

Context as a Framework for Analyzing Text and Music

James Marriott

When I was pursuing my undergraduate and graduate degrees in Parish Music, I encountered a document prepared by the 2004 Commission on Worship for the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod (LCMS) entitled *Text, Music, and Context: A Resource for Reviewing Worship Materials*.¹

The document offers guidelines for evaluating appropriate texts and music to be used in corporate worship services of LCMS congregations, especially for congregations who utilize worship resources outside of those hymnals and liturgical books which are explicitly synodically approved. These outside resources include most of the songs of the Praise and Worship genre as well as ecumenical hymnody, choral anthems, psalm settings, and other musical works that might be included in corporate worship but would not be found in a LCMS Lutheran hymnal. Instead of providing lists of music and texts that would meet the approval of a doctrinal review board, the goal of this document is to equip worship leaders and congregations to make their own assessments of worship materials.

Many of the principles promoted by the document are salient, i.e., the use of texts which are in accord with the Word of God, the use of music which is accessible and facilitates congregational participation. Principles of contextual balance are prominent: the balance of the wide range of emotions which are part of a community experience, or also the balance of old and new worship materials as part of a

Rev. Dr. James Marriott is the Associate Pastor at Faith Lutheran in Georgetown, TX, and Associate Professor of Theology and Music at Concordia University Texas. Holding undergraduate and graduate degrees in Parish Music from Concordia Nebraska and Concordia Wisconsin, respectively, he earned a Ph.D. in Liturgical Studies from Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary with an emphasis in liturgical inculturation. He was ordained into the pastoral ministry through Concordia Seminary, St. Louis. He lectures and performs across the United States. Jim and his wife, Kristi, have been married for twenty-three years and are blessed with two children, Joel and Kirstin.



11 Context as a Framework for Analyzing Text and Music

community's expression. Nevertheless, the engagement of "context" as a cultural phenomenon is almost completely absent in this document, creating a variety of issues. The method of evaluating worship materials according to their text and music assumes a cultural contextual foundation—that may or may not be shared throughout the ecclesial body.

At best, this assumed cultural foundation creates confusion when implementing the evaluation methods; and worst, this assumption sets the whole system for evaluation as one that objectifies appropriate or inappropriate worship resources based on the standards of one fixed perspective.

Without the acknowledgment of cultural diversity and hermeneutical subjectivity, the evaluative tool is rendered almost totally ineffective; it is a subjective tool that seems to betray a relatively objective, universalized result. To that end, I hope to reframe the conversation by expanding the "context" portion of the document *Text, Music, and Context* in an attempt to render this and other similar tools more useful. Cultural context forms our worshiping communities and thus informs the way we utilize and evaluate our worship resources. To speak of "text" or "music," one must first speak of culture and context, and only from that foundation can any

...the intercultural dialogue that music fosters within our Synod as well as within the universal Church acknowledges the subjectivity of perspective, advocates a dialogue of diversity, and encourages the celebration of unity even in the absence of uniformity.

authentic evaluation of text and music occur. My thesis, then, is that the intercultural dialogue that music fosters within our Synod as well as within the universal Church acknowledges the subjectivity of perspective, advocates a dialogue of diversity, and encourages the celebration of unity even in the absence of uniformity.

In a previous article for *Lutheran Mission Matters*, I suggest a working understanding of culture and cultural context, with an emphasis on the theological notion of enculturation, and an endorsement of Robert Schreiter's model for intercultural hermeneutics. For the sake of brevity, I will simply point the reader to that text.² Building upon that previous work, I will establish a hermeneutical foundation for intercultural dialogue that will help us treat context more comprehensively. With that foundation established, I will consider the idea of tradition, especially as it relates to the music of the church. Finally, I will suggest a framework by which our congregations might enrich one another through the acknowledgement of subjectivity, the dialogue of diversity, and the celebration of unity. While the argument could be crafted using either text or music in context, I will speak more exclusively to music, and will engage various musical examples to help illustrate the tenets of these various sections.

