

“A splendid contribution to contemporary liturgical theology. Ricky Manalo is a refreshing voice who broadens our horizons by reflecting on the lived context of the worship lives of real people. This book is a valuable contribution to our understanding of the relation between religion and culture and how a number of disciplines can enrich our appreciation of liturgy as our lives.”

John F. Baldovin, SJ
Professor of Historical and Liturgical Theology
Boston College School of Theology and Ministry

“If the liturgy is the ‘summit and source’ of church life, as Vatican II asserts, what is the relation between it and daily life? Beside the liturgy celebrated in the church, is there the ‘liturgy of life’? If so, what is the relation between these two liturgies? This is no ivory-tower disquisition but a life-and-death issue for Christian life. No one is better equipped to help us understand this connection and live it than Ricky Manalo, who brings his mastery of sociology of religion, ritual studies, liturgiology, popular devotions, spirituality, and cultural studies to bear on this complex issue. His book will be of enormous help not only to theologians and liturgists but also to pastoral ministers, especially bishops and priests.”

Peter C. Phan
Ellacuría Chair of Catholic Social Thought
Georgetown University

“This is a timely, important, and stimulating book. Through ethnographic research and a rereading of key texts of the liturgical movement, Ricky Manalo maps a way toward a broadened understanding of liturgy, namely, as encompassing *all* worship practices of the faithful. With this, he contributes to overcoming an older, unhelpful division of worship practices into ‘liturgy’ on the one hand and so-called paraliturgical practices or popular devotions on the other hand (a division that has plagued liturgical scholarship for far too long). I very much appreciate this approach. More power to books like Ricky Manalo’s *The Liturgy of Life*.”

Teresa Berger
Professor of Liturgical Studies & Thomas E. Golden Jr.
Professor of Catholic Theology
Yale Divinity School

“In *The Liturgy of Life* Ricky Manalo has moved the discussion about the relationship between the official liturgy of the church and popular expressions of the faith into new and very productive territory. By studying questions about liturgy and the real worship experience of ‘the people in the pews’ using an interdisciplinary approach employing theology, history, and the social sciences, Fr. Manalo offers new insights that can only benefit pastoral theologians and all those who seek to serve the liturgy.”

Mark R. Francis, CSV
President, The Catholic Theological Union

Ricky Manalo, CSP

The Liturgy of Life

The Interrelationship of
Sunday Eucharist and
Everyday Worship Practices

A PUEBLO BOOK

Liturgical Press Collegeville, Minnesota

www.litpress.org

A Pueblo Book published by Liturgical Press

Cover design by Jodi Hendrickson. Cover image: Dreamstime.

Unless otherwise noted, excerpts from documents of the Second Vatican Council are from *Vatican Council II: The Basic Sixteen Documents*, by Austin Flannery, OP, © 1996 (Costello Publishing Company, Inc.). Used with permission.

© 2014 by Order of Saint Benedict, Collegeville, Minnesota. All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, microfilm, microfiche, mechanical recording, photocopying, translation, or by any other means, known or yet unknown, for any purpose except brief quotations in reviews, without the previous written permission of Liturgical Press, Saint John's Abbey, PO Box 7500, Collegeville, Minnesota 56321-7500. Printed in the United States of America.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Manalo, Vincent.

The liturgy of life : the interrelationship of Sunday eucharist and everyday worship practices / Vincent Manalo, CSP.

pages cm

"A Pueblo book."

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-8146-6308-0 — ISBN 978-0-8146-6333-2 (ebook)

1. Spiritual life—Catholic Church. 2. Worship. 3. Lord's Supper—Catholic Church. 4. Catholic Church—Doctrines. I. Title.

BX2350.3.M2555 2014

264'.02036—dc23

2014016183

*To Mary E. McGann, RSCJ,
in deep appreciation
for your friendship, wisdom, and accompaniment
throughout my doctoral studies;*

and to the Community of St. Agnes Church

Contents

Acknowledgments xi

List of Abbreviations xiii

Introduction 1

Chapter One

Welcome to St. Agnes! 19

Hospitality, Music Making, and Preaching 21

Meet the Participants of My Ethnographic Project 25

Chapter Two

The Interrelationship between the Eucharist as Source and Summit and Popular Religious Practices during the Liturgical Movement 31

Setting the Historical Context for the Relationship between the Eucharist and Popular Religion at the Start of the Liturgical Movement 34

The Eucharist as Source and Summit in the Writings of the Liturgical Movement 37

Summary 45

Chapter Three

Vatican II and Post-Conciliar Documents on the Relationship between the Eucharist as the Source and Summit of Christian Life and Popular Religious Practices 47

Articles 5–13 of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy 49

Article 11 of the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church and
Article 5 of the Decree on the Ministry and Life of Priests 59

The Writings of John Paul II and Benedict XVI 66

Summary 76

Chapter Four

The Liturgy of Life: The Interrelationship of Sunday Eucharist and Popular Devotions and the Extension of Worship Practices 79

Resistance and Debate over Article 10 of the Constitution on
the Sacred Liturgy 85

Peter Phan and the Liturgy of Life as Summit and Source 87

The Search for Adequate Terms for Considering the Scope
and Spectrum of Worship Practices 94

Summary 98

Chapter Five

Mapping Out the Sociocultural Context for Everyday Worship, Religion, and Spirituality 101

The Sociology of Lived Religion and the Everyday Practices
of Religiosities and Spiritualities 107

Principles for Enquiry into Practices of Lived Religion 112

Summary 124

Chapter Six

A Spectrum of Worship Practices: Ethnographic Method, Interpretations, and Correlations 125

Influences and Formation of Ethnographic Methodology 131

Ethnographic Participants and the Interrelationship between
Practices of Everyday Religiosities and Spiritualities and the
10:30 AM Eucharistic Liturgy 139

Correlation of Interpretations of Practices of Everyday Religiosities
and Spiritualities and the 10:30 AM Eucharistic Liturgy 142

What We Can Learn from My Subjects Regarding the
Interrelationships between Everyday Worship Practices and
Sunday Eucharistic Liturgy 147

Summary 149

Chapter Seven

**The Interrelationship of Sunday Eucharist and Everyday
Practices of Religiosities and Spiritualities: Correlations and
Theological Implications 150**

Correlation of Theological, Sociological, and Ethnographic
Findings 153

The State of Liturgical Theology and the Delicate Balance
between the Divine Initiative and the Expanding Contextual
Boundaries of Worship Practices 162

Conclusion 175

APPENDICES

Appendix One

The 10:30 AM Sunday Eucharist of St. Agnes Church 177

Appendix Two

The Hospitality Area of St. Agnes Church 179

Appendix Three

Helen Rosario's Home 181

Appendix Four

The Everyday Prayer Schedule of Helen Rosario 183

Appendix Five

"This Is Church!" Photos by Irene Duller 185

Bibliography 187

Subject Index 200

Index of Names 204

Acknowledgments

The writing of this book would not have been accomplished if it were not for the support of many academic colleagues, community members, family, and friends. First and foremost, I wish to thank Mary McGann for being my academic adviser throughout my doctoral studies at the Graduate Theological Union and for serving as coordinator of my dissertation. Her mentoring and friendship remain sources of grace in my life. I also wish to thank Peter Phan for mentoring me along the path of academia. His writings and insights continue to inspire my theological imagination. In addition, I remain grateful to Andrea Bieler, who served as a member of my dissertation committee, and Lizette Larson-Miller, who served as a member of my comprehensive exams committee. I extend my gratitude to the other liturgy professors of GTU, including Michael Aune, John Klentos, Ruth Meyers, Tom Scirghi, and Louis Weil. My interest in liturgical studies took a “sociological turn” when I studied under Ann Swidler of UC Berkeley, and it continued under the guidance of Jerome Baggett of the Jesuit School of Theology. I thank both of these scholars for introducing me to the world of sociology.

