

11-1-1998

Re-Membering the Body in Liturgical Action: Entry Points for Inquiry into Living Liturgical Practice

Donna Lynne Seamone

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholars.wlu.ca/consensus>

Recommended Citation

Seamone, Donna Lynne (1998) "Re-Membering the Body in Liturgical Action: Entry Points for Inquiry into Living Liturgical Practice," *Consensus*: Vol. 24 : Iss. 2 , Article 3.
Available at: <http://scholars.wlu.ca/consensus/vol24/iss2/3>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Scholars Commons @ Laurier. It has been accepted for inclusion in Consensus by an authorized editor of Scholars Commons @ Laurier. For more information, please contact scholarscommons@wlu.ca.

Re-Membering the Body in Liturgical Action: Entry Points for Inquiry into Living Liturgical Practice¹

Donna Lynne Seamone

*Lecturer in Worship and Spirituality
Waterloo Lutheran Seminary*

The fact that religion is embodied and acted out, not just read about, thought about, or believed, implies that if one wants to understand it, one cannot be content merely to study texts, even ritual texts. One needs to observe the performance of texts.²

We dwell very largely in the motions and gestures through which we go, and the specifically ritual motions are constitutive of that dwelling place.

Roland Delattre, *Ritual and Cultural Resourcefulness*

Yeah, I try to watch him prepare the table and serve the elements to his co-servers and I get so put off by him, he's just kind of going through the motions. Have you talked to others who have noticed that?

Marianne, *member of Lutheran Church*

Situating this Study in Liturgical Studies

Since Dom Gregory Dix first published the now classic and formative *The Shape of the Liturgy* in 1945, it has become axiomatic to refer to the liturgy as “the thing done” and not “the thing said”.³ I contend that Dix meant this statement in the theological sense rather than the pragmatic. I will, however, take him at his word (and step further than he, no doubt, would go) to make the literal claim that liturgy *is* always the thing done—by someone, somewhere, some time, some place.

This claim that liturgy is a practice, an event, and a thing done is currently asserted by various authors.⁴ This claim, however, might imply a prescriptive theological sense, for example, “a faith state-

ment about liturgy".⁵ Or, the claim might refer to the concrete, phenomenological sense. It is this latter sense of liturgy as embodied activity, which is the foundation of this inquiry.

Liturgical studies are preoccupied with textual study and theological reflection,⁶ that is, the doctrine of worship. Liturgical text prescribes the performance of a rite. Yet people who participate in liturgy know that the text of the rite and the doing of the rite are not the same thing. No one "does it the way it is in the book". The book is a text. The actors in liturgical action are living breathing beings: standing, sitting, speaking, listening, looking, walking, kneeling, handling objects. The actors occupy a space that is moved in and that moves in them. The common ordinariness of this gestural lexicon of liturgical performance has received little attention in the study of liturgy.

Recent authors advocate the need for both a contemporary method and investigative tools with which to study actual liturgical practice.⁷ Theodore Jennings highlights the need for detailed reports of action. Such reports would anchor the critique of liturgy in relation to concrete performance, rather than in "narrative or quasi theoretical explanation".⁸ Without detailed reports of action, Jennings realises, "it is easy to suppress important elements of variation and adaptation in ritual practice." This kind of inquiry necessitates learning the fine art of "scratching the surface of lived experience".⁹

This paper explores the promise and possibility of gesture¹⁰ and body as entry points into the field-based study of liturgical enactment. It is both a record and analysis of an experiment in development of a fieldwork methodology for the study of Christian liturgy.¹¹ Using gesture and body as primary categories for inquiry, the fieldwork and article are not thesis driven, but propelled by questions. What are presiders and people doing in worship? What is being communicated bodily and known in-body? If I "turn off" the sound what will I see being passed on? What theology is tacit in the motions people go through? What theological claims can be made for gesture?

The study of the lived experience of worshippers—leaders and congregants—cannot happen in the abstract. It is always *somebody* going through the motions. Therefore this paper is neither about the body nor the gestural acts of presiders generally. My con-

siderations are anchored in particular bodies. I locate my self, my body, re-membering in a story fragment and situating myself as researcher. Members¹² of a specific Lutheran Church in Berkeley are re-membered in this text from my fieldwork journal, interview transcriptions, and with the aid of photographs.¹³ In re-presenting the experience studied I draw on a re-remembrance of body discourse.¹⁴ Whether we go by rote and/or dwell in the motions through which we go, bodied theology always inhabits somebody.

Before entering the field

I began my field study at Lutheran Church (LC) in February of 1991. I came to this research with a near seven-year history as a pastor and a presider in Lutheran congregations. In that time I grew more and more astounded that people, including myself, would regularly go through motions called worship. Despite my concentrated attempts to enact liturgy with members of congregations that were aimed somewhere other than “from the neck up” I knew that we failed for the most part. Occasionally I caught a glimpse of something else.

I met Lloyd Crouse when I arrived in my first parish in 1982. Lloyd was a member of church council in his late forties or early fifties. I remember our first real conversation at the initial church council meeting in the basement in August of that year. I was eager and enthusiastic to have all go well in my service to these folks, so I was asking lots of questions. I asked if there were any babies about to be born, any baptisms coming up. Lloyd, tall and lean, was reclining in his chair. He sat up, looked me straight in the eye and said, “Hasn’t anyone told you? We don’t have babies or baptisms here. We’re a dying congregation.” Right away I knew I had met someone I could trust. Lloyd and Ida have one of those family histories that makes you wonder how they bear up.

Just when everything seemed like life was going to be easier for them, Lloyd was diagnosed with cancer of the larynx. I made several trips with them to specialists. The date was set for his surgery. It was possible that Lloyd would have his larynx removed as well as the tumour. I asked Lloyd if he would like to have communion at the church on the Wednesday before he went to Hamilton to have his surgery. I suggested that we could either do the communion service at home with him and Ida or at the church in front of the altar. He

opted for meeting at the church. He and Ida and I met at the church, and standing around the altar, we had a communion service. Since it was possible that Lloyd would not be able to speak after the surgery, I suggested that he read the Bible text. The three of us spent some time talking about all that was happening. We ate bread and drank wine. There were lots of tears, the loudest ones shed by Ida. It was gut wrenching.

The next day Lloyd had the surgery. His larynx was removed and also part of his tongue. Following the surgery he was able neither to talk nor to eat by mouth and would be able to do neither again. He came home from the hospital about a week later and I continued to visit him at home. He communicated by writing on one of those small magic slates that children play with. As he regained strength I asked him when he was planning to come back to church—people missed him there. He told me that he was not ready to be in public, for he found it embarrassing and difficult to be in places where people talked to him. I told him that I would not bother him about it again, but I wanted him to know that people wanted him to be at church as he was. I suggested that, if he found it awkward to deal with conversation with large groups, there was always the possibility of slipping in once the service had begun and leaving early until he felt ready to expand the time he could spend there. I kept my promise and did not push Lloyd on coming back to church.

