COMPOSING A CANON

ISBN: 978-94-6233-022-1

Cover design:	Wietske Otter
Hymnbook cover design:	Studio Anton Sinke
Printed by:	Gildeprint, Enschede

COMPOSING A CANON

Creating Networks of Meaning
in the Editorial Process of the Hymnbook
Liedboek, zingen en bidden in huis en kerk (2013)

Een canon maken
Het scheppen van netwerken van betekenis
in het redactieproces van het
Liedboek, zingen en bidden in huis en kerk (2013)
(met een samenvatting in het Nederlands)

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van de graad van doctor in de godgeleerdheid
aan de Protestantse Theologische Universiteit te Amsterdam – Groningen
op gezag van de rector, prof. dr. M.M. Jansen,
ingevolge het besluit van het college voor promoties
in het openbaar te verdedigen
te Amsterdam op donderdag 10 september 2015
des middags te 1.45 uur

door

Catharina Sarah van Andel
geboren op 13 december 1982 te Woudrichem

Promotor: prof. dr. M. Barnard

Co-promotor: dr. M.J.M. Hoondert

‘Het woord brengt de waarheid teweeg’

Jan Willem Schulte Nordholt

CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

The Protestant liturgical landscape in the Netherlands is said to have become 'layered, differentiated and complex' (Barnard 2006, 11). Tension is observed between unity and multi-colouredness in a way this is said never to have existed before (Van Tongeren 2009). The publication of the Dutch Protestant interdenominational hymnal *Liedboek, zingen en bidden in huis en kerk*[1] in May 2013 can be considered as both a reflection of and a contribution to the complexity and stratification of that field.

Consequently – and causally, as we will state and make clear further on – discussions in and about the liturgical landscape have become layered, differentiated and complex. The same applies to scholarly study of this field. The past decade and a half has seen an increase in methods and approaches applied to an increasing number of topics (Barnard and Post 2001; Barnard and Schuman 2002; Versnel-Mergaerts and Van Tongeren 2011; Barnard, Cilliers and Wepener 2014). Those contributions are witness to both an anthropological and a performative turn within Liturgical Studies. Among these, studies concerning music and liturgy (Vernooij 2000; Hoondert 2006; Klomp 2011), have acquired a place of their own. The relationship between music and liturgy has been reworked, with scholars considering 'liturgical music as a basic category of Christian ritual' (Vernooij 2000, 8), indeed preferring the notion of *sound* over that of *church music* in order to account for 'the broad sonic spectrum of ritual' (Klomp 2011, 41) as well as its performance.

The present thesis adds yet another approach to this list. It fits in with developments mentioned in the previous paragraph, by searching for scholarly approaches to date not explored within Liturgical Studies, yet very apt to function as a conversation partner to this discipline. Moreover, it fits in with the current tendency to consider music and singing in liturgy as a fully-fledged locus. This thesis, however, takes that tendency even further. No previous study has concerned itself with the question of how a hymnal comes into being. To date much of the research concerning hymnals has been historical or evaluative in nature and does not start before the moment a hymnal is published (e.g. Post 2010; Van der Knijff 2014). The present thesis takes the *editorial process* of the 2013 hymnal as its main area of interest. Apart from offering a new focus area to Liturgical Studies, this thesis offers a new perspective as well, by introducing a discursive approach. That approach will be discussed more profoundly below. It is already clearly illustrated in the phrasing of the overarching research question to this study which reads:

---

[1] This title can be translated as: 'Hymnal, singing and praying at home and in church'. In this thesis we will use *Liedboek* in short to refer solely to this 2013 hymnal. The 1973 hymnal, which was also called *Liedboek* (cf. *Chapter 4*) will throughout this dissertation be referred to by its full name: *Liedboek voor de kerken.*

What notions are identified as central in the meetings of the editorial board of the new Dutch Protestant hymnbook and what kind of discourses are (re)produced in the process of giving meaning to these notions?

Five notions, which each have proved their worth both within the discipline of Liturgical Studies and the meetings of the *Liedboek* editorial board, will be addressed successively, so to answer this question. A chapter will be devoted to each notion on its own, but will together be previewed in this introductory chapter. After first having introduced the empirical part of our research and then having accounted for our data, we will take the reader through these five notions: hymnal, ecumenism, history, identity and gender. We will then proceed to account for our approach. This chapter will conclude with the introduction of a broad framework to this study, followed by a description of the aims of the thesis and an outline.

EMPIRICAL RESEARCH

Considering the above, this study therefore aims at exploring the editorial process of the 2013 *Liedboek*. The analyses presented in the chapters to come are based on long-time empirical research. As a participant observer, I[2] studied the *Liedboek*'s editorial process, that is: I attended the meetings of the editorial board, its working groups[3] and some of the groups that had been installed by the Protestant Church in the Netherlands to function as a sounding board. I also attended regional and national events that were organized to introduce the hymnal. The reason for selecting this process is in the first place a pragmatic one: this editorial process just started at about the same time as the present study was designed. A second reason is of more theoretical concern. We considered the meetings of a hymnal's editorial board as 'spaces where these [liturgical] discourses are concentrated and clearly articulated there and then' (Van Andel and Barnard 2009, 55). By observing this board's meetings, we hoped to have gained access both to the meanings constructed in the broader liturgical landscape and to the power relationships in that field. The topic will also be dealt with below under the heading of discursive approach.

---

[2] In this dissertation, the personal pronoun 'we' will be used most frequently. That reflects that the study the contributions originate in, is teamwork. Only when it is obvious that one researcher, the author of this thesis, is meant, will the pronoun 'I' be used.

[3] There were eight editorial working groups. At the outset we observed them all. After a year of observation, however, it turned out that the pressure this exerted on precious research time – to that point the observation activity itself took one day a week, the preparation of the meetings and working out the field notes another day – did not account for the diversity of results this yielded. We therefore decided to reduce the number of working groups we observed to four. By this choice we were mainly led by the number and intensity of debates in a working group and thus discontinued observation in the working groups that were rarely confronted with extensive discussions.

When the research design was in a preliminary stage, we contacted the coordinator to the editorial process, the Rev. P.H. Endedijk, in order to discuss opportunities for a researcher to take part into that process. There turned out to be little time for exploration. On 9 May 2008, the very day after becoming acquainted, the meetings of those involved in the editorial process were set to begin. We decided not to let that opportunity pass us by, although the research design had not yet been completed. We considered the advantages of being present from the outset to be greater than the disadvantage of not having a well-defined research design. Besides, it turned out during the process that the research design would continually change and be influenced by the empirical study, and where the empirical study was shaped by a theoretical research frame which crystallized out over the years. Indeed, it is a characteristic of qualitative research that it is 'exploratory, fluid and flexible, data-driven and context-sensitive. Given that, it would be both inimical and impossible to write an entire advance blueprint' (Mason 2002, 24).

This cyclical movement from the empirical study to the construction of the theoretical framework and vice versa can be traced in the articles included in this thesis. Minor differences will become apparent when comparing how the main research question is phrased in the five following chapters. These can be explained by referring to the stage of research in which the respective articles were written. It will also show that none of the articles word the main question as it is presented in this opening chapter. Since it was in fact the last chapter to be written, it provides a concluding wording of the main question, culminating from the empirical and theoretical part of the present study and verbalizing what we did throughout the past seven years.

The distinction between the empirical and the theoretical part of research, moreover, is not as stringent as we presumed in the previous paragraph. We agree with sociologist Jennifer Mason, who asserts that qualitative empirical research is not about collecting data, but about generating them. By this she means that 'as a researcher you do not simply work out where to find data which already exist in a collectable state', but instead 'you work out how best you can generate data from your chosen data sources' (Mason 2002, 52). This working out is naturally a theory-loaded activity. The theoretical part of the research encouraged the making of audio-recordings of the meetings I attended as from 17 April 2009. By then we had found that field notes were not detailed enough when looking for meaning constructed in interaction. In order to be able to produce detailed transcripts, I proceeded to audio-record the meetings. From 13 January 2012 on, I used a video recorder as well. The introduction of the video recorder was necessitated by the amount of information we wanted to include in our transcripts. Some events such as voting by the raising of hands, pointing at people or books, and editors (temporarily) leaving the meeting, could not be accounted for on the basis of audio recordings. The final meeting was held on 21 September

2012. In a little more than four years I attended 138 meetings of the editorial board and its working groups.

PERMISSIONS AND TRANSCRIPTS

Initially, consent to conduct the study was given by the foundation responsible for the editorial process, the *Interkerkelijke Stichting voor het Kerklied* (*ISK;* Interdenominational Foundation for the Church Hymn). ISK did not pay for the study, nor did it in any way try to influence its approach or its outcomes. The agreement between ISK and the Protestant Theological University, which hosted the research and employed the researcher, only knew two restrictive conditions: (1) the thesis was not allowed to be published before the hymnal was published and (2) the researcher, just like any member of the editorial process, was not allowed to make public who had taken which stance in any particular debate. These conditions had to insure that the research did not affect how the hymnal was received after the editorial process nor the experienced freedom of speech by the board members during the process. Besides asking for permission at an administrative level we also asked for personal permission from all those involved, from the moment that we started making the audio and video recordings. The recorders were always used overtly. Whenever pieces of transcripts are quoted in the articles, we provided speakers with fictitious names. An interesting and distinct casus is how we tried to make recognition as difficult as possible when distinguishing according to gender. This proved to be untenable in the end, as *Chapter 6* will extensively show.

Writing the transcripts was a substantial part of our analysis. We explicitly took the transcription process to be part of the analysis, as is argued in more detail in the chapters to follow, especially in *Chapter 5*. In referring to Mason again, it is part of our way of generating data from the meetings observed. We chose not to follow any published transcription convention, but instead to transcribe in a way that met our requirements. We thus constructed transcripts that could answer the kind of questions we asked. We noted seven different aspects of interaction, namely: who was speaking; what was said; when lines were sung and whether this singing was done accompanied and if so: by whom; what other actions occured (such as people leaving or entering, people raising their hands when a vote was called, et cetera – which indeed was the primary argument to start making video recordings) and whether speakers used quotations, for example from the hymns under discussion. Thus, we arrived at transcriptions of the meetings using about one page for every three minutes of meeting. This provided us with sufficient insight into the dynamics of the meetings to answer our specific research question as to what meanings were constructed for the central notions.

CENTRAL NOTIONS

A chapter is devoted to each of these notions, namely *hymnal*, *ecumenism*, *history*, *(professional) identity* and *gender*. The list of central notions was set in relating the main research question to the transcripts. In order to count as a central notion a concept had to be a recurrent topic or word in the transcripts, not only in one meeting but over the course of time. Then, it had to have some sense of being rooted in or connected to 'the social element', either a social relationship or a socially relevant (id)entity. That for example, ruled out the frequently mentioned term 'coffee', although one could attempt to argue that this can indeed function as a socially relevant mark. We took a broad view of notions as being social, as evident from our inclusion of the notion of hymnal. What is more, the concept should already have received some attention in Liturgical Studies, since this study aims to contribute to that discipline. The latter requirement in fact is the death-blow for 'coffee' as a central notion.

The selection of these notions thus arose from interaction between the development of a theoretical framework and the generation of data. After a year of observation, analysis of our field notes already indicated that 'identity' was a recurring theme (Van Andel and Barnard 2009). Later, after thorough and informed thinking about the topic, it was split into two perspectives: professional identity and gender. The notions of hymnal and ecumenism were each stimulated in the first place by the topic of a conference at which we lectured. In preparing those lectures, and the subsequent articles, we observed that these were indeed key notions in the process. The notion of history, finally, arose from a critical evaluation of its preceding chapter, where we caught ourselves using images of the past (such as pillarization and secularization) as established facts, a habit we also had noticed during the editorial board meetings.

Overseeing these five central notions and their interrelations – which will appear from the cross references between the individual chapters – we argue that they largely cover the debates and discussions in the editorial process. Having explained their context of discovery, we will now move on to sketch the particular debates each of the notions should be positioned in.

Hymnal

Since this thesis has the *Liedboek* editorial process as its main topic, it probably does not come as a surprise that one of its chapters is devoted to 'hymnal', which is a translation of the Dutch word 'liedboek'. Both within the discipline of Liturgical Studies and, naturally, that of hymnology, attention has already been given to the notion of hymnal, albeit in distinct manners. In positioning our contribution in the field of existing work on the topic of a hymnal, as we will shortly come to do, it will, however, become clear that it still *is* surprising that we wrote an article on this topic. In recent literature, both in Liturgical Studies and in hymnology, it is namely not very obvious that 'hymnal' is a notion that should or even could be approached from a discursive point of view. This point of view will be introduced later on in this chapter; we will now turn to a brief overview of 'a hymnal' as an object of study.

In hymnology, a hymnal is usually considered as a collection of hymns. These hymns can be analyzed and evaluated for their texts and/or their tunes and/or the practices to which they refer. As a consequence, a hymnological study could ask how a particular confessional identity is expressed in (the texts of) hymns published in successive hymnbooks (Post 2010). Many hymnological studies can be characterized by a historical approach: they explain, for example, where a text or tune, or a series of them as collected in a particular hymnbook, comes from, how it has evolved, how it is meant to be used and how it should be interpreted, given the listed backgrounds. It thus approaches a hymnal by looking thoroughly at its history or that of the hymns it contains. This has indeed already been done for the hymnal central to our study (Smelik 2013; Van de Woestijne 2014).

In contrast to this hymnological perspective, attention is currently usually only devoted to a hymnal in Liturgical Studies when and insofar as it is used in the performance of liturgy. A shift within Liturgical Studies precedes this approach. Over the past several decades it can be observed that Liturgical Studies moved away 'from text-based methods of analysis to a broader incorporation of the human and social sciences (…) [which] has shifted our theories about how meaning is mediated in liturgical performance' (McGann 2002, 15). Consequently, books such as service books and hymnals are understood as 'essential tools' that 'do not of themselves account for or describe all that takes place in local performance' (McGann 2002, 16). This does not imply that hymnals have become completely absent in the description or evaluation of local performances of worship. They, however, have acquired another function. They are not studied for their contents – words and tunes – but instead for what can be called their symbolic function: '[u]sed ritually, they function symbolically, becoming part of the meaning making that takes place' (McGann 2002, 16).

This perspective implies that hymnals are treated as symbols, mediating a regional, social or religious identity, for example. This symbolic approach for example can be found in Dutch professor Marcel Barnard's pivotal contribution on the concept of (liturgical) bricolage. In his article Barnard introduces the songs used in one particular service as stemming from several hymn-books and then introduces the hymn-books in question each as representatives of a particular poetical language and musical idiom (in: Barnard, Cilliers and Wepener 2014, 117). In Liturgical Studies then, not the individual hymn but the hymnal as an object is of the researcher's interest.

In both disciplines, however, a hymnal is not considered to be a notion open to several meanings. Usually, the function and meaning of a hymnal are taken for granted, although a careful reading of the work of Dutch Roman Catholic scholar Gerard Lukken does reveal a loosely introduced distinction of several meanings of 'hymnal'. When discussing the increasing number of hymns written for the congregation, Lukken mentions some recently published hymnals and calls them a reflection of this increase while at the same time suggesting they will 'undoubtedly in the future (…) also prove to be inspiring for parish liturgy' (Lukken 2005, 459). We found no other impulses in ascribing several meanings to a hymnal.

By dealing with the concept of hymnal and the several ways it is constructed, this thesis' second chapter offers a 'hymnal-logy' to hymnology and to Liturgical Studies. It raises the awareness that a hymnal is not only a collection of hymns, nor a tool to be used by performers of liturgy. Both of these meanings, along with several others, are better understood as constructed in social interaction and (thus) as finding their reason for existence within a particular social group. Moreover, our contribution particularly addresses hymnology. It has turned out to be both disturbing and enriching to realize that an image of a hymnal, which traditionally is not a concept hymnologists work with, comes to play a role in the evaluation of hymns.

Ecumenism

Just as it may not be surprising to find 'hymnal' as a key notion in this thesis, 'ecumenism' should be much expected in this context as well. As will be clarified in greater detail in the chapters to follow, *Liedboek* is an interdenominational hymnal. It was from its very outset intended to be a hymn-book for several different churches. How to arrive at such an ecumenical book, was a question implicitly and explicitly stated by editorial board members and others involved in the editorial process.

In addition, it deserves mention that a number of scholars have published on the notion of ecumenism in relation to liturgy. However, their contributions focus mainly on aspects such as the order of worship and the service book (Uytenbogaardt 2007), the Eucharist (Ploeger 2008) or the lectionary (Bradshaw 2013). The connection between ecumenism and hymnal has not been widely written about. An exception is the comment of liturgical scholar Paul Bradshaw that 'the widespread use (…) of the same core repertoire of worship songs across denominational boundaries has produced its own sense of shared identity between individual congregations' (Bradshaw 2013, 7). In this he, not entirely without regret, seems to refer to contemporary (evangelical) worship music.

In relating the notion of ecumenical liturgy to the hymnal used, we thus offer a perspective that has not yet received much attention. Since a hymnal is not only relevant because of the hymns involved, but also as a symbol, which we stated in the previous section, this contribution matters as much to scholars in Liturgical Studies as it does to those in ecumenical theology. Besides, the chapter on ecumenism also matters to the board members and other practitioners in the liturgical field, since it unambiguously makes clear that a desire for ecumenism should not be interpreted as a desire for uniformity. Similar to how we approached the notion of hymnal, we state that the notion of ecumenism is not univocally and once and for all clear. This relates to our discursive approach, to which we will return once all of our five central concepts have been introduced.

History

The third notion that will be elaborated on in this thesis is that of history. As an object of study, much attention has been paid to the notion of history in Liturgical Studies over the past decades. Indeed, '[a]s a result of the great advances that have been made in liturgical scholarship in the last few decades, we now know much less about early eucharistic worship than we once thought that we did' (Bradshaw 1999, 1). In that quote, 'Eucharistic' could easily be deleted and it still would be true. We know much less than we once thought we did. We now know we should better speak of histories instead of history, continually asking ourselves why we appeal to which part of history anyway (Barnard 2004), what kind of history we are constructing (Stringer 2005) or whose history we are telling (Berger 2011).

History within Liturgical Studies is thus commonly regarded as a partial story of the past, told for a specific purpose. However, this seems to be valid only for a past that has really passed, for example the late fourth century that once was considered as 'the 'golden age' of liturgical evolution' (Bradshaw 2013, 1). When the distance to a period decreases, the number of stories of that particular part of the past also seem to diminish. In the Netherlands, this, for example, applies to the story of liturgical movement(s) in the twentieth century. This story appears to be solid and solidified. A possible explanation of course relates to the distance in time which is too small at present:

> It is high time that a critical balance be drawn up for the Liturgical Movement (…), but at the same time most of the practitioners of liturgical studies are allied with the Liturgical Movement, or were at least trained when the Liturgical Movement was at its prime, and are thus shaped by it. (Barnard and Post 2010, 469)

When pondering the process central to our study – the *Liedboek* editorial process – the relevance of the topic of history immediately becomes evident. This hymn-book is, both by the editors and by the *ISK*, positioned as a new hymnal, a successor to the 1973 hymnbook

– which by the way is commonly considered as ‘the result of a unique creative impulse’ (Lukken 2005, 459), so the task to succeed it will not be an easy one. This implies that some sense of history, or rather: some account(s) of history, is present in the editorial process. In our contribution we try to bring that account into debate with the current attempts in Liturgical Studies to draw up a critical balance for twentieth century liturgical history. The main contribution of this approach both to modern Liturgical Studies and to the practitioners in the (editorial) field, will be the far-reaching conclusion that a single and linear (progressive) model of history does not apply to recent past (twentieth century), just as it does not apply to earlier past (fourth century) either. Linearity is a model imposed on a story, instead of a characteristic of history.

Identity

Our decision to add ‘identity’ to the list of topics this thesis elaborates on, is related to a larger debate concerning liturgy, more in particular the songs and music in liturgy. Increasingly, the question as to what the role and character of music/singing in liturgy could or should be, has opposed (groups of) people to each other. In recent years, a number of authors have begun to discuss this phenomenon. Some refer to this opposition as a (worship) war. They suggest that the opposition runs between ‘traditional’ and ‘contemporary’ forms of worship (Dawn 1995, 4). Or they use stronger and more vivid images and oppose ‘veterans of the fort’, people defending worship the way they know it, to ‘veterans of the front’, people who had been ‘taking the central biblical message to the street’ and then ‘came back indoors, eventually, changed by what they had discovered outdoors’ (York 2003, 13). Indeed, whether they promote the opposition, try to solve it, or express their aversion, a majority of the contributors to this debate understand it as particular for these post-modern times with their focus on the believer who does the singing and their personal taste (Kruger 2007, 17). The overarching question seems to be if and to what degree the music in church should sound the same as outside the church: should the church ‘keep up with the times’ or not?

In response, it is argued that this war is not unique at all. Scholars point to issues with respect to singing and church music in other eras and state that the current wars are rather ‘the same old issues in modern dress’ (Westerfield Tucker 2009, 8). Other responses are also conceivable. The presuppositions behind the description of the worship wars have been attacked, for example by Dutch church musician Frits Mehrtens. Even before the notion of worship wars was coined, he stated that ‘a separation of music in a worldly and a spiritual genre is incorrect since it is in-human’ (Mehrtens 1960, 74). This separation, although the worship wars are not her main address, is also denied by Dutch scholar Mirella Klomp who states that ‘[i]t is obvious that sound is culturally influenced’ (Klomp 2011). To be sure: sound here also covers what others call church music.

Still, the worship wars are of interest to us as the backgrounds to our elaboration on the notion of identity. The parties opposing each other are not only classified as traditional versus contemporary/modern. Distinction is also made along the lines of profession: clergy versus laity. U.S. theologian Robert Webber, who has some following in the Netherlands for his notion of 'blended worship', boldly states:

> The Reformers knew it was wrong to take worship out of the hands of the congregation, so they sought to return worship to the pew. Unfortunately, Protestantism is now in the same situation that Roman Catholicism was in five centuries ago; it, too, has become clericalized and finds it worship services mired in passivity. (Webber 1998, 23)

We should keep in mind that the situation in the Netherlands differs from that in the United States in one relevant aspect: whereas in the United States the Liturgical Movement and the Praise and Worship movement are contemporaries, in the Netherlands the latter is more recent while the former is of older age (Barnard 2006, 70). This quote of Webber's, however, in equating 'clericalized' to 'passivity' and opposing it to 'congregation', echoes the distinction as it is, albeit controversially, made in the Netherlands: the educated theologians/church musicians versus the ordinary members of the congregation (Van Andel 2011); the elite versus the people. This distinction played a central role in the *Liedboek* editorial process, since it was continually put on the agenda both by people commenting on the editorial process (such as supervisors, ecclesial synod members) and by the editors themselves. Which side are the editors on? They continuously had to define and defend themselves.

The debate sketched in the preceding paragraphs functions as the background for our thoughts on identity, which – not coincidentally – focus on *professional* identity. The value of our contribution is that it does not take for granted any of the dichotomies as introduced above. This is caused, again, by our discursive approach. Before elaborating on that approach we will, however, first introduce our fifth and final central notion.

Gender

This notion is the last one to be added to our list of central notions in the editorial process. This was not due to it being less evidently present in the process – on the contrary! – but rather by a troubled understanding of it that only came to be replaced during the research trajectory by a more fruitful understanding. In the chapter on gender we extensively dwell on the history, the importance and the controversy of the notion of gender in relation to liturgy and hymnals in the Netherlands. At this point we will therefore limit ourselves to two other matters: the importance of the topic of gender in Liturgical Studies and our own growing appropriation of the theme which finally led to its inclusion in this thesis.

To begin with the latter. In May 2009 two female working group members organized a meeting for all of the women in the editorial board and the working groups. They wanted to share their experiences and find out whether there were ways they could encourage or support each other. Being a female researcher, I was invited as well. I did not attend for various reasons. One was that I, as a researcher who attended every meeting, already knew the several women, whereas they did not know each other. I was less eager. Moreover, I did not see that their being a woman was what mattered. Naturally, I was familiar with a feminist approach to liturgy and to hymns in particular, and I underscore the relevance of inclusive language in the new hymnal. But, these were my thoughts, this could also be aspired to by men, so why organize a meeting for women only? In the course of time, however, it became clear to me that the (female) body does indeed matter in meetings. I was pregnant with my first child and when this became all the more visible, I began to notice that this affected how editorial board members, both male and female, approached me. I was no longer just a researcher – if that had ever been possible – but a pregnant researcher. Indeed, when one is 'pregnant, privileged and PhDing', these characteristics interfere. More generally speaking, 'the researcher's body is never in exteriority to the ways in which social research is carried out' (Kannen 2013, 178).

This observation made me reconsider the role of women in the meetings. Perhaps their need of getting together in a female-only rendezvous was not suggested by the topics the meetings usually are about, but by their bodily presence in it. Most working groups and the editorial board had only one or two female members, with at least about three or four times as many male members. What if the notion of gender is not so much to be found in the hymns they discuss, but in the value that is ascribed to arguments uttered by a female body? What if this not only applies to the question of whether a hymn should be in the hymnal or not, but also to the establishing of definitions, even that of gender itself? Why should we repeat the statement that gender simply and solely refers to the inclusive language of the hymns? We decided, in line with our discursive approach, to let go of that narrow definition and to look for how, when and by whom gender was constructed in the editorial board meetings.

In this, we were encouraged by the words of Roman Catholic scholar Teresa Berger. She is one of the key writers on the intersection of gender and liturgy. She makes a quite substantive and important claim in the opening chapter of her latest book on his topic:

> Liturgical historiography in the past, for all its skills and insights, was largely oblivious to gender as a fundamental marker of cultural formations and thus presented seemingly non-gendered liturgical facts. The reasons for the *continuing* occlusion of gender in liturgical historiography (…) are connected to the development of liturgical studies as a discipline, its scholarly practitioners, their construal of their subject-matter, and the conversation partners they privilege. (Berger 2011, 7. Italics hers)

We wish to elaborate on the fourth reason Berger mentions: the conversation partners chosen by scholars in Liturgical Studies. Berger states that although '[o]verall, liturgical studies in the past decades has moved to the social sciences as a new conversation partner', the category of gender remains mostly invisible in liturgical historiography (Berger 2011, 16). Probably a discursive approach stimulated by the current state of the art of gender studies – that indeed takes gender to be discursively constructed, which our sixth chapter will make explicitly clear – is the conversation partner Berger is looking for. Such an approach makes gender visible in liturgy and its historiography, not only as a topic but also as an instrument of power.

Gender is the fifth and final topic to which a chapter is devoted. The chapter on gender can, as a matter of fact, be considered a key chapter. Not only because it was the chapter that raised the most difficulties when writing it, as that chapter shows. Not only because it is the topic that appears to be most controversial over and again when presenting this study. It is a key chapter mainly since it was precisely the writing of this article that made us aware of the focus on power that had been present throughout our entire study. We will return to that briefly in explaining our approach, just below, and more extensively in the final chapter of this thesis.

Discursive approach

In accordance with what was already pointed out above under the heading of 'empirical research', the approach taken in this study was stimulated by the findings of our empirical study. When this project started, we expected the *Liedboek* editorial process to be like a marketplace: a meeting place for people to display their merchandise, in this case their opinions on hymns, hymnals and liturgy (cf. Van Andel and Barnard 2009). During the first year of observation, however, we noticed that people started changing or at least refining their opinions. Moreover, we noticed that these changes and refinements sounded as echoes of what was discussed or had happened in earlier meetings. This observation finally resulted in our decision to focus on what was constructed in and by the meetings, instead of a preoccupation with what we thought would be reflected in the meetings.

The concept that accompanied this shift of focus was the concept of 'discourse'. The concept turned out to extremely well suit our new purposes of studying the board meetings and at the same time it helped to sharpen our focus. It offered many advantages. It did, however, present one major disadvantage: it had become popular over the past few decades. Consequently, many definitions of 'discourse' can be found, some very precisely defined, others used rather loosely. Many ways of studying it can be found as well, all captured under the umbrella notion of 'discourse analysis'. Their relationship is best described by the metaphor of a family (Van den Berg 2004, 29). Like in every family, relationships between the several approaches are not always without troubles, envy or rejection. Indeed, the use of the notion is abundant and not always unproblematic. It sometimes even appears to be a wonder drug for each pain and problem, which has led to debate about the question whether discourse scholars have not pushed the boundaries of their beloved notion, allowing it to colonialize too much of the social world (Alvesson and Kärreman 2011; Iedema 2011). As the case may be, the multitude of definitions given to discourse and methods for studying it, can be argued to be inherent to the notion itself: 'it is inconsistent to search for a "correct" definition of discourse because the whole idea of discourse is that definitions play an important part in delineating knowledge. Hence, they require scrutiny, not replication' (Bacchi 2005, 198-9). Instead of presenting a precooked definition of discourse at this time, we therefore choose to sum up the advantages we encountered when using this notion, and thus present an overview of what we want the notion to accomplish. In our final and concluding chapter we will once more return to this topic.

