Liturgical Traffic in Culture: 
Gridlock, Beginning Drivers, Detours, and DUI
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In the Sunday New York Times from March 16, 1997 a short piece with accompanying picture offered a report on a weekly liturgy at St. Mark's Episcopal Cathedral in Seattle, a liturgy which is very popular with young people. Entitled "The Faithful Are Casual at This Sunday Service," the article concerns a forty-year tradition of doing sung compline in a space which is almost totally dark except for about fifteen male singers, bedecked in cassock and surplice, who stand dimly lighted at portable choir desks. Young people hurry to the 9:30 p.m. service to sit in the pews, lie prone on their backs or in fetal position, some kissing each other, both those straight and those gay. Ushers carry calligraphic signs that urge silence and no whispering. It's a kind of date night, attendees say, and it is well-liked because the service is not preachy but offers both anonymity and community. A former liturgist at the cathedral reflected that "in our culture we do things regarding love and spirituality better by candlelight, at night."

For the final test in my required course in worship at the Lutheran School of Theology in Chicago (LSTC), I made this news report available to students and asked that they respond about the potentials and the problems of this long-standing example of historic liturgy. One student had been there many times while living in Seattle and said it was a kind of "cult." She and friends drove twenty-five miles to get there. Yet she and others thought through my question carefully, and while I cannot here share all their answers with you, the quality of reply—unless, of course, they were trying to please the teacher—was impressive and assuring for the future.

The Seattle liturgy is instructive, for it raises a host of questions about the relationship between liturgy and culture; for instance: the contrast between desired anonymity and the public nature of historic ritual, the association of spirituality and darkness, expected liturgical decorum and cultural patterns, the association of high liturgy with social class, the draw

of historic liturgical practice as object, etc. In many ways this liturgical phenomenon embodies fundamental questions about worship and culture, and, of course, the musical component is, as is often the case, right in the center of things.

Ten years ago my interest in ethnic church music was sparked by a three-month sabbatical leave in East Africa. Six years ago I joined a world-wide study team on worship and culture as part of a project promoted by the Lutheran World Federation (LWF). There is no way I can rehearse for you the many ways my mind has changed in the course of those ten years; some of what I held in the past is a great embarrassment to me now. About the only thing which has remained constant is the birth of always new questions, new perspectives, new dimensions of the issues related to worship and culture. Three of those, at least, are very clear to me right now, and I would invite you into them with the promise that there are no easy answers at the end but rather more small roads which lead to interesting places. While I understand my assignment as one relating to culture and music, specifically ethnic music, the first of these three is a bit more general.

*Listening to Nairobi: How Do We Contextualize Worship in Our Own Backyard? (Beginning Drivers)*

It is no secret. One of the purposes of the LWF study on worship and culture is to motivate Lutherans around the world, but particularly those in Africa and Asia, to seek ways of inculturating the liturgy locally in their own countries and regions. Probably because we from the Euro-American environs had given such tasks just a little more thought, it was easy for us to fall into a kind of good-natured paternalism, strengthened all the more by the eagerness of African and Asian delegates to learn whatever they could about the liturgy. As those of us from the West gain more maturity about these matters, it is easier now to perceive these dynamics in retrospect, but it must also be said that from the very beginning we joined hands—all of us—to tap our deepest resources for the two statements which have so far come from the group: the first from Cartigny, which described the biblical/theological foundations of studying worship and culture; the second from Nairobi, which offered help in sorting out the issues and the processes attending such a dialogue between worship and culture.

The Nairobi document speaks of four ways to think about the dialogue: 1) worship as transcultural, i.e. those items which are the same
in any culture, such as the mega-narrative of christological redemption, the importance of the word and of the sacraments, etc. 2) worship as contextual, i.e. those dynamics involved when worship begins to reflect and utilize the culture in which it takes place; 3) worship as counter-cultural, i.e., in what ways does worship take a stand against culture; 4) worship as cross-cultural, i.e., the potentials and problems connected to realizing the body of Christ liturgically.