This was a small congregation. Average worship attendance was about a hundred people a Sunday, so, it was easy for me as pastor to be aware of who was present and who was not. So, on this one particular Sunday, I got to the part of the service where I was distributing communion. There is a kind of rhythm to the action for me, and so as I proceeded around the rail I went from giving one person the bread, all of me focusing in one moment to give this, then moving on, and doing that with the next person. In the rhythm I lose awareness of what is going on outside the circle or even who is next until I'm there. There is a flow to the thing, that consists of focusing, release the focus, move the focus, move to the next, release the focus, and so on. I had not noticed Lloyd in the congregation, and so I was surprised when the next person at the rail was Lloyd. In encouraging him to come back to church it had not occurred to me what would happen at communion. The fact that he could not eat had slipped by my notice. I had the bread in my hand as I got to him, and as I looked at him he smiled at me, and I at him. I looked at the bread in my hand, surprised to find it there. This all happened in an instant. I realised that the bread was useless to me

here, so in the space of seconds, I handed the plate off to the acolyte, took Lloyd's hands, looked in his eyes, and said, "Lloyd, the body of Christ, given for you." Both our eyes filled up with tears. He returned my gaze as steadily as he had the first night I met him and squeezed my hands. I released his hands and moved on. The assisting minister had caught what had happened and repeated the same gesture.

I tell this story to illustrate how, when pushed by circumstance; we had to define gesturally what we believed. Lutheran theology tells us that God comes to us through the ordinary stuff of life—through bread and wine. Lloyd could receive neither bread nor wine. I learned something in that moment which may take me the rest of my life to fathom. Gestures are defined in the context of relationship. Lloyd could neither eat nor talk. He gave me and I gave him something in this meeting, in this interaction, that neither of us could have received alone.

Ritual theorist Ronald Grimes posits, in a discussion of ritual, illness, and the body, that in ritual activity metaphor "is a drastic symbolic act".¹⁵ He claims:

As a bearer of meaning the body is not merely a tool for obtaining knowledge or communicating; it *is* knowledge and communication (Polhemus, 1978). The postulate of the centrality of the human body implies that meaning is embodied in overt action, posture, and gesture and that both culture and psyche can be "somatized" (Kleinman, 1980: 149) in the form of symptoms. Ultimately culture and body are not opposites. Bodies are enculturated. Cultures are embodied.¹⁶

In the years since that Sunday morning I have variously named what Lloyd and I touched in gesture real presence, mystery, and meaning. Something transpired between us in-body. As Grimes says above, meaning was embodied in overt action, posture and gesture. We enacted a metaphor in-body. As we simultaneously took each other's hands I uttered the words, "The Body of Christ given for you." We were bread and wine for each other in that event and beyond it. In eucharist bread is body; here body was bread and body. Following Grimes' development of metaphor we acted across strata: somatic, religious, and social. In the moment, radicalized by necessity, we were pushed to enact something. We embodied Christian culture ("This is my body"). The gesture arose in the context of

relationship. I learned the power of non-verbal metaphors that are simultaneously what they say they are and are more than they “express”. Had I simply uttered the words, and we had done nothing more, what transpired would have been severely altered and limited. The fact that years later I continue to ponder and remember the event is part of the indication that it was not limited to an expression of kindly feelings between us. The assisting minister and Lloyd repeated the gesture.

As Roland Delattre asserts regarding ritual, our motions did not only express something prior. Motions occurred which rendered articulate our humanity; “a living impulse worked itself out constituting something new.”¹⁷ Delattre identifies the power of ritual to articulate with the life of feeling. Ritual action understood in this way is not separate from political action, since in ritual we may seek to re-order the state of affairs. There was feeling in this event, but the significance was borne as much in the tissues of our hands and in our mutual gaze as in what brought the tears. It was articulation and re-ordering: the feeling was in the motion.

As a seminary student I read a critique of classical Christian liturgics. My recollection of point three of seven has rung in my ears (and elsewhere in my being) ever since:

Classical liturgics has typically operated from the top down, from synod to worshipper, from intellect to soul or body, from human or divine to animal. Our Christian rituals are gnostically disembodied and our gestures continue to contradict most of our theological proclamations of the incarnation.¹⁸

Convinced of the merits of this critique, I took up the task of seeking the how, when, why, and where the gestural contradictions appear. As both clergy and scholar, I observe (and indeed construct) the ways in which we deny or reveal the incarnation in worship activities. Whatever liturgy may aim or purport to be, it is always an embodied practice, regardless of whether what is incarnated is what we intend or claim to be real meaning. This inquiry into action begins not with assertions of theological commitments about what worship is but with attention to what Geertz, Rappaport, and others have called “the surface of things”. Who is doing? Where is the doing? When is the doing? How is the doing done? In such inquiry attention is trained not only on the ostensibly meaningful actions or ceremonial

gestures but on the overall doing of worship. Special attention must be paid to the non-verbal dimensions of corporate and individual action, since they do “speak” as well. Or, setting aside the linguistic metaphor altogether, they *body force*. They are by nature incarnating.¹⁹

I came to the fieldwork project with questions. What are presiders and people doing in worship? What is being communicated and known in-body? How are people going through the motions? If I “turn off” the sound what will I see being passed on? What theology is tacit in the motions through which people go? These questions necessitate exploration in particular experience.

Going through the motions at Lutheran Church: What gestures and movements are they going through?

The Setting. Lutheran Church is located on College Avenue in Berkeley at the edge of the sprawling University of California Berkeley campus. The selection of this site was in some way random.²⁰ The Sunday bulletin cover gives a self-description of the congregation: “A Community of Christian Faith at Work in the World”. The Pastor and congregation present themselves as attentive to worship and engaged in ongoing liturgical renewal. On average, approximately sixty-five people attend Sunday worship. Most of the members are adults, some are students, and there is a small number of children.

The Presiders. Observation of facial expression, body movement, and gesture of presiders represents what was to become one phase of the fieldwork. I was driven to this task by a frustration with the preoccupation of liturgical theologians with an instructional prescriptive “body as signal box” approach to gesture and style of presiders. Kavanagh’s *Elements of Style*²¹ moves beyond directions for precise movements to consideration of leadership style, attempting to address the wholeness of rites and their rhythms. But even in Kavanagh’s efforts the body is treated as a tool. This body of literature prescribing gesture and style is of little use in deciphering what the action or style of presiders communicates in living enactments.