In the following paragraphs we will highlight four advantages. The first considers the perspective on language that is allowed by taking discourse as a central notion. Instead of assuming that language is primarily expressive or referential, discourse analysis 'redefines these functions of language as ways by which representations of reality are constructed' (Van den Berg 2004, 30). Language is not expected simply to reflect or express something that exists 'out there', be it in speakers' minds or in reality. Use of language is considered as social practice. In our particular study the notion of discourse thus shifts our attention from what is intended to be expressed through the meetings to what the meetings themselves construct.

The second, related, advantage concerns the definition of language. Language, when considered from a discourse point of view, is much broader than spoken or written words. Although 'the commonsense uses of the term discourse' limit it to the linguistic domain, this limitation 'does not make sense' (Iedema 2011, 1166). French philosopher Michel Foucault, one of the first to systematically develop this notion in the way it is now used, wished to 'include partial sentences and even graphs and illustrations', which could of course be extended with 'actions, images and environment' (Stringer 2005, 11). The rationale behind this is that 'language does not simply manifest *as* language' (Iedema 2011, 1167. Italics his). Discourse analysis, different from other approaches to language, does not relegate issues such as gestures, pitch and dress to the area of context. Indeed, all the while during our research project, one of our ideas has been to write about dress. Unfortunately, time to do so lacked, as did, more importantly, our knowledge of Dutch male dress codes. The very idea to do so, and our sensitivity to the editorial board members' 'uniforms', however, was made possible by the notion of discourse.

The third way our research gained from using the notion of discourse is the interaction this presupposes between one particular text (with language taken in its broadest sense, just like we have argued above) and the larger social practice. Researcher's tools such as 'interpretative repertoire', 'frame' and 'schematic template' each suggest that people have cultural resources at their disposal which they can use, whenever in the according circumstances, to speak, act, behave, connect and so on. At the same time these resources are subject to change because of such speaking, acting, behaving, connecting, et cetera. An analysis of discourse thus does not provide a relentless necessity, neither does it ascribe to the view of a tabula rasa. Instead, it is about 'collective resources and idiosyncratic remakes' (Welschen 2012, 37). For our particular study this suggests that, although we have limited ourselves to a small project by a small group, the findings may be valid for other groups as well. That is, since the resources that the editors employ are collective, these may also shape and be shaped by discourse in other instances. We will return to this question of validity in our final chapter.

We now come to the fourth and final advantage we encountered when deciding to use the concept of discourse in our study. It is notably inextricably connected to the notion of power (Bacchi 2005; Stringer 2005). A more extended review of this notion can be found in our closing chapter. For now it will suffice to say that discourse analysis has a critical potential (Van den Berg 2004). The notion of discourse namely opens up the questioning of self-evidences, which are considered as discursively constructed and thus as contingent instead of necessary. Moreover, when considering discourse as setting boundaries that could be transgressed, albeit very difficultly, a discursive approach allows for the realization of the not-yet-thinkable (Iedema 2011). This matters to our research area since, as we will argue later on, the topic of hymnals in the Netherlands always touches on the question of power, force and inequality.

These four advantages together encouraged us in the use of a discursive approach. This indeed should be considered as an approach more than as a method. Their work being part of discourse analytical history by now, social psychologists Jonathan Potter and Margaret Wetherell are still accurate when stating 'that there is no *method* to discourse analysis in the way we traditionally think of an experimental method or content analysis method. What we have is a broad theoretical framework concerning the nature of discourse and its role in social life' (Potter and Wetherell 1987, 175). Parts of this framework, formulated as advantages, were pointed out in the previous paragraphs. As a matter of fact we prefer to speak of a discursive approach. Although this thesis can be included in the large family of discourse analyses, we do not prefer it to be called that, in order to avoid any recollections of the laboratory, of checklists and of standard procedures. We wish to stress that a discursive approach is an outlook, a perspective from which to approach an object of study.

Yet, this absence of method does not imply that anything goes. In the five chapters to follow we deliberately joined several existing procedures of studying discourse, sometimes altered and adapted for our purposes in that particular chapter. We have two main reasons for choosing another procedure each time. The first is that the contributions were each written in distinct phases of research. Our choice therefore was made on the basis of data we had constructed up to then, in combination with the particular topic. The contribution on ecumenism, for example, was written in the very beginnings of our empirical research, at a time when no transcripts had yet been made. Still, it is discursive in its approach since it shows how the notion of ecumenism, which for example in board meetings is presented as massive and unambiguously clear, shifted meaning over the past decades. This shift, although it is not made explicit, is echoed in the official documents surrounding the *Liedboek* editorial process. The second reason for picking another style of approach each time is that this thesis is to be considered as (only) the first steps in investigating what a discursive approach can bring to Liturgical Studies. It is therefore experimental in its design, examining several possible procedures. It deliberately does not repeat the same trick five times in a row. We believe that the chapter on gender, which as we have already claimed is to be considered as a key chapter, has best succeeded in showing the possible benefits of a discursive approach to Liturgical Studies. All of the four advantages mentioned previously are present in that article. It stresses the connection to power; it shows the pervasiveness of the collective resources in other debates than the editorial board; it elaborates on more than language – it does not only look for songs or talk about women, but also to talk/behavior to women/female bodies – and it shows how gender is constructed rather than merely reflected in the editorial board meetings. Moreover, it helps to better understand the notion that indeed had become quite troublesome or neglected in Liturgical Studies and thus it shows how a discursive approach can be a reliable conversation partner to Liturgical Studies.

The coherence between the several chapters can best be explained by bringing one aspect of a discursive approach we already indicated to the fore once again: the interrelations between a specific instance of text (in a broad sense, again) and its broader social practice, introduced as collective resources. Because of these interrelations, discourses can be imagined as networks. We will further specify this in our final chapter. This image delivers a first indication of the coherence of the five following chapters. Each of the chapters is a node. By elaborating on them and presenting them in a sequence, networks become visible, or rather, as we will argue in our final chapter, they are created. This thesis thus creates networks of meaning in the *Liedboek* editorial process by asking what the nodes are (central notions), what meaning is given to these nodes and where these meanings possibly stem from. Although each central notion is approached differently, within the large family of discourse analysis these approaches belong to the same household. They namely each focus on the same level of discourse: the level of the construction of meaning in small-group interaction in relation to larger surrounding networks of meaning. One final caveat before we move on to the localization of this thesis: we do not intend to offer an all-knowing point of view, making earlier or other analyses redundant. This thesis is itself part of the liturgical field which is inhabited by so many people working in so many contexts with so many different (analytical) tools. In the end, this thesis is made possible by the very liturgical landscape it maps out, in our final chapter understood as a *discursive field*.

LOCALIZATION OF THIS STUDY

In the previous sections we have indicated the position of this study in the field of Liturgical Studies, the debates the five successive central notions are engaged with, as well as our orientation in the large field of discourse analysis. In this section we will briefly sketch a broad framework which has caused us to study this topic by this approach. The reasons for starting and carrying out this study were multiple and can be indicated at several levels. Firstly, the study fits in with the recent interests within the field of Liturgical Studies for music and its particular and independent contribution to liturgy and ritual, which we have already pointed out in the beginning of this chapter.

Secondly, this thesis joins a specific debate concerning the role of power in liturgy and ritual. Returning briefly to the issue of worship wars: apart from studying music/sound in its own right, recent publications are also occupied with a detected tension between advocates of several genres of (church) music and the question of what this should mean for liturgy and worship (Webber 1998; York 2003). Music then is usually introduced as an area that reflects changes in church and society. Other authors argue the other way around and look for the changes in church and society (pop) music effects (Gordon 2010; Marsh and Roberts 2012). As it may be, this group of publications points to the issue that music in liturgy is always related to matters of power. It raises questions such as: Who decides what can be sung anyway?; What effect does the music have on liturgy and its participants? This underlying focus on power has been an important stimulus to taking a discursive approach in this study, since power and discourse are inextricably connected. This we will argue extensively in our concluding chapter, although we will show that this understanding of power differs somewhat from the understanding of power that comes with the use of a discursive approach.

The third cluster of backgrounds to this study is related to the two clusters mentioned above. It is a widely held view (Bosch 1996; a romanticized version in 't Hart 2006) that the reception of new hymnals in the Netherlands has always been unexpected and wayward. There is, by the way, no reason to believe this is a circumstance particular to the Netherlands (cf. Kruger 2007). A (constructed) dichotomy between those making the decisions and those who use the hymnal, is a cause for mistrust and distress, culminating in the question 'why did they take away our favored hymns?' (Van Andel and Barnard 2009). For the present research this focus can be traced in our quest for *kinds of* discourses. We are not so much interested in stating that some meanings prevail in evangelical discourse, whereas others belong to confessional discourse, for example. Such notions, to our opinion, do not exist outside of discourse. Instead, we look for the sources of discourse, which will be explained into more detail in our final chapter.

Aim and Outline of the Thesis

By now this chapter will have demonstrated that this thesis should not be read as the unveiling of the origination of the *Liedboek.* Neither is it intended as a manual for ministers, church musicians and members of the congregation who use the *Liedboek* in their liturgical practice. The audience the contributions in this thesis primarily aim at consists of scholars in Liturgical Studies, as well as theologians and scholars in social sciences who favor a discursive approach. The contributions were therefore submitted separately to academic peer reviewed journals and some of the chapters have indeed already been published as an article. This is evident, among other, from our way of referencing. In this thesis we have decided to use reference system particular to the journal the article in question is published in or submitted to. Because each journal either has its own standard or a slightly adapted version of an existing international reference standard, this thesis is in itself an overview of the current, highly diverse, state of scholarship.

Within the field of Liturgical Studies in the Netherlands, indeed within the larger field of theology, it is a relative novelty to compile a thesis in the manner the present thesis does[4]. It reflects the changes that are currently going on in Liturgical Studies as well as in humanities. As a matter of fact, it might stimulate them as well. The two important and

[4] By now, two other theses consisting of articles have been written (and defended) at the Protestant Theological University. These are: 'Moving and Mixing: The Fluid Liturgical Lives of Antiochian Orthodox and Maronite Women Within the Protestant Churches in Lebanon' by Rima Nasrallah and 'Youth Worship in Protestant Contexts: A Practical Theological Theory of Participation of Adolescents' by Ronelle Sonnenberg.

mutually related changes we wish to highlight are: the border traffic with other disciplines and the design of research groups. To begin with the latter: research is increasingly being conducted by groups consisting of PhD students and professors. Together they examine one topic or one area of interest, or they take the same approach to similar fields of interest. Generating knowledge thus becomes teamwork and authoring is not the same as writing. That is why all of the articles in this contribution are products of co-authorship. To be honest, in several instances even more authors could have been listed. Since the exact combination of scholars working together varies according to the topic or approach, a division of a (PhD) study into separate articles seems a clear and effective way of commissioning everyone's expertise in the right places.

These articles were each submitted to academic journals in order to reach the peers who would be the most interested in the specific subject. Liturgical Studies being increasingly interdisciplinary, these peers do not necessarily have to be scholars in Liturgical Studies. In our opinion publication of articles is an excellent way of reaching scholars one might otherwise not reach, and thus of engaging in relevant debate. This thesis can, in consequence, be considered as a recapitulation of debate the authors have already held, instead of marking the entrance of a new (group of) scholar(s).

The contributions hereinafter together constitute an answer to the main question. Chapters 2-6 each present one notion central to the *Liedboek*'s editorial process, giving an account of the discourses involved in constructing that notion. The final chapter provides a general summary and discussion.

Chapter 2 begins by introducing *Liedboek*, both as a hymnal and as a topic of research. It then goes on to show that one of the notions central to the editorial board meetings is the notion of hymnal itself. Three discourses, introduced as metaphorical fields characterized by their opposing borders, provide a meaning to this concept as well as a set of criteria for the hymns that could be incorporated.

In **Chapter 3**, then, we will introduce the historical context of the *Liedboek.* Ecclesiological developments in Dutch Protestantism since World War II will be related to the composition and publication of both the 1973 and the 2013 hymnbook. This contribution argues that during this period, the meaning of the concept of ecumenism has shifted.

Chapter 4, on history, engages in a critical dialogue with the previous chapter, since it stresses that historical contexts are to be considered as histories, i.e. stories of the past. This chapter shows the several ways in which the *Liedboek* is connected to its 1973 predecessor. It resorts to the concept of collective remembering in order to highlight the various histories that are constructed in the board meetings. It also sheds a new light on the historiography of Liturgical Studies itself.

After these three chapters concerning the hymnal, the two following chapters will deal largely with the editors themselves. **Chapter 5** seeks to examine the editors' identities. In line with the overall research approach, it treats identity as discursively constructed. Out of the many possible aspects, this chapter limits itself to professional identity, i.e. the aspects of identity that concern the relationship between the editors and the users of the book, as it is established in the editors' interaction.

Chapter 6, finally, will emphasize another aspect of identity, namely that of gender. The chapter argues that adherence to an outdated definition of gender has caused the editorial board of the hymnal to overlook instances where gender was constructed in their interaction. Considering gender as related to power, which involves the power of definition – even the definition of gender itself – offers a stimulus to address the unease concerning this topic as we observed in the meetings. Moreover, it offers a stimulus to bring the debate in Liturgical Studies up to date with developments in gender studies.

Since each chapter enters into a different debate, this has made for a diversity of sources. We will therefore provide a bibliography for each chapter. That will help the reader to assess which perspective we have taken within each of the distinct disciplines.

BIBLIOGRAPHY TO CHAPTER 1

Alvesson, Mats and Dan Kärreman (2011). ‘Decolonializing discourse: Critical reflections on organizational discourse analysis’, in *Human relations* 64, pp. 1121-1146.

Bacchi, Carol (2005). ‘Discourse, Discourse Everywhere: Subject “Agency” in Feminist Discourse Methodology’, in *NORA: Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research* 13, pp.198-209.

Barnard, Marcel (2004). ‘*Liturgia semper reformanda quia ecclesia reformata:* Het gebruik van tradities in recente protestantse liturgiehervormingen’, in *Jaarboek voor Liturgie-onderzoek* 20, pp. 59-72.

– (2006). *Liturgie voorbij de Liturgische Beweging: Over ‘Praise and Worship’, Thomasvieringen, kerkdiensten in migrantenkerken en ritualiteit op het internet.* Zoetermeer: Meinema.

Barnard, Marcel, Johan Cilliers and Cas Wepener (2014). *Worship in the Network Culture: Liturgical Ritual Studies. Fields and Methods, Concepts and Metaphors*. Leuven etc.: Peeters.

Barnard, Marcel and Paul Post (Eds.) (2001). *Ritueel bestek: antropologische kernwoorden van de liturgie.* Zoetermeer: Meinema.

Barnard, Marcel and Paul Post (2010). ‘Balance and Perspective: Some Critical Observations Regarding the Historiography of the Era of the Liturgical Movement in the Netherlands’, in Louis van Tongeren, Marcel Barnard, Paul Post and Gerard Rouwhorst (Eds.) *Patterns and Persons: A Historiography of Liturgical Studies in the Netherlands in the Twentieth Century.* Leuven etc.: Peeters, pp. 469-485.

Barnard, Marcel and Niek Schuman (Eds.) (2002). *Nieuwe wegen in de liturgie: de weg van de liturgie, een vervolg.* Zoetermeer: Meinema.

Berger, Teresa (2011). *Gender Differences and the Making of Liturgical History: Lifting a Veil on Liturgy’s Past.* Farnham: Ashgate.

Bosch, Roel A. (1996). *En nooit meer oude Psalmen zingen: Zingend geloven in een nieuwe tijd 1760-1810.* Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum.

Bradshaw, Paul F. (1999). ‘Continuity and Change in Early Eucharistic Practice: Shifting Scholarly Perspectives’, in Robert N. Swanson (Ed.) *Continuity and Change in Christian Worship: Papers Read at the 1997 Summer Meeting and the 1998 Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society.* Oxford: Boydell & Brewer, pp. 1-17.

– (2013). *Liturgical Reform and the Unity of Christian Churches.* Keynote lecture at the Societas Liturgica Congress, Würzburg.

Dawn, Marva J. (1995). *Reaching Out without Dumbing Down: A Theology of Worship for This Urgent Time.* Grand Rapids (MI): Eerdmans.

Gordon, T. David (2010). *Why Johnny Can't Sing Hymns: How Pop Culture Rewrote the Hymnal.* Phillipsburg (NJ): P&R Publishing.

't Hart, Maarten (2006). *Het Psalmenoproer.* Utrecht: De Arbeiderspers.

Hoondert, Martin J.M. (2006). *Om de parochie: ritueel-muzikale bewegingen in de marge van de parochie: gregoriaans, Taizé, jongerenkoren*. Heeswijk: Abdij van Berne. (PhD Thesis Tilburg University)

Iedema, Rick (2011). 'Discourse studies in the 21st century: A response to Mats Alvesson and Dan Kärreman's 'Decolonializing discourse', in *Human relations* 64, pp. 1163-1176.

Kannen, Victoria (2013). 'Pregnant, privileged and PhDing: Exploring embodiments in qualitative research', in *Journal of Gender Studies* 22:2, pp. 178-191.

Klomp, Mirella (2011). *The sound of worship: liturgical performance by Surinamese Lutherans and Ghanaian Methodists in Amsterdam*. Leuven/Walpole (MA): Peeters. (PhD Thesis Protestant Theological University)

Kruger, Daleen (2007). '*A high degree of understanding and tolerance:* Veranderende denke oor die hedendaagse kerkmusiek', in *Vir die Musiekleier* 34, pp. 17-25.

Lukken, Gerard (2005). *Rituals in Abundance: Critical Reflections on the Place, Form and Identity of Christian Ritual in our Culture.* Leuven etc.: Peeters.

Marsh, Clive and Vaughan S. Roberts (2012). *Personal Jesus: How Popular Music Shapes our Souls*. Grand Rapids (MI): Baker Academic.

Mason, Jennifer (2002^2). *Qualitative Researching.* London etc.: Sage.

McGann, Mary E. (2002). *Exploring Music as Worship and Theology: Research in Liturgical Practice.* Collegeville (MN): The Liturgical Press.

Mehrtens, Frits (1960). *Kerk & Muziek.* 's-Gravenhage: Boekencentrum.

Ploeger, Mattijs (2008). *Celebrating Church: Ecumenical Contributions to a Liturgical Ecclesiology.* Groningen: Instituut voor Liturgiewetenschap. (PhD Thesis Utrecht University)

Post, Pieter (2010). *Geschiedenis van het doopsgezinde kerklied (1793-1973): Van particularisme naar oecumeniciteit.* Hilversum: Verloren. (PhD Thesis VU University)

Potter, Jonathan and Margaret Wetherell (1987). *Discourse and Social Psycology: Beyond Attitudes and Behaviour.* London etc.: Sage.

Smelik, Jan (2013). *Het nieuwe Liedboek in woord en beeld.* Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum.

Stringer, Martin D. (2005). *A Sociological History of Christian Worship.* Cambridge: University Press.

Uytenbogaardt, Hans (2007). 'Eredienst en katholiciteit: Dienstboek – een proeve: een uitdaging tot katholiciteit', in Hans Kronenburg en René de Reuver (Eds.) *Wij zijn ook katholiek: Over protestantse katholiciteit.* Heerenveen: Protestantse Pers, pp. 81-97.

Van Andel, Nienke (2011). ‘‘Zitten de echte deskundigen niet zondags in de kerkbank?’: Over de samenstelling van het nieuwe Liedboek’, in *Theologisch Debat* 8:4, pp. 33-39.

Van Andel, Nienke and Marcel Barnard (2009). ‘Discourses in Liturgy: De totstandkoming van het nieuwe protestantse liedboek (2012) vergeleken met de totstandkoming van het *Liedboek voor de Kerken* (1973) – een onderzoekspresentatie’, in *Jaarboek voor Liturgie-onderzoek* 25, pp. 55-70.

Van den Berg, Harry (2004). ‘Discoursanalyse’, in *KWALON* 26, pp. 29-40.

Van der Knijff, Jaco (2014). ‘Lutherse liederen voor gereformeerde gelovigen: Beschrijving en poging tot duiding van een onopgemerkt gebleven Nederlands liedboekje uit 1566’, in *Jaarboek voor Liturgie-onderzoek* 30, pp. 105-136.

Van Tongeren, Louis (2009). ‘Liturgische verscheidenheid en uitwaaierend religieus ritueel’, in Louis van Tongeren (Ed.). *Liturgie op maat: vieren in het spanningsveld van eenheid en veelkleurigheid*. Heeswijk: Abdij van Berne, pp. 7-17.

Van de Woestijne, Christiaan (2014). ‘Liedboek – Zingen en bidden in huis en kerk: Ein Porträt des neuen niederländischen Gesangbuchs’, in *Jahrbuch für Liturgik und Hymnologie* 53, pp. 159-167.

Versnel-Mergaerts, Petra and Louis van Tongeren (Eds.) (2011). *Heilig, heilig, heilig: over sacraliteit in kerk en cultuur*. Heeswijk: Abdij van Berne.

Vernooij, Anton (Ed.) (2000). *Liturgie en muzische taal: Het gezongen eucharistisch gebed*. Kampen: Gooi en Sticht.

Webber, Robert E. (1998). *Planning Blended Worship: The Creative Mixture of Old and New*. Nashville (TN): Abingdon Press.

Welschen, Saskia I. (2012). *The country we are supposed to be: ‘Born free’ South Africans talk about their nation.* Amsterdam: VU University. (PhD Thesis)

Westerfield Tucker, Karen (2009). ‘Music Wars: A New Conflict?’, in *Liturgy* 24:4, pp. 3-9.

York, Terry W. (2003). *America’s Worship Wars*. Peabody (MA): Hendrickson Publishers.

CHAPTER 2

HYMNAL

A slightly different version of this chapter is published as:
Nienke van Andel, Martin J.M. Hoondert and Marcel Barnard (2014), 'Images of a Hymnal: Criteria for selecting songs derived from constructed meaning of a hymnal',
in *Jahrbuch für Liturgik und Hymnologie* 53, pp. 143-158.
An earlier version of this chapter was presented by the first author at the *Internationale Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Hymnologie* Conference in Amsterdam, August 2013.

INTRODUCTION

The focus when composing, evaluating or studying a hymnbook, usually lies on the hymns it contains and/or the criteria used for their incorporation.[1] In this article we will add another point of view to the study of hymnals, seeking to show that the desired end result of the editorial work contributes to the evaluation of a particular song. We will argue that images of the hymnal as they were evoked in the meetings of its editorial board when discussing a song, became a criterion for incorporation, summarized in the question of whether the song met the desired meaning of the hymnal. The editorial process referred to concerns the Dutch *Liedboek* (2013), which we will now proceed to introduce.

A NEW DUTCH PROTESTANT HYMNAL

On 25 May 2013, Monnickendam, a small picturesque town near Dutch capital Amsterdam, hosted a special event. Representatives of eight Dutch and Flemish protestant churches[2] were presented with a new hymnbook entitled *Liedboek, zingen en bidden in huis en kerk*. This book is intended to be the successor of the 1973 interdenominational hymnbook which has been the most commonly used Dutch Protestant hymnal over the past decades.

Like its predecessor, the new Dutch hymnal was not compiled by the churches, but by a separate foundation which presented it to the churches involved. This foundation, *ISK*, was commissioned by four churches in 2007 to compile a new hymnal. During the process, four other churches joined the project over time.[3] In order to fulfill its task, *ISK* installed an editorial board and eight editorial working groups in 2008, altogether some seventy people. The members were selected on the basis of their theological, liturgical, church musical or linguistic knowledge.[4] Although nearly all of them belong to one of the participating churches, they were not chosen as representatives of their particular church or congregation. After some four years the main editorial board was able to present the draft

---

[1] e.g. Tönsing, Gertrud: "There Must be Mouse Dirt with the Pepper". A Lutheran Approach to Choosing Songs. In: Dialog. A Journal of Theology 48 (2009), 320-328.

[2] The Protestant Church in the Netherlands, the Mennonite Society, the Remonstrant Brotherhood, the Dutch Protestants Union, the Dutch Reformed Churches and the Reformed Churches (Liberated) are six of the largest Protestant denominations in the Netherlands, together representing some 2400 local congregations with over 2.2 million believers (about 13% of the total Dutch population). The United Protestant Church of Belgium covers about 100 congregations and the Evangelical-Lutheran Church of Belgium consists of 2 city churches.

[3] The four churches mentioned first in footnote 2 participated from the beginning. The Dutch Reformed Churches and Reformed Churches (Liberated) joined in 2009. The United Protestant Church of Belgium became a participant in 2010 and the Evangelical-Lutheran Church of Belgium joined in 2011.

[4] Cf. Van Andel, Nienke/Hoondert, Martin J.M./Barnard, Marcel: We is Plural. Identity Construction in Hymn Book Editorial Meetings. In: Journal of Empirical Theology 27 (2014), 214-238.

of the new hymnbook to *ISK*. Then, in 2013, the book was published and presented to the churches which had commissioned it.

Brief Characterization

The hymnbook can be briefly characterized by three more or less related aspects: its sources, its index and the (musical) forms it contains. Firstly, the hymnal does not only contain newly written material. Quite the contrary, out of the over 1400 items, only a few have never been published before in one way or another. This book brings together existing material, sometimes slightly altered, from several sources. Among these sources are very well-known and much used Dutch hymnbooks, such as the 1973 predecessor. Other sources that were used are hymnals from abroad such as *Den Svenska Psalmboken* (1986), *Church Hymnary 4* (Church of Scotland, 2005) and American *Evangelical Lutheran Worship* (2006). Secondly, the contents of the book have been ordered using 'time' as the guiding concept. This relates to worldly time (day, seasons) as well as to church time (feasts and Sunday) and to personal time (graduation, marriage, illness). In structuring the hymnbook in this manner, the editorial board tried to design a hymnal that could be used both in the celebration of public worship and in personal devotion. Hence the subtitle which mentions both *at home and in church*. Thirdly, an adequate description of the hymnal requires a mention of its diverse contents. It does not only contain approximately 1280 hymns,[5] but 130 texts (prayers, poems, thoughts) meant for personal or small-group use as well. Judged by their forms, the songs included show great diversity. Short antiphons, the complete Genevan Psalter, four-part editions of internationally known hymns, songs requiring a role division between cantor/choir and all, and lively canons stand side by side.

The Editorial Process as a Topic of Research

In 2008, the first author of this contribution started (PhD) research concerning the editorial process of the hymnal *Liedboek.*[6] As a researcher, she attended almost every meeting of the editorial board, as well as large part of the meetings of the working groups. The main editorial board, consisting of sixteen people, was assisted by eight editorial working groups. The working groups each provided the board with a selection of material from the area they were responsible for, such as psalms, hymns from abroad and children's songs. The editorial

[5] Throughout the text we will use the words 'hymn' and 'song' alternately, both of them as a reference to a combination of lyrics and tune. Although from a hymnological point of view there is a difference between them, this is of little relevance in Dutch Protestantism and is furthermore of no concern to us in this contribution.

[6] An early overview of this study in: Van Andel, Nienke/Barnard, Marcel: Discourses in Liturgy. De totstandkoming van het nieuwe protestantse liedboek (2012) vergeleken met de totstandkoming van het Liedboek voor de Kerken (1973) – een onderzoekspresentatie. In: Jaarboek voor Liturgie-onderzoek 25 (2009), 55-70.

board, consisting, among others, of the chairs of the working groups, made the final selection from these lists and added other items.[7] *ISK* allowed the researcher to attend the meetings,[8] without having any voice in them herself. Acting as a participant observer, who did far more observing than participating, she took notes, from 2009 on audio-taped the meetings and in the final year also video-taped them. Part of the recorded meetings, which usually lasted about six hours each, have been transcribed for the purpose of analysis.[9]

Out of the many aspects that together constituted the editorial process, we have chosen to focus our analysis on the meetings of the main editorial board. The reasons for this choice are obvious as well as abundant. The pursuits of the editorial board can be considered to be the heart of the selection procedure, since this board was responsible for the final selection as well as for the layout of the hymnal, its index and the approval of translations. Next to (or rather, because of) constituting the heart of the procedure, the main editorial board also yielded the greatest amount of data, because their meetings lasted until September 2012 whereas the working groups had finished their tasks by the beginning of 2011. Moreover, the editors on the board spent much time together, even more so since they met several times for two or more-day conferences, which accounted for vivid, animated and profound discussions.

