pope John Paul II, in his 1993 visit to Denver, Colorado, challenged Americans to foster a "culture of life" rather than a "culture of death." These cultural phrases would soon make their way into his 1995 encyclical *Evangelium Vitae.*

Cultural Sociology. During the 1970s, peaking in the 1980s, academic interest arose among sociologists and other social scientists to embrace a more semiotic approach to cultural analysis that was emerging in the field of anthropology (recall Geertz' influential work, *The Interpretation of Culture*). This became known as "the cultural turn." Before, sociologists of culture generally were not interested in "interpretive approaches" to culture; rather they were more interested in the production and distribution of cultural products and practices. Now, with the cultural turn (i.e., analysis of what these social practices and products *mean* to people) a new subdiscipline began to emerge: "cultural sociology." As Jeffrey Alexander writes:

> Cultural sociology makes collective emotions and ideas central to its methods and theories precisely because it is such subjective and internal feelings that so often seem to rule the world. Socially constructed subjectivity forms the will of collectivities; shapes the rules of organizations; defines the moral substance of law; and provides the meaning and motivation for technologies, economies, and military machines.[25]

Cultural sociology is defined as the meaning-making processes (hence, cultural) that occur within and around various societal frameworks; it is the analysis of *sociocultural* practices and the investigations that demonstrate how such practices come to be interpreted among social actors and institutions. In sum, and with the risk of over-simplification, one may frame these two sociological subdisciplines in the following way: *Sociology of culture* is focused on the production and stratification of cultural objects and practices (often using quantitative and objective tools), while *cultural sociology* is focused on the interpretive reasons behind meaning-making processes (more subjective approaches) and how such processes influence everyday life. It should be noted that sociologists and anthropologists today borrow, mix, and combine these approaches and tools that have emerged since the cultural turn. The social science fields have become more interdisciplinary than had been the case before.

Sociologists of culture today would most likely approach the field of Roman Catholic liturgical music with a set of questions focused on the *effects* and *impact* that material music and worship resources have had within and outside Roman Catholic social contexts.

The Second Approach to Culture and Roman Catholic Liturgical Music. Sociologists of culture today would most likely approach the field of Roman Catholic liturgical music with a set of questions focused on the *effects* and *impact* that material music and worship resources have had within and outside Roman Catholic social contexts. Their interests would perhaps examine both what and how social artists/production institutions *create* their products of cultural meaning.[26] Cultural sociologists, on the other hand, would probably want to conduct a series of surveys or interviews investigating *why* people buy these products or what personal, religious, and/or social meanings are attached to social practices that involve liturgical music. Sample questions could include:

From the field of sociology of culture:

- What are the capitalistic dynamics that exist between liturgical music publishers (OCP, GIA, and WLP), and how do these dynamics impact U.S. Sunday worship?
- What liturgical music products are people using today, and what would this data say about Roman Catholic worship life?
- What clothing do people wear during Sunday Eucharistic celebrations?

From the field of cultural sociology:

- How and why do people finding meaning in everyday social activities that involve "liturgical music," activities that exist beyond the boundaries of liturgical celebrations: e.g., listening to the latest CD of our favorite liturgical composer in the car, downloading a liturgical music podcast, singing our favorite liturgical tunes in the shower? How do such social practices impact our interpretation, understanding, and experience of Sunday Eucharist?
- How does the recollection of a liturgical tune, which can sometimes outlast the memory of a homily, inform one's actions beyond the temporal boundaries of Sunday worship?

Third Approach:
Culture as Practice Ritual and the Dynamics of Power

In 1984, Sherry B. Ortner articulated a new paradigmatic shift in social and cultural analysis that had been increasingly influencing her own field of anthropology: practice theory.[27] "This growing interest in analysis is focused through one or another of a bundle of interrelated terms: practice, praxis, action, interaction, activity, experience, performance. A second, and closely related, bundle of terms focuses on the doer of all that doing: agent, actor, person, self, individual, subject."[28] While she notes that the roots of this theoretical approach may be traced back to the 1970s (for example, the French publication of Pierre Bourdieu's *Outline of a Theory of Practice* in 1972 and its English translation in 1978), she sees this approach as a reaction to the structuralism that developed throughout the 1960s, mostly through the efforts of Claude Lévi-Strauss. Lévi-Strauss "argued that the seemingly

Cultural sociologists, on the other hand, would probably want to conduct a series of surveys or interviews investigating *why* people buy these products or what personal, religious, and/or social meanings are attached to social practices that involve liturgical music.

bewildering variety of social and cultural phenomena could be rendered intelligible by demonstrating the shared relationships of those phenomena to a few simple underlying principles."[29]