Mary Douglas established that “the body is a medium of communication in its own right, distinct from the words issuing from its mouth.”²² I set out to discern what was being communicated by the

whole action of presiders. I include here one account from my field-work journal to demonstrate what I “saw” and to demonstrate the mode of recording observation. Attention was trained not only on the ostensibly meaningful actions or ceremonial gestures but on the overall action of the presider. This presider is the pastor of the congregation. He was the presider most frequently observed. My gaze in this passage is acute, focused, and rigorous, and is, admittedly, an exaggeration of normal watching of presiders by worshippers.²³

March 10. I have moved to the balcony. I have moved from the congregation to get a bird's eye view of the sanctuary. Here I sit, take notes and draw pictures. I have realised that when I get home I cannot remember exactly what happened. The gestures all blur into one another. I take note of that. The music is playing; the organist sits beside me. The pastor enters just as the prelude stops; there is no music. He walks with an easy gait to the altar. He seems to be making things ready. The things are paper. He has a neutral expression. He does not acknowledge anyone; he is focused on his task. He goes to the kneeler at the left. People stand. He crosses himself. He faces the altar, which someone has moved down to the floor level. He is holding a book in his hand while he speaks. Then he kneels. This man gives no signs, no cues. He folds his hands and rests them against his mouth. There is silence. Then he rests his hands over the edge of the kneeler armrest. He seems comfortable, understated, and begins to speak. When the speaking is finished he stands, takes the book and comes to the edge of the carpet facing the congregation. He is engaged with the book; he has it in his right hand. He draws a cross in the air with his left hand. His palm is open and his movements are easy. He turns away now from the people, goes back to the altar, places books on it and leaves the sanctuary while other people are entering. He moves with a purposeful gait. During the singing of the hymn he re-enters and joins in the singing. I notice there is a street person in the fifth pew from the back on my left. He has a number of postures. He is much more active than anyone else is. His arms rest on his hips; he looks impatient, then he raises them and moves them around. He does not stop moving. The pastor enters now from the back with the assistant and they go and stand behind the altar. He fidgets with the book. I look back down to where the street person is seated. People are keeping their distance, but not too far away. He is still moving. The music stops. The pastor looks at the congregation and says the greeting. He engages with them visually. Both he and the assistant are using their own books. The assistant is a woman, about twenty-five, with

long ebony hair, she is short (5'3") compared to him (6'). He extends his arms in greeting again. His movements are quite fluid and then he assumes a sort of 'W' prayer position - his arms raised vertically, his head down to book. When the prayer has ended his hands go down and he speaks. He is introducing "lessons". While he does this he fiddles with his grey, close cropped hair. He is wearing the same clothes as last week, a white robe, and a purple chasuble. All of the chasubles at this church look like shields. While someone else is reading he follows the words on the book. He is engaged with the paper. He reaches up and scratches the right side of his face and fiddles with the paper. Then scratches the left eye above his glasses. The reader is reading from the third pew from the front on the left. He looks back to the reader, fiddles with his hands, shifts his feet, and gazes. His gaze moves around the room. Is he bored? He cocks his head toward the right side of the congregation once the reading ends. He announces the psalm with his head down. His posture is blanketed, covered by the robe. The assistant is still standing with him at the edge of the altar. The pastor is in the central position. He has the place of power, I think. He does not share the space, but assumes it. He is singing the psalm. His gaze stays with the book. There is a slight rocking motion in his body. He looks up to the congregation, shifts his hymnal to the side and fiddles with paper while the second lesson is being read. Then he folds his hands and looks at the back door. Is he waiting for someone to arrive? He scratches the right side of his face with his thumb, bites his lip, scratches his left cheekbone with his finger, picks up the Bible and looks for his place. Now he moves. Perhaps he really was looking for his place. The congregation stands while he walks from behind the altar down to about the third pew from the front. With his left hand he makes a tiny cross on his forehead, his heart, his mouth, and then he scratches his face. He holds the book away from his body, which is in a resting, graceful pose. He looks up and down as he reads but seems more interested in delivering the words than making eye contact. His voice does most of the work. He closes the book and returns swiftly to his place behind the altar. The assistant leaves to sit on the right side. He scratches his face with his left hand and assumes a resting posture against the altar, arms outspread, palms flat against the top of the table. His left hand picks up, puts down, and points to a book. His right hand waves in the air as he speaks. He is mobile. He picks up a leaflet but then stops the movement with his hand. As he speaks he sways, turning from side to side, both his hands in a pushing away posture and then, parallel to the table, they bounce off it. He has not yet smiled.

His facial expression is not frozen, nor is it fluid. He points with his hand toward the people, his finger extended. His movements become more rapid. He is talking with his hands. They are lovely, graceful dancing motions. The tone is gentle and rhythmic. The tone of his voice matches the tone of his hands. He looks from time to time to his notes, but is now not bound to them. I cannot tell who he is engaged with visually, I'm too far away; one of the sacrifices of perching in the balcony. He has a resting posture, which he assumes from time to time. His hands are behind his back, under his chasuble. When his hand escapes from the resting posture his left hand is often palm spread facing toward the congregation. He moves rhythmically in an inviting way and then resumes his position with palms facing us. This seems to hold us away. Then the flat palm spread changes to a finger pointing and there is a rhythm back and forth between the two. This lasts a few minutes. He scratches his face; he looks like he is painting pictures in the air. I find it more difficult not to listen to what his words are saying. His movements draw me in to hear. He assumes the resting posture again, shifts his feet and begins to rock. I remember that he has used this same gesture when he is praying. Now he brings his hands together and threads his fingers. There is a change from static repetitive movements of pointing fingers and flat palms. His hands open and he turns more. He returns to the resting posture, then his left arm breaks free. His hand points and bounces. He rests his hands once again on the altar. This last sequence of motions drew me into his words. I heard what he was saying. He was saying something about a fetal faith, life restricted in the womb. YUCK! I am glad I am not listening. He tones down more now in both volume and movement. The tone is gentler. He slows down the movement, and the tempo switches. His head only bounces at the end of sentences. He folds his notes. He is finished. Shuffling his book, he packs up. He returns to his bench, the bench with the assisting minister on the right side of the sanctuary. He opens a hymnal and sings. While singing he holds the book with two hands, one wrist grasping the other at waist height. He does not lift them during the singing. At the last verse he goes to the altar, shuffles more paper and pages in the missal. People are standing. When the music stops they begin to recite the creed. His head turns to the words on the book. His hands are folded, resting on top of the table behind the burse and veil. He crosses himself when Jesus rises in the creed. There is no smile. There have been no smiles. This seems to be serious business. The young woman assistant invites us to pray. (She is hanging on the edge of the altar. There is no place for her in the