I wish to express my appreciation to the members of the parish community of St. Agnes Church, San Francisco, for making me feel welcomed and for allowing me to perform an ethnographic study of their worship practices, and to the parish staff, Rev. Ray Allender, SJ (pastor), Frank Uranich, Scott Grinthal, Zack Zweber, and Frank Mitchell. A heartfelt thanks goes out to my support team at St. Agnes, Rosemary Robinson, Frank Uranich, and Justin Walsh, and the participants of my ethnographic interviews, including Helen Chen Abrams; S. Janet Chau, RSM; David and Rosemarie Dittman; Irene Duller; Mark Durst; Mark Malaspina; Tom Matty; Jude Pendland; Rachel Pinette; James Robinson;

Helen Rosario; Tim Szarnicki; Sally and Gene Tongson; and Edward Williams.

Next, I wish to thank members of my Paulist community for their support, particularly former presidents Frank DeSiano, John Duffy, and Mike McGarry and current president Eric Andrews; my brothers at Old St. Mary's Cathedral in San Francisco; my classmate Brett Hoover, whose passion for pastoral theology kept me grounded in reality; and George Fitzgerald for his friendship and support throughout the writing of this book.

Thanks to the entire staff at Liturgical Press, particularly Peter Dwyer, director; Hans Christoffersen, publisher of the academic department; and Lauren L. Murphy, managing editor. Because this is my first book with the Press, I feel truly honored and humbled! I am also deeply grateful for the friendship and wonderful editorial eye of Denise Anderson, who assisted me during the final stages. You are amazing!

And finally, to my parents, Pat and Dom; my siblings, Lyn, Dom, Riza, Robert, and Chris; and to my dear close friends, Paul, Len, Bob, and Alazar: You are all a blessing to me as you remain forever close to my heart!

Abbreviations

DD	The Lord's Day (<i>Dies Domini</i> , 1998)
EE	On the Eucharist in its Relationship to the Church (<i>Ecclesia de Eucharistia</i> , 2003)
IL	Liturgical Institutions (<i>Institutiones Liturgiques</i> , 1841)
LG	Dogmatic Constitution on the Church (<i>Lumen Gentium</i> , 1964)
LL	The Liturgical Year (<i>L'Année Liturgique</i> , 1841–1875)
MC	On the Holy Eucharist (<i>Mirae Caritatis</i> , 1902)
MCC	Mystical Body of Christ (<i>Mystici Corporis Christi</i> , 1943)
MD	The Sacred Liturgy (<i>Mediator Dei</i> , 1947)
PO	Decree on the Ministry and Life of Priests (<i>Presbyterorum Ordinis</i> , 1965)
SC	Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy (<i>Sacrosanctum Con- cilium</i> , 1963)
SOC	The Sacrament of Charity (<i>Sacramentum Caritatis</i> , 2007)
STS	On Frequent and Daily Reception of Holy Communion (<i>Sacra Tridentina Synodus</i> , 1905)
TLS	The Restoration of Church Music (<i>Tra le Sollecitudini</i> , 1903)

Introduction

All Glory Be to Invisible Mary

My earliest memories of praying can be traced back to the daily recitation of the family rosary during my childhood years. We began this devotional practice when I was only six years old. Each and every night my mother would gather her six children together. During that first year she would lead us through the sequence of Hail Marys and Our Fathers. Eventually each of the children would be given the responsibility of leading the rosary, but only after the child had memorized all fifteen “mysteries”¹ and could recite them forward and backward. Memorizing all fifteen mysteries was not the challenge: the challenge was maintaining interest and remaining attentive throughout the prayer. One day my mother thought of a brilliant solution: she suggested that we imagine Mary walking around the room as we recited the rosary. “Our Lady is invisible,” she said, “and even though we can’t see her, she walks around this room every time we pray the rosary . . . and she’s always smiling!” It worked. Every night I imagined an invisible Mary walking around the room, always smiling and always making sure we paid attention. At other times, other saints would join our family, particularly if it was a special feast day, but by and large Mary had

¹ The fifteen mysteries of the rosary consist of fifteen events in the lives of Jesus and Mary that are meditated upon during the recitation of this litany. The mysteries are divided into three groups: the *Joyful Mysteries* (the Annunciation, Visitation, Nativity, Presentation, and the Finding of the Child Jesus in the Temple); the *Sorrowful Mysteries* (the Agony in the Garden, the Scourging, the Crowning with Thorns, the Carrying of the Cross, and the Crucifixion); and the *Glorious Mysteries* (the Resurrection, Ascension, Descent of the Holy Spirit, Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary into Heaven, and Coronation of the Blessed Virgin Mary as Queen of Heaven).

become my spiritual mother and the primary symbol of holiness. We continued to perform this daily family ritual each night for approximately the next ten years, until my siblings and I eventually moved out of the house and, one by one, went our separate ways. Naturally there were some days when we were unable to pray the rosary together, but those were few and far between.

Two years after we began this practice, during one of my religious education classes, the teacher, Mrs. Brunori, spent part of the class teaching us about devotions to the saints. At one point she opened up a discussion about the rosary, a devotional exercise with which I was well familiar. During that lesson she asked the class: "To whom do we pray the rosary?" The answer was obvious to me, and so I raised my hand and answered, "Mary, the Mother of God!" She looked at me but did not respond right away. Instead, she paused, waiting for others to respond, but nobody came forward. Why this pause? I thought to myself. Could I be wrong? After all, why else would "Invisible Mary" walk around our house each night? After a few moments, Mrs. Brunori broke the silence and said, "Well, we pray to Mary . . . but we *really* pray to God." Except for those words I do not recall her exact words in detail, but she somehow explained that, in the end, Mary takes up all of our prayers and presents them to God. I had already *known* this deep inside me (perhaps at one point my mother may have explained this to my siblings and me), but somehow my world was turned upside down at that moment. It was not that my answer was wrong *per se*. After all, we begin those prayers with "Hail Mary." But in hindsight I can see that my image of Invisible Mary had a functional purpose of keeping me attentive (as my Mom told me years later), and the image of Mary walking among us spoke to my heart more than any other theological explanation of her mediating role. I had never seen a picture of God; I didn't know how "He" looked. There was a more intimate connection between Mary and me; Mary, as Mother, was more comforting than God, as Father, and, *deep down inside of me*, she was more real and more personal.

In addition to the family home, the other primary location where my family prayed was in a church building each week at Sunday Mass. But, oddly enough, I do not have any strong memories of

“going to Mass” until I was eight years old, two years after we had begun praying the family rosary. My loss of any memory of these weekly events is probably due to the fact that my family moved around a lot during the first six years of my life. Even so, my earliest memory of celebrating was “First Confession” when I was eight years old, at St. Gabriel’s Church in Marlboro, New Jersey. For the first time, I stepped into a confessional and proceeded to tell Fr. Sullivan, the associate pastor, my sins, which probably consisted of unkind acts toward my siblings and being irresponsible in performing house chores. Memorizing the opening prayer and the act of contrition was easy: I had become quite skilled in memorizing a litany of prayers that always accompanied the last portion of our daily family rosary. And while I do not remember the penance Fr. Sullivan assigned me, I remember feeling quite relieved when I walked out of the confessional and returned to the pew. What is even more remarkable is that I do not recall the details of my First Holy Communion service, just a couple of months later, save one image: my older sister dressed in a white dress (we celebrated this event together that same year). Beyond that image, not much exists in my memory bank. No doubt First Confession and First Holy Communion were pivotal sacramental events in my childhood. But as it turns out, my fondness for Invisible Mary and praying the rosary with my family each night in our home has become the earliest and most vivid religious memory of my entire life.