But while the "enduring contribution of Lévi-Straussian structuralism lies in the perception that luxuriant variety . . . may have a deeper unity and systematicity," practice theorists during the '70s and '80s would soon challenge structural theory. They noted that while structuralist systems, organizations, and institutions may "have very powerful, even 'determining,' effect upon human beings" attention must also be paid to how such systems are created in the first place, where such systems come from, "how they are produced and reproduced,"[30] and how social actors (everyday people in everyday life) come to negotiate and appropriate these structural components in their own lives. Ortner writes that "modern practice theory seeks to explain the relationship(s) that obtain between human action, on the one hand, and some global entity which we may call 'the system,' on the other."[31] If practice may be defined broadly as "anything people do,"[32] then cultural practice theorists feel the need to hold up these everyday practices as a credible resource for academic inquiry in order to challenge what constitutes cultural boundaries, albeit from a "particular–political–angle."[33]

Culture as Practice and Catherine Bell's Theory of Ritual Negotiation. In order to align this approach of culture closer to the field of liturgical studies, it is worth mentioning the writings of the late Catherine Bell on ritual and power.[34] In *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*, Bell borrows heavily from postmodern thinkers such as Michel Foucault and Antonio Gramsci, who highlighted the discursive force of ritual. Foucault, for example, viewed power as being contingent, relational, organizational, imprecise, and local. For Foucault, power is only exercised on free subjects insofar as they remain free. The movement of power is not *just* from top to bottom but also involves bottom to top. Furthermore, Foucault postulated, it is the social body that becomes the political field in the exercise of power. The body becomes the link between the individual and larger societal frameworks.

For Bell, ritual is a way that this form of power is expressed. Because ritual involves distinguishing and privileging certain actions over other actions *on the part of all people involved*, the *boundaries* of power within these rituals remain flexible and fluid. Bell wrote that while those in charge of rituals may objectify their office, create a hierarchy of practices, and use tools for the purposes of traditionalization and legitimization, there are certain limits. People, insofar as they are free, still choose or negotiate whether they agree or disagree with ritual prescriptions. If they subscribe to the hierarchization of religious institutions, for example, they may comply with such rules and laws and come to a disposition and subscription to the worldview that specific institutional/religious leaders promote. If not, they may choose to negotiate around the boundaries of ritual laws and prescriptions.

One example comes to mind. In reference to the Roman Catholic priest speaking the Eucharistic Prayer during the Mass, the *General Instruction of the Roman Missal* (GIRM) states that "while the priest is speaking these texts, there should be no other prayers or singing, and the organ or other musical instruments should be silent" (GIRM, 32). In some African American Catholic communities, however, it is not uncommon to find keyboardists playing underneath the presider's words during the Eucharistic Prayer (as well as

during many other moments throughout the entire celebration). While those in charge of controlling ritual events may feel empowered to write official documents, at the same time, practitioners, participants, and even local leaders (and I am admittedly bracketing whether these practitioners are even aware of GIRM 32) negotiate various levels of resistance and compliance. In this example, these African Americans communities and their cultural sensibilities toward having instrumental music play underneath the spoken words of a priest negotiate between their cultural expressions, on the one hand, and the collective cultural institution and "traditioning" agenda of the Roman Catholic magisterium.

This approach to culture often challenges the perceived boundaries of cultural identity (in this example, the challenge is to the perception of what style of music making constitutes Roman Catholic identity/culture). It does this by considering the practices that occur along the boundaries of perceived established norms, the practices that occur in-between the dominant social structures. In doing this, it tries to legitimize these "other sites of cultural actions" in order to complement—if not critique—the perceived status quo.

Summarizing the Three Approaches

Obviously, this list of "approaches to culture" is not exhaustive. However, the approaches described here do represent the dominant approaches to culture which exist in academic discourse today. Before we move into the second part of this essay, allow me to demonstrate how all three approaches to culture outlined here usually flow in and out and overlap with one another. The gospel music tradition of African American Roman Catholics (culture in the first sense) becomes promoted through the recent publication of *Psalms from the Soul,* volumes one and two[35] (culture in the second sense and the concern of sociologists of culture). For some predominantly African American parishes, these products are a godsend and represent their own "treasury of sacred music" (culture in the first sense). These products are greatly valued in many communities because the musical styles promoted by these CDs and songbooks represent a cultural emancipation envisioned by the civil rights movement (culture in the second sense through the prism of cultural sociology). And yet, some of the African American parishioners in a Catholic parish in Oakland, California—a parish community where I am presently engaged in ethnographic field research—have shared with me that they do not prefer this style of music in their own Eucharistic celebrations but would rather sing selections from more traditional western hymnody. Thus, while they see African American brothers and sisters physically moving and shouting out "Amen!" in other services, they have negotiated their own cultural worship style of participation against what is perceived to be the more popular black gospel tradition and have chosen to celebrate their Sunday Eucharist in a predominantly white community (culture in the third sense through the prism of ritual practice, power, and negotiation).