centre. He does not give her the place of power.) Her movements alternate between arms extended, palms cupped. When she finishes speaking each petition she closes her hands and folds them. Both she and the pastor close their eyes and are still during these silences. When the prayers have finished he extends his arms toward the people. When they respond to the sharing of the peace he bows in response. He walks out from behind the altar, again with a free gate, and touches people. He seems freer now. He hugs, smiles, shakes hands, pats on the back. He seems not to be in a hurry though. When he is finished he walks swiftly back to his place. Now he is smiling. Is he relieved that the sermon and the creed are finished? While the ushers gather offering in plates he folds the veil, removes the burse. He looks like he has done this before. He turns and smiles toward the back door, then I see a child has entered. He looks about, smiles, and rubs his belly as people approach. They are going to eat. I decide that I will join them; I watch for a while first though. He has given the bread to himself. During the communion he does not engage visually with the people. When he gave me the bread his eyes were back on the plate ready for the next piece of bread. Feeding looked like a business. (It felt like receiving fast food or the cod liver oil tablets we lined up for in school.) He did not engage visually. After every one has eaten and returned to their seat he draws a cross in the air. It is the blessing. He must trust the organist; he does not look up. I realised my blood is warmed by the wine. Though there is music playing, he is not singing the hymn. He stands quietly with his head down, fidgeting a little. Then he comes to the centre of the carpet and gives a blessing. It is a one armed blessing like you see in the icons. When the singing stops he waits for people to sit. He does not make any movements. Now he stands and makes announcements, points, scratches, folds his arms, and shifts on his feet, rocking back and forth. He becomes very animated in the conversation, and laughs. (It is easy going.) His movements are engaging; I keep hearing what he is saying. Now he is very animated. He is talking about the trip he will make to El Salvador. This is more movement than I have seen him make during the whole service. During all this activity Jesus is hanging on the cross in the starkness of the sanctuary. The light plays over him. From time to time I see people look up. Suddenly I notice that the street person is no longer present. He must have slipped out some time when I was not looking.

These observations are representative of those made for sixteen Sundays.²⁴ I position myself in the account to locate the site and

dynamics of observation. On the basis of my detailed reports of action, I offer the following conclusions about the non-verbal liturgical action of presiders at LC.

1. *Presiders at LC were male.* The involvement of women as helpers—assistants and readers—appeared to reflect and reinforce gender role stereotypes. Men also occupied these roles and so hierarchical arrangements were complex, not easily deciphered.
2. *Presiders had more mobility than anyone else.* They could stride and cover “territory” only a select few of the members would enter during the service.
3. *Presiders occupied central positions.* They stood in the place of power, “centre stage”. Presiders were reluctant to relinquish or share this space with assistants, even when the latter were leading. At LC this central focal space is “under the cross” which visually hangs over their heads. (This cross is about twelve feet high and the corpus is about ten feet long. It hangs suspended at the front of the church in the chancel.)
4. *Presiders made a lot of gestural noise.* Intentionally enacted ceremonial gestures appeared as one more “blip on the screen”. Often these gestures appeared to be pushing others away. Largely the presiders’ bodies were expressive of their personality; they appeared lived in.²⁵ The notable exception was in their faces. During worship their faces were immobile, often fixed, expressionless.
5. *Presiders attended more to their words than their bodies.* Primary attention was given to speech and verbal content. This bore no consistent relationship to what was done bodily.
6. *Vestments both masked and defined their bodies.* These served to display and protect them from view.
7. *Ceremonial gestures* often appeared as frozen moments in movement. When these were enacted in an “assume-the-position-mentality” they appeared awkward and stilted, as if the presider memorised a manual on gesture. They were uninviting and unbelievable.

Further to garnering these insights I made repeated attempts to construct categories of analysis for movement and non-verbal communication.²⁶ As I explored these possibilities, the bodies kept disappearing in the analysis.²⁷ Gesture was the basic category with which I began this study of the bodily enactment of liturgy. However,

based on observation of action, *movement* emerged as the basic category of concern. Movement has quality, tone, character, and rhythm and is comprised of gesture and posture. *Posture* is an orientation of the whole body and an inclination in space. It directs the attention of observers and establishes placement and position. *Gestures* are frozen moments in movement and more likely to be found in art than in life. Furthermore, I had learned to think of pastoral leadership solely in relation to presence. The presiders observed in this locale were often present-absent, i.e., lacking bodily conviction. There was an ambiguity and/or a refusal of presence, which called for an expanded notion of presence/absence.

The most fruitful discovery from this phase of the fieldwork consisted in the realisation that most of what I produced from analysis, based on the observations alone, I could have predicted, learned, or addressed with traditional approaches and methods of liturgical studies. The detailed reports of action called for by Jennings yielded insight but by themselves were insufficient in two ways. First, my own exercise of participant-observation kept the focus solely on the enactment of presiders. Second, participant-observation alone does not take the researcher far enough into the relational component of any enacted liturgical rite. The questions kept asserting themselves: What does this mean to worshippers? What communication are they receiving? What gets them here? What about their lives? Their bodies? What is happening for them? I would have to talk with the members of LC.

The Interviews. I conducted eight two-hour interviews. Interviews were tape recorded and transcribed. I composed a framework of questions for the interviews (Appendix A). Concerned with meaning, I wanted to know what people came to know and experience. I heeded Spradley's caution in *The Ethnographic Interview*²⁸ and avoided asking motivational or "why" questions. The questions focused on non-verbal elements of liturgy: space, gesture, movement, and the worshippers' own bodily participation.

What had seemed too speculative in analysis, based on observation alone, came to life for me in the interviews. The interviews included inquiry about presiders' actions. The questions expanded and shifted the focus of the study to the relational dynamics of members' lives and their own bodily engagement in worship. I consider

two of the interviews here.

Brian: Presence/Absence

Brian was a thirty-year-old seminarian, in his last year of school. I had been in a class with him the previous fall. He expressed an interest in my project and was eager to talk with me about it. I took notice that he often arrived early for worship, spent time kneeling, and then generally sat by himself. He presented himself as bright, reserved, and was clear in expressing that he valued good theology. He volunteered that he went to church for the Word.

We met in a coffee shop for the interview. The following is one of my questions to him, and his response.

One of things you mentioned when we were talking on the street one day was that you had continued to go to this church because of the crucifix. Since space is one of the non-verbal dimensions of liturgy, I would be interested to hear you talk about this.