The main question the research seeks to answer is *what meaning is attached to the central notions in the editorial process of the new Dutch hymnal?* This question clearly indicates that we have chosen a discourse analytical, social constructivist approach to our topic. These two qualifications of our approach imply that we have only taken into account meanings that were actually discursively constructed within the editorial process. We are not establishing an outside evaluation of the process by using criteria not inherent to the interaction in the process. Neither are we listing things that were missing from the

[7] More detailed on this procedure: Van Andel, Nienke: Het *Liedboek*: wie, wat, waar? In: Van Andel, Nienke (ed.): Van horen zingen. Wegwijs in het nieuwe Liedboek. Zoetermeer 2013, 29-33.

[8] Part of the agreement between the Protestant Theological University, which hosts this research, and *ISK* is the intellectual independence of the researcher. This article is, therefore, not commissioned nor reviewed by *ISK*.

[9] We used a not so fine-grained level of transcription, merely indicating the basic structure of the conversation. Apart from indicating who delivered which utterances, we marked the following items:

/?/	word or words inaudible
…	pause (between words of the same speaker or between speakers)
Text in italics	quotation of a text under discussion. This is important, considering the difference between “I search for you, God”, and “The next song we will decide on is *I search for you, God.”*
(text in brackets)	indication of what occurred audibly or visibly in the meeting and was part of the interaction, for example (laughter), (whistling) and (pointing at his coffee cup).

proceedings of the editors. We deliberately focus on construction of meaning in meetings of the editorial board. We considered the meetings of the board as spaces of meaning construction. Social interaction in the meetings was constructive for the meaning and weight of central notions by (more often implicitly than explicitly) assuming, negotiating, denying, (re-)establishing, et cetera. We thus did not assume that we already knew what central notions such as identity,[10] ecumenism[11] and history[12] meant beforehand, but we proceeded from the assumption that such notions acquire a particular meaning and relevance depending on both the (broader, social) context of the meeting itself and the (smaller, interactional) context the meeting provided to these notions.

STUDYING CRITERIA

It is evident that this approach allowed us to pay attention to the criteria the editors established during their meetings for (not) incorporating any particular song in the new hymnal. In accordance with our perspective, we considered how these criteria were (re)formulated and made ready for use during the meetings. Any official report, either given in advance to structure the proceedings of the board or written retrospectively as an account to the general public, as is the case, for example, with a preface to the hymnal, fell outside the scope of our interest – which of course does not mean that it would not have been interesting. We restricted our attention to criteria that were actually discursively constructed in the meetings of the board and thereby sought a perspective which allowed us to take a stand which was both an inside perspective and a critical approach of the constructed criteria. Taking a closer look at those criteria, we noticed several which did not refer to an inherent characteristic of the song under consideration, as would be the case with criteria relating to specific wordings, for example, to characteristics of the tune or to how a song is related to a specific part of Scripture. Such 'song-inherent' criteria are present naturally, but next to these we also observed several criteria that were 'song-transcending', as they start from a (discursively constructed) image of the hymnbook and judge the song under consideration on the basis of how well it fits this overall image.

The present contribution is devoted to these criteria. On the basis of an analysis of our transcripts we were able to distinguish six images of a hymnal which are all involved in the editorial process of the new Dutch hymnbook.[13] We will introduce each of these images

[10] Van Andel/Hoondert/Barnard: We is Plural.

[11] Van Andel, Nienke/Koffeman, Leo J.: Singing Together the Song of Diversity. Liturgical and Ecclesiological Reform in Dutch Protestantism. In: Questions Liturgiques 93 (2012), 236-250.

[12] Van Andel, Nienke/Hoondert, Martin J.M./Barnard, Marcel: Remembering '73. Collectively Constructing a Liturgical History in a Hymnbook Editorial Board. (under review)

[13] These images were presented in a keynote lecture at the IAH 2013 congress in Amsterdam. The members of the editorial board present there all recognized (and felt recognized by) this division

below and pay special attention to how a hymn can answer or refuse this (constructed and desired) image, in short: which criteria the images impose on the hymns under discussion. Before doing so, however, we will first make some general remarks about our approach towards these images.

IMAGES OF A HYMNAL

In accordance with our overall approach we will not present an exhaustive list of all possible ways of imagining the hymnal. We will limit ourselves to the images that we can relate to the transcripts of the board meetings, which implies that we will only present enacted and actually constructed images. We thus do not intend to make statements about 'the real', 'the best' or 'the perceived' meaning. Just like other scholars using the same approach in quite different areas, we "did not take into account the intentions behind [the discussions] or how these intentions were perceived by the audience. Whenever we speak about any potential meaning to an audience", (or, we might add, a congregation), "we do so from a theoretical or analytical point of view."[14]

The rationale behind our approach is the statement that a hymnbook should be treated as something loaded with value and meaning rather than as a neutral multi-purpose tool. We deliberately use the notion 'meaning' here, although it is "a kind of catch-all grab-bag word [… which] can range from the entries in dictionaries to 'the meaning of life'"[15]. This indicates that we should be careful to distinguish between the meaning of 'hymnal' and the meaning of the hymnal. The former is to be found in a dictionary and will be something like "bundle of songs, mainly comprising their texts".[16] This is obviously not what we are after. The latter is of our interest. By this we stress the construction of the hymnal in social interaction: in using the word hymnal and talking about it, all kinds of presuppositions are involved which together establish a temporary and partial meaning of the hymnbook.

Looking at a hymnal this way leads us away from the view of a hymnal as a descriptive and/or prescriptive text book.[17] It also leads us away from the tendency to judge a

---

between several images. Cf. Van Andel, Nienke: Shaping Worship in Protestant Churches. Images of a Hymnal. In: IAH Bulletin. (forthcoming)

[14] Lundgren, Anna Sofia/Ljuslinder, Karin: "The baby-boom is over and the ageing shock awaits". Populist Media Imagery in News-Press Representations of Population Ageing. In: International Journal of Ageing and Later Life 6 (2011), 39-71, here 44.

[15] Hughes, Graham: Worship as Meaning. A liturgical theology for late modernity. Cambridge/New York 2003, 4.

[16] Translation of the dictionary entry 'liedboek' in: Geerts, Guido/Den Boon, Ton (eds.): Van Dale Groot Woordenboek der Nederlandse Taal. Utrecht/Antwerpen [13]1999.

[17] E.g. the hymnal as a community's cue card: Westermeyer, Paul: A Hymnal's Theological Significance. In: Dialog. A Journal of Theology 48 (2009), 313-319.

hymnbook by taking a detailed look at the songs it comprises.[18] It even leads us away from the more recent view of the hymnal as an essential tool,[19] which can be studied for the way it is used.[20] Treating 'hymnal' as a notion open for several meanings makes us alert to the possibility that it does not have to be unambiguously and immediately clear what is meant when one uses it. Of course, the primary referent of the notion 'hymnal' is the book as it is printed, but since we consider meaning as arising in social interaction, we are interested in how the hymnbook is constructed to be an actor in social interaction, more specifically: how the editors construct a meaning of 'hymnal' which comes to play a role in their mutual discussions. Our approach thus offers a new dimension to the scholarly study of hymnals.

We read the transcripts thoroughly in order to observe how the hymnal was depicted. Here we specifically looked for "any use of linguistic metaphor, metonymy or recurrent words and phrases that stood out".[21] The reason to do so was the property of metaphor to achieve understanding by uniting two otherwise separated domains. That gave us the opportunity to map how the editors called the hymnal they were making into existence, even before it was printed. We then thematically ordered the resulting imagery of the hymnal, thus arriving at three different metaphorical fields, each of which can be characterized by the opposites establishing its borders. Six images came to the fore. We will now present these images and the criteria for selecting songs they involve.

Mirror

The strongest, clearest and most often used image is the image of the hymnal as a mirror. It pictures the hymnal as a reflection of what is already going on in the field of liturgy and church music. According to the story accompanying this metaphor, people and the music in church have moved on since 1973 and the new hymnal should do justice to that movement. It should capture the actual and current liturgical landscape. This metaphor asks specific qualities from songs that might contribute to the hymnal. Key terms are recognition, diversity, popularity and domestic position. By this latter term reference is made to hymns that belong to one or more groups within the churches (that is: they are 'domestic'). They

---

[18] As is done for example in Wood, Peter/Wild-Wood, Emma: 'One day we will sing in Gods home'. Hymns and songs sung in the Anglican Church in North-East Congo (DRC). In: Journal of Religion in Africa 34 (2004), 145-180 and Hildenbrand, Udo: Das Einheitsgesangbuch Gotteslob. Eine theologische Analyse der Lied- und Gesangtexte in ekklesiologischer Perspektive. Vol I-VI. Frankfurt am Main 2009 and Grub, Udo: Evangelische Spuren im katholischen Einheitsgesangbuch „Gotteslob" von 1975. Berlin 2012.

[19] McGann, Mary E.: Exploring Music as Worship and Theology. Research in Liturgical Practice. Collegeville 2002.

[20] Helweg Hanson, Kristin: Not the Words. Hymnody, Enacted Theology, and the Lutheran Inupiat. In: Dialog. A Journal of Theology 48 (2009), 348-357.

[21] Lundgren/Ljuslinder, 44.

are expected to be recognized by at least one group and hence contribute to the recognizability of the hymnal that is intended to be a mirror. Indeed, in order to be able to mirror the whole of Protestantism, the several songs included in the hymnal should at least present some diversity.

Motor

Opposed to this mirror metaphor is the image of the hymnal as a motor, something that can function as a catalyst. To comply with this image of a hymnal, songs that are domestic to the participating churches should only be incorporated if they can be expected to enrich others. The hymnal should strive to impose a breakthrough in current compartmentalization. All existing sources and traditions should be seriously considered for incorporation. Consequently, when elaborating on this image, the editors believe all lyrics and tunes should be open for improvement, which indeed brings in another requirement for any song to be incorporated. If the hymnal wants to present an overview that invites people to get to know other song traditions, it should contain as few barriers as possible, such as linguistic incorrectness, musical infelicities or troubled accents in words. As a matter of fact, and in opposition to what is evoked by the metaphor of a mirror, ameliorating songs is constructed in the editorial board meetings as a signal to the groups they stem from that the board has seriously considered their heritage. The groups might even be thankful for being supplied with a better version of a favored song.

Between Mirror and Motor: an Exemplary Discussion

This debate has not been solved in favor of one of the opposing images. In the editorial board meetings they kept being constructed as opposites. Sometimes the mirror argument was stronger, other times the motor argument carried its point. In order to illustrate how these two images were brought into debate by the editors and how these images of the overall hymnal were used as a criterion in deciding whether or not and if so, how a specific song should be incorporated, we will provide a piece of transcript from one of the board meetings. With an eye to the accessibility we have chosen a rather lengthy fragment, so the reader will become acquainted with the editors and their way of interacting. In this fragment we encounter the question which one of two existing Dutch translations of *Rock of ages, cleft for me*, should be incorporated, if at all. To guide the reader through this discussion, we will translate any quotation from the hymn in the footnotes and indicate whether it is taken from the older, early 20th Century, Dutch translation (O) or from the newer one, stemming from the second half of the 20th Century (N).

Tom:[22] Well, eh, we eh, now arrive at the song *rots waaruit het leven welt.*[23] To the tune *vaste rots van mijn behoud.*[24] Ah, no, eh, new hymnal, it was always *vaste rots van mijn behoud*, was always mentioned as the song which did not make it into the '73 hymnal, always *vaste rots van mijn behoud*. Well, now, eh, we now have a eh eh rhyming of *rock of ages*. What, eh, whom can I listen to? First on the text. … I don't hear anybody,

Ben: Going wild.

Mark: Well, if people really like to sing the tune eh because of the reminiscence to eh *vaste rots van mijn behoud*, of course this is a much better text but the question is whether we serve the people who adhere to *vaste rots* with an a, alternative. I think it eh, it involves as such really beautiful stuff, *uw genade is genoeg,*[25] such a phrase will immediately eh be recognized by eh by that group. And again that is a strong sentence with Brown.[26] … So it sometimes has some very pregnant lines which, as well eh,

Jim: I think this text just is very acceptable, indeed.

Luke: Yes.

Jim: If people really like to sing this tune.

Chris: When considered from the target group's perspective.

Jim: Yes indeed.

Chris: It probably is a very old Brown.

Dave: Yes.

Chris: Actually I mean it is an early Brown but eh,

Luke: Yes, yes, (chuckling)

Dave: Even from before 1973.

Chris: Yes.

Tom: An early year of construction. Eh,

Evan: I would not be too sure on that. No, this eh, I don't know for sure since eh, whether it was even before '73. However, when this song was discussed the working group choose eh chose for this version. Since *laat mij rusten in uw schaûw*[27] of course is not /?/ Dutch anymore.

Tom: *GKB* is eh?

Chris: Liberated,

[22] In this fragment names of editors and poets have been anonymized. Translation of the transcripts by the authors.

[23] (N): Rock from which springs life.

[24] (O): Safe rock of my rescue.

[25] (N): Your grace is enough.

[26] Poet who provided the newer translation.

[27] (O): Make me to rest in your shadow. In the Dutch text, instead of 'shadow' a contraction like 'shaow' is used which is not recognized anymore.

Evan: The reformed churches liberated indeed.

Tom: So they also have it, yes.

Luke: But that is all.

Chris: Yes, yes. It is for this target group as, as a song for funerals, eh,

Mike: Well, it is a very eh pastoral tune also for funeral services.

Chris: Yes absolutely.

Mike: And as a matter of fact people who eh have not attended since ‘73 can just sing along.

Jim: Haha, they can simply join again!

Evan: It must be a very old mother who will be buried then.

Mike: Well I eh I regularly have to play this. I have eh, I keep that small red hymnal next to the organ. It has the tune, well of course *bundel ’38* has it as well, but that is a reformed hymnal so I don’t use that one. (chuckling)

Ron: *119 gezangen*!

Tom: Well. Eh.

Mike: /?/

Ben: That final verse is a little strange, so that *adem die mij ontgaat*[28] that is, I think it, I like it, though. And *als mijn ziel gedoken is in de dorre doodsvallei.*[29] I think that is a rather strange combination of images.

Tom: Yes. You, you would say that this final verse can be left out.

Ben: Well that cannot be left,

Mark: No.

Ben: When it comes to the meaning.

Tom: No.

Bert: Then it is not complete.

…

Chris: How eh. When you accompany this, is it *vaste rots* or is it these lyrics?

Mike: *Vaste rots* is what I would plead for. That is that is what is holy about this song of course. That *schaûw* is beautiful, that, you will have, an undertaker always prints on the eh eh, /?/ *schaûw*, is written with a circumflex isn’t it.

Mark: Circumflex. On the *a*.

Mike: Yes. No-one can find that so it is always spelled incorrectly in the booklet. (chuckling) Beautiful.

Ron: They print a β.

Mike: Yes!

---

[28] (N): Breath leaves me.

[29] (N): When my soul has dived into the barren valley of death.

Tom: You want to keep that, such a eh trigger.
Chris: Just like the *wijngeschenk.*[30]
Luke: Hmhm.
Mike: But of course it is, the hymn is favored for, just like Mark says, for *vaste rots van mijn behoud*,
James: Yes.
Mike: That, therefore the hymn is beloved. Text and tune are eh,
Evan: Yes, but I really believe that would go too far.
…
Mark: No, this *schaûw* is really really out of order. I also think it is /?/
Jim: But how exactly is the /?/ text?
Evan: I, I also think if we, then we eh,
James: Well, *vaste rots van mijn behoud als de zonde mij benauwt,*[31]
Evan: Don't eh, doesn't do justice to what we what we eh usually do. We naturally say, no, a text should at least meet some minimal demands.
Bert: Yes, yes.
Evan: And eh I just think, of course comments can be made about this text, when it comes to its contents,
Ben: (acts as if choking) *Als de adem mij ontgaat.* (chuckling)
Evan: Of course, of course, when it comes to its contents as well,
Ben: I dive *in de doodsvallei*,
Evan: I think with something like that we should do exactly what we wish to do, namely to have sympathy for for eh the fact that something is beloved, but at the same time say eh, well, we also would like to update something.
Dave: Yes.
Jim: Yes.
Evan: And who then wants to sing *vaste rots* will sing it anyway. But this eh with this, we also make a, I think this is a very good statement, if you do it like this.
Bert: Yes.
Evan: It doesn't have to be sung for me when I die, I won't hear it by then, anyway, but eh,
Mark: You don't know!
Tom: Well yes eh because, I asked, it is also in the eh, in the hymnbook of the reformed churches liberated, yes well eh, that is a group as well,

[30] Reference to a joke made earlier this meeting, about a churchgoer who thought that a piece of Scripture containing the phrase *dedicated things* (Dutch: wijgeschenk) was incorrect and should have been *winery things* (Dutch: wijngeschenk).
[31] (O): Safe rock of my rescue. When sin suffocates me.

Evan: Yes, yes. I think it just,

Tom: And there are many of them!

Evan: No, but that with this eh, the choice for this song you would unite two eh two things.

Bert: Yes.

Tom: Yes.

Dave: Yes.

Evan: Because we consider the eh tradition /?/ that it is beloved. But we also want to say eh such a text with that *schaûw*, that,

Tom: Agree?

Bert: Yes.[32]

Museum

The third metaphor we want to discuss is that of the hymnal as a museum. This is an interesting metaphor since the ambivalent attitudes people can have towards the notion of a museum are involved in the evaluation of this metaphor. Generally speaking we can state that it was usually explicitly denied by the editors that the hymnal should be a museum. Nevertheless, we introduce it in this paper for two reasons. One, although it is denied, museum is still constructed as a metaphor for the hymnal. Two, we noticed many instances where editors attributed certain functions to the hymnal which in our perception belong to the metaphorical field of a museum such as ‘guarding heritage’, ‘historical relevance’, ‘availability’ and ‘preservation’ for ‘future generations’. This short fragment from a transcript underscores our analysis of how the editors dealt with the metaphor of museum and its related metaphorical field.

Rick: I actually think, the same eh, I think (number of the song) for example, that here the historical criteria argue heavily for incorporation because it eh eh it stems from the Lutheran psalter. I, I, but at the same time I think this is an argument which is not heavy enough, because, because indeed you don’t want the hymnal to be a museum. But at the same time, at the same time (Mark leaves) you want a hymnbook which eh eh, say, also evokes the recognition that eh eh there is an ancient hymnological tradition which eh where we root. I really think this is tricky.[33]

[32] Transcript 27 October 2011.

[33] Transcript 26 June 2009.

Whatever words are used to do so, in the editorial board meetings the hymnal was equated to a guardian of the hymnological heritage.[34] According to that image the hymnbook should present an overview of hymnological history. It is a hymnological responsibility to show the origins of contemporary singing practices by incorporating songs that can be considered as typical for the several ages past. Some tunes or texts just are hymnologically indispensable. Even, so the argument goes, if nobody would actually sing one of these hymnological pillars, they should still be in the book in order to preserve them for future generations. Moreover, although people do not always realize it, the editors know that songs from the past are of importance for contemporary people. Accordingly, its position in a hymnological heritage can be a criterion for an individual song to be incorporated or not.

Utility

The metaphor of the museum is opposed by that of the hymnal as a book intended for use, a utility. Although hymnological tradition should be respected, it is neither the responsibility of the editorial board nor of the hymnbook to preserve it. This hymnbook must be engaged and take a stand in the midst of current society, according to this image. It should therefore only use hymnological heritage which is still being used. Furthermore, the editors warn each other not to overestimate their own and the hymnal's importance. If a song is not incorporated, this does not imply that it is forever lost. This argument is used to underscore that utility should be more important than museum.

As for the criterion whether or not to incorporate a specific song into the complete hymnal, this image implies that it has to be made plausible in the discussion that the hymn under consideration fulfills the wishes and demands of actual liturgical practice.[35] We again provide an extract of a transcript. Here the editors are dealing with the question whether a rendition of *Vater unser im Himmelreich* should be incorporated, and if so, how many verses it should have in order to be useful. In this fragment, the argument between museum and utility is obviously present.

Tom:[36] But the question is what to do with a ca, what to do with a catechetical song. And eh, to my opinion, if one wants to use it, would you really need a song with, which has a new verse for each prayer? I would plead for a … compressed text which indeed does eh explain *Onze Vader*, elucidates it.

---

[34] For reasons of brevity we will in this contribution not enlarge on how the editors construct the idea of a hymnological heritage and invest it with meaning. For this topic see Van Andel/Hoondert/Barnard: Remembering '73.

[35] At this point we must note that this notion of 'actual liturgical practice', as well, is discursively constructed in the meetings of the editors.

[36] The fictive names in this transcript do not necessarily match the names in the other transcripts.

Ben: Mark?

Mark: Eh, I don't think it is catechetically right to explain a Dutch text in French… I mean, this hymn uses language from long ago which I don't think will turn out to teach people. It explains a familiar text in an unfamiliar language, at least that is what I think is happening in these ten verses.

Jim: Yes, indeed, that is true.

Luke: Yes, but it is, at the same time it is now now eh some kind of museum responsibility to, to, to just,

Mark: Okay, then you will,

Chris: This really is hymnologically indispensable.

Mark: But that is not catechetical.

Luke: If we have a museum then this will be one of the pieces that will make it into it.

Chris: Yes but, but,

Ben: Just hang on a second!

Dave: Well, I think it is an excellent proposal. To make a new rhyming in five verses or something, because just for the catechetical, I think it is far more important for the text to be clear eh when compared to a museum hymn or a sacred hymn or so, this, this. When you really consider this as a catechetical hymn then you have to make a new rendition of it.

(…)[37]

Chris: I, I, I think it is really weird, simply the thought to have a hymnal lacking this Luther song. I really think that is absurd. It is such a basic and typical song and such eh, even if it would be museum-like to keep it, maybe there are some reasons to store a couple of hymns just for reasons of museum.

Evan: It is too strongly tied to Luther.

Chris: Yes, that is its hymnologic basis.

Dave: But then, do you refer to the tune or the lyrics?

Evan: No, lyrics,

Chris: This song, this song as a whole.

Ben: Even the ten, the ten, actually you are saying not, no compressing. Ten verses has been the catechetical practice by then.

Chris: Yes, yes, yes. Yes.

Dave: I think that it will then miss its goal.

Mike: But the question is eh, what you are pointing at is in fact its historical meaning. That is a criterion we have declared is secondary, so the

[37] Here we have omitted part of the discussion, where the editors focus on what it would take for anybody to make a new translation of this hymn.

question still stands eh, whether this text suffices nowadays as a, from the perspective of a primary criterion or does it need new rhyming.

Ron: The latter, I would argue for the latter.

Chris: And then and then, and then make a new eh rhym, eh translation of Luther's text?

Ron: I would, I would again eh, that, say, eh considering the historical character and because there is much eh literature for organ to this melody, by the title *Vater Unser im Himmelreich*, eh, then I think, there is a hymn on *Onze Vader* in the new hymnbook to this tune but with a new text. And eh than eh, I think the translator can use both the German text by Martin Luther and just the Lord's prayer like we all know it as an inspiration. And just make a, a, a new text which might borrow some motifs from Martin Luther but eh eh, not a piece for museum like this one.[38]

Aid

We now arrive at our fifth metaphor which compares the hymnal to a helping hand. This metaphor depicts the hymnal as an instruction book. According to this position the hymnbook should be as helpful to local congregations as it can be. Long hymns with over six verses, for example, therefore should be reduced to a sizable length so people do not have to make a selection themselves. The intended use and performance of a song should be clear by how it is printed and classified. Because, as it was phrased in the editorial discussions, one can never be sure that ministers and church musicians are well up in this task, the hymnal should prevent as much ambiguity as possible.

In the discussions within the board this image of a hymnal led to the conclusion that certain hymns should be accompanied by instructions for use. Whereas the other images could be directly related to criteria for including or excluding specific songs in the hymnal, this metaphor in the first place influences how a hymn is approached at all. If the hymnbook is indeed considered to be an aid, a hymn is always considered within its context. By context in this case we refer to the place of a certain song within liturgy, its rootedness in specific liturgical or musical traditions and other relevant aspects of it. This in a secondary manner evokes criteria applied to individual songs, namely the question whether it is possible to transfer all these relevant aspects to the users of the hymnal. Sometimes a hymn was denied incorporation in the book because the editorial board thought it was too 'dangerous' to include it. They just didn't expect it was possible to give the users of the hymnal the right instructions, in the following case the instructions which instruments to use for accompaniment:

[38] Transcript 2 October 2009.

Bert: But, my question, so, eh, look. I also have eh, while I was listening to those songs I thought eh, well, I just don't have eh, who am I to say that this is not good. That is not what it is about, but it is about eh what happens when you include this in the book. Is it a song that could be in a book meant for a congregation? And, just, eh, it feels to me like putting this in the book will cause great incidents.

James: If you don't put it in the book?

Bert: If you do put it in the book.

Ron: Well, not yet with this one. I think.

Bert: Indeed, if you don't put it in incidents will happen as well, but other ones.

James: And just what kind of incidents will happen?

Bert: Look, you can only perform this with a band. Maybe with a piano when you have the skills, or a guitar.

Ron: Well, no, with this one you don't need a band yet.

Bert: But yes,

Ron: It could also be performed by an organ.

Mike: Could it?

Ron: Maybe, yes.

Bert: I don't know. Because when you hear the recordings then you also hear, they all use these Klezmer instruments. That makes you think, eh, hey, eh, an atmosphere is added to this song which is just eh beautiful.

Ron: Yes, indeed, so it is.

Bert: But that is a certain kind of atmosphere which you can never eh imitate in a congregation.[39]

Resource

Opposite to the 'aid' metaphor stands the constructed image of the hymnal as a resource. Taken as a resource, a hymnbook only offers basic needs and local custom will transform it into liturgy. Liturgy here is primarily envisaged as a local act. How and when to use the psalms, canticles and hymns, which stanzas or refrains to select, how to account for the time of the year, which instruments to use for accompaniment, how to divide roles in singing it – all of this should be left to the insights of the people responsible for shaping worship in local Protestant congregations.

We consider this image of a hymnal to be radically opposed to the image of the hymnal as an aid. This becomes even more obvious when we trace the consequences this image bears for the evaluation of an individual song. Whereas the image of an aid asked for a hymn to

[39] Transcript 20 May 2010.

be approached with as much background knowledge as possible, this image of a resource actually allows for incorporating songs without knowing anything about them. Their context is irrelevant, no additional information is needed, it should be ‘left to practice how people do or do not blend’.[40]

Conclusion

In this contribution we have dealt with the six images of the new Dutch Protestant hymnal that were discursively constructed in the meetings of its main editorial board. We have especially put effort into showing how these images of what the hymnal should (ideally) be, influence the criteria that are used in judging individual hymns. The six images together describe three areas of debate. We were able to highlight the first two areas, mirror-motor and museum-utility, by introducing lengthy pieces of transcript from the meetings, each showing how the space between the two opposite metaphors is a discursive space, where negotiations abound about when which image is most important and how this applies to the hymn under discussion. The third area, aid-resource, is somewhat different from the former two, since it mainly influences the extent to which a hymn’s context is taken into account. The relationship between the image of a hymnal and the discussion of a single hymn here thus is located on an other level but here as well the overall image of the hymnbook affects the evaluation of a particular song.

The distinctive point of this contribution is its argument that the evaluation of a song and the criteria used for measuring it not only relate to song-inherent aspects such as text, tune and theology. It has sought to emphasize how criteria are also derived from the larger framework the individual hymns will be incorporated into: the hymnal. In doing so, this paper has added another perspective to the large field of hymnology.[41] Although the editors of the new Dutch hymnbook kept stressing that it was their task to assess a song on its own merits – which they usually used as a counterargument against such statements as ‘we already have seventy-nine Christmas carols so why select yet another one?’ – they in fact always involved in their discussion aspects which were not related to the hymns. Each debate, although in varying degrees, involved an argument that went beyond the hymn under consideration and related it to one of the described constructed images of a hymnal.

[40] Transcript 13 November 2009.

[41] In an overview of results and challenges for hymnology in the current Century, this aspect is not yet involved, although practice of singing and using hymnals is cautiously hinted at. Cf. Marti, Andreas: Hymnologie an der Jahrhundertwende. In: Jahrbuch für Liturgik und Hymnologie 42 (2003), 203-210.

Bibliography to Chapter 2

Geerts, Guido and Ton den Boon (Eds.) (1999[13]). *Van Dale Groot Woordenboek der Nederlandse Taal*. Utrecht/Antwerpen: Van Dale Lexicografie.