Part Two: *Sing to the Lord* and Culture

It is now time to consider the USCCB statement *Sing to the Lord* and use the three approaches to culture outlined in the first part of this essay as the

lens through which one may read this document.

Examining some numbers may provide a context. Within the text of STL (not counting titles or headings) and in its various combinations and forms (e.g., "culture," "cultures," "multicultural," "intercultural," and so on), the word "culture" appears thirty-four times.[36] In contrast, instances of and combinations of "culture" appear five times in *Music in Catholic Worship*; nine times in *Liturgical Music Today*; fifty-eight times in *The Milwaukee Symposia for Church Composers*; and just once in *The Snowbird Statement on Catholic Liturgical Music*.

Sing to the Lord and the First Approach to Culture

It is obvious that the predominant approach to and understanding of culture as found throughout the text of STL reflects the initial approach to culture outlined in the first section of this paper: culture in the plural (e.g., cultural groups) representing bounded social identities. I categorize this first approach to culture in STL under five themes: 1) cultural diversity awareness; 2) a Church marked by immigration; 3) appreciation of and respect for cultural musical styles; 4) consideration of intercultural dynamics; and 5) the relationship between the music of culturally bounded groups and Gregorian chant.

1. Cultural Diversity Awareness. The opening section of STL, entitled "Why We Sing," makes explicit the awareness of cultural diversity: "The choir may draw on the treasury of sacred music, singing compositions by composers of various periods and in various musical styles, as well as music that expresses the faith of the various cultures that enrich the Church" (STL, 30). But it is most telling that STL devotes an *entire* section to this approach to culture: "Section II. The Church At Prayer; H. Diverse Cultures and Languages." Within this section, cultural groups are viewed as having some relationship with other cultural groups.

2. A Church Marked by Immigration. Closely connected to the cultural diversity awareness theme is the ongoing activity of immigration that is changing the social ecclesial landscape of the Catholic Church in the United States. Official statements by the U.S. bishops that preceded STL articulated this reality, and it is seen in STL's reference to one of those documents: *Welcoming the Stranger: Unity in Diversity* (2000).[37] In this area, STL has done a tremendous service to the pastoral life of the U.S. Church, namely, pointing out that attention must be paid to the liturgical/musical needs of our immigrant sisters and brothers.

3. Appreciation of and Respect for Cultural Musical Styles. In light of this awareness of cultural diversity, STL logically takes the next step and acknowledges the genuine appreciation and respect that should be demonstrated toward the musical styles of all cultures: "The choir may draw on the treasury of sacred music, singing compositions by composers of various periods and in various musical styles, as well as music that expresses the faith of the various cultures that enrich the Church" (STL, 30). In this passage, "sacred music" includes music from past historical periods, various musical styles and idioms, and music from various cultures. And quoting *Welcoming the Stranger*, STL speaks of the "cultural *gifts* of the new immigrants" (STL, 57, emphasis mine), thus extending beyond musical gifts in order to include

(one may surmise) artistic, linguistic, gestural, and other gifts.

4. Consideration of Intercultural Dynamics. STL breaks new ground in its consideration of intercultural relationships that exist in worship contexts. This is the first time that this term ("intercultural") appears in an official Roman Catholic liturgy document.[38] Its use in this statement is linked to another term—"multicultural"—in order to move beyond the numerical designation of the *presence* of many cultures (multiculturalism) and highlight the more dynamic interactions that exists between cultural groups before, during, and after worship events.

5. The Relationship between the Music of Culturally Bounded Groups and Gregorian Chant. Quoting the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy (SC, 116), STL 72 notes the appropriateness of celebrating the liturgy using Gregorian chant and, to some extent, the Latin texts set to chant (see also STL, 74–76): "The Church recognizes Gregorian chant as being specially suited to the Roman Liturgy. Therefore, other things being equal, it should be given pride of place in liturgical services." STL continues: "Gregorian chant is uniquely the Church's own music," and it may serve as "a bond of unity across cultures, a means for diverse communities to participate together in song, and a summons to contemplative participation in the Liturgy." The bishops are very specific in directing that "each worshiping community in the United States, including all age groups and all ethnic groups," learn certain chant settings of parts of the Order of Mass (STL, 75).

Speaking specifically about the use of Latin texts as a unifying factor (STL, 61–66), the bishops are somewhat tentative in encouraging its use (see STL, 64), though they promote it for "international and multicultural gatherings" along with "selections of Gregorian chant" (STL, 62). As a composer of a few liturgical songs that are completely in Latin (though not, of course, in Gregorian chant), I can testify to the unifying power of the Latin language, particularly in a multicultural context. At the same time, let us not forget that other musical styles and other languages may also serve as unifying agents. For example, if the majority of worshipers understand English, then popularly sung Eucharistic Mass settings may serve as a unifying thread throughout the Mass. At the same time, in some U.S. dioceses, the use of languages such as Spanish help promote unity.