From Nairobi we were sent home to put all this to work in our own cultures. It seemed like such a simple task to accomplish, especially with the “shape of the liturgy” (as it now appears in With One Voice) already on the horizon. But when the North Americans came together to address the assignment, we discovered two hard facts: 1) we were all very good at complaining about our culture (which is not the same thing as recognizing the need for and devising useable counter-cultural programs for the sake of the gospel); 2) we discovered that it was very difficult to isolate the deep cultural patterns in our societies which could assist the contextualization of worship better, which would mandate the contextualization of worship. That is what I raise before you as a pressing agenda, a conundrum, a profound question for the remaining years of this millennium.

But I need and want to say more about this. For us here at this institute thinking seriously and positively about our culture—especially as a dialogue partner in shaping worship—is no pleasant thought. We can say it to ourselves here in a huddle, can’t we, that many of our own personal joys at worship are tied to cherished liturgical incarnations, spaces and places, that admitting culture into anything but the gathering space of our liturgies is a bit too challenging, so please, let’s not even entertain the possibilities? Second, we do live in a time which is by all indications hosting a creaking of cultural foundations, lamented by commentators and church people alike. How can we be serious about our culture when it asks us to distinguish between real fakes and fake fakes in the theme park business? How can we be serious about our culture when it advances a merchandising practice tailored primarily to cosmetics because cosmetics make the most money for department stores? No wonder that people are retreating to bizarre cults or to romanticized
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notions of their racial or ethnic heritages, all of which, by the way, retards any progress we might make to actually seeing and sensing what the body of Christ might be as we transcend our Jewness, Greekness, or Germanness. Is the Pauline ideal, after all, only something to be thought?

But, like I said, it is easy to complain. We need to listen to Nairobi. But not before some help in thinking through what our culture is. From Canada, which has had to deal with cultural matters way before her neighbor to the south, comes some help in grasping what we are talking about with this word "culture." Nearly everyone on this planet, writes Gregory Baum, lives in two cultures simultaneously. A primary culture is that in which by birth we share heritages such as home life, cooking, music, and values; secondary culture is superimposed on primary culture and includes the web of world markets, mass media, technology, the Internet, and values connected to capitalism.\footnote{Gregory Baum, "Two Question Marks: Inculturation and Multiculturalism," in Christianity and Cultures: A Mutual Enrichment, ed. Norbert Greinacher and Norbert Mette (London: SCM Press, 1994), 102.}

Since secondary culture has been introduced to the rest of the world by those of us in the West, it only makes sense that we Western worshipers deal with it as a dialogue partner, if for no other reason to show the way, a positive way of contextualizing. What follows then are some attempts to take our culture seriously, to explore ways of contextualizing. The attempts are not recipes, nor are they meant as signposts for the future. Rather, hear them as ruminations, as possible implications of embracing the values and technology in which you and I live.

First, we live in a time sensitive to the discovery that not everyone comes to know something in the same way. Women, we are told, know in ways quite different from men. Sizeable proportions of the population cannot read, or read just barely, or suffer from dyslexia. Among the young image is far more potent than word. More people learn new music by rote than they do by reading music. Computers make possible unique presentations of information, and interactive TV, while not a substitute for personal presence, connects people like never before. What does all that mean? For the liturgy?

Why is it that we continue to publish weekly mini-books to enable people to worship? Why all the text for people for whom reading is secondary? Do we have too many hymns? Is it necessary to trim the fat from the liturgy, so that the shape is actually apprehensible each time? Are people staying away from the liturgy because it appears preachy? Or because it is simply overwhelming and full of traps for the neophyte or the
experienced liturgy-goer? Do we need catechesis simply to help people
know what’s required of them as worshipers? Are three lessons too many?
Are there too many words—with Bibles in pews, lessons on sheets, and
still more text in a holy book? Is it time to simplify so that we can see
form beyond the fat? In Thailand missionaries discovered quickly that
people will not sit to listen to anyone for more than four or five minutes.
Sermons there now consist of Bible studies interspersed with three-minute
homilies. What prevents us from similar considerations?