Grub, Udo (2012). *Evangelische Spuren im katholischen Einheitsgesangbuch „Gotteslob“ von 1975*. Berlin: LIT Verlag.

Helweg Hanson, Kristin (2009). ‘Not the Words: Hymnody, Enacted Theology, and the Lutheran Inupiat’, in *Dialog: A Journal of Theology* 48 (4), pp. 348-357.

Hildenbrand, Udo (2009). *Das Einheitsgesangbuch Gotteslob: Eine theologische Analyse der Lied- und Gesangtexte in ekklesiologischer Perspektive.* Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Hughes, Graham (2003). *Worship as Meaning: A liturgical theology for late modernity*. Cambridge etc.: Cambridge University Press.

Lundgren, Anna Sofia and Karin Ljuslinder (2011). ‘“The baby-boom is over and the ageing shock awaits”: Populist Media Imagery in News-Press Representations of Population Ageing’, in *International Journal of Ageing and Later Life* 6 (2), pp. 39-71.

Marti, Andreas (2003). ‘Hymnologie an der Jahrhundertwende’, in *Jahrbuch für Liturgik und Hymnologie* 42, pp. 203-210.

McGann, Mary E. (2002). *Exploring Music as Worship and Theology: Research in Liturgical Practice*. Collegeville (MN): The Liturgical Press.

Tönsing, Gertrud (2009). ‘“There Must be Mouse Dirt with the Pepper”: A Lutheran Approach to Choosing Songs’, in *Dialog: A Journal of Theology* 48 (4), pp. 320-328.

Van Andel, Nienke (2013). ‘Het *Liedboek*: wie, wat waar?’, in Nienke van Andel (Ed.). *Van horen zingen: Wegwijs in het nieuwe Liedboek*. Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum, pp. 29-33.

Van Andel, Nienke and Marcel Barnard (2009). ‘Discourses in Liturgy: De totstandkoming van het nieuwe protestantse liedboek (2012) vergeleken met de totstandkoming van het *Liedboek voor de Kerken* (1973) – een onderzoekspresentatie’, in *Jaarboek voor Liturgie-onderzoek* 25, pp. 55-70.

Van Andel, Nienke, Martin J.M. Hoondert and Marcel Barnard (2014).‘We is Plural: Identity Construction in Hymn Book Editorial Meetings’, in *Journal of Empirical Theology* 27 (2), pp. 214-238.

– (under review). ‘Remembering ’73: Collectively Constructing a Liturgical History in a Hymnbook Editorial Board’.

Van Andel, Nienke and Leo J. Koffeman (2012). ‘Singing Together the Song of Diversity: Liturgical and Ecclesiological Reform in Dutch Protestantism’, in *Questions Liturgiques* 93 (3/4), pp. 236-250.

Westermeyer, Paul (2009.) ‘A Hymnal's Theological Significance’, in *Dialog: A Journal of Theology* 48 (4), pp. 313-319.

Wood, Peter and Emma Wild-Wood (2004). ‘‘One day we will sing in Gods home‘: Hymns and songs sung in the Anglican Church in North-East Congo (DRC)’, in *Journal of Religion in Africa* 34 (1/2), pp. 145-180

CHAPTER 3
ECUMENISM

A slightly different version of this chapter is published as:
Nienke van Andel and Leo J. Koffeman (2012). ‘Singing Together the Song of Diversity: Liturgical and Ecclesiological Reform in Dutch Protestantism’,
in *Questions Liturgiques/Studies in Liturgy* 93 (3-4), pp. 236-250.
An earlier version of the chapter was presented by the two authors jointly at the *Peter and Paul* seminar in Leuven, May 2012.

INTRODUCTION

In this contribution we will show that liturgical reform is not only a passive process, caused by external factors and agents. It is an active process as well, since it also operates as an agent of further reform. This joint case study seeks to clarify the interrelationship of liturgical reform and ecclesiological reform within Dutch Protestantism. Concerning liturgy, the development of two important hymnals in the mainstream of Dutch Protestantism will be considered: the 1973 hymnal and its forthcoming successor. The production of these hymnbooks will be related to what, from an ecclesiological point of view, can be considered as the major reform within the same ecclesial context: the unification of three churches into the Protestant Church in the Netherlands. We will argue that this unification both is affected by and affects the liturgical reform.

In order to reach this conclusion, this article will continually switch between liturgical and ecclesiological (i.e. ecumenical and church political) perspectives. The first two paragraphs introduce the two main topics and are particularly aimed at those readers not familiar with the backgrounds and circumstances of current Dutch Protestantism. After thus having introduced the Protestant Church in the Netherlands and the 1973 hymnal *Liedboek voor de Kerken*, we will proceed with two paragraphs that shed light on Dutch Protestantism in the post-World War II period. This light will be shed from two directions: first from an ecclesiological point of view, as we refer to the church law on liturgy, and second from a liturgical point of view, as we will have a closer look at the genesis of a new rhyming of the psalms (1967) in cohesion with the ecclesial context.

Having thus elaborated on our starting point, we will move on with two paragraphs on the central theme that connects both reforms to each other: consensus. Both song-consensus and ecclesiological consensus are to be seen as expressions of the interpretation of ecumenism which is typical of the first decades after World War II. After a connective paragraph about the developments in church hymns after 1973 we will proceed with two paragraphs on that interpretation of ecumenism which can be said to be typical of the late 20th and early 21st Century: organic unity as a way to deal with plurality. This is reflected both in ecclesiology and in liturgy.

In our final and concluding paragraph we will evaluate the reforms we have discussed and briefly look forward to the near future, when the new hymnal will be published. Also in this final paragraph, we will reflect on the broader culture of the Netherlands in the period we are describing, when the relevance of traditional divisions within society – catholics, orthodox reformed, socialists and liberals having their own organizations in education, health care, broadcasting, and so on – gradually decreased. Increasing secularization stimulated ecumenical cooperation.[1]

THE PROTESTANT CHURCH IN THE NETHERLANDS (2004)

The unification process – known in Dutch as the *Samen-op-Weg proces* (literally: 'Together-on-the-way process') – started in the early sixties, and at that time involved the two largest Protestant churches in the Netherlands, the Netherlands Reformed Church (NRC) and the Reformed Churches in the Netherlands (RCN). Until the early 19th century both churches had been one Netherlands Reformed Church; two splits (in 1834 and 1886), basically motivated by resistance to the role of the Dutch state in ecclesial matters of the NRC and by a rejection of theological modernism, had led to the birth of the RCN, in 1892. On their journey together, as of the early sixties of the 20th century, they were joined by a third church, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the Kingdom of the Netherlands (ELC), in 1986. In 2004 the Protestant Church in the Netherlands was born.

THE HYMNBOOK FOR THE CHURCHES (1973)

In 1973, the Dutch protestant 'Hymnbook for the Churches' (*Liedboek voor de Kerken*, *LvdK*) was published. This title indicates two important characteristics of this hymnal.

First, it was meant to be used by six different churches and as such it has been called "a first-order ecumenical effort."[2] The churches involved are: NRC, RCN and ELC, the Remonstrant Brotherhood, the Baptist Society and the Dutch Protestants Union. Although this paper focuses exclusively on PCN and its forerunners, we must keep in mind that the hymnal does not exclusively belong to PCN. Contrary to what is frequently expressed in the Netherlands, it is principally not so much a matter of 'them' using 'our hymnal', but of 'us' sharing one hymnbook.

The second important characteristic of the 1973 hymnal is to be found in the preposition *for* as used in the title. The hymnal is made for the churches, which becomes even more clear when reading the subtitle: 'Psalms and Hymns for Worship in Church and at Home offered by the Interdenominational Foundation for the Church Hymn' (Dutch: *Psalmen en Gezangen voor de Eredienst in kerk en huis aangeboden door de Interkerkelijke Stichting*

---

[1] Cf. L.J. Koffeman, "Ekklesiologie und Kirchenrecht in einem Unionsprozess: Erfahrungen aus der Protestantischen Kirche in den Niederlanden," *Catholica. Vierteljahrschrift für ökumenische Theologie* 59 (2005) 108-127.

[2] W. Bleij: "25 jaar Liedboek voor de Kerken," Interkerkelijke Stichting voor het Kerklied, *Zingt voor de Heer een nieuw gezang: 25 jaar Liedboek voor de Kerken* (Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum, 1998) 9-10, p. 9.

voor het Kerklied).[3] It is thus a distinctive aspect of the Dutch situation that the hymnals, at least the two we are comparing in this contribution, are not edited by the church but instead are compiled by a foundation (*ISK*) that offers the hymnbook to the churches. This foundation, to be sure, is not a department of either one of the churches. The role of the synods is to commission the foundation in the beginning of the process and to approve (or disapprove) the result at the end of it. Although each church participating is allowed to appoint members who will join the board of the ISK on behalf of that church, the foundation itself is an independent institution in terms of civil law.[4] On the one hand, this means that the churches have limited possibilities to influence its work. On the other hand, the churches can maintain their own structures and regulations with regard to ecclesial issues like liturgy.

LITURGY AND CHURCH ORDER

The Constitution (1951) of the NRC, in itself a result of church renewal after the Second World War, includes an article on worship services (*XI. Van de kerkdienst*). In its first paragraph it characterizes a worship service as consisting in the ministry of the Word, the ministry of the sacraments, the ministry of prayers, and the ministry of mercy. After having dealt with the liturgical calendar and with the competence of leading worship services, its final paragraph reads: “In worship services no other hymns will be sung by the congregation than those collected in the Worship Book.”[5] It has to be noted that this is part of the Constitution, and so it was not seen as just a matter to be regulated in the By-laws! At that time, i.e. as of 1938, a hymnbook containing the 150 rhymed Psalms as well as 306 hymns was in use in the NRC. In practice, the more conservative part of the NRC would only use the Psalms in the liturgy.

The RCN Church Order, a 1957 revision of the so-called Dordt Church Order of 1619, contains a similar rule. In Article 68 it first gives some general regulations regarding the character of worship services – which, by the way, are very similar to the one in the NRC Constitution –, and regarding responsibilities, and then this article concludes with these words:

3 A small remark at this point: we will use both the words "song" and "hymn" as a translation for the Dutch word “gezang”. From a hymnological point of view they do not indicate the same thing, but in Dutch Protestantism this distinction plays such a limited role that we will ignore it for now. The only distinction that does truly matter is already mentioned in the subtitle of the hymnal: psalms and hymns. Psalms being translations of the 150 chapters from the biblical book of Psalms – rhymed translations sung in the Genevan tunes – and hymns being all other songs. Interestingly, this distinction will not be maintained in the forthcoming hymnal.

4 An important legal characteristic of a foundation is that it is not allowed to make profits, so the fact that the churches do not compose their own hymnbooks does not mean that the production and composition of new hymnals has become a matter of money, as it sometimes has become, cf. Terry W. York, *America’s Worship Wars* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003) 37-40.

5 Art. XI-4 HKO: “In de kerkdiensten zullen door de gemeente geen andere liederen worden gezongen dan die, welke zijn bijeengebracht in het kerkboek.”

"In the(se) worship services the Bible translation, the hymnbook and the liturgical forms as designated or determined by the general synod will be used (…)."[6] In the RCN tradition only Psalms were allowed, together with nine 'biblical hymns', like rhymed versions of the Decalogue, Magnificat, Benedictus and Nunc Dimittis. During the fifties and sixties the number of authorized hymns increased in hymnbooks containing 29, 59 and finally 119 hymns.

So, in 1973, the year *LvdK* is published, both the NRC and the RCN have very restrictive regulations in this respect.

A New Rhymed Version of the Psalms

This 1973 hymnal comprises two sections: one with psalms and the other with hymns. These initially started as two separate projects which together lasted a few decades. The new rhymed version of the psalms, first published in 1967, was realized as a coproduction between the NRC and the RCN. Even before World War II, they independently had decided it was time to replace the rhymed version they had been using since 1773. Until the late fifties they each tried to go their own ways,[7] but by the end of this decade an interdenominational foundation for the psalms was established. This was the forerunner of the already mentioned *ISK*, although at this time only two churches, that happened to be the two largest protestant churches in the Netherlands by that time, were participating. This may sound like a small achievement, but the importance of this step cannot be overestimated: the mutual mistrust was deeply rooted and there were so many areas NRC and RCN disagreed on, but on liturgy – or at least part of it – they were of one mind. So in 1967, two different synods agreed on one concept of a completely new rhymed version of all 150 psalms. By now this rhymed version is used by the majority of all protestant churches in the Netherlands, although a 2008 survey revealed that almost 16 % of the congregations of the PCN were still using the 1773 version on a weekly basis.[8] The new 2013 hymnal, with which we will deal below, will not provide a new rhymed version but instead will reprint the version of 1967, since both time and (poetic) talents are considered missing to provide a new translation. So the zest and zeal that were attributed to the publication of this rhymed version are still recognized.

---

[6] 3. Art. 68 par. 3 GKO: "In deze kerkdiensten zullen gebruikt worden de Bijbelvertaling, het psalm- en gezangboek en de liturgische formulieren, welke door de generale synode zijn aangewezen of vastgesteld, en zal men zich zoveel mogelijk houden aan een orde van dienst, die door de generale synode is vastgesteld."

[7] We must leave aside a description of those ways and the quarrels and mutual irritations this evoked. Suffice it to say that it was not only war and post-war worries that can account for the fifteen years it took them to find one common way.

[8] *Voortgangsrapportage Nieuw Liedboek*, Generale Synode april 2009, (KTO 0902).

ECCLESIAL CONTEXT

Among the aspects of the relations between the churches that can be characterized by mistrust and irritations is the question as to how the church considers its role in broader society. The NRC adopted a new Constitution in 1951. This is no less than a watershed in NRC history. After having lived for 135 years under a church order imposed by the government in 1816, and after having been unable to agree on a new Constitution for decades, in spite of the fact that the government had already given up its interference in church matters around 1848 (!), the NRC was more or less 'reborn' in the struggle of the Second World War. It redefined its responsibilities for Dutch society, and wanted to be a confessing church, after the example of the Confessing Church in Germany.

The RCN, however, experienced a deep trauma during the Second World War. Although its members were overrepresented in Dutch resistance against National Socialism, its general synod spent years on a hardly comprehensible theological dispute which resulted in another split in the church in 1944. It took the fifties to nurse the wounds to some extent. NRC representatives looking for possibilities to broaden the NRC process of redefining its identity, ran into suspicion and aversion. RCN members advocating church renewal were isolated.

In 1961 a mixed (NRC/RCN) group of eighteen pastors, mainly student chaplains and such, published a common appeal to NRC and RCN to start a dialogue on bridging the gap between both churches. They succeeded in bringing together thousands of sympathizers in Utrecht around Pentecost 1962, but their appeal seemed nonetheless to fade away. It was only when the youth organizations of both churches took up the initiative again in 1968, that both synods started discussion at the level of their Boards. It is likely that the common acceptance of a new rhymed version of the Psalms made this step a bit easier to take.

'SONG-CONSENSUS'

Meanwhile another project had started, namely an attempt to revise the hymns of the 1938 NRC songbook. This project soon took a different shape and instead of providing just a reformed revision, a whole new interdenominational hymnbook was composed. Interestingly, it was only after the NRC together with the three other churches participating – i.e. those not included in the merger afterwards – had finished the first draft of the hymnal that the RCN was asked/allowed to join. Even now, half a century later, different stories go round to explain this delay, depending on which blood type one belongs to. Most stories point to mutual personal grievances that were the barrier to overcome and which could only be broken after orders of the respective synods.

ELC initially was hesitant to cooperate, because as recently as 1955 they had published a new volume of their own. Joining the *LvdK* project would mean a huge waste of resources.

Still, when noticing the promises of an interdenominational hymnal, they did. This step was widely praised and they were rewarded by the inclusion of a great number of Lutheran hymns in the 1973 hymnal.

So, compiling an interdenominational hymnal with psalms and hymns took some more doing than one might expect at first glance. Yet, the relationship between the contents of the book and the desire to publish an interdenominational hymnal after all is obvious. The rationale behind the selection of hymns can be theologically explained as ‘reflecting the communion of the saints’. Liturgical song is a way for the congregation to be united with the faithful of other places and other eras. Therefore the best of hymnological heritage, hymns deriving from the ‘treasure of the ages’, should be in the book. For biblically inspired Dutch protestants, the psalms are the only possible starting point. But they must be accompanied by the best other generations have produced. Therefore the new hymns that were written were not so much new, but rather were new translations of existing songs. The songs that were newly created were deliberately shaped according to tradition, both in language and in sound. One of the poets who made a large contribution to the hymnbook verbalizes this as follows: “It had to be possible to both be authentic and be part of a tradition at the same time.”[9] *LvdK* thus is an ecumenical hymnbook in this sense that its contents try to unite the roots of the several protestant traditions in the Netherlands. This immediately indicates its lack as well: there are no orthodox tunes nor Gregorian chants to be found. The ecumenism of the book limits itself to metrical hymns from the period before the Reformation, which the Protestants also count as their history (Ambrose, Francis of Assisi). After the Reformation the ecumenism only spreads out to the protestants abroad, mainly within Europe, e.g. Germany (Gerhardt, Tersteegen), England (Watts, Keble) and the Scandinavian countries (Grundtvig).

The hymnal has been characterized by *ISK* as a ‘song-consensus’, a canon of shared ground. This is the essence of the ecumenism this hymnal tries to bring about: finding a balance between “the right of a certain preference for certain songs”[10] and the duty to “grant each other space.”[11] Or, somewhat more bluntly: “Ecumenism is a sacrifice (…) This is a warning that nobody can state that this book is theirs.”[12] Or, retrospectively: “We wanted to be

---

[9] J.W. Schulte Nordholt, “Constanten en Variabelen, de smaak van het kerkvolk,” Idem, *Het woord brengt de waarheid teweeg – essays over literatuur en werkelijkheid* (Kampen: Kok, 1992) 61-68, p. 66.

[10] A.W. Lazonder, “Ter verantwoording,” *Liedboek voor de Kerken* (Den Haag: Boekencentrum, 1984^3 [1973]) x-xiv, p. xiv.

[11] A.W. Lazonder, speech, delivered May 19, 1973, published in *Eredienst, tijdschrift voor liturgie* 7 (August 1973), no. 3, 27-30, p. 27.

[12] J.W. Schulte Nordholt, “Het lied van de kerk,” *Eredienst, tijdschrift voor liturgie* 7 (August 1973), no. 3, 5-15, p. 13.

united together in the churches in the one song of praise."[13] Having characterized the hymnal as such, it will not be surprising that it had to be interdenominational. If one truly considers singing as being connected with the communion of the saints, one cannot possibly have one's own denominational hymnbook. This is a theologically, perhaps even eschatologically, inspired argument: singing not only unites the singing congregation with those who have passed away but also with contemporary brothers and sisters. Liturgy may be the herald of what more is to come: "Singing the same hymns is a strongly unifying achievement and it could be that this turns out to be a powerful means in hastening an even tighter cooperation."[14]

Towards an Ecclesiological Consensus

It is interesting that this expectation was expressed in 1973, at the occasion of the presentation of *LvdK*, by one of its composers. It leaves no doubt that the speaker implicitly referred to the joint session of the general synods of NRC and RCN. After about a decade of cautious deliberations between the boards of both general synods, it was in 1973 that the general synods of NRC and RCN had their first joint meeting, and discussed basic theological questions like the role of the confessional standards in church life and discipline. This new hymnbook could provide a strong impetus to the unification process. However, this proved to be a lengthy process. The seventies were dominated by exploratory discussions on a synodical level. Not much progress seemed to be made.

However, new initiatives were born on the local level, where NRC and RCN congregations started to meet, and occasionally to worship together – using the same hymnbook! This was particularly the case in two specific contexts, i.e. in the new-built suburbs around the main cities in the Western part of the country, and in the small congregations of both denominations that lived in the diaspora of the mainly Roman Catholic Southern provinces. It soon appeared that major differences in terms of church polity and denominational structures severely impeded progress on a local level, and congregations started to plead with the synods to better facilitate local cooperation. This led to the formal adoption of a set of common 'Interim Regulations', as of 1979, which made it gradually more possible for a NRC and a RCN congregation to live together as if they were one congregation, in a so-called 'federation'. The number of such federations grew continuously, and together they became a factor not to be neglected in the unification process.

It took some time before the general synods were ready to take another decisive step. Everybody involved was aware of some important differences between the NRC and the

[13] *Trouw*, May 7, 1998, "Een lafenis in de ruimte van de hele kerk," interview with W. Kloppenburg.
[14] Lazonder, speech, p. 27.

RCN. The differences most visible were: the exercise of church discipline, the role of theological plurality, the issue of the so-called 'members by birth' (non-baptized members) of the NRC, the relation between local congregations and the denomination as such, and the issue of the way churches address political and social issues. Behind all these specific issues two common denominators played a role: whereas the identity of the NRC was mainly seen in its broad responsibility for national life, the RCN rather focused on confessional identity. The NRC had a history of accepting internal theological plurality, making room for non-baptized children, and feeling obliged to keep in close and critical contact with the national government. The RCN had a tradition of maintaining church discipline in terms of doctrine (which had led to several splits), and tended to leave political and social responsibilities to Christian organizations rather than addressing them itself. Most of all: whereas the denomination was the centre of gravity in the NRC, the local congregation was the primary subject in the RCN. In other words: the NRC had a unifying structure, leaving room for a broad plurality of views and practices, whereas the RCN saw unity first of all in terms of agreement on doctrinal and other ecclesial issues, leaving room for local responsibilities as to the way this was given shape.

In 1982, the joint general synods decided that the time had come to explore the theological issues behind such differences. In 1984, a first text of a "Declaration of ecclesiological consensus," bridging the gaps, was accepted by the joint synods, and sent to the congregations for their comments. It was also in that year that the third edition of *LvdK* was published.

Open-ended Canon

The foreword to this third edition states that "as initially hoped and expected, the ecumenical function of the hymnal has become significant."[15] In spite of these wishes and expectations, this hymnal has never become the single hymnbook in use by all congregations of the participating churches. The 2008 survey we already referred to, shows that almost 84% of the PCN congregations is using this hymnal on a weekly basis. It also shows, however, that 119 (!) other hymnbooks are being used in liturgy. Besides, about 10% of the congregations are using a custom-made volume adapted to their own expectations and realizations of liturgy.[16] At this point it must be added that although PCN offers to its congregations a volume that reflects its confession, there is no central power having the authority to ban any of the new (or old) volumes.

---

[15] W. Bleij and O.Th. Boonstra, "Voorwoord bij de derde druk/uitgave," *Liedboek voor de Kerken,* xv-xvi, p. xv.
[16] *Voortgangsrapportage Nieuw Liedboek*, Generale Synode april 2009, (KTO 0902).

In this process of diversification *ISK* played an important role. In the first place by stating from the very publishing of the 1973 hymnbook on that this was not meant as a once and for all closed canon; in the second place, by itself publishing several volumes as "contributions to the development of the new church song."[17] Yet, the diversity and dispersion was not considered a desirable situation. By the end of the nineteen-eighties, within the board of *ISK* the conviction had taken root that one day they should provide a successor to the 1973 hymnal that would be the new unifying hymnbook.

This book is now being edited and it will be published in 2013, on May 25th. Whereas the 1973 hymnal can be said to reflect and bring about consensus, this new hymnal is inspired by and will bring about organic unity.

TOWARDS ORGANIC UNITY

In 1986, the comments to the draft "Declaration of ecclesiological consensus" from congregations and regional bodies had come in, and a slightly adapted text of it was formally adopted by both synods. In the same year, the ELC applied for participation in the unification process, and was accepted after having agreed with the "Declaration of ecclesiological consensus" in an additional letter. The ELC was a very small denomination in terms of membership (about 1 % of the total constituency of the present Protestant Church in the Netherlands has a Lutheran background), but, of course, it represents an important stream within the churches of the Reformation. The entrance of the ELC implied a broadening of traditions, not only in terms of confession and theology, but also in terms of liturgy and church music.

The "Declaration of ecclesiological consensus" paved the way for a decision taken by the three joint synods in 1990, which in fact defined full organic unity as the goal of the unification process. One new Constitution had to be drafted first of all, and after that a set of By-laws for one new church had to be conceived. It took more than another decade to implement this decision, but finally, in December 2003, each of the three synods decided to continue church life together as one Protestant Church in the Netherlands, to be a juridical entity as of May 1st, 2004.

In the course of this period between 1990 and 2004 a new Worship Book in two volumes (Part I, 1998, about 1300 pages; Part II, 2004, about 1000 pages) was presented, to be 'tested' by the congregations. It heavily draws on the rich Lutheran heritage, and at the same time it contains a large scope of alternatives in term of orders of worship, liturgical forms, prayers, etc.

[17] As is the subtitle of eight volumes in the series *Zingend Geloven.*

To some extent, this illustrates how the relationship of unity and diversity has changed over the last decades. In terms of structure, the unity of the Protestant Church in the Netherlands is a differentiated concept. The church order, too, on the one hand gives a set of rules which are supposed to be ordinary, but on the other hand provides room for alternatives with regard to issues like the way congregations are organized, office-bearers are elected, etc. The church explicitly mentions a number of issues in practical church life that can be arranged according to local custom and desire, albeit not without the explicit involvement of the congregants. A few examples are: the admission of children to Holy Supper, and the ritual of blessing same-sex relationships.

Above, we pointed to the fact that the valid NRC and RCN church orders in 1973 contained very restrictive regulations with regard to liturgical books. “No other hymns will be sung by the congregation than those collected in the Worship Book,” and “the Bible translation, the hymnbook and the liturgical forms as designated or determined by the general synod will be used.” The church order of the Protestant Church in the Netherlands reflects a different view. Its Constitution says: “For use in worship services the general synod, according to rules given by ordinance, designates, offers, or determines the Bible translation, the psalm-book and hymn-book and the worship book with liturgical forms.”[18] The By-laws specify this rule in the following regulations: “(1) The general synod fosters unity in the church by designating one or more Bible translations, offering one or more psalm-books annex hymn-books, for use in worship services. In worship services these translations and books are preferred for use. (2) With a view to worship services and other celebrations the general synod determines liturgical orders, which together constitute the Worship Book (…).”[19] The by-laws include a procedure for testing such publications for some years before they can be decided to be final.

As we see plurality plays a major role. The general synod designates one or more Bible translations, but they are in no way exclusively mandatory. Hymnbooks are offered to the congregations, but they do have the option to use alternative songs. These books are (only) preferred for use. This will also apply to the new hymnbook to come.

Dispelling the Worship Wars

This new hymnbook will be even more interdenominational than its predecessor. In 2013, the new hymnal will be presented, not only to the PCN and the three other churches using the 1973 hymnal from the beginning, but also to two other Dutch and two Flemish protestant churches. The PCN general synod is expected to decide on a provisional

[18] Art. VII-2 Constitution PCN.
[19] Ord. 5-9 PCN.

introduction – in accordance with the church order procedure for testing – in April 2013. From this perspective, ecumenism and the search for unity can be said to be served or perhaps enhanced by the developments in liturgy. A closer look, however, reveals that the unity desired might be very particular and limited to the PCN. It is, however, a kind of unity reminiscent of organic unity as the craved for solution to deal with plurality.

It was only in 2007 – some twenty years after the thought of a new hymnbook had been raised for the first time – that the synods of the participating churches assigned *ISK* to provide a new hymnal. Two of the considerations of the PCN general synod were: "(4) A new hymnal should be an expression of the identity of the PCN and should make allowance for the several vocabularies and sound groups within that church and (5) A new hymnal is important for the unity of the church."[20] This stress on unity already discloses that it is not so much part of the current but rather of the desired situation. Within the merged church, the differences between the former churches do not have to be bridged anymore. Instead, other differences have come to the fore, which are not unique to PCN but can be witnessed world-wide. The question central in this opposition is whether and if so, to what extent, the church should explicitly relate to (changes in) the surrounding culture. Since these differences are most obvious when it comes to the question of liturgy, in the USA and the UK these have been named the worship wars.[21] Within PCN, the two most obvious parties participating in these wars are the evangelicals and the so-called 'Reformed Alliance' (*Gereformeerde Bond*).[22] The former being in favour of contemporary worship music, the latter striving for more adherence to scripture and tradition, they meet each other in their aversion of the 'average 1973 hymn' and their plea for language and music the 'common member of the congregation' can understand. It is also with a view to keeping these large groups on board that the general synod has formulated its decision as it is. This interpretation is underlined by the demand of the board of the General Synod in 2008 to add more members from these groups to the editorial process. So this new interdenominational hymnal functions partly to bridge oppositions within the Protestant Church in the Netherlands as the largest of the denominations involved.