An Interaction of Worshipful Practices

The story of my childhood memories of praying the rosary with my family in our home and going to First Confession at St. Gabriel’s Church is not meant to suggest that I find no value in Sunday Mass. On the contrary, today I participate more in eucharistic liturgies on average than I pray the rosary. But at the same time, other forms of everyday worship practices have emerged since my childhood, including presiding at daily Mass every Thursday morning at Old St. Mary’s Cathedral (the place where I reside); composing liturgical music, often late at night while I am alone in the church and I have the piano all to myself; reciting Morning Prayer and Evening

Prayer from the Breviary with other members of my religious community (or by myself on the iPad); and drinking Japanese tea every day at 4:00 PM on my tatami mat, a time when I either reflect on the scriptural readings of the day, prepare for an upcoming homily I have to deliver, or simply sit in the quietude of God's presence. Becoming aware of and responding to God's presence is my simple definition of worship. In each of the worship practices I mentioned above there is recognition of being in the presence of God, either by myself or with other people, and there is a response to this presence. The responses take different forms, some more explicit than others, and involve different elements. As Dwight W. Vogel suggests in his reflection on "worship," some of these elements may include prayer and praise, lament and thanksgiving, confession and commitment. These elements may be manifested through ritual expressions, but they are not restricted to those expressions. Praise of God is worship whether or not it is embodied in ritual.²

While the purposes and goals of each of these worship practices are varied, so too are the locations in which each of them takes place: the side chapel of Old St. Mary's Cathedral for daily Mass, at the piano in the main church to the left of the sanctuary, the rectory chapel, and my Japanese tea room. So are the days of the week and the times of the day: 7:30 AM for daily Mass, 10:00 PM for composing, 8:30 AM for Morning Prayer, 6:00 PM for evening prayer, and 4:00 PM for tea.

Since the start of my doctoral studies at the Graduate Theological Union, I have often reflected on the interactions that exist among the various worship forms people cultivate. These reflections, in turn, led to a conviction that an examination of these interactions could be beneficial to scholars in the field of liturgical studies. For example, the worship practices I listed above not only take place at different locations, on different days of the week, and at different times of the day; they also dynamically interact with one another. During my tea drinking on Wednesday afternoons I usually pre-

² Dwight W. Vogel, "Liturgical Theology: A Conceptual Geography," 3–14 in *Primary Sources of Liturgical Theology: A Reader* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2000), at 5.

pare for the homily I will deliver the next day during Thursday daily Mass. The scriptural readings and presidential prayers of Thursday daily Mass, in turn, are usually connected to the previous Sunday Mass, which, in turn, is connected to the larger liturgical season of the church year. At the same time, during other times when I drink tea I make no intentional connections between the quietude of recognizing God’s presence and any eucharistic celebration. All of this is to suggest that there is always an interplay between Sunday Eucharist and other worship practices. Sometimes these practices influence each other; at other times they do not.

Considerations of the Cultural Context of Liturgy after the Second Vatican Council

At the time of the Second Vatican Council (1962–1965), the church’s self-awareness of its ecclesial identity within the larger global context, coupled with its rich history of Christian missionary activities and the social scientific tools that were made available from anthropological disciplines, contributed to corollary concerns between worship practices and the cultural contexts in which these practices took place. Calling for a revision of the liturgical books, the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* (1963) addressed cultural adaptation of the rites in articles 37–40 and consequently opened the door for “legitimate variations and adaptations” during liturgical celebrations:

Provisions shall also be made, when revising the liturgical books, for legitimate variations and adaptations to different groups, regions, and peoples, especially in mission lands, provided that the substantial unity of the Roman Rite is preserved; and this should be borne in mind when drawing up the rites and devising rubrics.³

The liturgical reforms that emerged out of the Second Vatican Council opened the way for the critical evaluation of the Roman Rite—marked by centuries of European classical form—in light of

³ SC 38.

the cultural practices, rituals, symbols, and worldviews of local church contexts. As scholars and pastoral leaders investigated the ecclesial identity and liturgical activities of the church in relation to the rest of the world, “cultural groups” were viewed as being bounded by geographical, national, racial and ethnic realities. More recently, Gerald Arbuckle described this “modern approach to culture” as a type of “billiard ball” model of cultures as separate, impenetrable units, passing with little or no change from one generation to the next in a quasi-automatic way, self-integrating to maintain the status quo, resistant to external influences, homogeneous, and devoid of internal dissent.⁴

Around the same time that the Council convened, a new branch of anthropology, “symbolic anthropology,”⁵ was emerging and offering scholars new tools for assessing the cultural dimensions of worship. Works in this field at that period included those of Clifford Geertz,⁶ Mary Douglas,⁷ and Victor Turner.⁸ For example, in Geertz’s method of “thick description,” interpreters of ritual events observe symbolic actions within which are embedded the worldview, values, and ethos of the particular culture. The symbolic action speaks for itself (the action is the text), but the inter-

⁴ Gerald A. Arbuckle, *Culture, Inculturation, and Theologians: A Postmodern Critique* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2010), 4. See also Alan Barnard, *History and Theory in Anthropology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 158–84; Kathryn Tanner, *Theories of Culture: A New Agenda for Theology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 3–58.

⁵ I borrow this term from Sherry B. Ortner, who provides the qualification that “symbolic anthropology” “was never used by any of its main proponents” as a label during its formative years (1963–66), but was “a shorthand tag (probably invented by the opposition), an umbrella for a number of rather diverse trends.” See her “Theory in Anthropology Since the Sixties,” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 26 (Jan. 1984): 126–66, at 128.

⁶ Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York: Basic Books, 1973).

⁷ Mary Douglas, *Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1982).

⁸ Victor Turner, *The Forest of Symbols: Aspects of Ndembu Ritual* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1967); idem, *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure* (Chicago: Aldine, 1969); idem, *Dramas, Fields and Metaphors* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1974).

preter (i.e., the voice that speaks “from the actor’s point of view”) must decipher the various layers of meanings embedded in the presentation. Geertz’s hermeneutical approach focuses on the observed event front and center; all other cultural symbols, activities, and representations that surround the event are then placed in alignment with the observable presentation. Geertz’s approach to cultural analysis assumed that the observable cultural representation, by way of the anthropologist’s interpretation(s), signified the entire way of life of a people and thus fortified the seeming boundaries of cultural identity.⁹

⁹ Among the many critiques of Geertz’s *The Interpretation of Cultures* (1973), Ann Swidler outlines some of the “causal assumptions” that arise from his method of thick description: “Geertz prefers exploring ritual events that deeply engross their participants. But whatever piece of culture he chooses, his method is the same. He focuses on a cluster of symbols, moving out from that core to the social and symbolic experience within which it has meaning. Thus he ‘interprets’ the Balinese cockfight by following the many strands of Balinese life that wrap themselves around this vivid public play: Balinese conceptions of animality in human nature, the symbolic sexual significance of cocks, the status rivalries played out in betting on cockfights, and the excitement added to the sport by Indonesian government attempts to outlaw it.” See her *Talk of Love: How Culture Matters* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001), 20. For earlier critiques of Geertz see Talal Asad, “The Construction of Religion as an Anthropological Category,” 27–54 in idem, *Genealogies of Religion: Discipline and Reasons for Power in Christianity and Islam* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993), first published as “Anthropological Conceptions of Religion: Reflections on Geertz,” *Man* 18 (1983): 237–59; Paul Shankman, “The Thick and the Thin: On the Interpretive Theoretical Program of Clifford Geertz,” *Current Anthropology* 25 (1984): 261–79; James Clifford and George E. Marcus, eds., *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986), particularly Vincent Crapanzano’s entry, “Hermes’ Dilemma,” 68–76 in this volume; Mark A. Schneider, *Culture and Enchantment* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993); Richard Biernacki, “Method and Metaphor after the New Cultural History,” 62–92 in *Beyond the Cultural Turn: New Directions in the Study of Society and Culture*, eds. Victoria E. Bonnell and Lynn Hunt (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999); Stephen Greenblatt, “The Touch of the Real,” 14–29 in *The Fate of “Culture”: Geertz and Beyond*, ed. Sherry B. Ortner (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999).