Thus, STL 73 states that while Gregorian chant was given a pride of place by the Second Vatican Council, "these 'other things' are the important liturgical and pastoral concerns facing every bishop, pastor, and liturgical musician." STL concludes this section by stating that sensitivity needs to be exercised when considering the "cultural and spiritual milieu" of worshiping communities: "In considering the use of the treasures of chant, pastors and liturgical musicians should take care that the congregation is able to participate in the Liturgy with song. They should be sensitive to the cultural and spiritual milieu of their communities, in order to build up the Church in unity and peace."

Sing to the Lord and the Second Approach to Culture

The second approach to culture, which includes the production of cultural products and activities (sociology of culture) and the meaning-making processes inherent in social activities (cultural sociology), can mostly be found in

STL's consideration of the work of music publishers (social institutions that produce cultural products). Only once does it refer to culture as encapsulating everyday social activities, though I will focus first on this latter usage.

1. Culture as Counter-Cultural. The first time the term "culture" appears in STL is in the first section, which postulates "Why We Sing": "'In a culture which neither favors nor fosters meditative quiet, the art of interior listening is learned only with difficulty. Here we see how the liturgy, though it must always be properly inculturated, must also be counter-cultural'" (STL, 12). This is a direct quote from John Paul II's 1998 address to the bishops of the United States. In this quote, John Paul II continues to use an approach to culture (culture in the singular) in which specific mindsets and social practices (in this case, the busyness of modern culture) are contrasted with other (more desirable) social activities that promote *prayerful* activities such as meditation and interior listening.

2. Culture as the Production of Cultural Products. I categorize the way that STL addresses the ministry and duties of music publishers in four subtopics.

2.1. Publishers Addressing the Needs of the Church. STL 57 encourages music publishers to continue producing resources that address the growing diversity of the U.S. Church: "The cultural gifts of the new immigrants" are "taking their place alongside those of older generations of immigrants," and this calls for interaction and collaboration between peoples who speak various languages and celebrate their faith in the songs and musical styles of their cultural, ethnic, and racial roots. In order to support this collaboration, music publishers need to be encouraged to offer multilingual options for use which would be more expressive of our unity amid such great diversity.

2.2. Publishers and Composers. The section of the document on the role of the liturgical composer acknowledges the work of both composers and publishers in the production of "new repertoire" in light of the liturgical reforms of Vatican II and the need for music in indigenous languages:

> In the years immediately following the liturgical reforms of the Second Vatican Council, especially because of the introduction of vernacular language, *composers and publishers worked to provide a new repertoire of music for indigenous language(s).* In subsequent decades, this effort has matured, and a body of worthy vernacular liturgical music continues to develop, even though much of the early music has fallen into disuse. Today, as they continue to serve the Church at prayer, composers are encouraged to concentrate on craftsmanship and artistic excellence in all musical genres (STL, 84).

2.3. Publishers and the Production of Recorded Music. When addressing the use (or misuse) of recorded music, STL (93–94) retrieves almost verbatim the directive that was found in *Liturgical Music Today* (LMT, 60–62).

> 93. Recorded music lacks the authenticity provided by a living liturgical assembly gathered for the Sacred Liturgy. While recorded music might be used advantageously outside the Liturgy as an aid in the teaching of new music, it should not, as a general norm, be used within the Liturgy.

> 94. Some exceptions to this principle should be noted. Recorded music may be used to accompany the community's song during a procession outside and, when used carefully, in Masses with children. Occasionally, it might be used

as an aid to prayer, for example, during long periods of silence in a communal celebration of reconciliation. However, recorded music should never become a substitute for the community's singing.

2.4. Publishers, Copyrights, and the Production of Participation Aids. STL (105–108) also retrieves copyright concerns that were addressed in *Liturgical Music Today* (LMT, 71–72), but the newer document describes the protection of published works as a "legal and moral obligation" of the Church and other institutions: "Many published works are protected by national and international copyright laws, which are intended to ensure that composers, text writers, publishers, and their employees receive a fair return for their work. Churches and other institutions have a legal and moral obligation to seek proper permissions and to pay for reprinting of published works when required, even if copies are intended only for the use of the congregation" (STL, 105).

STL notes that publishers "provide licenses and other convenient ways for obtaining permission for reprinting texts and music for the use of a liturgical assembly" making it even easier for "pastors, directors of music ministries, and other pastoral musicians . . . [to] act with a sense of justice" (STL, 106).