But does this imply that this hymnal is less ecumenical than its predecessor? It would be all too easy to just blame the synod for a lack of broad perspective. In a certain way, their decision *does* express a broader perspective. The same ecclesiological, maybe even eschatological, considerations that were underlying the 1973 hymnal can be found here. The synod has not responded to the loud voices calling for abandoning the idea of one

---

[20] *Besluitenlijst van de generale synode van de Protestantse Kerk in Nederland gehouden op donderdag 19 en vrijdag 20 april 2007 te Lunteren*, pp. 6-7. Cf. Ord. 5-9-1!
[21] E.g. York, *America's Worship Wars.*
[22] The RA is rooted in the orthodox wing of the former NRC.

hymnal altogether and providing a loose-leaf collection out of which each church and each congregation can compile its own volume. In deciding for one book, which should express the existing diversity and in doing so literally bind together (or, one could say, organically unite) the factions within the church, the synod has allowed for each group to sing its own song. But at least, these songs of diversity can be sung together, using the same hymnal.

EVALUATION AND CONCLUSION

The liturgical reform being dealt with in this article is limited in scope, in the sense that it 'only' refers to the introduction of a new hymnal. However, it is an aspect of a wider liturgical development as visible in the aforementioned recent introduction of a new Worship Book in two volumes. Most of all, it can only be understood within the ecclesiological context of growing ecumenical openness of the PCN, the unification process itself being the major but not the only expression of this important change. Finally, changes in culture and society, and particularly secularization,[23] have to be taken into account if we want to understand the dynamics of ecclesial development. Whereas until the nineties press coverage of the unification process was pretty high – in itself a factor that cannot be ignored if one wants to understand the dynamics of the process –, indifference has now come in its place.

There is no doubt that the 1973 hymnal has fostered unity on the local level during the first decades of the unification process. An important practical obstacle was cleared away by its introduction. It has to be taken into account that during those years the vast majority of local congregations would readily observe synodical decisions in this respect. This is no longer the case, as the aforementioned 2008 survey clearly showed.

The 1973 hymnal also represents an increased ecumenical disposition of the churches involved. For all participating churches this was in fact the first time that power regarding a pivotal ecclesial expression like liturgy is, was really shared with other churches. The relevance of this development should not be underestimated: it paved the way for further ecumenical cooperation.

From an ecclesiological perspective, one could question the role of *ISK*. Its foundation was in a way an emergency measure: direct involvement of all participating churches would probably have led to a very complicated process, which could easily have ended up in a deadlock. The relative independence of the *ISK* has fostered progress. However, there is a drawback to it. This division of tasks and responsibilities comes with a growing opacity about who actually is or represents 'the church'. In the process of compiling the new hymnal, a task that has been assigned by the general synods, the *ISK* has stayed in contact about the

[23] Nowadays, Dutch Christianity is a minority within a majority secular society and culture.

progress with the boards of the synods, by means of so-called round-table-conversations. These boards have appointed supervisors who, supported by a group of people intended to represent those who would use the book, advise the board on the acceptance of the hymnal. These supervisors have gotten insight in the editorial process and have seen some 400 items (songs as well as texts) which will be included in this new hymnal. In proceeding in this way, *ISK* is certain to have stayed in touch with the participating churches but meanwhile the relationship with those churches has shifted to another level. This might evoke the thought by the general synod that the church is kept away from fundamental decisions made and it may feel confronted with a *fait accompli.* For several reasons, the meeting in April 2013 when the synod will be asked to provisionally introduce the hymnal, will be of interest. It raises the question whether the church has factually renounced one of its fundamental responsibilities by allowing a foundation to deliver a hymnal or by providing itself with a large overhead structure where many different people and groups are involved and responsible.

It is here that an ecclesiological change of perspective is visible, particularly with regard to the underlying understanding of ecumenism. Whereas the 1973 hymnal was ecumenical in the sense that it *fostered* ecumenical cooperation on the local level, the 2013 hymnal will be ecumenical in the sense that it *reflects* ecumenical breadth. Whereas the 1973 hymnal was characterized by its being limited to 'protestant ecumenism', the 2013 hymnal will include hymns that are rooted in other traditions – catholic, orthodox, evangelical – as well. The 2013 hymnal will reflect a deeper understanding of ecumenism, similar to what Paul Murray calls 'receptive ecumenism',[24] or what Bert Hoedemaker, Anton Houtepen and Theo Witvliet describe as 'ecumenism as a learning process',[25] in which learning from other traditions is not regarded as threatening a church's heritage, but rather as deepening its authentic identity. From this perspective, the increased plurality within the PCN should not be regarded first of all as a loss of identity – although it cannot be denied that this plays a role as well! – but rather as a reflection of ecumenical openness.

This also has its consequences in terms of church polity. Within the liturgical and ecclesial reform at stake different actors have taken the lead at different times. The contents of the forthcoming hymnal 2013 have been strongly influenced by the ongoing pluralisation of the PCN: different traditions, including new traditions like the evangelical movement, had to be satisfied. Church politics certainly plays a role in this regard: the leadership given by, for instance, the general synod is partly stamped by the *iustitia distributiva* a plural church

[24] Cf. P.D. Murray, *Receptive Ecumenism and the Call to Catholic Learning: Exploring a Way for Contemporary Ecumenism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).
[25] B. Hoedemaker, A. Houtepen and Th. Witvliet, *Oecumene als leerproces: Inleiding in de oecumenica*, (Zoetermeer: Meinema, 2005^3).

needs. Whereas in 1973 it was self-evident that the church orders involved did recognize the power of a general synod to *decide* which hymns would be allowed, the PCN church order recognizes the right of local congregations to decide on such issues by its own authority, whereas the synod only *offers* hymnals. However, this should not be interpreted too readily as only a matter of loss of authority. It is no less a recognition of the diversity of the gifts of the Spirit, also in liturgy, and of the need to create room for new experiences rather than wanting to control local church life. In legal terms this means a shift from mandatory law to directive law.

Similar dynamics have played a role in the unification process. At some stages pressure from below, i.e. from those congregations that wanted to be facilitated in their wish for maximal cooperation, stimulated the process on a national level. At other stages pressure from below, in this case from congregations in the traditional orthodox wing of the churches, slowed down the process considerably. At times when a complete deadlock seemed to be reached, synods were able to act with resolve. Under all circumstances it was the goal of church leadership to create and maintain a climate in which local congregations could make their own experiences and learn from it.

This openness for new experiences is also visible in the way the PCN Constitution defines its ecumenical responsibility: “As manifestation of the one holy apostolic and catholic or universal Christian church, the church is called to seek and promote unity, fellowship and cooperation with other churches of Jesus Christ. The church takes part in and stimulates ecumenical work in the Netherlands and in the world. It seeks and maintains closer relations with churches to which it is joined by special confessional or historical bonds. It seeks union with the churches with which there is unity or kinship in faith and church order” (art. XVI-1). As a united church the PCN seeks further organic unity. From this perspective one could even say that the 2013 hymnal is characterized by an ecumenical anticipation.

Bibliography to Chapter 3

Besluitenlijst van de generale synode van de Protestantse Kerk in Nederland gehouden op donderdag 19 en vrijdag 20 april 2007 te Lunteren. http://goo.gl/eZyiI4, last time accessed 23 October 2014.

Bleij, Wonno (1998). '25 jaar Liedboek voor de Kerken', in Interkerkelijke Stichting voor het Kerklied (Ed.). *Zingt voor de Heer een nieuw gezang: 25 jaar Liedboek voor de Kerken.* Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum, pp. 9-10.

Bleij, Wonno and Otto Th. Boonstra (1984[3]). 'Voorwoord bij de derde druk/uitgave', in *Liedboek voor de Kerken.* Den Haag: Boekencentrum, pp. xv-xvi.

'Een lafenis in de ruimte van de hele kerk', in *Trouw*, 7 May 1998.

Hoedemaker, Bert, Anton Houtepen and Theo Witvliet (2005[3]). *Oecumene als leerproces: Inleiding in de oecumenica*. Zoetermeer: Meinema.

Kerkorde der Nederlandse Hervormde Kerk. (HKO) 1951. Den Haag: Boekencentrum.

Kerkorde en ordinanties van de Protestantse Kerk in Nederland. (PKO) 2004. Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum.

Kerkorde van de Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland. (GKO) 1957*.* Kampen: Kok*.*

Koffeman, Leo J. (2005). 'Ekklesiologie und Kirchenrecht in einem Unionsprozess: Erfahrungen aus der Protestantischen Kirche in den Niederlanden', in *Catholica: Vierteljahrschrift für ökumenische Theologie* 59 (2), pp. 108-127.

Lazonder, Ad W. (1973). 'speech', in *Eredienst: tijdschrift voor liturgie* VII (3), pp.27-30.

– (1984[3]). 'Ter verantwoording', in *Liedboek voor de Kerken.* Den Haag: Boekencentrum, pp. x-xiv.

Murray, Paul D. (2008). *Receptive Ecumenism and the Call to Catholic Learning: Exploring a Way for Contemporary Ecumenism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schulte Nordholt, Jan Willem (1973). 'Het lied van de kerk', in *Eredienst: tijdschrift voor liturgie.* VII (3), pp. 5-15.

– (1992). 'Constanten en Variabelen, de smaak van het kerkvolk', in Jan Willem Schulte Nordholt. *Het woord brengt de waarheid teweeg: Essays over literatuur en werkelijkheid.* Kampen: Kok, pp. 61-68.

Voortgangsrapportage Nieuw Liedboek. 2009. Generale Synode PKN.

York, Terry W. (2003). *America's Worship Wars.* Peabody (MA)*:* Hendrickson Publishers.

CHAPTER 4

HISTORY

This chapter is currently under review:
Nienke van Andel, Martin J.M. Hoondert and Marcel Barnard. ‘Remembering ’73: Collectively Constructing a Liturgical History by a Hymnbook Editorial Board’.

INTRODUCTION

History does not belong to the past. Neither is it the exclusive property of historians. Increasingly, scholars in liturgical studies discover history as an area of research. Joining the interdisciplinary platform of cultural memory studies, they focus on practices of performing the past.[1] Their critical attitude does not limit itself to liturgy and ritual as a field of interest. Since liturgical studies is an inherently self-critical area, the historiography of liturgical studies is also subject to debate. One of the central debates concerns the position of the scholars. Are they part of the history that is performed? Or could they instead claim for themselves a meta-position from which they can describe liturgy's and liturgical studies' history?

In the Netherlands, this debate surfaced with the publication of a study on the historiography of liturgical studies in this country in the twentieth century.[2] Whereas in the opening chapter to that edited volume two of the editors present a description of "the development of the liturgical movements in the various Dutch churches and […] the various (academic) settings in which the study of liturgy has been and still is carried out",[3] in the final chapter the two other editors question the normativity and self-evidence by which this description is introduced. On the contrary, they argue that "we need to learn to think in a radically acentric way";[4] moreover, they warn against a "dominant imbalance"[5] since the perspective by which historiography is written, is an exclusively inside perspective.

The present article seeks to contribute to this discussion. It analyses one specific instance of remembering the past. This paper critically discusses the editorial process of the Dutch Protestant hymnbook *Liedboek* (2013) by focusing on the histories by which this new hymnal in the meetings of its editorial board is related to its 1973 predecessor. We will argue that four different versions of history are established in social interaction, that each allow for a distinct relationship between old and new hymnal: following, imitation, emulation and mutation. The intention of this analysis is to shine empirical light on the claim

---

[1] Paul Post, "*Ritual criticism*: Een actuele verkenning van kritische reflectie ten aanzien van ritueel, met bijzondere aandacht voor e-ritueel en *cyberpilgrimage*," *Jaarboek voor Liturgie-onderzoek* 29 (2013) 173-99.

[2] Louis van Tongeren, Marcel Barnard, Paul Post and Gerard Rouwhorst, eds., *Patterns and persons: A historiography of liturgical studies in the Netherlands in the twentieth century* (Leuven: Peeters, 2010).

[3] Gerard Rouwhorst and Louis van Tongeren, "Liturgical Studies in the Netherlands: An introduction to its historiography," in: Van Tongeren, Barnard, Post and Rouwhorst, eds., *Patterns and persons,* 3-22, 4.

[4] Marcel Barnard and Paul Post, "Balance and Perspective: Some critical observations regarding the historiography of the era of the Liturgical Movement in the Netherlands," in: Van Tongeren, Barnard, Post and Rouwhorst, eds., *Patterns and persons,* 469-85, 472.

[5] Barnard and Post, "Balance and Perspective," 482.

that history is not a static objective fact or series of facts, but instead a story or multiplicity of stories performed over and again within a given community. In doing so, we side with scholars denying that there is a space singled out for scholars who want to study what ‘really happened’. On the contrary, we offer this article as part of the making of a history of the new hymnbook, and of its historiography.

This contribution is part of broader research concerning the editorial process of the 2013 hymnal. The rationales underlying that study will be introduced shortly. Before doing so, we will first engage with the topic of collective remembering, which informs our approach of history and memory. Then, after the overarching study has been introduced, follows a section showing our method and analytical approach. This section is a bridge between the broader context of our entire study and the four discursive connections we found are used in relating the new hymnal to its predecessor. Finally, we will return once more to the debate in the historiography of liturgical studies as mentioned above, and present our conclusion.

COLLECTIVE REMEMBERING

This contribution proceeds from the conviction that history refers to certain aspects dynamically and contingently ascribed to something or someone in a social interaction. We thus take a social constructivist and discursive approach to history. This approach considers history to be constructed in social interaction, by using all kinds of language, such as words, signs and actions. For our particular case, the history of the hymnbook, this means we assume language to be capable of anchoring the new hymnal in the past and relating it to earlier developments and events.

We prefer the notion of collective remembering over that of history, thereby stressing that history is not static but instead “involves the repeated reconstruction of representations of the past”.[6] This emphasizes the (inter)active character of history, or memory, the interrelation of which we will argue more extensively further on.

In preferring the notion of collective remembering, we join the emerging field of memory studies. Memory studies is an umbrella notion that covers the various activities undertaken by scholars from disciplines such as philosophy, psychology, history and educational studies. To this list, liturgical and ritual studies should naturally be added. Here we should not only include studies which concern the relationship between (liturgical) ritual and

[6] James V. Wertsch and Henry L. Roediger, "Collective memory: Conceptual foundations and theoretical approaches," *Memory* 16 (2008) 318-26, 319.

remembrance,[7] but also those which focus on a historiography of the field of liturgical studies itself.[8]

Memory and history

From this broad and evolving field of memory studies we draw three central assumptions on which this contribution is built. The first considers the relationship between memory and history. We do not assume memory and history to be radically opposed to each other, memory being the unreliable and subjective version of a thoroughly documented and verifiable account of events as it is given by scholars of history. Nor do we suggest that history and memory are the same, as if no comments or corrections can be suggested on any remembrance of past affairs. Instead, the relationship between both is entangled.[9] We proceed from the conviction that history cannot do without story, since the only way to remember and to relate to what happened before is to shape it by means of language, of which words are the most obvious instance but which also involves memorials, remembrance days and photographs, for example. Human memory "mentally transform[s] essentially unstructured series of events into seemingly coherent historical narratives".[10]

Selectivity

These narratives - and this leads us to the second central assumption - are necessarily selective. One simply cannot recall every aspect of everything. This does not imply that these narratives are corrupt or should be corrected from some objective point of view. We take the selectivity and (inter)subjectivity of remembering as our given starting point and not as a reason for proving its unreliability. In this respect our approach differs from methods which equal the identification of invention of traditions to their unmasking as false. We agree with literary theorist Aleida Assmann who impassionedly asserts that "this Marxist reading of traditions […] [affirms and reinstates] such categories as "true" and "authentic" […] *ex negativo*".[11] She argues that "[m]emory constructs that inform commemorative practices and traditions are […] not necessarily false because they are constructed – of course they are!".[12]

---

[7] e.g. Gerard Lukken, *Rituals in abundance: Critical reflections on the place, form, and identity of Christian ritual in our culture* (Leuven: Peeters, 2005).
[8] e.g. Van Tongeren, Barnard, Post and Rouwhorst, eds., *Patterns and persons*.
[9] Aleida Assmann, "Transformations between History and Memory," *Social Research* 75 (2008) 49-72.
[10] Eviatar Zerubavel, *Time Maps: Collective Memory and the Social Shape of the Past* (Chicago: University Press, 2004), 13.
[11] Assmann, "Transformations," 66.
[12] Assmann, "Transformations," 67.

Structure

The third assumption underlying our argument in this paper embeds this selectivity and subjectivity of historical narratives into their structural appearance. We do not state that anything goes in collective remembering. When it comes to their structure, memories are unmistakably social. In this context sociologist Zerubavel refers to "mnemonic socialization", which takes place both in formal and informal social settings: "When a young boy returns from a long day spent with his mother downtown and hears her "official" account to their family of what they did there, he is at the same time receiving a tacit lesson in what is conventionally considered memorable and forgettable."[13] Zerubavel, who introduces the notion of time maps, stresses the importance of the structure of a narrative and thus argues that the social meaning of events lies not (only) in the events themselves but (also) in how they are constructed and related to other events.[14] In an otherwise polemic account of Zerubavel's approach, anthropologist Fabian admits that "although [maps and schemes can be known] only in retrospect, that is, after individuals have done their cognizing and groups their matching of schemes, we infer that mapping pasts and thereby making them common, serves to create and maintain social identities (religious, ethnic, national)".[15] That is exactly why these structures are important for our question: once history is mapped, or structured, or collectively remembered, accounts of it, introduced by Fabian as *pasts*, become actors in social interaction.

With a view to the aim of this paper to contribute to the historiography of liturgical studies as suggested in our introduction, it is interesting to note that the existence of a script is also referred to when it comes to how the story of liturgical studies' history is told:

> [T]here seems to be a very closed and programmatic setting in which a rather stereotyped, closed account is repeated over and over. The script of that account, as it were, has been on hand for decades […] There are always the same names, […] always the same periodisation, the same significant milestones and the same programmatic sketch.[16]

STUDYING THE EDITORIAL PROCESS

As mentioned above, the question this contribution deals with is part of more extensive research on the editorial process of the 2013 Dutch Protestant hymnbook *Liedboek*. The main question guiding the overall research is: *what are the central topics in the meetings of*

---

[13] Zerubavel, *Time Maps*, 5.
[14] Zerubavel, *Time Maps*, 7.
[15] Johannes Fabian, *Memory against culture: Arguments and reminders* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2007) 46.
[16] Barnard and Post, "Balance and Perspective," 471.

the editorial board of the new Dutch hymnal and how is meaning attributed to them? The researchers consider these meanings as constructed in social interaction and thus take a discursive approach to the notions under study.

In the research, we concentrate on the production of meaning in the meetings of the main editorial board, although the editorial process included much more than just this board. A foundation, *ISK*, was commissioned by four different Dutch protestant denominations in 2007 to compile a new hymnbook. In the following years, four other denominations joined the group, two of which from Belgium. *ISK* was responsible for the compilation and publication of the hymnal, but did not undertake the task of compiling itself. It appointed some seventy people who were divided among eight editorial working groups and one main editorial board. The hymnal contains 1419 items: 130 texts and some 1300 songs. The first edition was sold out even before it was published. Other editions soon followed and were also quickly sold out. By November 2013, 175,000 copies had been sold and the fifth edition was underway.[17]

Within this broad area, the first author conducted the empirical part of the research under supervision of the other two authors. The central piece of the empirical study consists of participant observation at the meetings of the main editorial board and the editorial working groups, where the researcher did far more observing than participating. She attended ninety-seven meetings of the working groups, usually half a day each, and forty-one meetings of the editorial board, which usually took one day each in the period May 2008 to September 2012. After one year of observation she was granted permission to make audio-recordings of the meetings. Altogether, eighty-five meetings were audio-taped. The researcher was also allowed to make video recording during the final year, when the editorial board was still gathering and the working groups had already completed their part of the job. Six meetings of the editorial board were video-taped, five meetings of one day each and one gathering consisting of a five-day retreat in an abbey.

The reason for expanding the empirical part of the research can be found in the on-going interchange between study of theory and empirical observation. It gradually became more and more clear to us that the meetings should be considered as an environment where meaning is generated. Since this usually is not a conscious process, the details of the interaction mattered to us. We added recording equipment in order to catch these details as live as possible. In turn that allowed us to make transcripts of the meetings as detailed as deemed necessary.

[17] "Nieuw liedboek is bestseller in christelijke boekenbranche," *Trouw*, 19 November 2013.

Transcription is not a value-free activity. We suppose that recording is a first step in interpretation since the position of the recorder matters to what is recorded. Transcription then is the second step in the interpretation process. It requires interpretation on the part of the researcher. The involvement of the researcher in constructing the data is in fact totally in line with the theoretical approach presented in this article. We do not consider the tape recorder as "a time machine" that can provide "a direct and evidential record of a past event".[18] Instead, a version of what happened in the meetings is constructed in interaction between the recording, the transcript and the researcher (sometimes assisted by her field notes, which are of course at least as prone to the same limitations as are the other sources). Together they recall a past event, the remembering here taken as a discursive and active process. We obviously do not claim "an aura of epistemic authority"[19] for the transcripts nor for the tapes. Neither do we, in line with our approach of collective remembering, state that the transcripts are therefore corrupt or too subjective to work with.

METHOD AND ANALYSIS

For the analysis of our transcripts we have been inspired by the approach developed by linguist Mercer and his colleagues and introduced under the name of *sociocultural discourse analysis*. As the name already indicates, this is a way of doing analysis which starts from a discursive outlook on the area under study and thus belongs to the field of discourse analysis. It would take us too far to give an extended overview of that field, which is in itself the motive of numerous articles. We will just present the central characteristics of the approach we have taken.

The most central characteristic of sociocultural discourse analysis is its perception of language, in this approach mainly but not exclusively introduced as talk. Talk enables people to "interthink".[20] In interaction by means of talk, people's thoughts meet and reinforce each other, thereby establishing a foundation for further cooperation and interaction.

Next, sociocultural discourse analysis can be characterized by its attention for the reflexivity of talk. It takes into account that talk always relates to and structures its context. This implies that "the basis of common knowledge upon which shared understanding depends is constantly being developed".[21] This inclusion of context connects to our presupposition that a study on (the construction of) meaning should not be confined to the talk used, but should

[18] Malcolm Ashmore, Katie MacMillan and Steven D. Brown, "It's a scream: Professional hearing and tape fetishism," *Journal of Pragmatics* 36 (2004) 349-74, 349.
[19] Ashmore, MacMillan and Brown, "It's a scream," 351.
[20] Neil Mercer, "Sociocultural discourse analysis: Analysing classroom talk as a social mode of thinking," *Journal of Applied Linguistics* 1 (2004) 137-68, 139.
[21] Mercer, "Sociocultural discourse analysis," 139.

take the sociocultural embedding of the conversation into account since this embedding both shapes and is shaped by the words spoken. This comes most succinct to the fore in our decision to not just make recordings and transcribe them, but to act as a participant observer as well in order to get to know the culture of the meetings of the editorial board.

The third rationale underlying sociocultural discourse analysis is its conception of transcripts. Mercer stresses that a transcript should be a “faithful representation of what is actually said”,[22] but at the same time he does not fall prey to the fallacy that equates what is written to what was said. Mercer thus clearly puts the activity of transcribing within the research phase of interpreting. Transcripts are a valuable source of information, as long as one recognizes the nature of this information.

The three rationales elaborated upon are visible in the actual way Mercer proposes to perform analysis. What is most distinctive to his methodology is the complementary use of close reading and computational analysis. It is performed as follows: close reading of small parts of transcripts is done with an exploratory aim. The leading question is what happens in these particular interactions, in our case: is the new hymnal in these reports of social interaction put into a historical context, and if so, how, and in which context? When this content analysis of a small portion of all transcription is performed, computer-based techniques allow for “a comparative analysis of dialogue across a representative sample of cases”.[23] This enables the researcher to “reveal the way words gather meanings by the company they keep”.[24] With the help of concordance software[25] frequency as well as collocations, that is which words often occur in each other’s vicinity, can easily be mapped, analyzing several transcripts at the same time. This makes it possible to map the local use and meaning of a term, which quite often extends beyond its dictionary meaning. The two ways of analysis complement each other and at the same time, which is another great advantage, the researchers do not have to make a selection of their transcripts before entering this phase of analysis.

In our analysis we included transcripts of fifteen editorial board meetings held between 22 May 2009 and 21 September 2012, divided equally throughout the process. From each calendar year, we chose one transcript which we analyzed by means of close reading. We noticed attempts to link the new hymnal to a past were most often and most obviously made when relating it to its predecessor. Furthermore, we noticed this predecessor was not

[22] Mercer, “Sociocultural discourse analysis,” 147.
[23] Mercer, “Sociocultural discourse analysis,” 143.
[24] Mercer, “Sociocultural discourse analysis,” 143.
[25] We used the freeware AdTAT. Adelaide Text Analysis Tool, a concordancing tool provided by the University of Adelaide, see http://www.adelaide.edu.au/red/adtat/

only referred to by using its name, but also by means of the year it was published, 1973. We therefore performed concordance searches for the terms *Liedboek voor de kerken*, *oud(e) Liedboek* and *(19)73*. Besides these ways of introducing the old hymnal, by its name and by its year of publication, we noticed that the names of the main poets who contributed to the old hymnal were also used as a kind of pars pro toto. We therefore also performed concordance searches on the last names of the five central poets, namely *Barnard*, *den Besten*, *Heeroma* as well as his pseudonym *Jacobse*, *Schulte Nordholt* and *Wit*.

FOUR DISCURSIVE CONNECTIONS

The analysis as introduced above has led us to distinguish four different relationships between the new and the old hymnbook that are discursively established. We will present these relationships by using notions that stem from studies on Renaissance literature. In Renaissance art, of which we here limit ourselves to literature, the relationship of a new work of art to a classical example was central. Both Renaissance writers and contemporary scholars have reflected on the nature of this relationship. Key notion here is *imitation*: "Literary imitation in the Renaissance was a practice both codified and controlled. A systematization of vast discursive networks, imitatio distilled the world in a word".[26]

We follow the distinction of literary theorist Pigman who uses the word 'imitation' both as the overarching name of the established relationship and as the name of one of the versions of this relation.[27] The other versions he distinguishes are 'following' and 'emulation'. For our purposes we added one more version, which we have named 'mutation'. This division should, importantly, not suggest that the ways of relating to older sources are separate and independent discursive connections. Rather, it accounts for the "fluidity of boundaries"[28] between these connections.

Following

By 'following' we refer to the suggestion that the new hymnal is an heir to the old one, as if it is walking in its footsteps. This connection is established in several ways, three of which we will elaborate on in this section. The first connection we want to highlight is the use of the same name. Indeed, as Zerubavel states, "names as discursive tokens of "sameness" [have] tremendous mnemonic significance".[29] Like the 1973 hymnal the new hymnal will be called *Liedboek*, which was indeed verbalized as a connection between the two books:

---

[26] Alana D. Schilling, "The Worth of the Imperfect Memory: Allusion and Fictions of Continuity in Petrarch and Spenser," *MLN* 125 (2010) 1075-97, 1075.
[27] George W. Pigman III, "Versions of Imitation in the Renaissance," *Renaissance Quarterly* 33 (1980) 1-32.
[28] Pigman, "Versions of Imitation," 25.
[29] Zerubavel, *Time Maps,* 52.

Ben[30]: Well, I have an announcement to make on the name of the book. This has been a topic of discussion for several months. (…) The discussion went, eh, focused on the question of whether it should be a musical name or a practical one and finally the board rendered a Solomon judgment, eh, to leave the official name simply as *Liedboek*, with a subtitle which indicates function and goal, namely singing and praying at home and in church. So, the book will simply be called *Liedboek* and eh, just like for the Bible, we have a new translation but the Bible is still called the Bible. So in church we keep on reading from the Bible and singing from the *liedboek*.[31]

Secondly, a connection is established by the songs that are incorporated in the new hymnal. It mainly is a compilation of already existing material. The main source that has been drawn from is in fact the old hymnal. The rhyming of the complete Genevan psalter has been copied from the old hymnal and so is about two thirds of the hymns it offers.[32] The Genevan psalter in the 1967 rhyming indeed is introduced and over time firmly established as "the regular psalter",[33] "the basis",[34] "a clearly to be recognized line in the new hymnal"[35] and "a basal hymnological pillar".[36] Similar quotes could be provided for the hymns taken from the old hymnal. In two discursive steps the new hymnal is actually given a firm foundation: first a collection of psalms and hymns is positioned as hymnologically indispensable. Next, the new hymnal, since it incorporates so much of this corpus, is discursively constructed to connect to this tradition.