Hermeneutical framework

Hermeneutics is understood as the art of interpretation. Much like the understanding of culture, hermeneutical thought has developed and evolved over the last few centuries. While Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768-1834) sought to understand the author's perspective of a text³, hermeneutists such as Martin Heidegger (1889-1976) and Hans-Georg Gadamer (1900-2002) increasingly saw the difficulty of this objective, author-oriented interpretation, since each interaction between interpreter and author bore significant barriers of time, language, and culture.⁴ Thus, the hermeneutical emphasis began to shift, instead, to the interpreter's own situation.⁵ This reader-oriented perspective works to establish "a common understanding about something of interest to both reader and author."⁶ This perspective recognizes the multiplicity of meanings derived from the varying inherent biases of the readers and advocates a hermeneutical dialogue between various readers to achieve a richer comprehension of a text.⁷ Paul Ricoeur (1913-2005) expanded this even further by focusing exclusively on the text and its ability to speak independently of the author; the text itself discloses meaning in an immediate way.⁸

Thus, there are three perspectives when approaching a text: author, reader, and the text itself. Hermeneutics works to navigate the various horizons of meaning that come from the interaction of these perspectives.⁹ This allows for subjectivity in interpretation that acknowledges contextual differences between author, reader, and the text as appropriated in various contexts. This does not preclude the notion of better or worse interpretations, but it does recognize that the content and integrity of one's interpretation is conditioned by context and experience. Meaning, then, is not as much discovered as it is performed, and in a manner in which the immediacy of performance fosters a certain subjective uncertainty of meaning.¹⁰

Music provides an excellent demonstration of this. The performance of a piece of music is, inevitably, an interpretation of that music. That interpretation takes into account the intentions of the composer, which are relevant and yet ultimately inaccessible, the cultural conditioning of the performer, whose skill, knowledge, and experience interpret the score, and the audience, who receive and interpret the performance from the myriads of backgrounds that inform their

The performance of a piece of music is, inevitably, an interpretation of that music. That interpretation takes into account the intentions of the composer, which are relevant and yet ultimately inaccessible, the cultural conditioning of the performer, whose skill, knowledge, and experience interpret the score, and the audience, who receive and interpret the performance from the myriads of backgrounds that inform their experience.

13 Context as a Framework for Analyzing Text and Music

experience. The interpretation of the performance by a single audience member, then, combines that listener's experience of the performance, knowledge of the composer, and understanding of the artistry of the performer.

For example, my interpretation of the performance of a Bach organ work by a particular performer is conditioned by my knowledge of Bach's music, my experience of the performer's unique artistry, and my own conditioned affection for the music and the performer. Someone else with a different understanding of Bach and a different experience of the particular performer may interpret the performance in a remarkably different way. Similarly, my interpretation and experience of our congregation singing "God Who Bleeds" by Cara Berg and The Songwriters Initiative is conditioned by my friendship with the composer, my history with the song (I've had some unique performance opportunities), and my experience of the present performance in congregational context. It is the particular performance that brings forth a layered interpretation, one which is as immediate as the performance itself and one which fuses the horizons of composer/author, performer/text, and my own ability to ascertain the performance.

Furthermore, the communal reception of such a performance heightens the experience of a performance, even if the individual interpretations that make up the community are certainly nuanced subjectively. The same song is received differently by different people based on their own access to the author, their own history as reader/performer, and their encounter with the text/performance itself. The dialogue that results from these subjective perspectives enriches each individual perspective and can help the community to come to a kind of interpretative consensus. In a class session, we heard a hymn text recited by a single voice, then read aloud in unison, and finally sung to its assigned tune. We were asked to evaluate each performance of the text and to offer our perspectives and preferences. Through the ensuing dialogue, I came to appreciate aspects of the performances which I had dismissed, leading to a fuller understanding of the exercise as a whole. Thus, while my individual interpretation was a fusion of horizons of meaning, the ensuing dialogue furthered that process.