The works of symbolic anthropologists influenced the field of liturgical scholarship in the years after the Council. While this turn to the social sciences does not represent the first time liturgists have “looked over the shoulders of anthropologists,”¹⁰ the time period in which these anthropologists wrote coincided with the pastoral implementation of the Second Vatican Council. For example, in her 1975 address during the second annual conference of professional American liturgists,¹¹ liturgical theologian Mary Collins, a student of Victor Turner, set out “to do cross-disciplinary study of the various anthropological approaches to the study of rite.” In her address she urged liturgists to study the rites more holistically by extending the horizon of ritual inquiry beyond textual analysis and by including cross-disciplinary methods that were surfacing in anthropology and ritual studies.¹² In 1991 another liturgical theo-

¹⁰ In his 1989 assessment of the relationship between anthropology and liturgical studies Martin D. Stringer makes note of E. O. James’s *Christian Myth and Ritual: A Historical Study* (London: J. Murray, 1933) and the contributions of Anton Baumstark’s *Comparative Liturgy* (London: Mowbray, 1958) and Gregory Dix’s *The Shape of the Liturgy* (London: Dacre, 1945). The latter two liturgical scholars utilized comparative methodologies borrowed from the social sciences. For his part, Nathan D. Mitchell names Romano Guardini (1885–1968) and Louis Bouyer (1913–2004), who both expressed interest in the “anthropological antecedents” of Christian liturgy. See Mitchell, *Liturgy and the Social Sciences* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999).

¹¹ Mary Collins, “Liturgical Methodology and the Cultural Evolution of Worship in the United States,” *Worship* 49 (1975): 85–102. This article was later revised in her book, *Worship: Renewal to Practice* (Washington, DC: Pastoral Press, 1987), 73–90. See also her “Ritual Symbols and the Ritual Process: The Work of Victor W. Turner,” *Worship* 50 (1976): 336–46.

¹² In *Worship: Renewal to Practice*, 90, Collins wrote: “While we all agree that worship is not simply a matter of words, we continue to manifest a bias of the rational, linear culture which has nurtured us. The verbal code continues to be perceived as the clearest expression of the faith horizon of the church. So, studying texts continues to be perceived as the key to finding meanings in liturgical rites . . . Yet the cultural bias and the greater difficulty of gaining access to and control of non-documentary evidence has maximized the importance of texts and minimized the significance of other data in liturgical studies. The procedural model tended to make the text central and other factors more or less peripheral.”

gian, Margaret Mary Kelleher, who was also influenced by Turner's work, provided a detailed description of the communion rite as it was performed within a specific location, "one urban parish in the eastern part of the United States." Attempting "to expand the sources of data on Christian liturgy beyond texts to include the actual performance of rites," she interpreted the ritual meanings of the Eucharist as they were performed within this local worship assembly.¹³

While Collins and Kelleher promoted the use of anthropological tools for the empirical investigation of liturgy, another liturgical theologian, Anscar J. Chupungco, focused on the concerns for inculturation and the application of this theological term in the formation of liturgical rites. Beginning in the mid-1970s, Chupungco developed methods for implementing liturgical inculturation that gave primary consideration to local church contexts and created a dialogue between the worship practices that emerge in those contexts and the cultural predilections of Western Christianity that are often embedded within official rites.¹⁴

The ecumenical scope of liturgical scholars' use of anthropological tools in order to analyze and interpret the local cultural contexts of worship practices is also worth noting. Throughout the 1970s the World Council of Churches adapted the anthropological term "contextualization" to articulate "the process of updating church structures so that they would keep pace with the changes in the modern world."¹⁵ As a follow-up to these dialogues, the Lutheran World Federation set out to explore for itself the conditions and parameters for the inculturation of its own worship tradition by holding a series of consultation meetings from 1993 to 1996. The

¹³ Margaret Mary Kelleher, "The Communion Rite: A Study of Roman Catholic Liturgical Performance," *Journal of Ritual Studies* 5 (1991): 99–122.

¹⁴ Anscar J. Chupungco, "Liturgy and Inculturation," 337–75 in *Handbook for Liturgical Studies* 2 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998); idem, *What, Then, Is Liturgy: Musings and Memoir* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2010).

¹⁵ Anscar J. Chupungco, "Inculturation of Worship: Forty Years of Progress and Tradition," in *Liturgy in a New Millennium: 2000–2003*, ed. Rhoda Schuler (Valparaiso, IN: Institute of Liturgical Studies, 2006). Available online at <http://www.valpo.edu/ils/assets/pdfs/chupungco1.pdf>, there at p. 2.

participants at those meetings, including Anita S. Stauffer, Gordon Lathrop, and invited guest Anscar Chupungco, wrestled with terminology, questioning whether they should adapt the terms “contextualization” or “inculturation.” They also proceeded, with some caution, to fortify specific boundaries between official liturgical rites and extra-liturgical cultural symbols, while remaining open to their interrelationship. As Chupungco writes:

Many questions were raised and several left unanswered. I reproduced two salient questions. The first . . . was where to set the boundaries to the incursion of culture in Christian worship. Failure to do this could lead to a situation where violence is done to biblical doctrine in order to accommodate culture. It could also happen that the cultural elements that are integrated in worship overly evoke their cultural provenance and thus divert attention from the Christian rite or worse send an altogether different message to the assembly.

Another scenario would be the mere incorporation of cultural elements into Christian worship without the benefit of integrating them. They could be attractive, perhaps even entertaining, but if they are not integrated with the Christian rite they are no more than decorative appendices or cultural tokens with small role to play in the unfolding of the rite.¹⁶

In January 1996, during its third international consultation, held in Nairobi, Kenya, the Federation published the *Nairobi Statement on Worship and Culture: Contemporary Challenges and Opportunities*.¹⁷ Continuing the concern over the cultural context of Christian worship, the statement identified four parameters: that worship be contextual, cross-cultural, counter-cultural, and transcultural:

First, it is transcultural, the same substance for everyone everywhere, beyond culture. Second, it is contextual, varying according to the

¹⁶ Chupungco, “Inculturation of Worship,” <http://www.valpo.edu/ils/assets/pdfs/chupungco1.pdf>, 3.

¹⁷ *Nairobi Statement on Worship and Culture: Contemporary Challenges and Opportunities*, available online at http://www.worship.ca/docs/lwf_ns.html.

local situation (both nature and culture). Third, it is counter-cultural, challenging what is contrary to the Gospel in a given culture. Fourth, it is cross-cultural, making possible sharing between different local cultures. In all four dynamics, there are helpful principles which can be identified.¹⁸

In the more recent work *Christian Worship Worldwide: Expanding Horizons, Deepening Practices*,¹⁹ liturgical scholars from the full spectrum of the ecumenical field, including Charles E. Farhadian, John D. Witvliet, Philip L. Wickeri, Seung Joong Joo, Thomas A. Kane, and C. Michael Hawn, drew on the *Nairobi Statement* in order to consider “the tension between the contextual and the cross-cultural, transcultural, and countercultural” as it occurs in “public worship assemblies” throughout the global church, with studies including Kerala, Latin America, Samoa, South Africa, and South Korea.