Second, the fastest growing department of studies in the academy is
ecology. My seminary is a green zone; my wife and I shop at a whole
foods store, and organically-grown produce is available to us in other
stores. Contemporary students, in spite of the fact that they burn up
inordinate amounts of electricity on the Website and the VCR, are
nevertheless more conscious of this fragile earth than ever before. But
public liturgies come and go without overt recognition of ecological
stewardship, though we sing with gusto how “Heaven and earth are full of
your glory.” A liturgy at the public dump site might do. Less
dramatically, each liturgy needs scrutiny for inordinate promotion of
needless waste, even such waste as pouring large amounts of consecrated
communion wine down piscinas. Here culture is asking us to take worship
seriously and calls for us to ritualize what we teach and believe.

Third, beginning already two weeks ago and continuing weekly
through the first week in November, my Sunday commute with my wife up
Lake Shore Drive in Chicago includes some intersection with pedestrian
taxi affection made up of people running or walking in support of one or another
worthy cause. Of course, these events are self-serving—as we wise ones
observe—but then so are holiday craft shows at parishes. If these people
are not coming to the liturgy, then how about the liturgy coming to the
runners? More to the point, how can the liturgy provide a substantial
home for the hundreds of projects done by both the churched and the
unchurched? I suspect the answer lies somewhere in the vicinity of the
offertory. Offertory theology asks that we de-compartmentalize our lives
to see that working for Habitat for Humanity, or giving change to the
homeless, or running for March of Dimes, or volunteering to clean up a
local park are times and talents brought to the table with money and bread
and wine.

The same liturgical action, that is, the offertory, invites us to think
more seriously about the value of food in our culture. Should parishes be
extending Lenten soup suppers throughout the year? Or think of
themselves as food dispensers for both those able to buy and those unable
to feed themselves? Perhaps the most worthy of imitation at Willow Creek worship is the food court, but only if it is seen as a means by which to provide for the hungry. Can you imagine a better agency than the church to feed the hungry of all kinds? Is that not inherent in the sharing we do at the table?

Fourth and finally, an observation on music. A decade or two ago new toys for church organists consisted of mechanical action organs. Those new toys brought a liveliness to assembly singing and provided a tool for true musical partnership. But new toys are now available—called the MIDI and sequencer. Find an organist to explain them to you, but for the time being know that it permits the recording of impulses at the keyboard so that an organist can be playing the instrument without being physically present. What does this mean? It offers some possibilities for providing organ music while an organist is absent or otherwise engaged. It has implications for music that we have all along thought to be an art that is devoted to the immediacy of creating sound in response to the community presently taking shape. It has implications for smaller parishes and the need for church musicians or lack thereof in such parishes. MIDI technology stands to alter the way we think about church music. But we need not run away from the technology in fear. Is this an example of what the Nairobi document calls “dynamic equivalence,” that is, a cultural equivalent to a parallel practice already in place? Might the absence of a live keyboard player, created by MIDI technology, suggest new and other ways of leading song in the assembly? Is the technology leading us momentarily beyond tired old notions about assembly song?

Most of the ruminating above can be exemplary of the Nairobi principle of “Dynamic Equivalence,” one of two ways to assist the dialogical process of the contextualization of worship in culture. The other is called “Creative Assimilation,” that is, the insertion into the liturgy of certain cultural values and ritual moments that enhance worship in a particular culture. Both principles are meant to make our way a little easier as we begin to take our culture seriously. I don’t think we have done that well enough. Precisely because answers to the quest may be unfaithful, naive, or unworkable; precisely because our various pietist backgrounds prevent us from taking culture seriously; precisely because this is hard work to love our culture, it is much easier to retreat from the Nairobi call. On the other hand, if we propose to be faithful, we have no choice. The task is daunting, but surely worth the effort if by it we all recognize that the gospel has taken root also in our midst.
This is about music. Harvard University’s Nathan Glazer (whose credits include *Beyond the Melting Pot*) recently published a book entitled *We Are All Multiculturalists Now,* and in it shows that with respect to public education, the times change and we have changed with them. Even though the word “multicultural” is not found in spell checks of most computers, it does describe for us a situation in which public education specifically, but all of us generally, are trying to respond realistically to ethnic and minority diversity in this country. “It is a position that rejects assimilation and the ‘melting pot’ image as an imposition of the dominant culture, and instead prefers such metaphors as the ‘salad bowl’ or the ‘glorious mosaic.’” The movement, he says, has taken on vigor and force because of our greatest domestic problem, the situation of African Americans. He is not bashful about his liberal views on these matters, since he proposes that the new America multiculturalism envisioned will not take for granted, as of old, that this country is the most powerful, the richest, or necessarily the best.