Along with the foundation of cultural hybridity, enculturation, and hermeneutics, let us now also consider the role of tradition, since the Church's tradition and traditions are foundations and mediators of ecclesial praxis, even as these traditions themselves are formed by hybridity, enculturation, and hermeneutics.

Tradition

Tradition, like culture and hermeneutics, has a wide range of meaning. For some Christians, the scope of tradition encompasses the entire history of God's interaction with creation, while for others, tradition means little more than the inherited practice of the previous one or two generations. For some Christians, tradition is seen as the systematic source and norm of all Christian experience, doctrine, and practice, while for others, tradition carries overtones of colonization, oppression, and cultural

destruction. For some Christians, tradition means a dynamic, contextual, evolving corpus of Christian expression, while for others, tradition is an exclusive, static, and fixed set of practices that transculturally¹¹ apply to all corners of Christianity. Moreover, one might ask what contributes to tradition: Scripture, creeds, conciliar statements, Confessions, liturgy, music, attire, gesture, architecture...the list could continue! How these balance together, what is included, what is excluded, what is dynamic, what is static, etc., contributes to the wide range of meaning for Christian tradition. Here I suggest four categories in which we might consider tradition: as the Church's experience, as having local origins, as being dynamic, and similarly, as having permeating boundaries.

Before we explore each of these categories, I first want to lay a foundation for our conversation on tradition by recalling Robert Schreiter's use of Noam Chomsky's model for language acquisition.¹² In this analogy, tradition, for Schreiter, functions as a language system, or the all-encompassing system in which something, in this case, the Christian faith, is communicated.¹³ The Scriptures, creeds, and other "loci of orthodoxy" function as the grammar, or the criterion used to structure the boundaries of expression within the language system.¹⁴ The Christian faith is a kind of language competence; just as a child can have language competence without knowing the intricacies of grammar, so faith exists as "the source of our relation to God."¹⁵ Thus, the Christian faith and the loci of orthodoxy, while certainly interdependent, are nonetheless distinct entities that function very differently, just as language competence and grammar function distinctly within a language system.

Christian faith, then, is expressed in Christian performance, whether in liturgy, music, teaching, art, prayer, etc. These performances are critiqued by the "loci of orthodoxy" in the same way that grammar critiques a well-structured sentence from a poor one.¹⁶ In this model, then, tradition is the all-encompassing system in which faith is communicated through word and action and critiqued by the authority of Scripture and Church. Furthermore, even as grammatical structures can change, however slowly, throughout the life of a language, it is evident that the "loci of orthodoxy," or at least the contextual hermeneutics that engage these loci, also have a dynamic character to them.

On this foundation, let us first consider how tradition is the Church's experience. Without the experiences of the Church, there is no Christian tradition. James Cochrane says it this way: "If Christians call themselves thus, they necessarily relate to that particular heritage as the source and touchstone of identity, however critically they may judge parts of its legacy."¹⁷

This, of course, is a double-edged sword, so to speak, as the Christian tradition includes some Christian performances that have been oppressive, destructive, and antithetical to the Gospel, and includes shifts in the loci of orthodoxy that have been hurtful, exclusive, and difficult.¹⁸ When one becomes a Christian, one is baptized into this heritage, for better and for worse. Tradition does not, however, prescribe normative Christian performances; rather, tradition encompasses the eclectic diversity

15 *Context as a Framework for Analyzing Text and Music*

of Christian performances through its history. Thus, tradition is not the source of the Church's experience but is the witness to the Church's experience. Again, Cochrane says:

Christian tradition may best be grasped as the history of the attempts of the Christian community to discover truth and to frame their discoveries in the languages, cultures, and symbolic resources of their time. It is the deposit of wisdom borne of experience transmitted in claims about reality that endure over time, but it is not the source of known certainties or absolutes.¹⁹