While methodological and hermeneutical attention continues to be given to the cultural context of worship practices, what is missing in all of these approaches is an intentional consideration of how non-official worship practices, performed by individuals and/or collective groups, continually interact with Sunday Eucharist within the broader temporal and sociocultural realm of everyday life. The turn to the social sciences that emerged after the Second Vatican Council underscored the importance of cultural context for understanding *what* liturgy is and *how* liturgy is experienced and expressed but, by and large, it paid less attention to how everyday worship practices continually influence and interact with official liturgies and with one another.

In this book I contend that liturgical scholars need to consider the place of non-official worship practices in their reflections on Sunday Eucharist. Further, I would posit that broadening the scope and spectrum of what constitute worshipful practices in the everyday lives of Christians and putting these in dialogue with official

¹⁸ *Nairobi Statement*, 1.3.

¹⁹ *Christian Worship Worldwide: Expanding Horizons, Deepening Practices*, ed. Charles E. Farhadian (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007).

liturgical rites will render our understanding of the meaning-making that transpires in Christian worship more dense, rich, and textured than is currently the case.

The Source and Summit of Christian Life

In addition to demonstrating the various forms of worship practices that occurred during my childhood, the stories I recounted at the opening of this introduction illustrate how powerful images and metaphors come to be forever embedded in our memories. Some of these images become *fixed*: I do not think I will ever pray the rosary again without imagining and feeling the presence of Invisible Mary in the room. In other cases these religious images and metaphors are collective and shared among a group of people. That the Eucharist is “the source and summit” of Christian life is one such image, and it forms the starting point of this book.

One of the most influential achievements of the modern liturgical movement has been the reassertion of the centrality of the Sunday eucharistic liturgy in the everyday life of Christians. This reassertion culminated doctrinally in the Second Vatican Council’s *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* (1963), which stated that the “liturgy is the summit toward which the activity of the church is directed . . . [and] the fount [source] from which all her power flows” (article 10). As I will demonstrate later, eventually the term “the liturgy” within this article came to be designated as “the Sunday Eucharist” (as a privileged distinction from other forms of official liturgy, such as the *Liturgy of the Hours*), and the entirety of the article, along with the surrounding articles, eventually became truncated to “the Eucharist is the source and summit of Christian life” in official and academic parlance. But there have always been many variations of this phrase, and in each variation the metaphors “source” (sometimes translated as “font”) and “summit” (sometimes translated as “peak”) remained constant. I never questioned the meaning of the phrase beyond what I had been taught: to paraphrase, “All roads lead to Sunday Mass and all roads flow away from Sunday Mass.”

In 2005, at the start of my doctoral program at the Graduate Theological Union, I read a chapter in a book by Peter C. Phan entitled, “Liturgy of Life as Summit and Source of Eucharistic

Liturgy.”²⁰ In that chapter Phan introduced a term I had not heard before, “the liturgy of life,” and he placed this term in relationship to “summit and source.” Once I started reading his chapter and learned that the liturgy of life was based on Karl Rahner’s “liturgy of the world” (a term I had heard during my studies at the Washington Theological Union), I began to understand more clearly what Phan was proposing. For him the liturgy of life consists of the “universal experiences of God and mystical encounters with God’s grace in the midst of everyday life, made possible by God’s self-gift embracing the whole human history, always and everywhere.”²¹ In response to the statement in article 10 of the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*, Phan contends that “the liturgy of life is the summit and source of the church’s liturgy and not the other way around.”²² Later he suggests that “the liturgy of life and the liturgy of the church constitute the one worship that humanity renders to God and whose center and supreme fulfillment is Jesus Christ.”²³ My earlier (uncritical) conviction that the Eucharist was the source and summit of my life had suddenly changed, or at least became nuanced. Phan’s article introduced a new paradigm I had not considered before, and *deep down inside of me* his proposal made sense: the Eucharist is not so much the source and center of my life or the church’s life; God is.

The Sociology of Lived Religion

Two years later, in the Fall of 2007, I took a course on the sociology of culture taught by Ann Swidler at the University of California,

²⁰ Peter C. Phan, “Liturgy of Life as Summit and Source of Eucharistic Liturgy: Church Worship as Symbolization of Liturgy of Life?” 257–78 in idem, *Being Religious Interreligiously: Asian Perspectives on Interfaith Dialogue in Post-modernity* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2004). An earlier version of this article appeared as “Liturgy of Life as the ‘Summit and Source’ of the Eucharistic Liturgy: Church Worship as Symbolization of the Liturgy of Life?” 5–33 in *Incongruities: Who We Are and How We Pray*, eds. Timothy Fitzgerald and David A. Lysik (Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications, 2000).

²¹ Phan, “Liturgy of Life as Summit,” 268–69.

²² *Ibid.*, 265.

²³ *Ibid.*, 272.

Berkeley. I realized that up to that point my approach to cultural studies had been largely shaped by anthropological perspectives, and I began to reflect on how sociological studies might come to influence academic approaches to and experiences of Christian liturgies. That course led to the writing of a paper entitled, “Beyond the Boundaries: Sociology and Liturgy,” which I presented to my seminar group during the 2008 gathering of the North American Academy of Liturgy in Savannah, Georgia. The goal of that paper was to initiate dialogue between the fields of liturgical studies and sociology. This was a new turn for liturgical scholarship, since post-Vatican II explorations had focused more on cultural anthropology than on any other social science. It is not surprising that few, if any, liturgical theologians drew upon sociology, since methods for demographic and statistical analysis, which marked sociology during that period, did not provide the cultural interpretive tools liturgical theologians were seeking.

Within the last decade, however, the field of the sociology of lived religion has emerged as a critical and promising contribution to the social science fields and to liturgical scholarship. The sociologists who have led this movement include David D. Hall, Nancy T. Ammerman, Meredith B. McGuire, Giuseppe Giordan, and William H. Swatos. These sociologists and others critique past binary approaches that often pitted “official religion” against “popular religion.” “Lived religion”—that is, practices of religiosity and spirituality that occur in everyday life—occupies the middle space between and the inclusive space that surrounds official liturgies and non-official worship practices. Furthermore, sociologists of lived religion often privilege locations outside institutional boundaries as starting points of inquiry, and they also remain open to how individuals and collective social groups perform these practices within and around such boundaries.

Outline of the Book

All of these experiences provide the backdrop for and shape the methodological and interpretive tools I will use in this book. My goal is to expand the contextual horizon of liturgical scholarship

and to include a broader range of worship practices as appropriate subject matter for our inquiry. After providing some background to my ethnographic project, I will explore a historical evolution of understandings of the phrase “source and summit” as descriptive of the relationship between the Eucharist and all other non-official worship practices. Specifically, I will demonstrate that in the latter part of the twentieth century a notion of the liturgy, particularly the Eucharist, as source and summit vis-à-vis other spiritual religious practices became solidified and was promoted in Roman Catholic teaching. My choice to focus on the Eucharist does not imply that this is the only tradition of liturgical worship that historically has been a part of the church. But for the scope of this book I opted to focus on the Eucharist as representative of official liturgy, as it remains our most formal and central worship practice.

Then I will entertain Peter Phan’s revision of “source and summit” as a theological paradigm that includes both Eucharist and other non-official worship practices, all of which constitute the one worship that humanity renders to God. With this theological perspective as a basis, I will introduce the perspectives and methods of sociologists of religion as well as correlations of ethnographic data based on my own exploration of one community’s perception of these relationships. It is my contention throughout that examining the dynamic interrelationship between Sunday Eucharist and other forms of worshipful practice that occur in everyday life will reveal new theological, ecclesiological, and ritual understandings of “liturgy” that expand and inform the contextual horizon of liturgical scholarship.