One does not need to be a liberal to note changing global patterns in politics and the need to be a bit more modest about our place in the world. Glazer also lets the book be for him a frank admission of the ineffectiveness of expectations that he and others held about the “situation of African Americans” back in the 1960s and 1970s. In spite of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the optimism of many, the current economic status of African Americans, he submits, has not improved as was hoped, and relations between whites and African Americans have not changed much—perhaps in some instances having gotten worse. The prognosis, Glazer opines, is not bright, for among other things we have discovered that blacks and whites see the world differently. The message of the book is not depressing, however, as I will show below.

We are all multiculturalists now. About ten years ago a small volume of ethnic church music was published by Augsburg and Fortress jointly (as
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I recall) entitled Songs of the People. In some respects it was a daring volume, for it contained gospel songs as well as an example or two of rather tame music from Asia and Native Americans. Ten years ago the work of I-to Loh and of the Asian Institute for Liturgy and Music was known chiefly among Methodists, not Lutherans, since the Methodists financially subsidized the mission of I-to Loh and the Asian Institute. Because of the LWF, some African church music found its way to Lutherans in the United States.

Times have changed. All major denominational hymnals now contain rich and varied repertoires of ethnic music. Because of the knowledgeable, foresightful editing procedures connected to Hymnal Supplement 1991 and With One Voice, most of us now enjoy singing “Blessed Assurance,” “Hallelujah, We Sing Your Praises” and (what’s now become a hit at my seminary) the Javanese Hallelujah [With One Voice, #792]. Efforts are underway to create supporting materials for these repertoires so that church musicians everywhere can have the tools to deliver this music in ways both authentic and edifying. Elsewhere I have written about this surprising but welcome development: “Whether it be freshness of text, melodic attractiveness, or the immediacy of rhythm, the appeal of [this music] summons the interests of contemporary worshipers and thus enables the beginning stages of multicultural worship.”

Not surprising are a host of questions that accompany this music as it reaches the desk-tops of church musicians and the hands of parishioners. Because performance practice is the way of the musical world right now, we find ourselves wondering whether “period instruments” are essential for the delivery of African church music. Where does one get African drums? Are American substitutes workable? Are these real fakes or fake fakes? Can spirituals and gospel be done at the organ? Most of those questions can be answered, I think, rather easily. A harder question is why is it that we ask all these things? Partly church musicians want to have advice on these matters because, like Michael Jordan, we desire to be proficient in any idiom. Partly we want to be able to recreate the intended musical experience as closely as possible. But isn’t that a kind of romanticism, not
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Unlike the romanticizing of the so-called primitive in the art world? These latter questions are not easily answered, but there should be some happiness about their nagging presence, since they tend to push the entire church musical enterprise closer to some of its primary tasks.

If Nathan Glazer were part of this discussion, he might ask whether the multicultural situation has gotten any better now that we have all this music at our fingertips. That is, if one of the purposes, if not the major purpose, in singing these new repertoires is to be drawn ever more closely to the baptized of other cultures and ethnicities, has that in fact happened in our midst? How's the news on this front?

Surely better than it was ten years ago. But it is no secret that major work needs still to be done. At LSTC we have a women's dialogue group, now in its third year, the purpose of which is to bring whites and blacks together for sustained, profound work at gaining understanding and trust. Reports are that this goal is reached only with great difficulty, tears, and prayer. A colleague from another seminary instructed us a week or so ago that efforts at integrating non-white students into the full community where he teaches have gone largely unanswered, leaving all concerned somewhat puzzled by the ineffectiveness of their expectations.