It's a complex sort of thing. One of the things that I learned fairly early on as a member of LC, was that in terms of explicit pastoral care—that ain't gonna happen. Now I miss having a person who is my pastor. In terms of a person who I can go to, you know at some time during the week or something and talk about, well golly, things of God, where I'm struggling in my own faith, in my own efforts to conform my life to the life of the one who I follow. That doesn't happen. Or if it happens it is much more the people one to another and not from the person who is the pastor. Frank is involved in other things. So the question for me became, if I'm not getting my pastoral care, per se, from Frank, where does that come from? Do I just go through a dry period? To some extent, yes. But are there other things that are refreshing in the midst of that? And what I've found by being in other worship spaces is that one of the things that refreshes me here is that crucifix. Because, that is a terribly human Jesus there. Uh. (At this juncture the subject's eyes filled with tears.) And I can get quite gushy and emotional talking about that Jesus...uhh...the rendering of the strain of the muscles one feels every once and a while what it's almost going through. And from that standpoint it's a religious image that can evoke from one a sense of the fact that Jesus paid a propitiatory debt for us but also died in a way where he was with us in our suffering. And if part of the expression of my lack of having a pastor is feeling like I'm kinda hanging out in the midst of it on my own, with some very real pains and some very real suffering. There's a moment of reminding "that,

you know, he was like us in every way”, that image can evoke. And it becomes a kind of comforting reminder. There are times when it’s much more stark and scary too. Like you know, *qua* classic Lutheranism, you want to see what your sins deserve, look at Jesus. So I mean there are sometimes when it is painful to look at that cross because I see there the punishment of my own sin. But there are other times when it’s comfort because I see one who knows my suffering more deeply than I do. So as a sort of meditation, that cross is very helpful. And it’s helpful also in the sense that it’s not cluttered by anything. It’s up there in that very stark white space. But the interesting thing is, and I don’t know if you’ve noticed this, if you look above the cross on that wall you can see two holes that were patched over. It used to be much higher up on the wall.

Earlier in this paper I recounted learning that gesture is defined in relationship. For Brian and others at LC, the experience of the presence-absence of the presider in worship paralleled their experience of the pastor outside the sanctuary. Surprising to me was the lack of resentment or judgement this elicited.

Brian identifies his relationship with the crucifix as a substitute for a pastoral relationship. For him, “it’s a terribly human Jesus there.” He feels what “it’s almost going through.” There are times for him when “it’s comfort”. The corpus mirrors Brian’s experience of “hanging out in the midst of it” on his own. He feels himself accompanied by the Jesus on the crucifix.

There are several layers of gesture at work in the experience represented in this excerpt. First, the gesture of the statue. The statue is iconic, unchanging, fixed. Positioned in front and above in the space this Jesus is constantly available to anyone who will look. Hanging there, Jesus makes an offering of presence by being visible.²⁹

Second, there is the visual meditative gaze of Brian considered as gesture. Arriving early, confined to a pew, Brian’s movement is limited. He is isolated. He fixes his eyes on the statue and sometimes feels what “it’s almost going through”. This is more than mere looking: it is visual touch.³⁰ Looking, Brian experiences the presence of that Jesus as comfort and, sometimes, judgement.

There are multiple presence-absence relationships at work. The Jesus on the cross is not a pastor but “is comfort” and offers refresh-

ment. The pastor, who stands under this cross on most Sundays, is presider, but not the kind of pastor this man wants. Brian is “hanging out alone” but draws back and forth from this admission in the conversation.

I have ruminated on these questions: Does the gesture of Jesus, who keeps “hanging out”, sustain a similar posture in Brian’s own life? Does the violence done to Jesus encourage Brian to endure the pastoral absence without complaint? How does this happen (or not occur) for women in the congregation? When the pastor was present-absent during parts of the service did Jesus take over the presiding role? Invariably I raise more questions than I can answer or explore.

This was my first interview at LC. I knew I had heard something important but I did not know what to make of it. Looking back I wish I had narrowed my inquiry to a focus on the relationship of these people to the crucifix and the related dynamics between pastor and people, among members, and within themselves. I am unwilling to turn these findings into a judgement of the pastor, since Brian himself did not do this. Instead I find myself returning to the dynamics of presence and absence.

Prior to the field experience I thought of presence and absence as either/or alternatives. Schooled in the convictions of a ministry of presence I understood pastoral presence as good and absence as bad, inside and outside of sanctuaries. Watching the presiders at LC I realised that absence of liturgical leaders was also important. I yearned for them to intensify their actions of presence-absence. I wanted them to be more present in bodily conviction in active leadership or to relinquish space for assisting ministers to be present to other worshippers. As a result of the interview with Brian I gained awareness of the complexity of presence-absence dynamics operating simultaneously at multiple levels, inside and outside of worship settings. His experience illumines how the relational impact of the actions of a presider as defined in a matrix of relationships and within a particular liturgical space.

Hans-Georg Gadamer declares, “What a gesture expresses is ‘there’ in the gesture itself. A gesture is something wholly corporeal and wholly spiritual at one and the same time.”³¹ In this instance Brian’s experience re-presents the experience of the corporeal and the spiritual united in his own bodily experience of presence-absence.

The presence-absence of the other(s), Jesus on the crucifix and the pastor, is experienced through Brian's meditative gaze which he rehearses in the sanctuary in worship times. His corporeal sensation of tangible presence as palpable absence emerges in a matrix of relationships. In Brian's rendering of his experience Jesus is portrayed as more vibrantly corporeal than he himself is and as more consistently human and present than the presider is. In this case presence/absence occur in relation to one another as visceral bodied phenomena. They are not either/or alternatives; they are experienced non-dualistically.

Delattre defines ritual as,

Those carefully rehearsed symbolic motions and gestures through which we regularly go, in which we articulate the felt shape and rhythm of our humanity, and of reality as we experience it, and by means of which we negotiate the terms or conditions of our presence among and our participation in the plurality of realities through which our humanity makes its passage.³²

Brian's meditative relationship with the Jesus who is a ten-foot corpus at this church appears as an act of articulation and negotiation of presence, illuminating Delattre's claim for ritual. Brian is located in a time of transition in his own life from seminarian to pastor. In this time of personal transition the Jesus on the crucifix accompanies him but not his own pastor. How is this practice reinforcing the stark loneliness Brian says he feels in this transitional time? I am unable to speak conclusively for Brian, after the lapse of so much time and the geographic distance. However, what I glean from his account of his experience is that his meditative gestures in the sanctuary and the ensuing relationship offer him a way of touching his own felt sense of his experience and the rhythms of his own passage.

For some readers the categories of presence/absence and the raising of questions out of experience may appear inconclusive and without development. However, this study alerts liturgical scholars and practitioners to two things. First, categories of presence/absence are refined and expanded in this investigation indicating a course for further study. Second, we are reminded that conclusiveness in relation to any study of lived experience of this type may be a faulty aim. When we choose to study people's experience we can expect to generate more questions than answers or facile prescrip-

tions for practice.

Marianne: Sexuality/Spirituality, Motion/Emotion

Marianne, a forty-nine year old householder, was going to “return to school” in the week following the interview. She envied the opportunity of the pastor and her husband to read widely. She announced with some glee and without apology that it would soon be her turn to read. A member of LC for twenty-three years, she continues to attend worship because of the accepting community and their involvement in “worldly things”. She stated emphatically that she would not be part of a church if that involvement “did not nourish her as a person”. Her search could happen at this church because “people keep questioning themselves and trying new things”. She declared that if it were not for this church she “would probably not be in the church any more”.³³

Early in the interview (held in her living room) she responded to a question about her relationship with the worship space saying, “I think I could go to a beautiful church and tolerate an absent community, because it is a place that inspires me. Or, I could tolerate a space like this church because the community is there. One of those ingredients has to be there.” She continued on, volunteering that I would understand her comments better if I knew what spirituality was to her.