Thirdly, the new hymnal is discursively connected to the old one in a more tangible reality. Places, such as buildings and cities, "constitute a reliable locus of memories and often serve as major foci of personal as well as group nostalgia".[37] When it comes to the editorial process of the old hymnal, the village of Oosterbeek plays a central role in the stories.[38] The

---

[30] Ben is not his/her real name: in order to safeguard anonymity we have provided the editors with fictive, male, names. Moreover, the names are not used congruently between the several transcripts

[31] Transcript 28 August 2009.

[32] The 1973 hymnbook exists of two parts: 150 psalms (Genevan psalter) and 491 hymns. In Dutch Protestantism, this is the only distinction which is of relevance. Notions such as hymn or song are used interchangeably.

[33] Transcript 22 May 2009.

[34] Transcript 28 August 2009.

[35] Transcript 26 March 2010.

[36] Transcript 20 May 2010.

[37] Zerubavel, *Time Maps,* 41.

[38] This includes both stories by the poets themseves, e.g. Jan Willem Schulte Nordholt, "Dichters op de Pietersberg," in: Adrianus W. Lazonder, ed., *Uit de werkplaats van het Liedboek* ('s-Gravenhage: Boekencentrum, 1974) 39-49 and later renditions, e.g.: Klaas de Jong Ozn., "Beoordelaars en beoordeelden," *Weerklank* 10 (1992) 128-34.

Pietersberg, the name of a particular Oosterbeek housing, is indicated as the place where the poets who are responsible for the 1967 rhyming of the Genevan psalter met several times. They are said to have been so inspired by this place and their meetings there that they started to write hymns of their own, considered to be the beginnings of the hymn part in the 1973 hymnal.

The main editorial board of the 2013 hymnal met several times for an overnight meeting in a convent. There are no indications that they did so deliberately, but the convent where they met was only two kilometers apart from the *Pietersberg*. This gave way to connecting the two editorial processes even more closely to each other. Although the official address of the convent is in Arnhem, the board usually mention that their meetings took place in Oosterbeek, which should not be surprising after all. In doing so, the editors added another mental bridge between two separate moments in time. They even called Oosterbeek "a nursery for hymnals".[39]

Imitation

'Imitation' is, in reference to the metaphor of Pigman, the moment when the new hymnal walks alongside the old one. The discursive action by which 'imitation' is established is that of analogy, a way of relating events to each other which for example allows for talk about "another Vietnam".[40] Analogy in our particular research includes all suggestions that the editorial board of the 2013 hymn-book acted like their 1973 predecessors, even if this does not lead to the same outcome, as the next quote shows.

> Ron: I think, this proposal to keep the tune, as well as the strong parts of the text (…) yes, these are pastoral notions which are really appropriate at certain moments.
> Peter: That happened in 73 as well, with the hymnal, that they just, eh, certain texts,
> Ron: Yes.
> Peter: That, they said these texts are really very meaningful, but we need to change them, so Barnard[41] simply adapted certain texts, didn't he.
> Ben: Yes.
> Peter: Ahasverus van den Berg[42] was also revised at that time.[43]

[39] Transcript 20 May 2010.
[40] Zerubavel, *Time Maps,* 52.
[41] Dutch poet and minister (1920-2010) who delivered many contributions to the 1973 hymnal.
[42] Dutch poet and minister (1733-1807).
[43] Transcript 28 August 2009.

Emulation

The third version of imitation is 'emulation'. The corresponding narrative tells that the new hymnal not only sprouts from and continues the old hymnal, but even improves it. This narrative was already present from the outset. The report by *ISK* phrasing the need for a new hymnal namely stressed three developments in current liturgy and society.[44] These are introduced as renewal (so many new hymns have been published since 1973), broadening (more musical and textual styles are wanted and available) and change (the focus has slightly been shifting from just singing in liturgy to singing the liturgy as well).

These developments and the need for the new hymnal to emulate the old one are also discursively constructed by the editors in their meetings. The old hymnal here is said to be compiled in another era by another generation. That generation's approval and appropriation of the hymnological tradition was good but one-sided. They chose to follow and firmly establish a main stream. In doing so, they overlooked the relevance of other streams. Those streams have in the meantime grown and can no longer be ignored. The new hymnal has to do more justice to what the board of the old hymnal could permit themselves to leave aside.

The following quote shows that the new hymnal in the collective remembering of the editorial board exceeds the old hymnal when it comes to theological open-mindedness.

Jim: Four goes in, eh, is added. Verse four to be added.
Bryan: Eh eh eh,
Mike: Comes, eh, yes, eh stays stays, from this version and eh, all agree?
Pete: Well yes, yes, eh, can somebody explain why?
Jim: To add verse four.
Pete: Yes, but why?
Mike: This life as your stable,
Jim: That has, eh was deleted by the editorial board in 1973.
Pete: They probably had their reasons for doing so,
Jim: Eh,
Chris: No, /?/
John: Well, so, it is very interesting to, eh, in the first place this is a four-verse, eh was also translated with four verses. In 1973 the editorial board said, we are not going to use it. It is very strange that in the course of these decades eh, this image, which is of course a pietistic image of eh the heart is the stable, that they just could not under, eh did not want to understand

[44] Interkerkelijke Stichting voor het Kerklied, *Een nieuw Liedboek* (s.l.:s.n., 2006).

or did not, not, eh they just considered it too pietistic by then. However, now we do encounter it much more often in hymns.[45]

The same applies to musical open-mindedness, as is shown by the following quote, part of a longer and complicated discussion, where the editors discuss whether they should incorporate two versions of a melody, or just select one of them:

Louis: Here we really are discussing several versions of the same tune.
Tom: No, of course.
Louis: Look, back then, in 1973, they thought they had the wisdom to decide that isoritmic singing was a thing of the past, but see,
Tom: I do think we are too easily,
Louis: In these postmodern days eh this eh,[46]

Mutation

When analyzing the concordances and word company of all instances of the words we found referring to the old hymnbook, we noticed a fourth way of relating the two hymnals to each other, which we call 'mutation'. Whereas 'following', 'imitation' and 'emulation' reckon with the new hymnal as somehow walking the same path, 'mutation' positions the new hymnal as choosing its own way. Here the new hymnal is talked about as doing something new. The definition of new, however, is new in relation to the old hymnal. We therefore still consider this narrative as structuring a relationship between '2013' and '1973'.

New is not per se interpreted as better or to be preferred or as progress. The new developments can also be discursively constructed as decline. As this quote by board member Philip illustrates:

> Yeah, people really are curious. But its contents eh, of course differs from that of 1973, of course it is much more varied when it comes to the styles and genres and such, it has to, it was policy for this new hymnal from the beginning. Eh, but you really have to take the level of the churchgoers into account in that regard. This eh, (…) Back then, well eh they could handle a hymn with twelve stanzas with a load of biblical notions and blahblah and such. And nowadays people are much more eager for just one refrain and, and eh, just what immediately has to be evocative so you don't have the sense of not understanding what you are singing. Well, that was no problem in 73, that you did not get it at first glance or at first

[45] Transcript 20 May 2010.
[46] Transcript 1 October 2010.

> singing, because then you would sing it more often and try to grasp it. But now you have to get it immediately or else just leave it.[47]

Mostly, however, newer is evaluated in a positive tone as becomes clear from this piece of transcript taken from a longer discussion on how to arrive at suitable translations of songs in other languages:

> Bill: It could be of course, that for one or two texts we come to the conclusion that, it just is not possible to translate them.
> Fred: Yes.
> Bill: Look, since we now eh, we have totally, we use totally different genres of hymns now, so in fact you are also asking a translator to eh, to look at different texts and melodies from various perspectives. So that is something different than the '73 hymnal, which was more one genre,
> Fred: Yes.
> Bill: So yes eh this is eh a very exciting adventure of which we do not know how it will turn out.[48]

Conclusion and discussion

In the meetings of the editorial board of the new Dutch hymnal, this hymn-book is related to the old hymnal in several ways. Since 'the old hymnal' itself is a notion that can be filled with different meaning, each relationship that is constructed between the hymnals is also a form of collective remembering, namely 'remembering' exactly what the old hymnal is. In doing so, the new hymnal is given a history. In this article we have argued for a discursive approach towards memory, which is why we focus on collective remembering, and we have argued for a social constructivist approach of meeting transcripts, which is why we were mainly inspired by the methodology of sociocultural discourse analysis.

A close reading of a small portion of our transcripts has revealed that several metaphors have been used to refer to the old hymnal. These include the year of its publication, 1973, as well as the names of individual poets (or, by the same token, those of composers) who have contributed to the hymnal. We have sought to show the several story lines that are used to fill these metaphors with meaning and to which the new hymnal is connected. These have been constructed out of several transcripts we studied with the help of computational analysis.

[47] Transcript 20 May 2010.
[48] Transcript 22 May 2009.

A closer description of these narratives has brought us to the construction of four versions of imitation: 'following', 'imitation', 'emulation' and 'mutation'. These conceptions of the old hymnal and the new hymn-book's relation to it, are, of course, not limited to the editorial board. As we already stated in our introduction, this article emphatically engages with a current discussion on liturgical historiography. It is interesting to observe the pervasiveness of the time maps, stories or scripts. Both in recent[49] and in older[50] popular volumes related to liturgy and church music in Dutch Protestantism, we encountered scripts by which time and again the same stories are told about 'the' development of psalm singing/church music/liturgy/and so on.

To this list, we should add the story of liturgical studies. This is also scripted. It is a version of what has happened to which the present is discursively related. We would argue that the central question dividing scholars up until today is what exactly is their relationship to that script. Are they the ones who have discovered it, who can describe it and hand it to others, for example by providing "especially non-Dutch readers" with "some basic information about the history of Christianity in the Netherlands"?[51] Or are they rather part of the script themselves, performing within it the role of 'scholars', who are struck by the fact that "the story of liturgy and liturgical studies in the twentieth century was, and still is strongly dominated by one particular perspective"[52], and who try to unravel the elements of this story and its possible alternatives? The way we see it, this is the ultimate and important choice, a question the answer to which can be decisive for the enduring reliability of liturgical studies as an academic discipline.

[49] Klaas-Willem de Jong, ed., *Verbindend vieren: Spelen met vormen en stijlen in de eredienst* (Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum, 2013).
[50] Jan Luth, Jan Pasveer and Jan Smelik, eds., *Het kerklied: Een geschiedenis*, (Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum, 2001).
[51] Rouwhorst and Van Tongeren, "Liturgical Studies in the Netherlands", 4.
[52] Barnard and Post, "Balance and Perspective," 470.

BIBLIOGRAPHY TO CHAPTER 4

Ashmore, Malcolm, Katie MacMillan and Steven D. Brown (2004). 'It's a scream: Professional hearing and tape fetishism', in *Journal of Pragmatics* 36, pp. 349-374.

Assmann, Aleida (2008). 'Transformations between History and Memory,' in *Social Research* 75, pp. 49-72.

Barnard, Marcel and Paul Post (2010). 'Balance and Perspective: Some critical observations regarding the historiography of the era of the Liturgical Movement in the Netherlands,' in Louis van Tongeren, Marcel Barnard, Paul Post and Gerard Rouwhorst (Eds.). *Patterns and persons: A historiography of liturgical studies in the Netherlands in the twentieth century*. Leuven etc.: Peeters, pp. 469-485.

De Jong, Klaas-Willem (Ed.) (2013). *Verbindend vieren: Spelen met vormen en stijlen in de eredienst*. Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum.

De Jong Ozn. Klaas (1992). 'Beoordelaars en beoordeelden,' in *Weerklank* 10, pp. 128-134.

Lukken, Gerard (2005). *Rituals in abundance: Critical reflections on the place, form, and identity of Christian ritual in our culture*. Leuven etc.: Peeters.

Luth, Jan, Jan Pasveer and Jan Smelik (Eds.) (2001). *Het kerklied: Een geschiedenis.* Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum.

Mercer, Neil (2004).'Sociocultural discourse analysis: Analysing classroom talk as a social mode of thinking,' in *Journal of Applied Linguistics* 1, pp. 137-168.

'Nieuw liedboek is bestseller in christelijke boekenbranche,' in *Trouw*, 19 November 2013.

Pigman III, George W. (1980). 'Versions of Imitation in the Renaissance,' in *Renaissance Quarterly* 33 (1), pp. 1-32.

Post, Paul (2013). 'Ritual criticism: Een actuele verkenning van kritische reflectie ten aanzien van ritueel, met bijzondere aandacht voor e-ritueel en cyberpilgrimage,' in *Jaarboek voor Liturgie-onderzoek* 29, pp. 173-199.

Rouwhorst, Gerard and Louis van Tongeren (2010). 'Liturgical Studies in the Netherlands: An introduction to its historiography,' in Louis van Tongeren, Marcel Barnard, Paul Post and Gerard Rouwhorst (Eds.). *Patterns and persons: A historiography of liturgical studies in the Netherlands in the twentieth century*. Leuven etc.: Peeters, pp. 3-22

Schilling, Alana D. (2010). 'The Worth of the Imperfect Memory: Allusion and Fictions of Continuity in Petrarch and Spenser,' in *MLN* 125, pp. 1075-1097.

Schulte Nordholt, Jan Willem (1974). 'Dichters op de Pietersberg,' in: Ad W. Lazonder (Ed.). *Uit de werkplaats van het Liedboek.* 's-Gravenhage: Boekencentrum, pp. 39-49.

Van Tongeren, Louis, Marcel Barnard, Paul Post and Gerard Rouwhorst (Eds.) (2010). *Patterns and persons: A historiography of liturgical studies in the Netherlands in the twentieth century.* Leuven etc.: Peeters.

Wertsch, James V. and Henry L. Roediger (2008). 'Collective memory: Conceptual foundations and theoretical approaches,' in *Memory* 16 (3), pp. 318-326.

Zerubavel, Eviatar (2004). *Time Maps: Collective Memory and the Social Shape of the Past.* Chicago (Ill.): University of Chicago Press.

CHAPTER 5

PROFESSIONAL IDENTITY

A slightly different version of this chapter is published as:
Nienke van Andel, Martin J.M. Hoondert and Marcel Barnard (2014). ‘We is Plural: Identity Construction in Hymn Book Editorial Meetings,’
in *Journal of Empirical Theology* 27 (2), pp. 214-238.

INTRODUCTION

In May 2013, six Dutch Protestant denominations together with two Flemish have received their new interdenominational hymnbook. This hymnal was contested even before it was published. Much of the criticism focused on the individuals that made up the editorial board, more specifically on their profession, which was almost paradigmatically equated to a lack of knowledge about matters ‘common lay people’ are interested in (e.g. Haasnoot 2008). The 70 people on either the main editorial board or one of its eight working groups were selected because of their expertise and experience, in theology, church music, linguistics and/or liturgical studies.

Because of this starting position – being selected as experts in a context that does not seem to value expertise – the question concerning the legitimacy of their position has been a continuous point of reflection for the editors (Van Andel 2011). This is in line with broader societal developments since the Sixties, where authority has shifted from leaders to counselors. Besides, being an example that can be followed serves as a recommendation, whereas possessing knowledge that others do not have is not (Bauman 2000). This broader context makes it even more relevant to look at the way the board members perform their roles as editors.

In this contribution we focus on the editors’ identities. Identity of professionals (here used in a less strict sense than we will use in the remainder of this article) has been a subject of on-going research within practical theology, especially in the field of pastoral care (e.g. Smeets 2012). These studies usually focus on the characteristics of the professionals and how those characteristics help or hinder them to practice their profession. Identity then precedes practice. As we adhere to a constructivist perspective on identity, we focus on identities as being performed in social interaction. Identities are both performed and reformed in interaction. In accordance with our introduction, we will limit ourselves to one specific range of identities, namely identities concerned with the relationship between those who are preparing the hymnal, whom we will functionally refer to as editors, and those who will eventually buy, read, use or detest the hymnal, whom we will functionally refer to as users. As we focus on the interaction in the editorial process the users involved in this study are ‘constructed users’, that is, as verbalized and imagined by the editors in their mutual interaction. In order to stress this limitation to the editors’ identities, we have chosen to use parentheses and hyphens in our main question. The main question this article thus seeks to address is *which ‘identities-in-relation-to-users’ do the editors construct in the meetings of the board and how do they value these identities?* This is interesting from the point of view already hinted at above: the so-called authority crisis, which makes it impossible for people in leading positions to rely on their knowledge only, and the dilemmas this causes for professionals working in an ecclesial context (cf. Kolbet 2009). This contribution shows actual ways of people in leading positions constructing their professional identities. Furthermore, this article seeks to give an impulse to the study of identity in the broader area of practical theology by introducing a discursive approach to identity, which has not frequently been used within this area before. It must, however, be noted that in areas related to (practical) theology both a discursive approach in general (e.g. Wijsen 2013) and a discursive approach to identity (e.g. Lövheim 2004; Tiemeier 2006) are gaining more attention.

This paper begins by providing the theoretical background of this contribution. We will first introduce our definition of identity and highlight its particular emphases. This definition is related to our choice to use talk as a site of research. On the theory behind this choice we will elaborate in the section thereafter. We will then go on to a detailed description of our data: the embedding thereof in a broader research project, the method we used for generating them and the tools used for analysis of these data. Next, we will present the results of the analysis: six identity repertoires will be examined, provided with representative quotes from the transcripts. In the final section of this contribution we will state our conclusion and briefly discuss our findings.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUNDS

Identity

A large and growing body of literature has investigated the concept of identity, which over the last decades has become both famous and notorious for its capacity to contain several perspectives at once (Widdicombe 1998; Bucholtz and Hall 2005; Welschen 2012). In the following paragraphs, we will elaborate on our stance in this area.

The theoretical backbone of this article consists of a qualified constructivist approach to identity (Welschen 2012). The definition we are working with is derived from the sociocultural linguistic approach[1] of Bucholtz and Hall who define identity as *the social positioning of self and other* (Bucholtz and Hall 2005: 586). Opposed to everyday talk which seems to consider identity as an attribute of an individual irrespective of the context, we adhere to the view that identities are constructed in a state of flux, depending, among other variables on time, place, audience and task to be accomplished (Widdicombe 1998; Lowney and Holstein 2001). The relationship between identities and interaction is mutual: social interaction, whether in a casual conversation, a formal meeting or a digital chat session, serves as a context that enables people to perform part of the available identity repertoires.

[1] By this they mean *the broad interdisciplinary field concerned with the intersection of language, culture and society,* (Bucholtz and Hall 2005: 586).

At the same time this context is molded by those performances. Urged by our definition of identity, we show interest in these performances, not in their supposed underlying pure, whole or natural self. We thus focus on identity work, which holds the notion that identities are actively constructed in interaction, as molding and remolding of interpretive blueprints (Loseke 2001). Considering identity as action includes ignoring the inner thoughts of people, 'who they really are', or 'what they actually mean'. More to the point: [i]*n studying the conversational world, we have no interest in sincerity in any subjective sense, only in the manifestations of it* (Mühlhäusler and Harré 1990: 25). In our suggested approach, identity thus is not the possession of an individual but a common achievement negotiated in social interaction. It is not about 'I am' but about 'I act'.

Before further specifying our view on identity, we will first address the already mentioned notion of identity repertoire. Although we stress the performing and emerging character of identities and thereby introduce them as highly situational, we do not assume that identities are created *ex nihilo*. The *resources for identity work in any given interaction may derive from resources developed in earlier interactions* (Bucholtz and Hall 2005: 588). This portrays any interaction as embedded. This embedding concerns both the immediate interactional context and the broader context of culture. Culture here is taken as a database of possible themes, identities and attitudes, both accessible for and constructed by members of that culture. Yet, the dynamics and the circumstances of each interaction allow for a flexible and idiosyncratic use of these resources, or identity repertoires (Welschen 2012). The participant in social interaction is thus displayed as a craftsman: *As a bricoleur, the self constructor is involved in something like an interpretive salvage operation, crafting selves from the vast array of available resources* (Holstein and Gubrium 2000: 153).

As we already indicated, identity is a much debated concept, both in current scholarship and in contemporary culture. Consequently, several competing and conflicting definitions of this concept are *en vogue*. We therefore need to specify our approach thoroughly. Within late-modern sociologic work on identity, differences lie in the details. We will therefore focus on three important aspects of any current notion of identity and see how these are met in our particular conceptualization.

The first aspect to be considered is the relationship between identity on the one hand and social roles and categories, such as being a mother, a student, a European, or all of them at once, on the other hand. Nowadays, most scholars are convinced that identity does not equate to the exhaustive sum of one's roles (Castells 2010; Welschen 2012). How this relationship must be envisaged, however, is an issue still being debated. In our suggested approach, where emphasis is laid on the idiosyncratic use of repertoires, we treat roles and categories as discursively constructed and possible resources for identity construction. This notably not only applies to roles and categories that are obviously results of social convention (such as 'the boss', 'the welfare mother' and 'the villager') but also to roles and categories that are commonly considered as natural or given, such as race, age or gender (Edley 2001). It is of importance to our point in this contribution that, as others have already convincingly shown (Søreide 2006; Mayes 2010; Schnurr and Zayts 2011; Thirolf 2012), professional identities too are rooted in social interaction.

The second aspect regards the relationship between empirical data and identity. Although this question spans much more than just the topic of identity, it is worth considering at this point. Is identity to be conveyed by means of an interview or a scoring manual, as for example the influential empirical approach to Erikson's identity theory by James Marcia has suggested (Marcia 2004)? The following epistemological presupposition is present in many contemporary studies: an interview, or by the same token a meeting transcript, is a source of information about the identity people have developed inside. In line with the emergence principle, however, which holds that [i]*dentity is best viewed as the emergent product rather than the pre-existing source of linguistic and other semiotic practices and therefore as fundamentally a social and cultural phenomenon* (Bucholtz and Hall 2005: 588), we proceed differently. When ascribing identity to people, we suggest to start from the identity work they do and not from some supposed inner conviction. So instead of, for example, *labeling highly religious persons as orthoprax* (Visser-Vogel, Westerink et al. 2012: 114), we advocate reversing the epistemology and labeling orthoprax persons as constructing a highly religious identity. We thus do not assume that either quantitative or qualitative research exposes identity but rather we take the assumption that meetings as well as lists and interviews are contexts that enable people to perform part of the identity repertoire available to them. This also implies that the interaction under consideration should not necessarily have identity as its topic. Even when performing other tasks, such as teaching (Mayes 2010) or chairing a meeting (Schnurr and Zayts 2011), (professional) identities are constructed.

A third and final aspect of our notion of identity we want to discuss is the way the contrast of self and other is approached. We would argue for an approach that stresses the performative, situational and interactional character of this contrast. As a matter of fact, other social actors (and their positions) are required to position oneself, but this relationship is more multifaceted than the acceptance or denial of difference. We suggest that sameness and difference are constructed in interaction and may vary according to the position taken. They can better be thought of as two options on a continuum than as mutually exclusive opposites. In Bucholtz and Hall's footsteps, we prefer to use the terms *adequation* and *distinction* (Bucholtz and Hall 2005: 599) in order to highlight the rhetorical nature of these relations.

Talk as a site of research

Our constructivist approach to identity is inextricably connected to our choice to use talk as a site for studying the construction of identity. In this paragraph we will supply this choice with a theoretical embedding.

Since our notion of identity centers on the particular use and (re)make of repertoires provided by culture as a joint act of meaning making, talk becomes a site for analysis (Welschen 2012). It is only through communication, in whatever form, that identity repertoires are being used, put to the test, transformed and elaborated on. Out of the several possible modes of communication, we will limit ourselves to talk, since this was the main form of interaction at the meetings,[2] but we stress that the construction of identities does not solely or exclusively happen by means of talk.

This focus on the constructive and meaning-making aspect of talk, places our contribution in the field of discourse analysis. This term, however, suffers the same fate as identity: it indicates a vast field of competing and sometimes even conflicting notions. We therefore must clarify our use of this concept. It is important to distinguish between discourse analysis as a name for the whole, vast field of approaches taking the constructive power of language in its broadest sense as their ontological starting point on the one hand, and one of these approaches, or discourse traditions (Wetherell, Taylor and Yates 2001), by the name of critical discourse analysis on the other. Whereas our approach fits in the former, it does not belong to the area of the latter. Instead, we stand with discourse traditions which share a focus on the local, micro-level or contextually bound aspect of meaning making. More specifically, we are inspired by critical discursive psychology (Potter and Wetherell 1987) and positioning theory (Davies and Harré 1990) as well as the narrative identity approach of Holstein and Gubrium (Holstein and Gubrium 2000).

The rationales of these several discourse traditions we side with are met in the framework of Bucholtz and Hall (Bucholtz and Hall 2005) for approaching identity, which is the central theoretical framework we build on in this contribution. They list five principles that should be guiding in approaching identity. One of those, the emergence principle, has already been introduced. The other principles are the positionality principle, the indexicality principle, the relationality principle and the partialness principle. The former argues for incorporating the particular role in interaction one is taking, such as evaluator, joke teller or engaged listener (Bucholtz and Hall 2005: 591), to be part of the constructed identity. The indexicality principle has played a large part in our study. An index is, essentially, *a linguistic form that depends on the interactional context for its meaning* (Bucholtz and Hall 2005: 594). Basic

[2] The second most important mode of interaction, sound, we hope to explore elsewhere someday.

examples are words like 'this', 'I' and 'there'. Bucholtz and Hall state that the context an index relates to not only exists of the immediate context of the conversation, as is the case with the examples just mentioned, but also of its broader cultural context. As constructing identity is just about editing and acting out identity repertoires, which are part of the broader cultural context, this broadening of the notion of index is of importance for the discursive approach to identity that is central in this contribution. This principle thus *suggests more specifically the kinds of linguistic devices that can be used to produce different aspects of participants' identities* (Mayes 2010: 195).

An example from our data which may clarify this understanding of indexing, is the phrasing "let us sing (this hymn), the verses one and three". In Dutch Protestantism, similar words are commonly spoken by the minister during church services. Outside this context, it is odd or at least archaic phrasing. When using these words in the meeting speakers, at some times more consciously than at other moments, connect the talk to a broader context and position themselves as a minister. Even this small example indicates the relevance for the researcher to be familiar both with the transcripts and with their broader context. We will return to this indexicality principle more extensively when we account for our analysis and now go on to the other principles Bucholtz and Hall mention.

The relationality principles holds, briefly, that identities are constructed in several sorts of complementary relations (as for example the relation adequation and distinction we have already introduced), whereas the partialness principle states that in many ways *identity exceeds the individual self* (Bucholtz and Hall 2005: 605) and (thus) is always only partially constructed and known. Together these principles can be considered to be the theoretical ground of our analysis.

Data

The data we use for this study were generated in the editorial process of the 2013 hymnal *Liedboek,* intended for various Protestant churches. Several groups were involved in this process, namely eight editorial working groups and one editorial board. The foundation *ISK*, which is responsible for this project was so kind as to allow us to attend all of the meetings of these groups as a researcher, from the first meeting in May 2008 until the last gathering in September 2012.[3] This study is part of broader (PhD) research which focuses on the editorial process of this hymnal (Van Andel and Barnard 2009). The research starts from the assumption that discussions among the editors do not reflect but instead create convictions

[3] Part of the agreement between ISK and PThU is the intellectual independence of the researcher, which implies that ISK has not commissioned or reviewed this article. Neither is this paper intended to reflect an official ISK point of view.

on liturgy and related subjects. Since these convictions are decisive for the actual contents of the hymnal and thereby will influence liturgy and worship in the years to come, the current research aims to portray those.

Identity soon turned out to be both an important and a contested topic. In our field notes this was first phrased as a debate inherent to the process, concerning questions of division of responsibilities, for example between working groups and the editorial board, churches and *ISK*, editors and publishers. Moreover, as stated in the opening paragraph of this article, the question of identity was also emphatically raised by some critics. They definitely functioned as part of the *unseen gallery*, an audience not physically present during the interaction but vigilantly taken notice of when performing an identity (Welschen 2012, referring to a notion introduced by Gamson). Finally, as we have already stated, identity is an important concept both in current scholarship and in contemporary culture. The reasons for expanding on the topic of identity as part of our study on the editorial process were therefore multiple.

In line with Mason's instructions for doing qualitative research (Mason 2005), we would prefer to speak of a scholar actively generating empirical data instead of passively excavating them. In the process from interaction to transcript the researchers make several choices and thus actively construct their data. Below, we will account for how we constructed our data. As others have shown, identity is also constructed in settings that do not in the first place consider it as their topic (Lowney and Holstein 2001; Schnurr and Zayts 2011). It thus is not necessary to create a setting such as a (focus group) interview where identity is discussed (as is done e.g. by Bucholtz 1999; Søreide 2006; Welschen 2012).