If these repertoires of new music are used by the Western church for purposes of financial gain or simply to garner new resources for our consumption, then, it seems to me, we are caught in the common Western game of cultural plundering, which is not a happy scene. Surely our motives and excitement about these new resources are more noble, and we can see through the fog some signposts that invite us to come closer to the peoples whose music we are given to share. “Salad Bowl” is likely the metaphor we have to work with these days. When pressed, the metaphor itself gives us some truth about us: spherical green peas tend to roll to the bottom, there to enjoy and admire their common color and shape. Some pride in our various shapes, colors, and accomplishments is a tribute to the Creator, but fundamentalism about these things needs to give way to a full sense of our complementarity—an octave divided equally by five is no better, no worse than one divided by twelve.

Let me be more direct. Ethnic church music is an invitation. It is an invitation that has significant consequences with respect to our confession of Christ and the church and with respect to how we live publicly in this world. The continuing question is whether and how we will respond to that
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invitation. Glazer writes this to conclude his chapter entitled "Can We Be Brought Together?"

The forces that will produce the changes we are looking for are individual and voluntaristic, rather than governmental and authoritative. To adapt the title of Glenn Loury's book, it will have to be 'one by one' individual by individual, family by family, neighborhood by neighborhood. Slowly as these work, there is really no alternative.10

Here are two suggestions for responding to the invitation in a way more profound; these are suggestions meant chiefly to stir up hundreds more.

1) By pooling the resources and skills of groups like the Valparaiso Institute of Liturgical Studies, the Association of Lutheran Church Musicians, and the multicultural desks of all Lutheran bodies here in the USA, perhaps it is possible to devise a kind of dialogue group, built on the model of the women's group mentioned above, in which issues that are mostly spoken about or groused about privately can be raised publicly with trust and commitment to common goals. The problems here are enormous: church music professionals should probably be excluded from these meetings, at least at first, since those present need to perceive themselves as equals; how all can come to the space as equals; how the white establishment can be of help without being paternalistic; how we can hear one another's questions without judgment, when judgment is appropriate, etc. A beginning point for such discussions might be the soon-to-be-published African-American worship resource jointly sponsored by the LCMS and ELCA. Other such dialogue groups could develop as bridges to other cultural groups.

2) Philip Bohlman from the University of Chicago has recently written about music and pilgrimage with special reference to a 1993 musicians' pilgrimage to Mariazell in the eastern part of Austria.11 He relates how the basilica at Mariazell is a center for eastern Europeans of many ethnic groups, and how the pilgrims descend on this shrine from literally all over the area. The significance of this kind of gathering goes beyond shrine worship, however. "Pilgrimage, especially in contested areas and nations, metaphorically negates national and linguistic borders, redrawing and renegotiating them through the actions of pilgrims, who seek alternative meaning for the New Europe—a Europe they hope might be new—in the

10 Glazer, 146.

songs they sing and the paths they follow. Bohlman writes of the sacredness of the sight, the sacredness of the time, and how the pilgrimage itself represents passage from this world to the other, much like the Jewish feast of the Passover. Music here gives power to the powerless. In their ethnic musical differences the pilgrims confront difference but in a space and time that provides hope and meaning for the future. Pilgrims sing each other’s music, and find some things they can sing together, all of which opens up new possibilities. Bohlmann concludes, “This would be a Europe imagined as a fluid whole, with cultures interacting to negate boundaries and situate cultural production along the intersecting sacred and secular routes that bring cultures together and juxtapose differences, rather than driving them apart.”

Place, borders, shrine, contested space—four elements at the core of this pilgrimage. Where are those elements in your city, in your neighborhood? Individual by individual, family by family, neighborhood by neighborhood is what Glaser wrote. The songs we sing are the acoustic rooms for meeting, for encountering the promises and plan of God. These songs are meant as gifts. Where do we go from here?