So, my own spirituality has really changed a lot over the years. When I was studying in England I had a conversion experience and I became very, I don't know, withdrawn from my body, in some ways. And became very spiritual—in traditional ways. My sexuality was kind of repressed from my own early history and so when we came to the States I started opening up and wanting to experience what it is like to be a more sexual human being. James and I experimented with an open marriage for awhile in the 70s. Each experience was kind of an opening up, and an eye opener for another piece of beauty. I mean, I really began to understand how connected sexuality and spirituality are for me. I never put it together that way before. I think my spirituality had been just as superficial as my sexuality had been repressed. In '76, I met a man who I had very strong feelings for and he for me. I thought it meant that we were in love, in four months really. I must have gone through about ten years' worth of growth and learning and it became clear to me by that time that he had come into my life, really more as a

spiritual guide than as a lover. What was so hard for me was that he knew that, and I did not. So, I misread all the signs, you know, but that was really the time when I realised that my spirituality concerns all of me. And, um...that no part of me is holy. And it's an amazing discovery to me you know. I have few problems talking to my women friends, but my husband has a hard time understanding this.

Later in reflecting on this interview I realised that in the first fifteen minutes of conversation Marianne had given me a description of both her posture in the world and the values by which she evaluated her worship experience (including the pastor's effectiveness). Openness is linked to sight³⁴ for Marianne. Valuable experiences are those that give insight or those that are eye-openers to beauty and joy. "Signs" are to be read, in her personal life and in her church life. For Marianne, sight is a privileged sense and looking is the gesture she practices interiorly/exteriorly. Looking at life is not a detached activity. Life experiences are to be "gone through".

You've talked about how inseparable spirituality and worship are for you. My experience of worship, most often, is that a narrow range of us gets called on that doesn't in any way match our daily life experience. What's this like for you?

I am struggling with this same thing. But, while we are on it, I've had, for instance, when things were in the '70s was the hard time, and I would be struggling with a relationship which felt very unequal, it is like the man was in San Francisco and I was here and I would stand in the kitchen and look out the window and my whole being was torn out of me through that window trying to get over to San Francisco. It was a physically painful experience. I longed for this man so much and at the same time, I still felt that it wasn't right. I insisted on being true to what I felt, so, anyway, I was crying a lot during this time and James said to me one day, "If it is so painful, why do you continue with this relationship?" I said, "It is not about the relationship, it is about me. If the relationship is painful then there is some growing I have to do. And for me to just cut off the relationship stops the growth from happening." I have to go through this if I want to come out at the other end. So, I was crying a lot and one Sunday I was trying to figure out where to go from here. I went to church and Frank preached a sermon that was like it was written for me and so I cried, of course, and James didn't understand at all. And, ah...what Frank had said in the sermon kind of answered my question as to where I go with this or what I do next, some of the

lessons, too, that Sunday, I mean it was, an amazing experience and to me that always is an important indication of church being what life is all about, if I can't apply what I experience in church, to this intimate, painful, miserable being then it really is unimportant. I had those experiences a number of times, I get this chill down my spine, which is a thrill because suddenly everything makes sense, and everything comes together.

Marianne describes herself applying to her life the insights she gains through hearing but the experiences, as she describes them, are more immediate than her language of application might indicate. In telling of her own experience she says she applies what she learns to her life but in memory she moves from worry and upset into the church space where she hears things that move chills up and down her spine. For Marianne e-motion has motion in her body; she goes through things. The Jesus on the crucifix is going through something. Has this influenced Marianne?

Unlike Brian, Marianne did not use the theological term, *Word*, to describe what got her to church. She wanted her life addressed and re-membered.

Recently Frank said something; he was talking about faith, or of our lives, knowing how to go on. I realised that for me one of the most important signposts in my life of what is right for me to do and pursue was joy. When I experience this kind of almost palpable joy, you know where my adrenaline starts flowing and my cheeks are getting flushed because I am so excited about doing this, this is not from the devil. Why would God create us in a certain way to thrill to certain things and then say to you to be holy, this is what you have to give up, or deny...You know? The funny thing is that we talk so much about incarnation.

Often, Marianne realises insights and experiences joy because of what the pastor says in sermons. Her approach to the pastor is pragmatic; she takes what she can get. For her he is most present during the sermon in his words. She is annoyed by his presence-absence elsewhere.

Well, I think, he speaks from his experience. I think he doesn't come across as a person who does pastoral care very well...He is not inside his "pastoral-ness" with authority...and the liturgy, I get bothered during the liturgy, the eucharist, and so on because he should know these things by heart and he always looks in the book and it is like,

it strikes me like, I am sorry to say this, he is reading the words but his mind is really some place else. I think that he has too many things going in his mind and he is not, he is all there in his sermon, but I wonder sometimes, during the Table. I try to watch him prepare the table and serve the elements to his co-servers and I get so put off by him, he's just kind of going through the motions. Have you talked to others who have noticed that? And the contrast is so great because almost all of the people, whoever are servers, you know, they are always different. It is so lovely to come to the altar and have somebody reach you the cup and really look at you with a big smile and say, "Given for you", you know, there is something.

Marianne explained later that in liturgical prayer she prefers to pray with her eyes open.

In common prayers, I like to take in the space. Sometimes I look at the crucifix. During communion, I always watch the people go forward and the children especially. I don't like to shut things out.

Being open and not shutting things out are important to Marianne's way of being in the world. For her, although spirituality is not synonymous with sexuality, neither are these separate. Her engagement with the world through looking is in a relational mode. She looks to find connection with others who will look back at her. Emotion is presence with motion in Marianne's going through her life—joy is palpable, locatable.

In *The Physiology of Faith: A Theory of Theological Relativity*, Dixon presents an understanding of the incarnation as a processual ordering of relation in which, "The knowing of God is in the wholeness of things and in relation to them and to each other. Our world is the rhythmic exchange between ourselves, each other, and the things in our context."³⁵ In Dixon's view, the sources of this rhythm are organic, inorganic and also can be found in human creativity all of which can be the source for meaningful order. This perception of the wholeness of things accurately names the connections that Marianne experiences between spirituality/sexuality, motion/emotion. These dialectically paired categories emerge in this consideration as palpable, bodied phenomena. They occur as neither wholly coterminous (i.e., they are not simply identical to each other) nor wholly dualistic in the living practice of the searcher considered here.