Chapter 1 presents a general introduction to one Roman Catholic worship community in San Francisco, St. Agnes Church, followed by brief background introductions to the participants in my ethnographic project. From February 2010 to June 2012 I was engaged in participant observation of their 10:30 AM Sunday Mass, which took place within their church building, the official worship site of this parish. I also conducted targeted interviews with eight members of this community (“ethnographic participants”), gained deeper insights, and learned of their interpretations of the interrelatedness of the various worship practices in which they engaged. At the

beginning of each chapter I will share some of the stories and interpretations that emerged from these interviews.

Chapters 2 and 3 provide the historical background and development of the statement “the Eucharist is the source and summit of Christian life,” and demonstrate that articulations of this statement were indicative of the larger goal to identify the relationship between official liturgy and popular religious practices. Chapter 2 will trace the various usages of the term “source and summit” in the official documents and writings of some of the pioneers of the liturgical movement leading up to the Second Vatican Council (roughly 1833–1962). I will provide a brief description of the state of the relationship between the Eucharist and popular religion at the beginning of the movement, thus setting the backdrop for the documents and writings that will follow. Then I will provide brief summaries of how some of the pioneers of this movement came to use the terms “source and summit” in their writings, specifically Dom Prosper Gueranger, Popes Leo XIII and Pius X, Dom Lambert Beauduin, Virgil Michel, and Pius XII. Throughout the entire liturgical movement these ecclesial leaders and liturgical scholars experimented with images such as “source and summit” in order to promote a new fervor that could generate more lay participation during the Eucharist. Unfortunately, the vigorous promotion of the Eucharist eventually led to a decreased emphasis on popular religious practices by the time of the Second Vatican Council.

Chapter 3 focuses on how the image of “the Eucharist as source and summit” came to be articulated in three important documents from the Second Vatican Council and in some of the post-conciliar documents by Popes John Paul II and Benedict XVI. When Vatican II brought together all the energy and fervor of the liturgical movement, the image of the Eucharist as source and summit became even more solidified as the church vigorously promoted its official worship in relation to the rest of Christian life, including all those practices that were deemed devotional, spiritual, or pietistic. I will demonstrate this through several council documents: the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* (1963), the *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* (1965), and the *Decree on the Ministry and Life of Priests* (1965). This will be followed by an examination of post-conciliar

documents, including Pope John Paul II's *The Day of the Lord* (1998) and *On the Eucharist in Its Relationship to the Church* (2003), and Pope Benedict XVI's *The Sacrament of Charity* (2007). In short, all the writings that will be investigated in chapters 2 and 3 will demonstrate that the various articulations of this phrase were indicative of a larger unfolding process that attempted to define and order the interrelationship between official liturgy and non-official worship practices and to place the Eucharist at the top of the worship pyramid. Throughout this process of reordering, the fluidity of interactions between official liturgy and non-official worship practices remained.

Chapter 4 presents in more detail Peter Phan's proposal that the liturgy of life is the source and summit of the Eucharist and popular religion and, further, that both of these worship practices together constitute the one worship that humanity renders to God. Phan offers a theological paradigm that does not limit "worship" to eucharistic liturgies alone but instead broadens the scope and spectrum of what constitutes "liturgy." In doing so he expands the contextual horizon of liturgical scholarship to include a range of personal/communal practices. But where Phan focuses on popular religion as an example of non-official liturgy, this book will consider *all* forms of non-official worship practices as legitimate expressions of Christian faith that could potentially be placed in dialectical relationship with Sunday Eucharist. How I come to approach and understand what is entailed in this spectrum of worship practices will largely depend upon the next two chapters, 5 and 6.

Moving from theological foundation to social scientific methods of investigation, chapter 5 will provide an analysis of the writings of sociologists of lived religion in order to explore the disciplinary methods these sociologists use in their attempts to uncover the pluriform practices of worship that occur in everyday life.²⁴

²⁴ The specific writings include David D. Hall's edited volume, *Lived Religion in America: Toward a History of Practice* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997), Nancy T. Ammerman's *Everyday Religion: Observing Modern Religious Lives* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), Meredith B.

The works of these sociologists provide one of the methodological foundations for chapter 6, which provides correlations of my ethnographic data. My approach to ethnography is based on the methodologies of Mary E. McGann, who has been at the forefront of applying ethnographic research tools to liturgical studies (“liturgical ethnography”), and of anthropologist James Clifford, who opened up the boundaries of ethnographic field sites by considering the complexities and the “pervasive spectrum of human experiences” that transpire between a variety of locations.

Finally, in chapter 7, I engage in an interdisciplinary conversation among the three perspectives of my study (theological, sociological, and ethnographic), seeking to discover how the data I glean from sociologists of religion and my ethnographic research confirm, stretch, and recontextualize the theological framework I have drawn from Peter Phan regarding the liturgy of life. I will end with a presentation of how my work contributes to one current issue in the field of liturgical studies: the centrality of divine initiative in liturgical worship, and hence in liturgical-theological reflection.

McGuire’s *Lived Religion: Faith and Practice in Everyday Life* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), and Giuseppe Giordan and William H. Swatos’s edited volume, *Religion, Spirituality and Everyday Practice* (Dordrecht and New York: Springer, 2011).

Chapter One

Welcome to St. Agnes!

Jude Penlands's eyes beam with excitement when I ask her why she goes to St. Agnes Church for the Sunday Eucharist. She shares a story about a conversation she had with a friend who owns a tourist business, "The Mexican Bus," a city tour guide that takes place within a bus decorated with Mexican emblems and symbols. When her friend asked if she would like to rent the bus and if Jude could find "people to fill it," Jude right away thought of St. Agnes. "Immediately I said, 'Oh God, all I have to do is spread the word in St. Agnes!' *It's like I have a home base there!*"



When Helen Chen Abrams moved to her first condominium in the Haight-Ashbury neighborhood (she is a teacher), she started going to St. Agnes and found the preaching and ministries at the parish comparable to those at the Newman Center at the University of California, Berkeley, particularly the openness to gay and lesbian ministries that both parishes promote.

I started coming here and I *really* like St. Agnes. There was a series of coincidences when [one day] they announced that they're training altar servers and readers. So that's how I started getting involved here, because it was just like . . . I didn't just want to "go to Mass": I wanted to, you know, *do something and help*.

For Helen, "doing something" is her form of everyday worship. She continues: "The way I worship is not necessarily *true* prayer,

but more through *service*. I find I try to anchor my week's activities on the teachings of the Gospels. . . . That's why I really like going to church!"



In the late afternoon of February 17, 2010, around 5:10 PM, I walked into St. Agnes Church to participate in and observe their 5:30 PM service of Ash Wednesday, the beginning of the Lenten season. The parish is located in the Haight-Ashbury neighborhood of San Francisco.¹ As I walked through the small, narrow, and dark narthex (foyer), I entered the central nave of the church and came upon an open and wide area that took up a full quarter of the entire nave.² Nearly twenty years ago the last ten rows of pews had been removed in order to form "the hospitality area," the term used by the pastoral staff to refer to this area.³ The term "hospitality" mainly refers to the hospitality and social interaction that start *after* Mass ends when, for approximately fifteen to twenty minutes, 50 to 70 percent of the assembly walk over, and, while eating donuts, cookies, cut-up pastries, and drinking coffee, milk, and juice, socialize with one another: "gather with everyone after Mass," "catch up with my friends," "my time to say 'hello' to Fr. Ray Allender [the pastor]," "talk about the homily, whether we liked it or not," "tell Frank [the director of music and liturgy] how much we enjoyed his music," "eat donuts and feel guilty afterwards," and so on. Six of the eight participants I interviewed for this book, when asked why they go to St. Agnes, referred to this "time to catch up with one another." For example, for Rachel Durst, "this is the 'greeting space,' because we are a community of welcome and hospitality." For Edward Williams it was the sense of hospitality he experienced in this space that convinced him to join the parish and become Roman Catholic:

¹ See appendix 1, p. 177.