Lastly, STL (107–108) articulates the relationship between liturgy publishers and the USCCB, including the production of participation aids:

107. The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops has delegated to the Committee on Divine Worship the responsibility of overseeing the publication of liturgical books that describe and guide the reformed rites developed in the years since the Second Vatican Council. In light of this responsibility, *Guidelines for the Publication of Participation Aids* has been developed for publishers of popular participation materials.

108. Hymns, songs, and acclamations written for the liturgical assembly are approved for use in the Liturgy by the bishop of the diocese wherein they are published, in order to ensure that these texts truly express the faith of the Church with theological accuracy and are appropriate to the liturgical context.

Sing to the Lord and the Third Approach to Culture

Passages that address how worshipers engage in "practice negotiations" between institutional ritual prescriptions and their own cultural sensibilities are absent from the official text. Still, the intent of this presentation is not to confine my investigation of STL and culture to an analysis of the written text (the "ink-on-paper" approach) but also to assert that how worshipers negotiate its prescriptions may be an additional resource for understanding this document's approach to cultural concerns.[39] Academic consideration should advance the human agency processes that are involved in the preparation and appropriation of official documents. (That is, what happened or is happening behind the scenes from a cultural perspective that led to the writing and promulgation of STL?)

The Dynamics of Power in the Formation of *Sing to the Lord*. As an example, I suggest a consultation meeting that occurred on October 9, 2006. Sixty men and women gathered in Chicago to participate in a consultation on the revision of the 1972 document *Music In Catholic Worship* that would eventually lead to the writing of STL.[40] The task of writing this revised docu-

ment was given to an ad hoc committee—the Liturgy and Music Subcommittee—of the U.S. Bishops' Committee on Divine Worship. The subcommittee comprised three lay persons, three priests, and three bishops (though, at this meeting in Chicago, only one of the three bishops was in attendance). The remaining fifty-three participants in the meeting were allowed four minutes each to present their views, thoughts, and reflections on the shape, content, and principles that they hoped would be considered in the writing of the revised document (later named *Sing to the Lord*). I was privileged to be one of the fifty-three participants as a representative for OCP.[41]

Within the four minute timeframe allotted to me, I presented demographic statistics of the Catholic Church in the United States. My sociological data, taken from previous U.S. bishops' statements,[42] projected that the Hispanic/Latino population will comprise the majority (around fifty-two percent) of the entire U.S. Roman Catholic population within the next twenty years. After presenting this projection, I requested all sixty participants look around the room: There was not one participant with Hispanic/Latino heritage to be found among us. I added that my observation was not a questioning of democracy as far as equal voting power was concerned (after all, it was the nine members of the subcommittee who were to write this document, with final approval reserved to the U.S. Catholic bishops). My point was that the process of listening and consultation that had been initiated was already in question due to the absence of Hispanic/Latino representatives. Given the fact that Hispanic/Latino Catholics would soon constitute the majority social demographic group for whom this document was to be written, something was gravely wrong. Since the October 2006 consultation, I have been told that at least three people of Hispanic ethnicity were eventually consulted—*after the general meetings* and *at some point during the process of writing the document*. However, my point remains that the absence of representative groups *during* this pivotal meeting was a clear oversight. The very fact that these representatives were consulted only *after* this meeting remains a concern.

While the dynamics of power were apparent during the preparation phase of STL, it will be interesting to monitor how the various socio-cultural groups within the U.S. Catholic Church will appropriate the meaning of the text, how bishops will enforce its limited legislative power (the document is described as a set of guidelines), and how the various multicultural communities will negotiate the weight of its authority in light of their own cultural sensibilities. Have such sociological-ecclesial studies been done with regard to the appropriation of previous statements such as *Music in Catholic Worship* and *Liturgical Music Today*? This may be worth pursuing at some point in the near future.

Part Three: Looking Beyond the Boundaries of Ethnic Cultural Identities

Previous liturgical studies have approached the intersection between worship and culture through the disciplinary tools of anthropology and cultural studies. These approaches to liturgy and culture often emphasized the worldviews and practices of specific ethnic-cultural groups. As a result, these approaches fortified the seeming boundedness of such groups which, in turn, led to better articulations of how ethnic identity comes to be expressed

The process of listening and consultation that had been initiated was already in question due to the absence of Hispanic/ Latino representatives.

through worship practices: e.g., Hispanic/Latina/Latino processions, folk religiosity in the Philippines, African American gospel music, to name just a few. And yet, social experiences and practices of religious cultural identity—from social behaviors and mores, to religious rituals developed within and around domestic and workplace locations, to more transient phenomena such as the usages of the internet and the impact of globalization—are not necessarily bounded within or exclusively expressed through the traditions of existing ethnic-cultural communities. In fact, most people exhibit *multiple* social identities, including economic, gender, and generational markers. These "transboundering identities" exist in tension and in congruence with religious institutional structures and are often practiced beyond physical worship sites and around wider sociological frameworks. How might these cultural social dynamics influence our understanding and experience of liturgical music?