Furthermore, the loci of orthodoxy and the Christian performances that comprise our Christian tradition all have local origins. In the same way that hermeneutics must, in some form or fashion, take seriously the influence of the author, for our tradition to maintain its meaning, it can never become fully divorced from its contextual locality. Almost all theologians would concede that all theology is contextually derived; however, it is not enough to say this, for this allows that tradition be an essence to be appropriated to every situation. Rather, tradition is contextual in that the context in which it is formed is part of a "concrete totality," a totality of life circumstances that must be interpreted as a whole in order for the theology or tradition to be properly represented.²⁰ Thus, in our weekly celebrations of Word and Sacrament as local communities, we bring a fresh, dynamic, and perpetual expression to these local origins, holding in tension the duality of their locality—original and immediate.

In this way, tradition is inherently dynamic. Not only is tradition the collection of a loci of orthodoxy and Christian performances with various local and contextual origins, but the expression and re-expression of that tradition in various contemporary contexts guarantees that it would be impossible for tradition to become static. Cochrane says it this way:

It is clear that the Christian tradition must be understood as dynamic, as an unending development of various trajectories in faith...They live only because they enable human beings who claim the Christian faith as significant, to represent, orient, transform, and communicate their lives in ways they find realistic, meaningful, and hopeful.²¹

In this way, tradition is much more about the future than about the past; tradition is more about passing on and re-expressing the loci of orthodoxy than it is a preservation or reification of the past. This notion, however, is not without difficulty. For, in many cases, when tradition forgets the locality of its origins, tradition can also become blind to the way in which it is re-expressed in contemporary contexts. When this happens, tradition ceases to be tradition and rather becomes a hegemonic tool in the hands of the powerful to dictate Christian performances in a manner that fails to properly discern the body of Christ. Also, in the dynamic evolution of Christian tradition, it is possible for the structure of the tradition, as formed by Christian

performances through the critique of the loci of orthodoxy, to outlast its meaning. When this happens, the Church must decide whether to appropriate new meaning to the old structure, to revive the old meaning, or to abandon that aspect of structure in favor of other, more meaningful, structures.

Finally, in the same way, tradition must have permeating boundaries. Because Christian performances continue to occur constantly throughout the world, tradition is exponentially expanding. When the dynamicity of tradition is recognized, then the boundaries which help to shape tradition will necessarily remain porous. This does not mean that anything goes. It does, however, recognize the cultural contextuality of the Christian performances that have comprised and continue to comprise the Christian tradition, giving the Church the opportunity to critique these performances through the loci of orthodoxy and by the principles of intercultural hermeneutics described in the previous section. It also holds those who make these critiques, especially our ecclesial leaders, accountable for properly discerning the Church as a whole.

It does, however, recognize the cultural contextuality of the Christian performances that have comprised and continue to comprise the Christian tradition, giving the Church the opportunity to critique these performances through the loci of orthodoxy and by the principles of intercultural hermeneutics...

One of the challenges, especially in a postmodern, globalized world, is to remain attentive to all voices, not just the voices of the dominant or the majority. Tradition, and theologians who study it, can help shape the lives of the community as one voice, but must do so as a partner with the community, and a subservient partner at that.²² This will aid in an authentic development of local Christian performances that will contribute to the overall shape and spectrum of the Christian tradition.