² See appendix 2, p. 179.

³ At the end of the communion rite of Sunday Eucharist and during the announcements, the cantor, Scott Grinthal, always invites the assembly: "Join us for light refreshments in our hospitality area in the back of the church!"

I came here and the first person I met was Felina. She's very warm. . . . So I met her and then I turned to Frank [the liturgy director]. He told me that the Rite of Christian initiation doesn't start until September. So I met more and more and more people—pretty much I came every week—and they take your photograph and put it on a board [in the hospitality area]. People are coming up to me and saying hi . . . hi . . . hi . . .!

When I was selecting a worship community for this book, this particular space appealed to me at both an inspirational and a practical level. For me the hospitality area represents a *communal* liminal space between official space and the outside world where everyday religious practices occur. It is in the hospitality area that a more intentional communal gathering of ritual transitioning occurs, from the outside world to the inside and vice versa. This is the building's "contact zone," the borderland, where worshippers negotiate the overlapping meanings of worship through social conversation, liturgical preparation, and/or liturgical reflection on the Mass they have just experienced. Since the majority of parishioners "transitioned" into and away from this space, it became the primary (but not the only) place where I conducted casual interviews with the parishioners and the parish staff, before and after the Mass. Thus this space becomes an appropriate image to introduce the readers to the 10:30 AM Sunday Eucharist of St. Agnes Church.

Hospitality, Music Making, and Preaching

The 10:30 AM Masses at St. Agnes Church are well planned, prepared, and performed by all liturgical ministers and the assembly. Based on my interviews with dozens of parishioners over the course of my project, I concluded that the three most common reasons why people choose to worship at St. Agnes are hospitality, music making, and preaching.

Hospitality

There is a vibrant energy level that begins as early as twenty minutes before the start of the Mass, as the assembly members and

liturgical ministers converse with one another. This occurs throughout the entire worship space, along the center and two main side aisles, within the pews, near the choir section to the right of the sanctuary (while the choir rehearses) and, of course, in and around the hospitality area. For Rachel Durst, greeting one another at St. Agnes is a prophetic calling. "If we greet one another, we meet the stranger. We let them know that this is the place where all are welcomed." For Helen Chen Abrams, "The people, they're just so nice . . . just *genuinely* nice and I think that's what Christ wanted: to just be nice to each other." By 10:20 AM the noise level throughout the worship space is noticeably heightened with socializing. The start of Mass is ritually timed and planned to begin the moment Scott, the cantor, steps up to the microphone to the right of the sanctuary and announces: "Good morning, everyone! Welcome to St. Agnes!" After a moment's pause he continues, "We invite you to stand and greet others around you." For the next twenty to thirty seconds we turn to those around us, with extended hand reached out for a handshake, or a hug, or a simple gesture of greeting to those across the aisle.

During the Fall of 2009, while I was searching for parishes in the San Francisco Bay area, I surfed the Internet and came across the St. Agnes web page. The home page prominently placed three distinct words that served as a slogan for the parish: Inclusive, Diverse, Jesuit. A more descriptive mission statement followed:

Saint Agnes Parish is a 117-year-old Roman Catholic Jesuit parish community in the historic and socially conscious Haight-Ashbury district of San Francisco, California. Known for prayerful liturgies, well-prepared homilies, gracious hospitality, and vitality, Saint Agnes Parish draws men and women, young and old, straight and gay from the neighborhood and around the City and beyond to what some call "the last chance church!" It is truly Catholic—all are welcome.⁴

This statement, along with my recognition that this was a Jesuit parish, prompted me to visit.

⁴ <http://www.saintagnessf.com>. The parish was founded in 1893. The web page has since been updated.

St. Agnes is a community where those who often feel alienated from the church find themselves welcomed. As Fr. Ray explained:

It's mostly a white Caucasian parish. Our largest ethnic group, outside of the white population, is the Filipino group. It's also attractive to the gay and lesbian community; they're accepted here and they like a more integrated parish than, say, Most Holy Redeemer in the Castro [neighborhood]. It attracts a lot of people who are disaffected, young people who are looking for something. . . . It's a warm community, and you usually get a good homily. So all of these things come together and make this an attractive place!

The majority of the worshipers during the 10:30 AM Mass are of European American heritage and middle-income. Of the 260 worshipers (the average number according to parish "attendance records" for October 2010 and October 2011), I have noted that at any given Sunday service there is an average of fifteen Africans/African Americans, thirty-three Asian Pacific (mostly Filipino), and fifteen Hispanics/Latinos. Thus nearly 24 percent of the worshipers are non-white. The average breakdown of gender is 138 females and 97 males. There are about twenty-five infants and children below the age of twelve. During the Liturgy of the Word, some twelve to fifteen of these children process out from the pews to the side rooms where they have their own scriptural study, and return to the larger assembly during the preparation of gifts at the beginning of the second half of the Mass.

When I opened the bulletin the first time, I quickly noted a variety of ministerial groups, including Consolation Ministry, Food Pantry, Filipino Community, Legion of Mary Group, Liturgical Ministries, Gay and Lesbian Ministry, Rite for Christian Initiation of Adults (RCIA), Welcoming Ministry, and Young Adult Group. According to the leaders of most of these groups, members of their groups are present for the 10:30 AM Mass and are active in a variety of liturgical roles. Further, the majority of these groups hold, on average, meetings every four to six weeks, with some meetings occurring after the 10:30 AM Mass. As a further testament to this parish's hospitality, lectors are instructed to use inclusive language and women take a prominent leadership and liturgical role. In short,

groups who may feel alienated from the Roman Catholic Church or from the larger community of St. Agnes are made to feel welcomed.

Music Making

The assembly participates fully and actively in the singing and playing of music throughout the liturgy. This accomplishment is due in large part to Frank Uranich, who has been a member of this community since 1997.⁵ Every Sunday the choir begins to practice around 10:00 AM, in addition to their weekly practice every Tuesday night from 7:30 to 9:00 PM. On average there are twenty members of the choir (five per section: soprano, alto, tenor, and bass), with four paid section leaders. In addition to the piano and organ, which are played by Frank, there is usually a violinist and a cellist. On more solemn occasions such as Christmas Day, Easter Sunday, and Pentecost, there is a brass quartet and a timpanist. Scott, who also serves as the parish secretary, has served as cantor for this Mass for the past fifteen years. While the majority of song selections in the parish music repertoire include the music of contemporary composers, such as Bob Hurd, David Haas, and Dan Schutte, traditional Catholic hymns are also sung.

For some parishioners who worship during this Mass, “the music is the best part of coming to St. Agnes.” “You’re not gonna get anybody better than Frank!” Fr. Ray exclaimed. Others noted that the choir is “well-rehearsed” and “the time they [the choir] put into practicing their [vocal] parts shows!” Another has commented on “the joyful presence” of Scott whenever he leads the assembly. I always see many of the members of the assembly singing, but noted that more people toward the front half of the pews engage in sung participation. At the end of every Sunday Mass the presiding priest always recognizes the efforts of Frank, Scott, and the entire choir, after which the assembly joins in with enthusiastic applause.

⁵ Frank states: “I plan all of the liturgies, write the scripts for the presider, general intercessions. I copy them and provide a script to each presider. I make copies of general intercessions and place them in the church, set the ribbons for the Roman Missal. I choose the Preface and the Eucharistic Prayers and plan all of the music and make a weekly worship aid.”

This is followed by a listing and acknowledgment of *all* liturgical ministries, including readers, altar servers, eucharistic and hospitality ministers.