As I noted before, implications that arise out of the reality of immigration in the United States and in the Catholic Church in this country are prevalent throughout Section II.H. ("Diverse Cultures and Languages") of STL. Attention to these implications, while very much needed, accent the notion of "culture as bounded groups"—even more specifically of "culture as *ethnic* bounded groups"—to the detriment of an approach that would highlight the needs of other cultural groups that may not necessarily share ethnic identity: e.g., youth and young adults (generational), cultural groups that center around socio-political issues such as feminists and sexual orientation cultural groups, and groups identified by economic cultural considerations.[43]

To this end, STL at times makes distinctions between ethnic cultural groups and culturally bounded groups: i.e., "the rich cultural *and* ethnic heritage of the many peoples" (STL, 57, emphasis mine); "cultural, ethnic, *and* racial roots" (STL, 57); "multicultural *and* multigenerational assembly" (STL, 58). Once we move out of this section, there is an instance in which ethnic cultural groups are treated on equal footing with other cultural groups. This is when STL explains the kinds of music that need to be considered within a cultural context: "The *cultural context* refers to the setting in which the ritual and spiritual dimensions come into play. Factors such as the age, spiritual heritage, and cultural and ethnic background of a given liturgical assembly must be considered" (STL, 70).

Thus, STL moves us forward by expanding our concept of culture as bounded ethnic groups to include other culturally bounded groups, but more could still be done. While generational subgroups are mentioned, their consideration does not carry the same weight as the ethnic cultural concerns that dominate STL's treatment of culture. Thus, a future direction to be explored is found in the "transboundering dynamics" of cultural social groups in order that we better engage ourselves with the actual lived experiences and socio-cultural practices of liturgical music that extend beyond the boundaries of Sunday worship.

Looking Beyond the Cultural Boundaries of Sunday Worship. A further aspect of this point is an invitation for the Roman Catholic Church to move beyond the boundaries of Sunday worship when investigating the relationship between liturgy and culture. My thoughts on this subject will also serve as a closing to this essay.

While STL is primarily focused on Sunday Eucharistic celebration (and

Move beyond the boundaries of Sunday worship when investigating the relationship between liturgy and culture.

rightfully so), the next frontier of "worship and culture" lies in the relationship between the disciplines of cultural sociology and liturgical studies. I provided a sampling of questions around this relationship earlier in this paper. I continue to feel intrigued by questions concerning social networking processes such as globalization, the internet, and other modern and postmodern phenomena. Specifically, I am intrigued by how these processes come to influence meaning in peoples' lives. True, because culture is human-made—whether one examines culture in the first, second, or third approaches outlined here—not everything in culture is compatible with the Gospel message. But perhaps we also need to remind ourselves that not everything in "modern culture" is necessarily bad or incompatible with Catholic faith. In my own ethnic Asian cultural sensibilities, things are always both/and.

Thus, does every document addressing modern culture need to place it in a negative light? How may the meaning-making processes and experiences that exist beyond the boundaries of ethnic identity and Sunday worship develop legitimate access into Roman Catholic magisterial statements while still upholding the kernels of the Gospel message? While the ongoing question of "who prays" has been addressed in STL, particularly as it applies to ethnic cultural identity, challenges remain when one considers the full spectrum and fluidity of "Catholic identi*ties*." This often involves the boundless social activities and negotiations by people who, in their day-to-day lives, come to claim their own level of Catholicity. Such questions may appear to be more ecclesial in focus, but our liturgical gatherings and the music we sing are still capable of providing us some answers.

Notes

1. Among scholars discussing the issue, I recommend the following: Kathryn Tanner, *Theories of Culture* (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press, 1997); Lyn Spillman, "Introduction: Culture and Cultural Sociology," in *Cultural Sociology,* ed. Lyn Spillman (Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers, 2002), 1–15; Michael Paul Gallagher, *Clashing Symbols* (Mahwah, New Jersey: Paulist Press, 2003); and William H. Sewell, "The Concept of Culture," in *Logics of History: Social Theory and Social Transformation* (Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago, 2005). For a useful historical overview of cultural studies, see Sherry Ortner, "Theory in Anthropology Since the Sixties," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 26:1 (January 1984), 144–157.

2. See Victoria E. Bonnell and Lynn Hunt, eds., *Beyond the Cultural Turn* (Berkeley, California: University of California, 1999).

3. On the relationship between culture and postmodernism, see Gallagher, *Clashing Symbols*, 98–114; in the field of ritual studies and the negotiation of power dynamics, see Catherine Bell, *Ritual Theory; Ritual Practice* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1992).