In light of all this, what does it mean, then, to speak of “traditional” music? How does music participate in the formation and transmission of the Christian tradition? Music is a medium through which the Christian religion is communicated. From the early church to the present-day, music has been part of the Christian community’s expression of faith and, moreover, music itself is a method of God’s revelation *to* the Church and the world.²³ Nevertheless, while there is a corpus of essential *texts* which have survived through the history of the Church, such as the Scriptures, the ecumenical Creeds, and the texts of the liturgy, very little *music* can claim the same continuity. Even the broad notions of musical style have varied throughout Christian history, from the value of austere music by the Church Fathers²⁴ to the ornate sounds of polychoral Baroque works, from the introduction of the pipe organ to the introduction of the electric guitar. Thus, music has been instrumental in transmitting the tradition from generation to generation, yet at the same time it is difficult to speak of “traditional” music with any historical integrity. Rather, the music used by the church has been a

17 Context as a Framework for Analyzing Text and Music

reflection of the cultural practices and contextual values of every place and time. Throughout the course of church history, various genres of music have been seen as revelatory of God and especially apt at communicating the Gospel text and essence: plainchant, Palestrina, Bach, Mozart, etc. At the same time, the dynamic nature of music in culture has led each generation to appropriate new musical expressions to this same text and essence. This does not mean, for example, that plainchant is no longer a carrier of the tradition, but rather that it is in partnership with a dynamic range of other musical genres employed for the same purpose.

Conclusions: A new framework for assessment?

Thus far, I have suggested the following:

1. Culture, from a postmodern perspective, is dynamic, with permeating boundaries, leading to a proliferated notion of cultural hybridity.
2. The field of enculturation facilitates the conversation between culture and faith, giving the Church the sense of what is Gospel essence and what is cultural accretion.²⁵
3. The hermeneutical framework of intercultural dialogue stems from the interpretation of a performance in a cultural context, acknowledging the subjectivity of interpretation and relying on communal social judgment to establish consensus.
4. Tradition reflects this cultural hybridity and hermeneutical subjectivity in its inherent dynamicity; tradition, then, is a social construction by which faith, culture, and interpretation are transmitted from generation to generation.

From this nuanced understanding of context, therefore, we can better approach an evaluation of music in Christian worship.

First, it is helpful to acknowledge that music in general is a gift of God and a demonstration of God's transcendence and God's immanence.²⁶ At the same time, music is made manifest *within* humanity, and thus, is a product of the cultural and contextual influences that distinguish human communities over time. The music of Christian worship, then, is an enculturated entity, revealing the truth and essence of God through the medium of human performance. This performance is consequently interpreted by individuals in community, an interpretation which itself is conditioned by the cultural context and experience of the individual. The interpretation is one that recognizes God in music²⁷, depicting again the difficult distinction enculturation calls for between Divine essence and cultural accretion.

This leads finally to the evaluation of music. Albert Blackwell, referencing the work of Luther and of others, suggests that there are two categories of music: "good" and "bad".²⁸ Good music, for Blackwell, seems to be that which acknowledges, abides by, and thrives within the created order²⁹; good music, furthermore, transcends the

ordinary in a kind of classic timelessness. Good music reveals God's transcendent and immanent nature as "perfectly" as possible; bad music does not.³⁰ Bad music is identified as "music too vacuous to mediate sacramental depths...which, I'm afraid, is quite a lot of music."³¹ This acts as a continuum of quality, with some musical expressions achieving more success than others. All musical genres have the potential for this perfection; yet, in Blackwell's opinion, some genres of music have more good than bad, while others more bad than good.³² For Blackwell, Mozart's music achieves this type of transcendent perfection. The music of Mozart, for Blackwell, has a timeless character of transcendence, limited neither by Mozart's own cultural context nor Blackwell's cultural conditioning for comprehending Mozart's music, even if Blackwell acknowledges that context does matter. Blackwell's teenage son acknowledges the excellence of Mozart, but sees similar greatness in the music of Paul Simon, which his father also concedes.³³ So how does one judge between "good" and "bad" music?