The main author of this paper was present at the meetings as a researcher. We must account for the fact that she might have functioned as an audience for the performances of the editors' identities.[4] Being a young woman, she undoubtedly influenced the context of the meetings, where usually two other women, both under 50, and fourteen men, average age about 55, were present. Besides, as the researcher was introduced to the editorial board as a PhD student in liturgical studies, the editors now and then put effort into making what they considered liturgical remarks. Moreover, the fact that she was going to publish on the process meant the introduction of yet another unseen gallery. This happened to be even more the case from the moment the audio-recorder was introduced. This is not to say that the results are worthless or biased. In line with our theoretical framework, it indicates part of the context in which the identities under discussion are constructed.

[4]For brevity's sake we will ignore the issue of the researcher constructing identities in this context.

As we stated earlier, we consider talk to be our primary site of research. Since talk itself must be recorded in order to be analyzed, we have resorted to transcripts of talk, which is very common for discourse researchers to work with (Wetherell, Taylor et al. 2001). After an exploratory year of merely looking on, listening and writing, we decided to audio-tape the meetings for purposes of transcription. Consent was given by the chairs of the groups involved, on behalf of the groups over which they presided, as well as by *ISK*. The audio recorder was overtly placed on the table. All together, we observed 138 meetings: 97 of the working groups (usually lasting half a day each) and 41 of the editorial board (usually a day each). Of these meetings 85 were audio-taped.

For the purpose of the current analysis, the recordings of 7 meetings were transcribed, spanning approximately 36 hours of meetings, yielding about 800 pages of text. Indeed, a relatively small sample was chosen. This is not considered problematic since no significant differences between the several meetings were observed. Criteria for selecting the transcripts were as follows: (1) Since it is not our aim to compare several groups and group dynamics, we wanted to use data from one and the same group. Because of its position in the process we selected the main editorial board. Even so, the composition of the group was not the same each time. Sometimes one or more editors were absent. Furthermore, two members withdrew during the process because of health issues and were replaced by others. (2) As stated above, we picture any interaction as embedded, both in its immediate (conversational) context and in the broader context of culture. In order to do justice both to the changing group dynamics and the changes in broader society, we randomly selected one meeting from each half year to achieve a spread in time. (3) In order for other circumstances to be as constant as possible, we decided not to allow for a variation in venue. As we indicated earlier, we consider any interaction to be embedded in its immediate context. We believe the venue to be part of that context: the interaction and hence the availability and use of identity repertoires will vary when a group is meeting for an overnight session in a convent, surrounded by hospitable nuns, quiet forests and the rhythm of daily prayers, or when this same group meets in a stuffy room in a church building, surrounded by the coming and going of other groups, the noises of city life and the pressure of group members having to leave in time to catch the train. These three criteria resulted in the selection of the meetings held on 22.05.2009; 02.10.2009; 26.03.2010; 12.11.2010; 07.01.2011; 27.10.2011 and 12.04.2012.

We used a not so fine-grained level of transcription, since we are not interested in the exact details of turn-taking, duration of silence and amount of overlap between speakers. For our purposes, a transcript indicating the basic structure of the conversation sufficed.[5]

[5] Apart from indicating who delivered which utterances, we marked the following items:

ANALYSIS

We interpreted the transcripts while paying attention to three discursive strategies which Bucholtz and Hall all gather under the heading of indexing, namely labeling, implicature and stance.[6] Of these, labeling is the most direct way of indexing. It has as its basic form "I am an X" (real Protestant, Bach fan, minister, etc.), thereby labeling the speaker – and immediately positioning others as either not being an X or being sufficiently adequate to be an X as well. Implicature, secondly, is a less overt form of positioning self and other. It requires more interpretation by a listener or a researcher. As the name already indicates, this strategy portrays the speaker as implicating that he is an X, without directly mentioning the same. For example, when a man or woman speaks about 'my partner', this may implicate that one is in a same-sex relationship, although it requires more background knowledge to be completely sure about this (cf. Bucholtz and Hall 2005 who refer to Liang's research on a so-called gaydar). Stances, or subject positions (Søreide 2006), finally, are again less overtly displayed. When introducing themselves into the conversation, speakers can appeal to and evaluate several available identity repertoires, for example 'the editor as involved in local liturgical practice', or 'the editor as making important choices on behalf of the people of God'. The range of possible and accessible repertoires is flexible but not unlimited, as we have stressed earlier. From the three strategies involved, this one demands the greatest interpretative efforts.

Together, these discursive strategies give us insights in the identity repertoires that are at play in the interaction. We wish to point out again that *[t]he focus will be (…) on the structures [they] are embedded in and not on [the editors] themselves* (Søreide 2006: 528). As stated above, the several kinds of indexes establish a relationship between the talk and the context – in this case the identity repertoires. In line with our main question, we only paid attention to indexes that are related to the (discursively constructed) dynamics between makers and users of the hymnal. We have analyzed the transcripts of the talk in several rounds. Since *the trick to spotting interpretative repertoires is familiarity with one's data* (Edley 2001: 198), we started to read and reread the transcripts thoroughly. Then, we

---

/?/ - word or words inaudible

… - pause (between words of the same speaker or between speakers)

Text in italics – quotation of a text under discussion. This is important, considering the difference between "I search for you, God", and "Next song we will decide about is *I search for you, God."*

(text in brackets) – indication of what was audibly or visibly happening in the meeting and was a part of the interaction, for example (laughter), (whistling) and (pointing at his coffee cup).

[6] In fact, Bucholtz and Hall distinguish four indexical processes, the fourth being *the use of linguistic structures and systems that are ideologically associated with specific personas and groups* (Bucholtz and Hall 2005: 594).

listed all direct mentioning of positions, and noticed that the linguistic device of labeling was only rarely resorted to. As a next step, we looked for all instances where the editors talked about themselves and noted the implicatures in these fragments. The rationale behind this limitation is that identity work is not exclusively but still mainly done in talk about oneself. This led us to a preliminary list of available repertoires. We then again went through all transcripts and tried to check or corrupt our list. This led to a sharpening of our first division and resulted in a list of six repertoires, which we will present below. Finally, we looked at stance-taking, which not only involves an appeal to but also an evaluation of identity repertoires in order to answer the second part of this article's main question. We especially focused on instances where identity repertoires were challenged, compared or evaluated in another way. We thus have tried to establish a scale of repertoires.

Just as identities are not constructed *ex nihilo*, analysis does not start from a blank point of view either. As stated earlier, a researcher was present at the meetings, over a period of several years. This implies that she was thoroughly familiar with the research area even before the transcripts were made and analyzed. This is an advantage when doing the kind of analysis presented in this paper since *there usually comes a time when one begins to feel as though you've heard it all before* (Edley 2001: 198). We thus started the analysis keeping in mind three identity repertoires we found we had repeatedly jotted down in our field notes: (1) the editor as 'just a minister/church musician', who freely uses ones familiarity with 'the people' as a source of inspiration; (2) the editor as being extraordinarily equipped to be on the board because of his more than average knowledge of hymns and singing; (3) the editor as a puppet in the process, not being able to change the directions of the running train, whose influence is largely overrated by 'the people'. The first and the second turned out to be too broad, and in need of further specification, whereas the third presupposition did not find ground in the transcripts.

RESULTS

Our analysis yielded six identity repertoires available to the editors in their mutual interaction when positioning themselves towards the users. In this section, we will present these repertoires, ranged according to the distance between editors and users that is presumed, starting with the repertoire that constructs the greatest distance.

Editors

Throughout this paper we have referred to the members of the editorial board as editors. This was intended as a functional indication, referring to their membership of this board. At this point, we want to shift attention to the literal meaning of 'editors', as this turned out to be one of the identities that was constructed. To prevent this paragraph from being unnecessarily complicated, we distinguish between editors without parentheses, to refer to those involved in the editorial process, and ‘editors’ with parentheses to refer to the position as described in this section.

The position of ‘editors’ involves taking editorial decisions, considering spelling, notation, translation, index, etc. Some editors also repeatedly position themselves as being experienced in the process of editing, since they work for a publishing house or because they have edited other (hymn) books before. While thus positioning themselves as ‘editors’, the editors stress the difference between themselves and the users of the book. The users of the book are positioned at the end of a chain to which the editors constitute the beginning. Within this repertoire, the relation between ‘us’ and ‘them’ is designed by means of distinction.

The following quote shows the logic of this repertoire. Automatically, the typographical discussion of adding slurs (Paul1 until Paul3) raises the issue of how ‘they’ will sing the hymns and what ‘we’ think about that (Don1 until Chris3). In this quotation we also encounter how a connection is made between this conversation and a broader context, namely when Chris3 is jokingly referring to a hymn (220 in the 1973 hymnal) that is not at this moment under discussion, but which all present let know to recognize, given their chuckling. In this interaction they all position as professionals, a repertoire we will elaborate on below.

Paul[7]1: And when you sing, you sing *heemlen* there will be a slur between the second and the third syllable, below the second and the third syllable.
Chris1: No, between the first and the second I would say.
Leo1: Between first and second,
Paul2: Excuse me, first and second.
Leo2: *Heme* then will have a slur below it because it is sung on one tone.
Ben1: Indeed.
Paul3: But with, with, *uw hoog rijk te aanschouwen*, *te aan,* then *te* will also have a slur.
Don1: But I think that when you add a slur below it, people will add a note, and when you place an abbreviating they will swallow the syllable. That certainly is something else.

[7] The names used in the transcripts are pseudonyms. In order to safeguard anonymity of the speakers as much as possible, all speakers have been given male names. The analysis did not show any difference between the male and female editors in their use of identity repertoires and we therefore decided to disguise gender. For completeness: the names are not used congruently throughout the several transcripts. Names of poets, composers, etc., have been omitted from the text and replaced with (name of x). All transcripts have been translated from Dutch by the main author. Hymn texts are left untranslated.

Chris2: Well, we prefer them to sing all the syllables.
Don2: Well, I don't know.
Chris3: Well, I prefer them to sing *weduwe* instead of *weeuw* for example (chuckling)[8]

Interestingly, in some other transcripts, the position of 'editor' is also denied. This can be explained with a reference to the editorial procedure, which reckons with a differentiation of responsibilities between the final editor – here we come across a third use of this word, namely for referring to the publishing house – from that of the editorial board. The denial of the editors being 'editors', however, is not a weakening but rather a reinforcement of our argument that this is an available identity repertoire, since it is exactly in the dialectic of acceptance and rejection that subject positions become most visible (Søreide 2006; Welschen 2012).

Professionals

The repertoire next in line has been denoted as 'professionals', since it refers to the editors' appeal to their professional (theological or church musical) knowledge as a tool to distinguish themselves from the users. This knowledge is school and book based and highly normative. Moreover, it is presented as self-evident and not to be disputed. This does not imply that all editors are considered as possessing the same knowledge. The two professions go along side by side, as is testified by fragments such as 'let the musicians comment on this', or 'I am not a theologian, so I am not sure…'. Interestingly, although selection of board members accounted for the distinction of more professions, only those of 'theologian' and 'church musician' were constructed in the meetings.

As is the case with the repertoire of 'editors', the 'professionals' are distant. The users are constructed as ignorant and therefore should be helped and instructed. However, the distance between editors and users is somewhat smaller in this case, since 'professionals' assume that they will be using the new hymnal themselves, be it with much more background knowledge than the average user. The position of 'professional' does not imply infallibility, it is rather a matter of having access to the right sources and the best arguments.

In the following quotation, all aspects discussed are clearly present: knowledge as book based and normative (Don3-4 and Steve2), as self-evident ('the' lectionary (Don5 and further) does not need any specification; also Don7's loosely mentioned 'of course'), the difference between the editors themselves (Vince1 and 2 asking the others), the need for instructing people (Mark2-3) and the editors not being infallible but knowing their way in

[8] Transcript 27 October 2011.

relevant sources (Steve1). Although it is not part of our focus in this contribution, we quickly note that this quotation shows many implicatures of the role of chair of the board: Steve1, Don5, Ben2 and Hans1, for example, all contain 'chair-talk'. This fragment ends with a concluding remark by the actual chairman.

Vince1: So the intention is to publish all three of those different choruses again this time? At 16-II?
Don1: Yes.
Mark1: Yes.
Ben1: So ah, so ah, yes.
Vince2: Because that is meant as a choice?
Don2: Yes.
Paul1: Yes, one of the three.
Don3: That also depends on its place in the,
Vince3: Yes, exactly.
Don4: Liturgy. Sundays sometimes have different antiphons, eh, choruses.
Mark2: So good instructions are required, so people know this.
Vince4: Yes.
Gil1: Yes.
Mark3: So that they don't say 'after verse one we will sing chorus one', etcetera, because if they do that it will become a mess.
Steve1: Eh, I think that it could looked at more closely, for this psalm. To see if it is really necessary to publish all three choruses, since, since, in this case I am not sure if that is true, that a chorus belongs to certain times.
(Rob enters the meeting)
Don5: To check the lectionary as well.
Ben2: We should do that.
Don6: The lectionary.
Ben3: Yes, check the lectionary.
Steve2: When a psalm is intended for a special day, a feast day, then there will usually be a matching chorus. /?/
Don7: In this case of course chorus three fits the Eastertide.
Ben4: Okay, we will act accordingly,
Hans1: So, a point of attention,
Ben5: Yes,
Hans2: A note could be added, that for those choruses we check eh,
Ben6: Have a look if all of the choruses,
Hans3: Yes.

Paul2: If the choruses were perhaps selected, I don't remember, to fit the lectionary in eh where this psalm is mentioned.
Ben7: Yes, that was it,
Paul3: O that was what you were saying,
Don8: Yes, I was just saying.
Ben8: Yes, then that is our point for attention, right, to check the lectionary and relate it to the chorus. We are, we accept this, so, agreed.[9]

Both 'editors' and 'professionals' are repertoires with interesting dynamics when it comes to their persuasiveness. They are as much self-evident as they are contested. When an editor is forced to correct his repertoire, as we will see below in the paragraph on 'equals', the repertoires of 'editors' and 'professionals' are considered a good response. They are, we could say, the basic toolkit of the editor, their contents are irrefutable. Their forms however – the repertoires *as repertoires* – are susceptible to contradiction and will not win an argument with other repertoires. In the end, these are not the most favored repertoires among those accessible for the editors.

Experienced

The next repertoire also positions the editors as possessing more knowledge than others, but this knowledge is experience-based. It is not qualified by references to books, but by references to personal experiences which are related to the profession of the speaker. Arguments that draw from the repertoire of 'experienced' include speaker's experiences in preparing a sermon or a service, in accompanying a specific hymn, or in meetings with the users, who take the appearance of receivers of pastoral care, members of the congregation and/or singers in the choir. As is the case with the previous repertoire, the editors themselves are positioned as qualified users. Since their resources are less commonly shared and more subjectively interpreted, sequences using this repertoire are difficult to dispute, which the editors verbalize themselves:

Alwin1: I just have one question. Last time eh *ik wil mij gaan vertroosten* was accepted eh well, I used this hymn at a congregational meeting in (name city), yes, believe it or not they also have congregational meetings there, eh and it struck me that when you sing that last line *O Jezus zie mij aan* that it sounds almost blasphemous when sung by the whole congregation. It would be my proposal to restore that sentence back to *O Jesu zie mij aan*.
Chris1: Yes, I also suggested that once.

[9] Transcript 22 May 2009.

Alwin2: I thought it was, it sounded very bad, all of them going (sings:) *O Jezus zie mij aan*.
Chris2: I agree.
Mark1: You agree?
Chris3: I do.
Mark2: And others agree as well, do they? This is knowledge from experience, we can introduce this.
Rob1: No one can argue against that. (chuckling)[10]

Although the argument itself is positioned as not to be argued against, the very use of this repertoire is questioned from time to time. It then is challenged by 'professionals' as well as by 'equals'.[11] They both proceed from the conviction that what applies to one case does not apply to all. Speaker is then either forced (by the professional) to admit that single experience does not dispute common laws or (by the equal) that this is just an extraordinary example that does not reflect average experiences. Nevertheless, when the 'experienced' repertoire is employed this generally goes by practically unnoticed and unchallenged. In their mutual relationships, this repertoire certainly can be ranged among the more highly evaluated repertoires.

Vanguard

The 'vanguard' repertoire, next in line, pictures the editors as spies sent out to explore the promised land. On behalf of the users, they search, taste and judge. The relationship between editors and users can best be phrased in terms of privilege. Although they are not any more important or better than the final users, the editors have the privilege of exploring the lay of the land and from this privilege they derive the right to decide on the contents of the hymnal. 'The vanguard' is a vulnerable position, since being front runners implies standing out from the crowd. The editors also realize this, seen their recurrent joke that they will leave for Paraguay once the hymnal is published. The position of 'vanguard' requires that the editors try to think for the users and take into consideration what they expect their wishes and expectations to be, without completely losing their own editorial perspective. In this repertoire, the distance between editors and users is small although not absent. The editors are pictured as super-users, users with a little more experience, knowledge and skills than other users. They stand up for whom they consider the average users. This is best illustrated by the frequently used formula "if we are not able to understand (/sing/pronounce/etc.) it, the average user will not be able to do so at all". This

[10] Transcript 27 October 2011.
[11] This use of nouns does not imply that we refer to specific board members. It is an abbreviation for editors using the repertoire of professionals resp. equals. This can even be the same editor as the one who initially introduced the experienced repertoire.

tasting beforehand and deciding on the basis of that tasting is a vanguard position of the editors and is clarified by the first quotation below. The second quotation illustrates the editors reflecting on their desire to take into account wishes and perspectives broader than their own. Roy here noticeably not only acts as a member of the editorial board, but (in Roy2) he also connects his position to the broader context of the process where working groups are involved as well.

Bill1: I think actually, it, now I have heard this, now I have sung this, I think it gets worse.
Mark1: When men and women together will sing the melody line that will, is, this arrangement really is not,
Bill2: Lost.
Mark2: Good.
Ron1: Not good.
Mark3: No, you have to sing this in three voices or you should not sing it at all, but with this setting you cannot have the male voices to sing the melody, which we did in first instance, it,
Ron2: That was not fortunate, no.
Mark4: That sounds terrible.
Ron3: It was not fortunate.
Mark5: That sounded terrible, it, well, no. No, I think it, eh… no.[12]

Roy1: The hardest part with those texts is, at least as far as I am concerned but I am not sure whether… I want to underscore this: it feels like you are somewhat naked because you eh, there is no protection by a melody is it? So it is eh, to the point and confronting so eh then then you immediately get involved in this question of language fields as well as eh eh, yes of course we want to have texts for several age groups, we want to have texts for several people with different kinds of literacy so we, and that is the hardest part because yes, of course we can find lots of difficult and hard to grasp poems.
Ben1: Yes.
Scott1: Yes.
Roy2: Well that is not so hard but we are looking for, eh, have also been looking for texts which we think are, yes these are clear and can also face the passing of time. I say, I say, I don't say that this is it but I want to bring in the dilemma of the working group.

[12] Transcript 26 March 2010.

Luke1: Yes, no, of course.[13]

We did not find any fragments where this identity repertoire is contested, although sometimes the views on the desired distance between vanguard and backfield differ. It is in fact the most respected identity repertoire the editors have at their disposal. It steers the middle course between the picture of editors as dissociated from users on the one hand and as completely identical to the users on the other hand. This golden mean makes it hard to challenge, as we will argue below.

Pleasers

The fifth repertoire we distinguish is that of the editors as 'pleasers'. Unlike the names of the other positions, this name is derived directly from one of the transcripts:

Bob1: There are so many people we have to please.
Hero1: I brought that word up, I am sorry.
Bob2: We are not on the editorial board, this is a group of pleasers![14]

The repertoire of 'pleasers' also reckons with the editors reasoning on behalf of the users, as is the case with the 'vanguard' repertoire. The main difference is that 'pleasers' explicitly express their arguments and decisions in terms of satisfying (groups of) users. Consequently, 'pleasers' are intentionally self-censoring. They select texts and melodies they sometimes disapprove of personally, but of which they are sure that others, usually vaguely assigned, will be happy to come across in the hymnal. Notions such as 'commitment' and 'gratify' are part of this repertoire. This repertoire reckons with a distance between editors and users as well. Although the editors consider themselves as users, they know they are more empowered than other users, those whom they can satisfy. All these aspects are present in the following quotes. In the first quote a new rhyming of an old hymn is discussed; the second quote concerns a small debate about the suggestion of a working group to replace a famous as well as notorious version of the Apostolic Creed.

Bob1: I think we should recall why this, why we asked for this.
Simon1: Yes, exactly.
Bob2: That is because in certain, certain circles it is a beloved hymn for Advent and Christmas celebrations and eh one they like to sing and eh we don't

[13] Transcript 26 March 2010.
[14] Transcript 22 May 2009.

want to lose that song heritage but it has to be different and I think it was written for that group.[15]

Les1: Yes, but, well, it is a statement to eh incorporate (name poet of version of Creed) or to leave him out. So that, that, I want to make that point,
Peter1: Yes.
Les2: And so if you simply say that this can replace (name poet), well it just isn't that simple is it, because these two are not interchangeable in the perception of the average singer in church. So that is something I want to discuss.
Jim1: No. So,
Les3: In the, eh,
Jim2: Well to the point that this, but that could, so we eh can also propose to delete this remark.
Mark1: No. But the point Les is making is,
Jim3: Yes.
Mark2: That, so, eh, immediately, at least his question should be answered to the effect that the working group does not propose to include (name poet). So that is the essence of the, what this is all about.
Les4: Look, I am not all that keen on it but I am,
Jim4: You want to address it.
Les5: Not the average church singer.[16]

It could be that this repertoire functions as an antidote to the repertoire of elitism that is handed to the editors by their critics. It enables them to prove their critics wrong. It is, however, a repertoire that is challenged, since it is considered to be at least partly alien to the assignment the board was given by the *ISK*.

Equals

We frequently ran into sequences where the editors position themselves as a subject. This ranges from the explicit expression of subjective verdicts ("I think this is terrible", "This is beautiful!") to extended biographical accounts featuring the editor. This is introduced as some kind of expertise that is at the same time particular (this is my story related to this song) and universal (everyone has such stories). Within this repertoire, the distance between the editors and the users has disappeared: the editors position themselves as users. Just like any user, the members of the editorial board have preferences and rejections, they live their lives with highs and lows, accompanied by music.

[15] Transcript 2 October 2009.
[16] Transcript 12 November 2010.

Even more than is the case with the 'pleasers' repertoire, this repertoire is considered to be opposed to the fact that the editors have been selected on the basis of their (professional) expertise. Therefore we frequently witnessed an editor acting as 'equal' being asked to reformulate his position and use another repertoire. This can be done explicitly or very subtly, as we see in this quotation:

> Jay1: I actually think (name composer)'s melody is much and much more fun.
> Robin1: I think it is 100 times better.
> Jay2: Yes, better as well.[17]

This certainly is not the most positively evaluated repertoire, but although it is corrected several times, it still should be listed among the repertoires available to the editors.

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

The subject of editor's identity was introduced in the editorial process of the new Dutch hymnal from several distinct angles. We have suggested that the reasons for the appointment of the board members and the critical reactions this evoked as well as the division of tasks within the process itself have stimulated the question of what an editor should be like. Moreover, the urgent presence of the notion of identity in contemporary thought has pressed us to include this topic in our research.

Out of the many possible ways of approaching identity, we have chosen to take a discursive approach, stressing the priority of interaction. In this interaction, limited to speech, we focused on the identity of the editors in relation to the intended users of the hymnal as it was constructed during the meetings. We suggested that the spectrum of available repertoires stretches from the position of 'editors', where the editors have virtually nothing in common with the users, via the repertoires of 'professionals', 'experienced', 'vanguard' and 'pleasers' all the way to 'equals', where the editors are the users.

When it comes to the evaluation of these repertoires, it can be suggested that the centre of gravity is somewhere in the middle. We might argue that the golden mean is a safe road, carefully balancing between the repertoires 'on the edges' which are more sensitive for rejection. Indeed, the repertoires of 'equals' and 'editors' have a hard time and can rarely be used without an excuse, for example in the form of support from another repertoire. As was pointed out in the introduction to this article, according to Bauman authority in present day society is not (anymore) held by leaders but by counselors. He tersely verbalizes the demand for counselors: *Stop telling me, show me!* And: *The counsels which the counsellors*

[17] Transcript 22 May 2009.

supply refer (…) not to Politics with a capital P (or, we might add, Liturgy with a capital L), but to *what the counselled persons might do by themselves and for themselves, each one for himself or herself* (Bauman 2000: 63,65).The leadership presupposed in the repertoires of 'editors' and 'professionals' therefore can be considered to be unavailable to the editors. On the other hand, we want to suggest that the position of 'equals' is not open to the editors either, precisely because counselors need to distinguish themselves in some way from those counseled in order to be accepted as counselors.

The vanguard repertoire, as we have already argued above, can be said to be the central repertoire. The main task of the editors according to this repertoire is to pave the way and invite people to come along. Interestingly, when taken into consideration what has previously been said about the demand for counselors instead of leaders, it can be stated that the editors are acting out time-related identities. Although critics suggest otherwise, we argue that the editors are exactly proceeding like they are currently expected to. In their balancing act between positioning as editors and positioning as equals, the editors prove to be children of their times: they counsel. Moreover, this preference to position themselves as the vanguard can be said to be deeply rooted, since it is in their mutual interaction the editors construct this identity as the most favorable and acceptable one.

It is not only the editors who must be characterized as children of their times. The same applies to the researchers, which becomes clear when we realize what exactly we have been looking at. It was, in the end, our (informed) decision to range the identities according to the relation between editor and user that is presumed. This attention not only situates the editors but also the researchers in the 21st Century. This discussion remark is not meant as a devaluation of this contribution. On the contrary: to have the same concerns and presuppositions, as researchers, as the field one is researching, is, according to current empirical theological considerations, not a sin but a blessing. This is, however, not the place to further discuss these items related to the philosophy of science.

A final word on the scope of this contribution. Since it is our presupposition that the identity repertoires are culturally available resources, we assume that the identities we describe in this article are also available in other related contexts. They thus can be expected to be not only relevant for understanding the work of the hymnbook editorial board, but also for understanding other issues in the broader field of liturgy and church music. In taking a discursive approach to identity and thus treating it as constructed in a broader context of (in this case) liturgy and church music, we hope to have contributed to the further academic investigation of these fields as well.

BIBLIOGRAPHY TO CHAPTER 5

Bauman, Zygmunt (2000). *Liquid modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bucholtz, Mary (1999). 'You da man: Narrating the racial other in the production of white masculinity,' in *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3 (4), pp. 443-460.

Bucholtz, Mary and Kira Hall (2005). 'Identity and interaction: a sociocultural linguistic approach,' in *Discourse Studies* 7 (4-5), pp. 585-614.

Castells, Manuel (2010). *The power of identity: second edition with a new preface*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Davies, Bronwyn and Rom Harré (1990). 'Positioning - the Discursive Production of Selves,' in *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 20 (1), pp. 43-63.

Edley, Nigel (2001). 'Analysing Masculinity: Interpretative Repertoires, Ideological Dilemmas and Subject Positions,' in Margaret Wetherell, Stephanie Taylor and Simeon Yates (Eds.). *Discourse as data: a guide for analysis*. London: SAGE in association with The Open University, pp. 189-228.

Haasnoot, Arenda (2008). 'Frans Bauer,' in *Centraal Weekblad* 56 (25), p. 6.

Holstein, James A. and Jaber F. Gubrium (2000). *The self we live by: narrative identity in a postmodern world*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kolbet, Paul R. (2009). 'Rethinking Ministerial Ideals in Light of the Clergy Crisis,' in *Ecclesiology* 5 (2), pp. 192-211.

Loseke, Donileen R. (2001). 'Lived Realities and Formula Stories of "Battered Women"' in Jaber F. Gubrium and James A. Holstein (Eds.). *Institutional Selves: Troubled Identities in a Postmodern World*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 107-126.

Lövheim, Mia (2004) *Intersecting identities: young people, religion, and interaction on the Internet.* Uppsala: Uppsala University (PhD Thesis).

Lowney, Kathleen S. and James A. Holstein (2001). 'Victims, Villains, and Talk Show Selves,' in Jaber F. Gubrium and James A. Holstein (Eds.). *Institutional Selves: Troubled Identities in a Postmodern World*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 23-45.

Marcia, James (2004). 'Why Erikson?,' in Kenneth Hoover (Ed.). *The Future of Identity: Centennial Reflections on the Legacy of Erik Erikson*. Lanham (Md): Lexington Books, pp. 43-59.