4. Here I borrow heavily from Lyn Spillman and her work in cultural sociology. See her "Introduction: Culture and Cultural Sociology," in *Cultural Sociology.*

5. Spillman, *Cultural Sociology,* 2.

6. I addressed this social phenomenon briefly in my plenum address at the 2007 NPM Convention by noting the rise of the Civil Rights Movement and the rise of multiculturalism during the 1960s. See my "One Church, Many Cultures: It's More Than the Songs" *Pastoral Music* 32:1 (October-November 2007), 35–41.

7. Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Culture* (New York, New York: Basic Books, 1973).

8. Mary Collins, "Liturgical Methodology and the Cultural Evolution of Worship in the United States," *Worship* 49 (Fall 1975), 85–102; "The Communion Rite: A Study of Roman Catholic Liturgical Performance," *Journal of Ritual Studies* 5:2 (Summer 1991), 99–122.

9. Mark Searle, "New Tasks, New Methods: the Emergence of Pastoral Liturgical Studies," *Worship* 57:4 (July 1983), 291–308.

10. Margaret Mary Kelleher, "Liturgical Theology: A Task and a Method," *Worship* 62:1 (January 1988), 2–25.

11. Kevin Seasoltz, "Anthropology and Liturgical Theology: Searching for a Compatible

Methodology" in *Liturgy and Human Passage* (New York, New York: Seabury Press, 1979), 3–13.

12. Anscar J. Chupungco, *Liturgies of the Future* (Mahwah, New Jersey: Paulist Press, 1989); *Liturgical Inculturation: Sacramentals, Religiosity, and Catechesis* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1992). For a biography and bibliography of his works, see Cassian Folsom, "Anscar Chupungco and the Pontifical Liturgical Institute (1974–97)," in *Liturgy for the New Millennium,* eds. Mark R. Francis and Keith F. Pecklers (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 2000); and for a bibliography, see *Liturgy for the New Millennium,* 165–168.

13. Mark R. Francis, *Multicultural Celebrations: A Guide* (Washington, DC: Federation of Diocesan Liturgical Commissions, 2000); *Shape a Circle Ever Wider* (Chicago, Illinois: Liturgy Training Publications, 2000).

14. Keith F. Pecklers, *Dynamic Equivalence: The Living Language of Christian Worship* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 2003).

15. See *Directory on Popular Piety and the Liturgy: Principles and Guidelines: A Commentary,* ed. Peter C. Phan (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 2002).

16. See Peter C. Phan, "Liturgical Inculturation: Unity in Diversity in the Postmodern Age," in *Being Religious Interreligiously* (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 2004), 213–244.

17. Mary E. McGann, *Exploring Music as Worship and Theology* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 2002); *A Precious Fountain: Music in the Worship of an African American Catholic Community* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 2004).

18. These may include Clifford J. Geertz, Victor W. Turner, Louis J. Luzbetak, Gerald A. Arbuckle, and Aylward Shorter, to name a few.

19. A good example of this is Mark R. Francis's *Liturgy in a Multicultural Community* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1991), 11. Francis's beginning cultural framework is taken from Clifford Geertz.

20. Spillman, *Cultural Sociology*, 3.

21. More recently, the deaths of Farah Fawcett Majors and Michael Jackson on June 25, 2009, would be referred to as the "deaths of *cultural* icons" by news broadcasters. What contributed to their canonization as cultural icons had more to do with the popularlity that they achieved as performing artists. References such as these refer to culture in this second usage.

22. For example, Paul DiMaggio has written about the rise of "high culture" in the United States, tracing this social phenomenon back to Boston during the nineteenth century. See his "Cultural Entrepreneurship in Nineteenth-Century Boston, I: The Creation of an Organizational Base for High Culture in America," and "Cultural Entrepreneurship in Nineteenth-Century Boston, II: the Classification and Framing of American Art," *Media, Culture, and Society* 4 (1982): 33–50 and 303–322. For a more contemporary analysis, see Pierre Bourdieu's *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste,* trans. Richard Nice (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1984).

23. A wealth of resources may fall under this category. As a sampling, see Ian Watt, *The Rise of the Novel* (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1957); Walter Benjamin, "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction," in *Illuminations: Essays and Reflections,* trans. Harry Zhon (New York, New York: Schocken Books, 1968), 217–251; Robert Escarpit, *Sociology of Literature,* trans. Ernest Pick (London, UK: Frank Cass & Co., 1971), Appendix: "The Age Factor in Literary Productivity," 97–104; Robert R. Faulkner, "Hollywood Studio Musicians: Their Work and Careers in the Recording Industry (Chicago, Illinois: Aldine-Atheton, 1971); Pierre Bourdieu, *The Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field* (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1992).

24. Sewell, *Logics of History,* 158.

25. Jeffrey C. Alexander, *The Meanings of Social Life: A Cultural Sociology* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2003), 5.