Preaching

The content and message of the homily are usually engaging. Each of the three Jesuits who preaches has his own style.⁶ On average, homilies last close to ten minutes. Some worshipers described the homilies as “thought-provoking,” “spiritual,” and “not too long,” while many shared their preference of preachers, noting that at times the homilies may be “too heady,” “boring,” or “repetitive.” But as Rachel explains: “I need homilies that are thoughtful, homilies that will allow me to spend some time thinking about one line. It doesn’t have to be the whole thing but something that would catch my attention, that will make me say, ‘A-ha! I have to remember this in my life!’”

In my own observation the most common themes center on social justice, Christian spirituality, and discernment. The preachers often reference the scriptural readings of the day (primarily the Gospel reading) and interrelate these readings with social responsibility and acts of charity. It is not uncommon for all three preachers to make reference to the Jesuit community, charism, and spirituality.

Meet the Participants of My Ethnographic Project

In selecting a parish community as a base for my ethnographic research project I sought one whose administrative staff would be supportive of my goals and available throughout the course of the project. A supportive and available staff would assist in gathering informational resources (such as access to data concerning demographics) and provide and maintain a network of contacts among parishioners, liturgical leaders, and parish interest groups. Since

⁶ Besides Ray Allender, the pastor of St. Agnes, the other two Jesuit priests who are part of the preaching and presiding rotation schedule are Frank Buckley and Radmar Jao.

the start of my project the entire staff has been quite supportive of my ethnographic project. They allowed me to include a bulletin insert that detailed my project for the parishioners; they introduced me to the worship community at the end of one Sunday eucharistic liturgy and continually “checked in” with me each week to inquire about my progress.

During the early stage of my project I formed a support team made up of Frank Uranich; Rosemary Robinson, the director of the spiritual life center; and Justin Walsh, the director of the young adult group. I maintained regular contact with my team members throughout the duration of the project.⁷ Together we went through a process of discernment that eventually led to the selection of eight participants representing a cross-section of sociocultural backgrounds. I am deeply grateful that they all expressed a high degree of enthusiasm and interest in the project.

Helen M. Rosario

Helen, a widowed Filipina of eighty-seven, has the honor of having been a member of St. Agnes Church longer than any other parishioner. She had been coming to this church since 1954, when she was twenty-nine. She and her husband (twenty years older than she, he has since died) tried for five years to have children. “That [St. Agnes] is where I prayed and prayed to the Sacred Heart to become pregnant . . . and then I become pregnant! That’s why I named [my daughter] Agnes!”



⁷ During the first six months of my project I met with each of them separately and went over the proposal and goals of the project. During the course of meeting as a group we went through three stages to decide who among the worshipers at the 10:30 AM Mass would best serve as participants for my study, persons with whom I would engage in a series of more targeted interviews about the interrelationship between Sunday Eucharist and everyday worship practices.

Edward Williams

I met Edward⁸ at the spiritual life center, an adjacent building to the church building that primarily serves as the parish social center for meetings, workshops, and adult spiritual formation. Edward shared his story of how he found his “higher power” at the age of thirty-four when he attended a service at the Glide Memorial United Methodist Church in the Tenderloin district of San Francisco. He had been dependent on alcohol for many years and decided to join AA. After being raised Baptist (from the age of ten) and continually being told that he “was doomed,” he experimented with other denominations, including Pentecostal churches, until he discovered Glide. He found “satisfaction with AA” and eventually “wanted nothing to do with religion.” He also felt that “God had abandoned Black people,” and he discovered AA at a time when he wanted to “grow spiritually . . . needing something more.” His regular attendance at AA meetings led to his encounter with a Jesuit priest who recommended that he visit St. Agnes. He had been searching for “some kind of community . . . something bigger.” In his first visit to St. Agnes he was struck by the hospitality of the parishioners and eventually joined the RCIA. Today this seventy-five-year-old African American regularly goes to the 10:30 AM Mass, where he serves as an acolyte and eucharistic minister.

Jude Penland

Jude is a fifty-four-year-old woman, a physical therapist for the San Francisco Giants baseball team. When she is not playing therapist to the Giants she works at St. Francis Hospital. She is happily partnered with a Japanese woman who is Buddhist. She had been trying to “regain her spiritual life” after having been “away from church for many years.” She was



⁸ This name has been changed to protect the subject’s identity.

raised as a “high church Episcopalian,” but after experiencing a period of “spiritual dryness” in her life she surfed the Internet one day, discovered St. Agnes parish, and joined the community. Two years ago, after searching for a community of religious women to join as a lay person, Jude became an oblate of the Benedictine community of Our Lady of the Rock in Shaw Island, Washington. She visits the monastery about two to three times a year.

Rachel Pinette and Mark Durst

On September 25, 2008, the people of Christ the Light parish in downtown Oakland, California, moved into their newly built cathedral building. After close to twenty years without a cathedral building to call home (their last building was destroyed in the 1989 earthquake), many Catholics of the Diocese of Oakland marked this monumental event as a sign of hope and fulfillment of their prayers. But in the months to follow, not all of the parishioners of Christ the Light remained. For Mark, “the cathedral started to fall apart as a place to get good liturgy. . . . The people who were giving the homilies, the people who were doing the readings, the careful attention to how to do inter-ethnic Masses . . . that was sort of falling apart too.” Close to a year and a half later Mark and Rachel began searching for a new parish. They decided to go to St. Agnes, even though they would have to travel across the Bay Bridge and drive thirty minutes each way every Sunday. They have been married for thirty years and have two daughters and a son. Mark is a mathematician and Rachel teaches religion at Bishop O’Dowd High School in Oakland.



Irene Duller and James Robinson

Irene, thirty-five years old, and James, thirty-two years old, are newlyweds. Since the conclusion of my project, Irene has given birth to their first child, Ohio. They were married in St. Agnes Church on November 11, 2011. Irene was brought up by a “God-fearing

Catholic Mom” and was taught “a black-and-white” picture of the world. But she never related to any of this and became “the rebel of the family.” She explains: “I think I had an *idea* of God growing up, because I didn’t hate God; I just didn’t understand the way my parents expressed God in the house.” Both Irene and James go to St. Agnes, on average, once every three months. “I don’t think we are less Catholic if we don’t go,” explains Irene. “Here’s the other thing,” James chimes in, “after I go I kind of feel like I’m reset . . . reset as a clean slate. I mean obviously I don’t pray every day, every night . . . like, thank you for *this* and thank you for *that*, and take care of *this person*, etc. But I make sure to do that in church.”



Helen Chen Abrams

Born in Hong Kong, Helen is twenty-eight years old and has been married to a Jewish man, Jacob, for three years. She became a baptized Catholic when she was eight years old, due to her mother’s influence (her father is not Catholic). However, before she could receive Confirmation she and her parents moved to Los Angeles and for a few years she stopped going to Mass with her mother since they were not able to find a Chinese Catholic community they liked. One day, while she was studying at the University of California, Berkeley, her classmate invited her to Mass at the Newman Center. She enjoyed the preaching and the social justice ministries at Newman and was eventually confirmed. Today she commutes to St. Agnes Church from San Mateo most



Sundays. "I would put *Sacred Space* [a Lenten prayer booklet] in my iPhone and do prayer during my thirty-minute ride." More recently Helen has given birth to their first child, Quincy.

Unfolding Ethnographic Threads

At the beginning of each of the chapters of this book (as demonstrated above), I will provide brief narrative threads and insights that emerged from my ethnographic project. These threads will eventually be summarized and correlated in chapter 6. But first, due to my desire to use "source and summit" as a starting metaphor of how official church teachings and liturgical theologians came to interrelate the Eucharist with other forms of everyday worship practices, in the next two chapters I will offer a history of how these terms had been used throughout the liturgical movement and in the documents of the Second Vatican Council.