What began as an investigation of bodily communication of pre-

siders came to include the movement and gesture of worshippers in the course of this project. The observation, the processes of the interviews, and the reading went hand in hand with my own search for a fieldwork methodology. Though my conclusions are modest and provisional this project has helped me refine my questions about the significance of gesture and the position of bodies of worshippers.

Body Re-membered in Liturgical Action: Going Through Motions.

What is the yield of this fieldwork study of liturgical action? Liturgical studies and participants in liturgy are practiced in the art of overlooking the obvious. Often, we think the actions we perform consist of the “meaning” we ascribe to the act, the meaning we intend, or that meaning is ensconced in some prized moment in history. We also make the mistake of presuming the rite enacted is the same as what we imagined it would be when planning it. The value in focusing on the body and gesture and utilising these as entry points for inquiry into living liturgical practice resides in attending to the incarnate dimension of enactment.³⁶ Meaning that may reside behind, beyond, above, or before space, objects, time, sounds, languages, identities, and actions is always in a particular relation to meaning that arises *in* specific, incarnate, relationally-dynamic, enactments we perform.

Approaching liturgical action from a performance perspective through the lenses of body and gesture raises fresh questions that enlarge the field of attention and interest. Bodied human agency becomes active presence embedded in a matrix of action. Liturgical performance always occurs in the multiple contexts of everyday life, culture, and history. The relationships amongst these contexts become sources of insight and investigation, as we ll. This inquiry is lodged in a vantage-point close to—not detached from—flesh and blood. In this investigation categories of presence/absence emerged in both the participant-observation and interview phases of the work. The emergence of these categories in relation to worship is, in one sense, nothing new. However, the way that these emerge in relation to liturgical actors expands discussion of presence beyond something concerning presiders alone. These considerations and discussions about presence in worship suggest an expansion of debates about real presence. Similarly, movement emerges as a more fruit-

ful category in relation to liturgical enactment than my original category of gesture. There is a noted difference between conceiving oneself as presider to be moving in relation to people than to be doing gestures. Likewise worshippers in pews move and are moved.

Contemporary Christian anthropology eschews an understanding of the human person as having an outer bodily shell and an inner soul. But our history haunts us in local theology and culture. Attending to religious practice through the lens of gesture, movement, and space—making the body the entry point for inquiry—allows a clarification of how the Cartesian legacy in western culture is manifest locally in relation to particular practices, particular bodies.³⁷ In my consideration here the categories of presence/absence, motion/emotion, and sexuality/spirituality emerged in specific persons and circumstances as neither simple unities nor dualistically experienced in living practice.

Liturgical renewal based on the revision of worship texts and tinkering with names has limited possibilities. Revision must be based on knowledge of what the practising of rites is effecting. We can only gain such knowledge by asking questions such as: What are people doing? What gestures and motions are they going through? What attitude(s) do liturgical actors embody? What do the actions of liturgical actors cultivate in them as they move outside of the liturgical space?

The questions that this kind of exploration encourages us to explore are vast in number. They include at their heart a basic query: What kinds of activities incarnate what kinds of attention and living in the rite and beyond it? The task of re-membering body in theology calls for both modesty in theological claim and expansion of the horizons of theology. Dixon made a similar claim in asserting, "Theology is not religion or the definition of religion or the authority of religion, it is one of the embodiments of religion."³⁸

Can we conceive of theology as enactment? Theology as enactment occurs in worship settings, in people's small gestures, and in the grander motions through which they go. Claim must arise from these particular movements of the body. Part of what I hope to have demonstrated in this exploration is that the body also searches, the search occurs in-body. Attending to this search calls for a descriptive phase in liturgical theology. It must be marked by modesty in

claim and aim. Engaged in this enterprise, one does well to heed these words: "We cannot live other people's lives, and it is a piece of bad faith to try. We can but listen to what in words, in images, in actions they say about their lives...It's all a matter of scratching surfaces."³⁹

APPENDIX A

Interview Conversation Format: Field Study 1991

NAME

SEX/AGE

PROFESSION

YEARS OF MEMBERSHIP

RELIGIOUS BACKGROUND

ROLE(S) IN LITURGY

I am interested in studying what goes on in Sunday worship in congregations. What gets people to worship. What happens in liturgy. How the non-verbal elements space, tone, manner affect or don't effect the experience of worship.

A good place to begin would be for you to give me some history of your experience at this church. In particular your experience of worship and how important that is?

What gets you up in the morning and out to attend worship?

What is that you look for in worship?

Space is a non-verbal dimension of worship. How do you relate to the physical space?

How important is the presider in liturgy? Leaders?

Do you notice "ceremonial gestures"? Do you notice them when they are missing?

Do you notice where people stand to read?

Do you notice the method of distributing communion? Common cup? Bread?

Where do you sit? Same place? Different places?

How do you share the peace? (What physically do you do?)

Generally would you say that you are someone who relies more on verbal or non-verbal information? In liturgy?

Do you enjoy singing?

Do you find worship boring...refreshing...enlivening... monotonous?

Are there physical things gestures postures that you personally practice? (i.e., kneeling, closing eyes to pray, standing, sitting, etc.).

Notes

- ¹ This article is an abridged version of a much longer unpublished paper entitled "Going Though the Motions: Re-membering Body in Theology".
- ² Donald W. Musser and Joseph L. Price, ed., *A New Handbook of Christian Theology* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1992), s.v. "Ritual", by Ronald L. Grimes, p. 415.
- ³ For Dix "the liturgy" refers to eucharistic liturgies. Along side his assertion that liturgy is the thing done is a claim that eucharist is "always and everywhere the same". Cf. Dom Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (London: A.C. Black, 1945; repr., New York: The Seabury Press, 1983), xii-xxi.
- ⁴ For a summary of this issue see Kevin W. Irwin, *Liturgical Theology: A Primer* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1990) 18ff.
- ⁵ This phrase is Rebecca Slough's, from a conversation 13 August 1993.
- ⁶ This reference to the preoccupation of liturgical studies with history of liturgical texts and doctrinal matters is mentioned to contrast with the emphasis on liturgy as an activity or performance. For a consideration of reading and interpretation as "doing" and performance cf. Alla Bozarth Campbell, *The Word's Body: An Incarnational Aesthetic of Interpretation* (Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1979) 1-49.
- ⁷ Cf. Irwin, 68-73. Also Theodore W. Jennings Jr., "Ritual Studies and Liturgical Theology: An Invitation to Dialogue," *Journal of Ritual Studies* 1 (1986) 43.
- ⁸ Jennings, p. 43.
- ⁹ *Ibid.*, 15. This image is used by many who investigate lived experience. Its use here echoes Clifford Geertz in an essay "Making Experiences,

Authoring Selves,” in *The Anthropology of Experience*, ed., Victor Turner and Edward Bruner (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1986) 373. The essays in this collection explore the “anthropology of experience”, a term that represents the same concerns as does operational efficacy. Anthropology of experience explores “expressions” or “performances” to ask what kind of people are these and what kind of lives do they lead? This genre of exploration seeks understanding through ethnography rather than assigning causal or functional explanation for social and cultural phenomena.