26. Reflecting on past approaches of a "sociology-of approach," Jeffrey Alexander writes that this approach to sociology "sought to explain what *created* meanings; it aimed to expose how the ideal structures of culture are formed by *other structures*—of a more material, less ephemeral kind." See *The Meanings of Social Life*, 5.

27. Sherry B. Ortner, "Theory in Anthropology Since the Sixties," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 26:1 (January 1984), 126–166.

28. Ibid., 144.

29. Ibid., 135.

30. Ibid., 146.

31. Ibid., 148.

32. Ibid., 149.

33. Ibid., 149.

34. Bell received the North American Academy of Liturgy's 2006 Godfrey Diekmann

Award for her "groundbreaking work in ritual studies." More recently, Nathan D. Mitchell devoted his "The Amen Corner" to the legacy of Catherine Bell after her death on May 23, 2008: "Ritual Matters," *Worship* 82:5 (2008), 446–456.

35. Music by Rawn Harbor, ValLimar and Frank Jansen, and Val Parker (Portland, Oregon: OCP, 2008).

36. As a further breakdown: "cultural": 12; "culture": 7; "cultures": 5; "multicultural": 5; "intercultural": 2; "counter-cultural": 1; "bicultural": 1; "inculturated": 1.

37. Official statements that preceded the writing of STL include *Asian and Pacific Presence: Harmony in Faith* (2002).

38. It should also be noted that footnote 57 of *The Milwaukee Symposia for Church Composers* addresses the "interlinking of subcultures" within "apparently homogeneous parishes": "Cultivating the cross-cultural dimension of the Christian life in worship does not mean simply borrowing ideas from some distant culture or language. The previously cited text from *Fulfilled in Your Hearing* is a reminder that even the apparently homogeneous parish is *a network of interlinking subcultures.* Thinking cross culturally about worship and its music must begin at the local level. The task here is to respect the variety of worldviews and relationships that define the various subcultures within the worship of the local church. Such attentiveness should affect profoundly the manner in which worship is prepared and celebrated" (emphasis mine).

39. In so doing, I hope to illustrate that liturgy is not, in the end, "ink-on-paper," but involves, as Lawrence Hoffman wrote, the academic effort to move "beyond the text" in order for us, in his quoting of Mark Searle, to see "'the formal object of . . . liturgical studies . . . [as] the actual worship life of the living offering praying Church.'" See Mark Searle, "New Tasks, New Methods: The Emergence of Pastoral Liturgical Studies," *Worship* 57 (1983), 306, quoted in Lawrence A. Hoffman, *Beyond the Text: A Holistic Approach to Liturgy* (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1987), 2.

40. *A Consultation on a Revision of* Music in Catholic Worship (Chicago, Illinois: Subcommittee on Music in the Liturgy, United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2006). The original document *Music in Catholic Worship* may be found in *The Liturgy Documents: A Parish Resource,* fourth edition (Chicago, Illinois: Liturgy Training Publications, 2004), 269–293.

41. Other participants included representatives from archdiocesan offices of worship (i.e., Chicago, Seattle, Philadelphia, and others); universities and theological institutions (e.g., University of Notre Dame, Chicago Theological Union, Ave Maria University), liturgical organizations (Adoremus, Latin Liturgy Association, We Believe); and publishing companies (e.g., Liturgical Press, GIA Publications, World Library Publications).

42. Demographic projections and pastoral guidelines were taken from the following statements issued by the USCCB: *The Hispanic Presence: Challenge and Commitment* (1983); *National Pastoral Plan for Hispanic Ministry* (1987); *Encuentro and Mission: A Renewed Pastoral Framework for Hispanic Ministry* (2002); *In Spirit and Truth: Black Catholic Reflections on the Order of Mass* (1987); *Plenty Good Room: The Spirit and Truth of African American Catholic Worship* (1990); *Welcoming the Stranger Among Us: Unity in Diversity* (2000); *Strangers No Longer: Together on the Journey of Hope* (2003); and *Asian and Pacific Presence: Harmony in Faith* (2001).

43. One must also note that this tendency of viewing "cultural groups" as specifically "ethnic cultural groups" is consistent with the 2007 formation of the USCCB's Secretariat of Cultural Diversity in which five previously independent ethnic subcommittees (African American; Asian and Pacific Island; Hispanic; Native American; and Pastoral Care of Migrants, Refugees, and Travelers) were placed together in a newly formed secretariat. Should not the proper name of this secretariat be "Secretariat of *Ethnic* Cultural Diversity in the Church"? How are the needs of other social-cultural groups to be considered?

Rev. Ricky Manalo, csp, is a liturgical composer and doctoral candidate in liturgical studies, cultural studies, and sociology at the Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley, California.