Music as Behavior: The Rough Road to a New Song

The study of other musical systems yields a host of questions about one’s own. A certain kind of relativism is sure to emerge, for instance. Cherished aesthetic ideals are often put into perspective, and “greatness” in music or in church music is discovered to have its own borders. Nowhere has this been more evident than at the level of basic definitions. Because so much of Western music is printed or in manuscript, we speak freely about going to a music library—a concept completely strange to most peoples across the globe. We treasure musical concepts and ideas (like Beethoven’s idea that generated the Fifth Symphony), and we pay huge amounts of money to hear an artist embody that idea in performance. It is customary to think of music as event or idea, inspiration, as technique embodied in some blessed individual.

Studies of world music, sacred and secular, yield alternative ways to think about music and thereby provide a path out of the aesthetic morass in which we frequently find ourselves. Ethnomusicologist Alan Merriam (and he is noted because of his classic way of describing these new

\(^{12}\)Ibid., 385.

\(^{13}\)Ibid., 406.
insights) is an exemplary advocate in this respect. From his broad experience he ventures a three-fold formula for analyzing and apprehending all music. Any musical experience, he maintains, consists of 1) the musical concept, 2) the musical event itself, and 3) the attending behavioral circumstances.\textsuperscript{14} Merriam is neither proposing this definition as exclusive of others nor is offering it as a formula for creating new music. Rather, it seems to him and to many others who have adopted this 1964 description that these three facets of the musical experience are interdependent and as a definition far more complete than envisioning music as object alone.

At the heart of his description are questions that have to do with the social meanings and patterns of the music-making process itself: as this or that music occurs, he would want us to ask, “How are things going?” What else is happening when a choir sings? Who is active and who is not? Does the music call forth active participation or communal involvement? Does it prejudice the professional or the amateur? If music is a way of processing information, or if it is social communication at a deep level, what is being processed?” These kinds of questions not only get us closer to the heart of liturgical music, but they also shed light on the vocation of the musical leader, who in some cultures is asked to be as attentive to the social processes surrounding the musical event as to the “music” itself. Lifting up the activity of musicians/listeners/participants as music is experienced provides an entirely new and insightful way of understanding the significance of a musical event. The behavioral and social dimensions of music especially suit the whole repertoire of what we mean by liturgical music. There are a variety of avenues one might take to explore aspects of this behavioral/social phase of the musical event.

In his study of the social dynamics surrounding the comparative history of Western music making, Michael Chanan writes in summary “Music is a form of social communication; music in performance is a site of social intercourse, and a form of social dialogue.”\textsuperscript{15} Chanan is then led to understand the evolution of the symphony orchestra and the music for this group as profoundly dependent upon the industrial revolution—not a new thought but one worth repeating. Today’s orchestra is a well-oiled machine, located in a factory complete with CEOs, support staff, support staff.

\textsuperscript{14}Alan Merriam, \textit{The Anthropology of Music} (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1964), 32.

marketing departments, etc. For a long time its social function was to provide a mirror of everyday life, if not for rich landowners (such as Haydn’s Esterhazsy family) then for the workers and entrepreneurs of successful industry. Nowadays, we enter this factory to descend into darkness so that one by one we can identify with, yearn for, or become nostalgic about the precision and perfect cooperation the music machine proposes to offer. Audience behavior in all of this is particularly notable.

But orchestras are falling on hard times, and Chanan might suggest that the machine model simply does not mesh with our interactive, information-inclined age. Perhaps he is right, although it doesn’t matter. What matters here is the tight relationship between musical concept, event, and behavior. Economic factors join hands with behavior and offer further significance. Is there money to be made from the musical event, and who makes it? If music is a matter of social communication or intercourse, and if there is a music business, what kind of music can emerge from those without money? How does the economy control the musical event and ultimately social intercourse or communication?

In African music percussion parts are distributed among many people, usually one to a part, because the rhythms in their multiplicity and variety are meant to reflect and to ventilate the complex relationships of the people. Rhythmic cooperation encourages and models social discourse. Western economic factors assign these cooperative rhythmic explorations to a single drum set, which would be perfectly fine if the product is understood simply as concept and event, without behavior. Taking seriously the behavioral dimension of music, we can expect to travel some terrain that is bumpy but worth the bother, if we are willing to keep asking the questions along the way.