As evident through our hermeneutical discussions above, the very notion of this evaluation is subjective. Subjectivity does not make our evaluations invalid, but it also does not make them authoritative outside of their limited subjectivity. Thus, based on my cultural and contextual preconditioning, I may deem a performance of a piece of music as "bad," while my fellow audience member might see it as "good." Now, I may be tempted to consider my fellow audience member who deems such a terrible performance as incompetent or even "uncultured," but that attitude only reinforces a pre-modern type of cultural understanding that posits one perspective as "better" than another. At the reception following the performance, I may also be tempted to associate only with people who share my sentiments about the performance, but this would limit my horizons of meaning and understanding to my own narrowly conceived ideals. Alternatively, I may choose to engage in dialogue with my fellow audience members, hearing and even appreciating how their perspective enabled them to see greatness in the performance, while perhaps also sharing what I thought could have been improved in the performance. This dialogue enriches both perspectives.

Subjectivity does not
make our evaluations
invalid, but it also does
not make them
authoritative outside of
their limited subjectivity.

This dialogue, in macro form, is one manner in which music becomes associated with the Christian tradition: Music that is deemed to be good by an intercultural hermeneutic continues to be used throughout the life of the Church.³⁴ The music has local origins and is hermeneutically renewed in each performance; consequently, it is constantly evaluated for its ability to communicate God. At the same time, the dynamicity of culture ensures that the interpretation of a performance will always be somewhat nuanced. This dynamicity of culture also allows the same song to be recast in new genres, timbres, and forms, just as the dynamicity of tradition allows new song

19 *Context as a Framework for Analyzing Text and Music*

genres, timbres, and forms to be included into the Church's practice. Thus, there is music that, having been deemed "good" by the Church, exists as part of the church's tradition; however, the dynamic nature of music, culture, and tradition ensure that "traditional" music is constantly in flux.

Therefore, when we consider music and context in our corporate worship services, we would do well to do so within this framework. In my experience as a church musician, songs ranging in style and genre including "A Mighty Fortress," "We Praise You and Acknowledge You," "Deep River," "In Christ Alone," "Revelation Song," "Jesus, Remember Me," "Siyahamba," and new songs from The Songwriters Initiative³⁵ all would be evaluated as "good" songs by various members of my congregations. Furthermore, I have come to see these songs as "good" songs in my various contexts because of the way they work in that context. Not all songs work the same, and songs that might not work in some contexts are highly effective in others. This doesn't keep me from evaluating these songs based on my understanding of their melodic integrity, musical worth, and corporate accessibility; however, it does nuance my understanding by the cultural and contextual hybridity that enriches our Christian community, helps me acknowledge my own biases based on my own cultural and experiential formation, and discourages me from making sweeping generalizations based on narrowly sculpted perspectives. Likewise, as our Synod equips congregations to make evaluations of their music for corporate worship, we must recognize the cultural diversity and hybridity that exists within the Synod, acknowledging any hermeneutical biases that would unjustly limit this diversity, and must especially refrain from making sweeping generalizations about genres of music based on narrowly sculpted perspectives, as has been done far too often in the scope of my experience.

In closing, then, it is difficult to associate music with a specific cultural context or influence; rather, music facilitates intercultural dialogue. Early church practice sought to avoid music with secular and profane cultural connotations.³⁶ In the same way, I have heard colleagues suggest that church music in today's profane and pluralistic world must be equally countercultural. I'm not sure this is the best approach. It certainly does not foster intercultural dialogue by which the Gospel might be richly enculturated into our North American context, nor does it recognize the historical cultural influences on the music advocated as "countercultural." If the Church attempts to divorce itself from the culture, it will be neither the Church *of* nor *in* the culture. Rather, intercultural dialogue, cultural hybridity, and enculturation enable the Gospel to enrich the Church in the world by acknowledging the subjectivity of perspective, advocating a dialogue of diversity, and encouraging the celebration of unity even in the absence of uniformity. Context, then, is the framework by which music and text might be most effectively evaluated in our congregations.

Endnotes

¹*Text, Music, Context: A Resource for Reviewing Worship Materials* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 2004). <http://www.lcms.org/page.aspx?pid=539>.