- ¹⁰ There is nothing new in making gesture the focus of attention in theology. For a consideration of the long theological tradition of reflection on gesture, see Jean Claude Schmitt, “The Ethics of Gesture,” chap. in Michel Feher, Ramona Nadaff, and Nadia Tazi, eds., *Fragments for a History of the Human Body: Part II* (New York: Zone Books, 1989) 125ff.
- ¹¹ I further expand and develop this approach to fieldwork in my dissertation, “‘This is My Story, This is My Song’: Verna Maynard’s Life Story and Ritual Performance at the Kitchener Church of God (New Testament)” (in progress). A key difference is the valuing of long term study and in-depth interviewing.
- ¹² All names of persons in this article are pseudonyms as is the name of the congregation studied.
- ¹³ Fieldwork was conducted from February through May 1991.
- ¹⁴ The use of hyphens in this work reflects a similar dilemma expressed by Scheper-Hughes and Lock, “We lack a precise vocabulary with which to deal with mind-body-society interactions and so are left suspended with hyphens.” Nancy Scheper-Hughes and Margaret Lock, “The Mindful Body: A Prolegomenon to Future Work in Medical Anthropology,” *Medical Anthropological Quarterly* 1:1 March 1987, 10.
- ¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 148f.
- ¹⁶ Ronald L. Grimes, *Ritual Criticism* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1990) 148.
- ¹⁷ Roland Delattre, “Ritual Resourcefulness and Cultural Pluralism,” *Soundings* 61:3 (1978) 282.
- ¹⁸ Ronald L. Grimes. *Beginnings in Ritual Studies* (Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1982) 4.
- ¹⁹ I am drawing on Bourdieu’s concept of habitus, the dispositions and generative classificatory schemes are embodied in real human beings. For Bourdieu, the body is a mnemonic device upon and in which the very

basics of culture are imprinted and encoded in a socializing process which begins in childhood and is inculcated by experience more than explicit teaching. Cf. Pierre Bourdieu, trans. by Richard Nice, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, Cambridge Studies in Social Anthropology No. 16 (Cambridge University Press) 72-95.

- 20 Factors influencing the selection were time of service: at 11:00 a.m. (I am awake enough to be observant) and proximity (commute time is 10 minutes, close enough that travel time is minimal). I was not looking for any particular worship style (i.e., "high or low"). In my few inquiries about the style of this congregation one informant thought that it would be a good place to study since "people at the chapel take worship seriously".
- 21 Aidan Kavanagh, *Elements of Rite: A Handbook of Liturgical Style* (New York: Pueblo Publishing Company, 1982). See also, Peter Fink ed., *The New Dictionary of Sacramental Worship* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1990), s.v. "Presidential Style," by James Empereur, 1006-1010.
- 22 Mary Douglas, *Implicit Meanings: Essays in Anthropology* (London and New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975) 85ff.
- 23 I was especially conscious in both the performance of the fieldwork and in the writing of this account that any presider, including myself, would bear up variously under such scrutiny. In this account I attempt to maximize the emic or outsider character in observing.
- 24 The pages of my field notes are littered with stick figure drawings not represented here. Eventually, I recruited another doctoral student to take photographs of one service.
- 25 A characteristic resting pose (of the pastor) was crossing his arms over the chest. Strauss suggests this may indicate either humility or self protection. For a discussion of live body movement of the trunk, see Erwin Strauss, "The Forms of Spatiality," Chap. in *Phenomenological Psychology* (New York: Basic Books, 1966) 25ff.
- 26 These efforts were made in consultation with Dr. Clare Fisher, Professor at Starr King School for the Ministry. Some potentially rewarding avenues of analysis presented themselves: the investigation of faces and vestments using Grimes' categories of masking. See Ronald L. Grimes, "Masking: Toward a Phenomenology of Exteriorization," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 43:3 (1975): 508-516; the analysis of laughter or its absence and the relationship of these to hierarchy and structure calling on Mary Douglas' work; Mary Douglas, *Implicit Meanings: Essays in Anthropology*, 83-89; the relationship of gender and particular movements drawing on Kristeva's concepts of the

pulsonal. Julia Kristeva, "Gesture, Practice or Communication" chap. in Ted Polhemus, ed., *The Body Reader: Social Aspects of the Human Body*, 264-284.

- ²⁷ I craved the possibility of film, however, this avenue was not accessible. The "living" record film provides might have led me into mikrokenesic gestural analysis. Ray Birdwhistell, "Kinesics," chap. in Ted Polhemus, ed., *The Body Reader: Social Aspects of the Human Body*, 284-294. Also, for a consideration of common gestures used to communicate see Desmond Morris, *Gestures* (New York: Stein and Day, 1979).
- ²⁸ James P. Spradley, *The Ethnographic Interview* (San Francisco: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1979).
- ²⁹ For a consideration of the capacity of art to make presence, see, Mario Perniola, "Between Clothing and Nudity," chap. in Michel Feher, Ramona Naddaff, and Nadia Tazi, eds., *Fragments*, 249f.
- ³⁰ Young claims that looking as gazing that objectifies characterizes male experience and looking as touch is characteristic of women's experience. I disagree with her in this instance. See, Iris Marion Young, "Female Body Experience," Part III in *Throwing Like a Girl & Other Essays in Feminist Philosophy and Social Theory* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1990) 178ff.
- ³¹ Hans-Georg Gadamer, Robert Bernasconi, ed., *The Relevance of the Beautiful and Other Essays* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986) 74-82.
- ³² Delattre, 283.
- ³³ Marianne was the first woman I interviewed. Because of her willingness to volunteer information and similarities in our worldviews and interests I found myself talking more and probing less. I take this to be both success and failure. If I had been doing sustained field study I would have probed more deeply in follow-up interviews into specific topics she raised. As I have worked with this interview I have felt that lack of information acutely. I sought Marianne out because of the ease with which she moved in the worship space.
- ³⁴ Iris Marion Young, 125ff.
- ³⁵ Dixon, 296f.
- ³⁶ I believe the vitality of these categories overrides the fact that such an approach may still be riddled with mind-body dualisms. Perhaps our only hope for correcting this divisive bias is by continuous, dogged focus on living practice.

- ³⁷ For a consideration of the relationship of dualism in Hellenized Christianity and western philosophy, see Bryan Turner, *The Body and Society: Explorations in Social Theory* (New York: Blackwell, 1984) 36ff.
- ³⁸ Dixon, 148.
- ³⁹ Clifford Geertz, "Making Experiences, Authoring Selves," Bruner and Turner, 373.