In my contributions to the LWF study on worship and culture I have tried to show how questions of behavior can assist evaluations of music’s usefulness in the liturgy, no matter where one might be in the world. The gamelan offertory I heard and saw in Bali, together with the dancers whose postures and hand movements communicated a Bible lesson, kept the rest of us unoccupied if not ruling out any kind of active participation on our part. One might argue that such musical events silence the people and are therefore not fit for the liturgy. But then, that’s not much different from Leipzig parishioners hearing their Sunday Bach cantata. How much of that can or should a liturgy take? Do massive organs encourage or intimidate assembly singing? Does an organ prelude put strictures on the way an assembly gathers, especially in this our day when gathering for any event is casual and gregarious?
Behavioral concerns can assist necessary self-critique, but they can also help to chart a way for the new song. Two examples will bring all of this to a close:

1) Accustomed as we are to standardized versions of assembly song—"with considerable supporting literature and research to establish such standards—it must be noted that many cultures are far less concerned with such matters. Instead, the interesting practice of heterophony prevails. Technically speaking, heterophony occurs when several if not many versions of a given tune are simultaneously delivered by a music-making group. Recordings of old-style congregational singing among African Americans offer such heterophony, and we all know those individuals in our own worshiping groups who consistently render their own versions of the tune at hand. Chances are this is a practice worth encouragement rather than critique, simply because heterophony—probably even better than imitative polyphony which with equal voice participation shows a kind of unified cooperation—points to the strength of monody, and so alerts us to pay attention to the beauty of personalized unity in melody. Rather than silencing those who can't or won't stay within the lane demarcations, heterophony invites everyone into the song.

2) If one should take Merriam's description of music as a kind of guide for developing or choosing assembly music, then the liturgy itself will look for a specific kind of music. My worship students were right: the assembly's liturgy asks for participation and involvement; it asks for ways that all can enter the agenda—those things to be done. To be sure, it gives place to the gifted tongues of its members (1 Cor. 14), but remembers that the sharing of bread and wine is the mode of its prayer, its teaching, its proclamation, and its sending. Music, then, needs to take up the mode as both mirror and midwife.

In societies where social cohesion is valued and strong, where interaction is evident, where all voices are welcome and honored (and isn't this what we hope for in the liturgy?) music is often simple and closely integrated in concept, musical event, and behavior. In other words, it is folk music. Often, in these same societies, there is a kind of art music that coexists with this folk music, but it is not meant to replace the folk music or its purposes.

Paying attention to the behavioral dimension is a way to discover the music of the people, that music which engages them, even though music of the people is likely more elusive today than ever before. The challenge is to find ways of nurturing that kind of music alongside the great tradition.
of churchly art music—a kind of speaking in tongues—and to do that in such a way that everyone, both those inside and outside the assembly, recognizes the authenticity of all these musical events as behavioral/musical manifestations of the body of Christ. There is a call here for simple rhythmic song. There is a call here for voice-based music. There is a call here for rescuing the great tradition from the concert hall, for interpreting it so that all might perceive the gift of tongues which that tradition embodies. And there is always a call here to keep the question about behavior on the front burner.

With the advent of the computer chip wishful ideas from the recent past are becoming reality. Automobiles with onboard technology to drive hands-free are well into the experimental stage and expected for common usage in the early part of the next century. Liturgical traffic through culture implies that we have been in a vehicle of some kind. The vehicle is the shape of the liturgy. We are the drivers. This is not a hands-free road, and we are driving under the influence—DUI—in this case, of the Holy Spirit. But we can't take that for granted. One of the display cars for the coming out of the new hands-free technology blew a fuse when it was plugged in; the story line: "Seems like there is always a power failure en route to Tomorrowland." All the more reason to pray: "Send, now, your Holy Spirit . . . that we might be the body of Christ in this world."