²James F. Marriott, “Postmodernism and Mission,” *Lutheran Mission Matters* 31, no. 2 (2023): 150–63.

³David S. Dockery, *Biblical Interpretation Then and Now* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1992), 163.

⁴Dockery, *Then and Now*, 173.

⁵Jean Grondin, *Introduction to Philosophical Hermeneutics* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), 103.

⁶Dockery, *Then and Now*, 173.

⁷Grondin, *Hermeneutics*, 119.

⁸Paul Ricoeur, *Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning* (Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1976), 92.

⁹Ricoeur, *Interpretation Theory*, 93, referencing Gadamer’s idea of a “fusion of horizons.”

¹⁰Lawrence Kramer, *Interpreting Music* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010), 12.

¹¹For one example, see Arthur Just, *Heaven on Earth: The Gifts of Christ in the Divine Service* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 2008), 28–9. In speaking of Lutheran liturgy, Just claims that “there is a common assumption today that the liturgy must reflect the language and the ethos of the current culture. If this is true, then liturgies will veer toward the pop culture in which we live. These culturally devised liturgies are at times exciting and entertaining but are not transcultural. . . Lutheran worship is its own culture, distinct from both the pop culture of secular society and the worship that characterizes most evangelical denominations in our country today. The Lutheran Church must develop and maintain its own cultural language that reflects the values and structures of Scripture, not of the current culture.”

¹²Robert J. Schreiter, *Constructing Local Theologies* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2015), 114.

¹³Schreiter, *Constructing Local Theologies*, 115.

¹⁴Schreiter, *Constructing Local Theologies*, 115.

¹⁵Schreiter, *Constructing Local Theologies*, 115.

¹⁶Schreiter, *Constructing Local Theologies*, 116.

¹⁷James R. Cochrane, *Circles of Dignity: Community Wisdom and Theological Reflection* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999), 45.

¹⁸The evolution of the doctrine of the Real Presence, the justification of slavery in the period of colonization, and the role of women in the church, are a few of many possible examples.

¹⁹Cochrane, *Circles of Dignity*, 64.

²⁰Cochrane, *Circles of Dignity*, 55.

²¹Cochrane, *Circles of Dignity*, 43.

²²Cochrane, *Circles of Dignity*, 62. Steven Bevans also makes this point in his *Models of Contextual Theology* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 2011), 106. On p. 18, Bevans references Leonardo Mercado, who speaks of theologians as “midwives to the people as they give birth to a theology that is truly rooted in a culture and moment of history.”

²³Maevae Louis Heaney, *Music as Theology: What Music Says about the Word* (Eugene: Pickwick Publications, 2012), 2.

²⁴Calvin R. Stapert, *A New Song for an Old World: Musical Thought in the Early Church* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 131.

²⁵*Adiaphora* is a synonym to this idea.

²⁶Albert L. Blackwell also makes this argument in *The Sacred in Music* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1999), 16, 47.

21 Context as a Framework for Analyzing Text and Music

²⁷See Mary McGann, *A Precious Fountain, Music in the Worship of an African American Catholic Community* (Liturgical Press, 2004), 263, for her notion of the epicletic nature of music to invoke the Holy Spirit.

²⁸Blackwell, *Sacred in Music*, 17.

²⁹See Blackwell, *Sacred in Music*, 49–124 for the formation of his notion of musical perfection around the universal Pythagorean principles of music.

³⁰Blackwell, *Sacred in Music*, 17.

³¹Blackwell, *Sacred in Music*, 153.

³²Blackwell, *Sacred in Music*, 17.

³³Blackwell, *Sacred in Music*, 122.

³⁴This is not to deny the role of authoritative ecclesial power in much of sacred music's retention or dismissal throughout the history of the Church.

³⁵<https://www.cui.edu/academicprograms/christcollege/center-for-worship-leadership/songwriter>

³⁶Stapert, *New Song*, 131.