Mason, Jennifer (2002[2]). *Qualitative researching.* London etc.: Sage.

Mayes, Patricia (2010). 'The discursive construction of identity and power in the critical classroom: Implications for applied critical theories,' in *Discourse & Society* 21 (2), pp. 189-210.

Mühlhäusler, Peter and Rom Harré (1990). *Pronouns and people: the linguistic construction of social and personal identity*. Oxford etc.: B. Blackwell.

Potter, Jonathan and Margaret Wetherell (1987). *Discourse and social psychology: beyond attitudes and behaviour*. London etc.: Sage.

Schnurr, Stephanie and Olga Zayts (2011). 'Be(com)ing a Leader: A Case Study of Co-Constructing Professional Identities at Work,' in Jo Angouri and Meredith Marra (Eds.). *Constructing Identities at Work*. Houndmills etc.: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 40-60.

Smeets, Wim (2012). 'Identity and Spiritual Care,' in *Journal of Empirical Theology* 25 (1), pp. 22-56.

Søreide, Gunn E. (2006). 'Narrative construction of teacher identity: positioning and negotiation,' in *Teachers and Teaching* 12 (5), pp. 527-547.

Thirolf, Kathryn Q. (2012). 'The Faculty Identities of Community College Adjuncts Teaching in the Humanities: A Discourse Analysis Study,' in *Community College Journal of Research and Practice* 36(4), pp. 269-278.

Tiemeier, Tracy S. (2006). *Bodied selves: a comparative theology of Asian American women's identity construction.* Boston: Boston University (PhD Thesis).

Van Andel, Nienke (2011). ''Zitten de echte deskundigen niet zondags in de kerkbank?': Over de samenstelling van het nieuwe Liedboek,' in *Theologisch Debat* 8 (4), pp. 33-39.

Van Andel, Nienke and Marcel Barnard (2009). 'Discourses in Liturgy: De totstandkoming van het nieuwe protestantse liedboek (2012) vergeleken met de totstandkoming van het *Liedboek voor de Kerken* (1973) - een onderzoekspresentatie,' in *Jaarboek voor Liturgie-onderzoek* 25, pp. 55-70.

Visser-Vogel, Elsbeth, Janneke Westerink, Jos de Kock, Marcel Barnard and Cok Bakker (2012). 'Developing a Framework for Research on Religious Identity Development of Highly Committed Adolescents,' in *Religious Education* 107 (2), pp. 108-121.

Welschen, Saskia I. (2012). *The country we are supposed to be: 'Born free' South Africans talk about their nation.* Amsterdam: VU University (PhD Thesis).

Wetherell, Margaret, Stephanie Taylor and Simeon Yates (2001). *Discourse theory and practice: a reader*. London etc.: Sage.

Widdicombe, Sue (1998). 'Identity as an Analysts' and a Participants' Resource,' in Charles Antaki and Sue Widdicombe (Eds.). *Identities in Talk.* London etc.: Sage, pp. 191-206.

Wijsen, Frans J. S. (2013). *Religious discourse, social cohesion and conflict: studying Muslim-Christian relations*. Oxford: Peter Lang.

CHAPTER 6

GENDER

This chapter is currently under review:
Nienke van Andel, Heleen Zorgdrager, Martin J.M. Hoondert and Marcel Barnard. 'Most highly favoured lady: Gendered power in constructing the boundaries of gender-relevance'

INTRODUCTION: DUTCH HYMNALS AND FEMINISM

On 25 May 2013, the very day the new Dutch Protestant hymnbook was published, new life was breathed into a discussion involving the notions of gender, feminism and the inclusivity of liturgical language use. The hymnbook in question, *Liedboek*, was intended as the successor of the 1973 hymnal *Liedboek voor de kerken*. As a successor, the new hymnbook was not only intended to follow in the footsteps of the old one, but it was also intended to make up for its forerunner's flaws.[1] One of these flaws is that "for the most part the language is considered too masculine",[2] for example when it concerns verbalization of the hymns in terms of God and believer. This perceived flaw stimulated the Protestant Church in the Netherlands, one of the churches that had requested the compilation of the new hymnal, to appoint as one of their nine supervisors to the editorial process – who each were given distinct areas of interest – a supervisor to explicitly examine the topic of gender and how this was dealt with in the selection the editors made. The lack of feminine influence was in fact noticed soon after the publication of the 1973 hymnal and has been a point of continuous attention ever since.[3] This critique was part of a broader movement of Christian women in the Netherlands raising their voice against "the perceived "androcentrism" of the faith, liturgy, pastoral care, adult education, and parish work".[4] Two volumes with songs written by female poets and female composers, entitled *Eva's Lied* (Eve's Song), were published 1984 and 1988 as a counter-movement. In 1993 the foundation *Nieuw liedfonds* (New hymn-fund) was established, which aims at "permeation of more texts and tunes by women in liturgy".[5]

The debate, with its roots in the second half of the last century, saw a revival once the 2013 hymn-book was released. One of the hymns in the 1973 hymnal which has been "attacked by feminists because of alleged masculine language use"[6] is the song *De Heer heeft mij gezien* (The Lord has seen me) by Dutch poet and former priest Huub Oosterhuis (*1933). The lines which especially evoked resistance are taken from the second stanza which says about the relationship between God and the faithful that "He brings us about, he enters and leaves us […], plants his own life in us like a tree, wants to play with us, takes us as his

[1] Nienke van Andel, Martin J.M. Hoondert and Marcel Barnard (under review). "Remembering '73: Collectively Constructing a Liturgical History by a Hymnbook Editorial Board".
[2] Interkerkelijke Stichting voor het Kerklied, *Een nieuw liedboek* (s.l.:s.n., 2006), 11.
[3] Alex van Heusden, "Het mannelijke Liedboek: Overzicht van een diskussie in Hervormd Nederland," *Werkschrift voor leerhuis & liturgie* 4:1 (1983): 133-136.
[4] Denise J.J. Dijk, "Celebrating Women's Power: *Oecumenische Vrouwensynoden* in the Netherlands," in *Dissident Daughters: Feminist Liturgies in Global Context,* ed. Teresa Berger (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 69-86, 70.
[5] Nieuw Liedfonds, "Nieuw Liedfonds," http://www.nieuwliedfonds.nl (accessed May 13, 2014).
[6] Anton Vernooij, "De taal van een smekeling: Over het lied 'Een smekeling, zo kom ik tot uw troon,'' *Jaarboek voor liturgie-onderzoek* 15 (1999): 253-266, 239.

bride". These lines have been received as introducing an image of God which might hurt people, especially, but not exclusively, females who have experienced transgressing sexual behavior. Irrespective of the intentions of the poet, the editorial board of the 2013 hymnal, being aware of the interpretations that had been given to the song over the course of time, had "the courage not to accept this song".[7]

The disappearance of the hymn was noticed immediately once the new hymn-book was released.[8] A barrage of public criticism attacked the board's decision not to incorporate it. Interestingly, the wish to care for wounded members in a congregation who could be hurt by these words, was immediately reduced to a feminist issue, perhaps echoing the particular attention given to sexual abuse by Dutch Christian feminist movements from their very beginnings on.[9] The editors were blamed for being "narrow minded", for having been brain-washed by "feminists – indeed, they still exist", and for being "too much involved in thinking about having sex themselves". It should be noted that all of the authors of these critical reactions are male. A Dutch professor emeritus in practical theology and women's studies, however, happily welcomed the decision as "a small success".[10]

PROBLEM CONTEXT: 'GENDER' IN PUBLIC/ECCLESIAL DEBATE

Although the four decades separating the two Protestant hymnals (1973, 2013) have witnessed many changes, for example when it comes to the position of church in society, or to the position of women both in church and in society at large, or to how power and authority are expressed and experienced,[11] this particular discussion hardly seems to have changed. The central starting point is that *gender* is about the relationship between men and women. The debate concerns questions on the nature of that relationship – sameness, difference, equality? – and how that could or should be reflected in liturgy and church music. Although answers or approaches have shifted somewhat over time, the definition of gender that all parties in this public and ecclesial debate agree on has not changed: gender still is about men and women, especially about how women are/were oppressed by men. Since this definition and the inequality it can make visible conflict with the contemporary

---

[7] Quote from transcribed sound recording of the editorial board meeting October 27, 2011.
[8] Sanne Hoving and Gerrit-Jan KleinJan, "In nieuw Liedboek is veel veranderd, maar niet alles," *Trouw*, May 25, 2013.
[9] Dijk, "Celebrating Women's Power."
[10] Ger Groot, "De nieuwe benepenheid," *Trouw*, May 28, 2013; Jaap Lodewijks, "Liedboek: 'Hij gaat ons in en uit'," *De Stentor*, May 29, 2013; "Letters to editor," *Trouw*, May 28, 2013; Hoving and KleinJan, "In nieuw Liedboek is veel veranderd."
[11] Nienke van Andel, Martin J.M. Hoondert and Marcel Barnard, "We is Plural: Identity Construction in Hymn Book Editorial Meetings," *Journal of Empirical Theology,* 27:2 (2014): 214-238.

ideology of self-realization and individual responsibility,[12] a certain amount of gender fatigue can be discerned in the discussions. People are tired of being confronted with the notion of gender and (therefore) consider it as outdated.[13]

Gender fatigue, however, "contributes to the lack of language needed to discuss structural inequalities between men and women, making gender inequality even more difficult, if not impossible, to address".[14] This standstill and arduous understanding of the notion of gender is remarkable, since in the large field of gender studies the debate as to what the notion of gender refers to has been far from immovable. Despite these developments in academy, however, the "current 'popular' understanding of gender' still relates it to 'differential tendencies' between women and men, boys and girls".[15]

This current popular understanding of gender is omnipresent and largely shared. We take this omnipresence as an indication that this understanding of gender prevails in a dominant discourse. We derive the latter notion from social scientist Stringer, who borrowed and adapted it from sociologist Baumann. Stringer takes discourse in the Foucauldian sense as a group of statements (in any form of language such as words, gestures, pictures, et cetera) that are used within a discursive field, such as medicine, politics or liturgy. He qualifies dominant discourses as "those held and used by those in authority, [which] (…) inevitably have an element of 'power' within them". He distinguishes them from demotic discourses, which are "used within everyday conversation and among smaller subgroups within a society".[16] These concepts refer to the position of the respective discourses in any society: the dominant discourse is assumed to belong to those dominating, whereas the demotic (derived from the Greek word 'demos' which means 'people') discourse belongs to the people.

By considering the common definition of gender as belonging to a dominant discourse, we gain two advantages in studying the debates on gender and hymnals. First, it alerts us to the possibility that definitions of gender are multiple and may even co-exist. Second, it

---

[12] Anneleen Decoene, "Vrouwen houden huis: Geloven in duurzame economie," March 8, 2014 http://vrouwensynode.nl/images/stories/synodedag2014/lezing_8mrt2014_adecoene.pdf (accessed May 13, 2014).

[13] Elisabeth K. Kelan, "Gender Fatigue: The Ideological Dilemma of Gender Neutrality and Discrimination in Organizations," *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences-Revue canadienne des sciences de l'administration,* 26:3 (2009): 197-210.

[14] Kelan, "Gender Fatigue," 206.

[15] Jane Sunderland and Lia Litosseliti, "Current Research Methodologies in Gender and Language Study: Key Issues," in *Gender and Language Research Methodologies,* eds. Kate Harrington, Lia Litosseliti, Helen Sauntson and Jane Sunderland (Hampshire/New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 1-18, 4.

[16] Martin D. Stringer, *A sociological history of Christian worship* (Cambridge: University Press, 2005), 13.

allows us to fully assess the aspect of power: "All discourses, inevitably, have some element of 'power' associated with them, either excluding individuals or imposing a particular way of thinking throughout a discourse community". Indeed, when approaching gender as "a language about power in a given society", it is exactly the process of domination, of deciding what a notion refers to, that should be taken as a gendered process. What is more, gender studies possess a "vibrantly self-reflective nature" and thus, when studying the power of definition, also include the power of defining 'gender'. As philosopher Butler sophistically states when discussing the relationship between sex and gender:

> This production of sex *as* the prediscursive ought to be understood as the effect of the apparatus of cultural construction designated by *gender.* How, then, does gender need to be reformulated to encompass the power relations that produce the effect of a prediscursive sex and so conceal that very operation of discursive production?[17]

QUESTION AND OUTLINE

The challenge we face in this contribution can be phrased in a way similar to Butler's question. Although in public/ecclesial debate the meaning of gender is presented as given, we wish to reformulate and extend the notion of gender in order to encompass the power relationships that produce this meaning. That is in line with current developments in gender studies, especially the impetus given by

> Social constructionism, broadly defined, [which] (…) sees gender as:
> * the active/interactive/negotiated construction of gender, including self-positioning
> * linguistic dealings *with* (individuals/groups of) women, men, boys and girls, e.g., how they are addressed, what is said *to* them
> * what is said and written *about* gender differential tendencies, similarities and diversity, including what is said and written *about* (individuals/groups of) women, men, boys and girls.[18]

In order to achieve that, we analyze the social interaction in the 2013 hymnal's editorial board meetings, which are the topic of broader research. In accordance with what we have

[17] Stringer, *A sociological history,* 13; Jeanne Boydston, "Gender as a Question of Historical Analysis," *Gender & History* 20:3 (2008): 558-583, 576; Teresa Berger, *Gender Differences and the Making of Liturgical History: Lifting a Veil on Liturgy's Past* (Farnham/Burlington: Ashgate, 2011), 27; Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York/London: Routledge, 1990), 7.

[18] Sunderland and Litosseliti, "Current Research Methodologies," 4.

stated above, we will neither start by assuming that gender is about men and women, nor by implying that men and women have different ways of interacting, simply due to their sex. Instead, we will offer an analysis which focuses on the power relations within the editorial board, especially when it comes to defining what gender is. The question that will be guiding this paper thus reads: *What, and whose definition of gender is dominant in the meetings of the editorial board of the new Dutch Protestant hymnal?*

The structure of the paper will be as follows. First we will sketch the theoretical backgrounds to our approach of gender, the first outlines of which we have already presented above. Thereafter we will introduce the empirical data, pieces of transcript from editorial board meetings, which have guided our analysis. Since this paper is part of a broader (PhD) study, we will present these data in the context of the overall research and devote attention to their particularities as well. The central part of this contribution, then, will be an analysis of the data which will read as an answer to this paper's main question. Finally, we will discuss our findings and suggest possibilities for further research.

CREATING GENDER

Sociologists West and Zimmerman open their 1987 seminal article on 'doing gender' with a short history of the creation of gender: "In the beginning, there was sex and there was gender". The concept of gender was necessary in the second half of last century to allow discussions on biological differences between the sexes – which by that time were suggested to be two: either male or female, a differentiation which by now has come to be seen as "more complex" – to be conducted apart from the meanings attached in specific cultures to these differences. As such, the concept of gender has been helpful in "developing a constructivist approach towards men, women and the relationships between the sexes".[19]

Soon, however, this turned out not to be a tenable division, for several reasons. Not only was the acknowledgement of (only) two sexes questionable, so was the distinction between characteristics subscribed by culture and those inscribed by nature.[20] Moreover, the sharp division between sex and gender turned out not to be that sharp, since a division between female and male gender (or femininities and masculinities) seems to echo the binary distinction connected to the notion of sex: "The presumption of a binary gender system

[19] Candace West and Don H. Zimmerman, "Doing Gender," *Gender & Society* 1:2 (1987): 125-151, 125; Berger, *Gender Differences,* 25; Gloria Wekker and Helma Lutz, "Een hoogvlakte met koude winden: De geschiedenis van het gender- en etniciteitsdenken in Nederland," in *Caleidoscopische visies: De zwarte, migranten en vluchtelingen-vrouwenbeweging in Nederland,* eds. Maayke Botman, Nancy Jouwe and Gloria Wekker (Amsterdam: Koninklijk Instituut voor de Tropen, 2001), 25-50, 36.
[20] Joan Acker, "From Sex Roles to Gendered Institutions," *Contemporary Sociology* 21:5 (1992), 565-569.

implicitly retains the belief in a mimetic relation of gender to sex whereby gender mirrors sex or is otherwise restricted by it".[21] This tight knit of gender to sex does indeed not deliver scholars from the perils of essentialism, which was one of the starting points for coming up with the concept of gender in the first place.[22] All of these central issues regarding what gender is and is not have resulted in a large field of gender studies where definitions of gender abound.

An even more fundamental problem with the concept of gender concerns its application in analysis. It is highly relevant – and a world of difference – whether scholars introduce the concept of gender in phrasing the question, in making empirical observations, or in discussing their findings, to mention only three possibilities. This relates to the epistemological and ontological status of the concept of gender. According to gender historian Boydston problems arise, even developments are stymied, once gender is claimed as a broad fixed category of analysis, instead of as a concept subject to continuous interrogation and reflection. She argues against the blunt application of one possible version of gender, namely one informed by "late twentieth-century feminist political mobilisation in Europe and the United States",[23] to other cultures, times and places. Sociologist Francis, in using a notion of Mikhail Bakhtin's, calls such models of gender "monoglossic in our contemporary socio-historic moment." It is monoglossic "because of its success in authoring itself as a total, and inevitable, or natural, system. […] [T]his monoglossic account of gender is commonly understood and agreed as a 'true', uncontested account".[24]

Yet, despite its notorious vagueness, its possible colonializing application and its tendency of being treated as stable and inevitable, we consider the notion of gender to be too valuable to be put aside. In congruence with what we have stated earlier in this contribution, we see gender as the active, interactive and negotiated construction of femininities and masculinities. This means that the constructing process itself matters more to us than the contents of its construction. The process of (not) assigning gender to people, actions or situations is itself gendered as well. Any analysis of gender thus should take the power of definition into consideration. We agree with Yancey Martin, scholar in gender in organizations, who asserts:

> If practice is gendered when interpreted within a system of gender relations as about gender, interpretations are more than conjectures. Interpretations are the

[21] Butler, *Gender Trouble*, 6.
[22] Becky Francis, "Gender monoglossia, gender heteroglossia: the potential of Bakhtin's work for re-conceptualising gender," *Journal of Gender Studies* 21:1 (2012), 1-15.
[23] Boydston, "Gender as a Question," 561.
[24] Francis, "Gender monoglossia," 5.

> sense-making efforts of people who engage in practices made available to them by the gender institution and workplace. Power has a role in these dynamics. Powerful men can deny that their behaviour is gendered, and women often cannot challenge them.[25]

EMPIRICAL DATA

The analysis presented in this article will focus on practices where gender is (not) constructed to be a central part of the practice's interpretation. We will compare two discussions from a single meeting of the hymn-book editorial board. The reasons for selecting those and the contents of the discussions will be discussed further on. We will begin by briefly introducing the empirical part of our study.

The first author attended the gatherings of the editorial board as a researcher from the first meeting in May 2008 until the last one in September 2012. She was allowed to be present at the meetings, to listen and watch, but not to take part in the discussions since she was not a member of that board. Before and after the meetings, as well as during the breaks, these regulations did not apply. The researcher decided, in line with the overall perspective of the study, not to use these opportunities to investigate what the editors 'actually meant' by certain comments or what they 'were up to privately', but instead to connect with them, trying to be part of the group in order to not be perceived as an outsider during the meetings. After a year of observation she was allowed to use an audio recorder to record the meetings. In the final year she also made video recordings.

Both the audio and the video tapes were used as a source for making transcripts of the meetings. These transcripts, as a researcher's interpretation of the interaction in the meeting,[26] are the basis of several analyses regarding the discursive construction of central notions such as history, identity and the relationship between hymnal and liturgy. Its discursive approach subsumes this study within the larger field of discourse analysis, a still expanding area which harbors several different approaches of which the mutual relationships can best be characterized by the metaphor of a family.[27] These approaches have in common that they consider language, in its broadest possible sense, as social behavior which constructs (a) reality. The adherence of our study to analytical tools such as 'a floating signifier' (a sign of which the meaning is at stake in a competition between several discourses) also indicates that it should be placed in this large field of discourse analytical approaches.

---

[25] Patricia Yancey Martin, ""Said and Done" versus "Saying and Doing": Gendering Practices, Practicing Gender at Work," *Gender & Society* 17:3 (2003): 342-366, 357.
[26] Van Andel, Hoondert and Barnard, "Remembering '73'.
[27] Harry van den Berg, "Discoursanalyse," *KWALON* 9:2 (2004): 29-39.

RESEARCH ETHICS

Permission to conduct this PhD research was given by the foundation responsible for the editorial process, *ISK*. The permission includes the independence of the researcher, which implies that the present article was neither ordered by *ISK* nor reflects an official *ISK* point of view. The permission also provides an agreement on how confidential discussions in the editorial board meetings could be reported in scholarly publications. The researcher is subject to the same limitations as the board members, which involve secrecy on the contribution of specific persons to the board's decisions. Furthermore, in accordance with current research ethics, it was agreed that quotations from the meetings would only be introduced in publications anonymously. We decided to meet this demand by using fictive names when presenting parts of a transcript. Because of the male-female ratio in the main editorial board (15 men and 4 women (including the researcher) were present in several arrangements) we chose to use only male names.

This latter agreement presented specific difficulties with respect to the article in hand. An analysis of gender processes cannot do without introducing the participants in the discussion as gendered persons themselves. Doing so would, however, reduce the level of unrecognizability, especially of the female board members. We encountered this as a serious dilemma. We decided to start writing this contribution because of the relevance of the topic and the stimulus we expect to contribute to a large societal, ecclesial and scholarly debate. Meanwhile, all of the board members were informed and could express their concerns, which some of them indeed did. In the end, none of them objected to the idea of writing such an article. Once finished, the article was sent to all of the members of the main editorial board, regardless of whether they indeed figure in the quotes used in this contribution. They were asked whether the way they are introduced in this paper is, in their opinion, sufficiently distant from their recognizable identities. The fact that this paper has been submitted reveals that all of the editors indeed thought so.

GABRIEL AND KYRIE

The meeting we have singled out for this contribution took place in January 2012. At this particular meeting, 9 men and 3 women (including the researcher) were present during the morning, which is central to our analysis. That meeting, like many other board meetings, was held in a meeting room in a church building in Amersfoort, in the centre of the Netherlands, and it lasted for one day, from 9.45 AM until 4.00 PM.

The reason for choosing this particular meeting is its aftermath. After a morning of heated discussions, one of the women decided to leave during the lunch break. This was announced to the other editors after lunch by the chairman. He also informed the board that the decision to leave was prompted by gender related questions. He specifically mentioned two discussions held that morning that the now absent board member told him she was not satisfied with. Before resuming their business that afternoon, the editors first evaluated their interaction during the morning part of the meeting, with special attention for these two discussions. During the evaluation a degree of unease was expressed, also related to the notion of gender, but it was not resolved. We will return to this feeling of unease in our conclusion.

At this point, right before introducing the two discussions in question, we wish to argue that the combination of leaving the meeting, relating it to gender, and specifically indicating two instances of debate, turned out to be a very powerful act of definition by the editor in question, for at least three reasons. First, since it forced the other board members to reflect on their own behavior seen from a gender perspective. Second, because in the end it changed the decision of the board: several weeks later they came back on it and revised it. Interestingly, this only concerned one of the decisions, an observation to which we will return later. Third, the power of the editor in defining the borders of gender-relevance as well shows from the fact that we picked exactly these discussions for our analysis in the present paper.

The first discussion took 21 minutes, including a six-minute break. The song in question was a Dutch translation of the carol *Gabriel's Message*, a song about the annunciation which was included in the hymn-book *Church Hymnary 4*. Its refrain hails Mary as *most highly favoured lady*. The translation had been discussed several times before and now the question was how Mary reacted when confronted by the angel Gabriel. The English text has the word ‘meekly’, to which the Dutch translator offered the word *verlegen*, which can be read both as ‘shyly’ and ‘in want of’. In the first fourteen minutes of the discussion, arguments from several corners were introduced by all participants, alternatives were sought, one of which seemed to satisfy everyone's wishes. Since the discussion was taking too long and a deadlock became manifest, the chairman announced a coffee break. After the break, the translator, who also happened to be a board member present at the meeting, vetoed the alternative. The chair decided to call for a vote. Five persons, all male, agreed with the word *verlegen*, whereas three, of whom two female, opposed. The translation was accepted for inclusion in the hymnal.

The second discussion occurred a little more than an hour after the first one. It lasted 20 minutes. One of the editors, actually the one who, together with the women, voted against the word *verlegen*, was not present in the room during the discussion since he had composed the tune. The song in question is called a Kyrie-litany. In Dutch Protestantism the exclamation *Kyrie Eleison!* is commonly not considered a prayer itself, but the congregational response to a prayer. A Kyrie-litany then refers to a litany of prayer intentions, in this case there are seven, each followed by the response *Heer ontferm u* (Lord, have mercy), a Dutch translation for *Kyrie Eleison.* After the editors sang it, with one of them acting as a cantor and the others acting as the congregation, they discussed several aspects such as the precise wording, the musical pointing and the relationship of this litany to the church calendar: they questioned whether it should be placed in the hymnal's section on 'Kyrie' or in that on 'Good Friday'. Most of the discussion, however, revolved around the question of whether this song expresses Kyrie or intercessory prayers, and what the differences are between these kinds of prayers. That discussion was opened by one of the women who stated that a sung Kyrie prayer with fixed intentions does not leave room for a congregation's intentions, whereas these should be central. She was told to have confused a Kyrie and intercessory prayers. A little later the point about this song's contribution to the liturgy was taken up by another woman who sarcastically asked "So you eh really wish to place this in the Kyrie section?". The first woman then brought up her point again and the discussion was repeated. Finally, when it was accepted that this song would be included in the new hymnal's 'Kyrie' section and the composer was called back into the room, the two women made a remark about the procedure and the discussion was recapitulated. The chair ended the discussion by calling for a vote. Six men voted in favor of the song, two women opposed. The song was accepted to be included in the Kyrie section.

STEPS OF ANALYSIS

In the previous section we presented an outline of the two discussions that will be the subject of our analysis in this paper. In the present section we will provide both the details of that analysis and its results.

We performed a textual analysis in several steps. First, we noted all the instances of the word 'gender' in the transcripts of the two discussions. We studied the transcripts to answer the question of what meaning is attached to the word 'gender' in that particular instance. In congruence with our discursive approach, we did not search for unarticulated intentions behind the language. Neither was it our intention to give an evaluation, distinguishing between good and bad use of the word. We took 'gender' at this point as a floating signifier and thus focused on the meanings that were attached to it in interaction. Although the word 'gender' is rarely used in everyday Dutch conversations, it occurred six times in the first discussion we analyzed and once in the second. At this point it might be clarifying to notice that there is no Dutch translation for the word 'gender'; the English word is simply left untranslated. The developments we sketched in our opening section, especially the presence of a supervisor on the topic of gender, will account for this word being part of the editors' vocabulary. Interestingly, most of the times 'gender' was connected to a notion indicating trouble, such as 'problem', 'issue' or 'question'. We will return to the content of these troubles further on.

As a second step, we paid attention to the discursive strategy of indexing,[28] more in particular to the ways speakers position themselves by invoking identities by means of labelling. That is, when making statements such as 'I am an X', speakers position themselves (and the others) to (not) be part of a certain category. We added this to our analysis because of the notion of intersectionality, which implies that gender as a section of identity is always related to other sections of identity such as race, age and sexuality.[29] We did not want to add categories to our analysis that were not introduced by the editors themselves. For example, (only) one of the editorial board members is engaged in a homosexual relationship, whereas 16 are in a heterosexual relationship and two in no such relationship at all. This balance could have caused us to make it a part of our analysis, but since this was not reflected upon and the editor in question never invoked this section of his identity in the discussions, we did not pay attention to it. One could, naturally, ask what not invoking it means, but that is a question beyond the scope of the present study.

The third and final step of our analysis consisted of searching for notions other than gender with a floating meaning as well. The reason for doing so can be deduced from the definition of gender we work with. If gender is a language about power in a given situation, then this also comprises the power of definition. A notion with not (yet) fixed meaning may show power at play, and thus gender at work. Consequently, we were not so much interested in establishing a list of floating signifiers, but mainly focused on the discussions involving (the attempt of) the fixation of their meaning. Who is involved, who wins, who loses, and (how) is gender a part of this meaning-constructing activity?

DOMINANT DEFINITION OF GENDER

Overwhelmingly and without hesitation, gender in the editorial board is suggested to be about the binary of men and women. In the discussions, the editors emphatically position themselves or the others as a man or a woman. Whenever mentioned, the notion gender is connected to men and/or women and their mutual relationships. These relationships are characterized by asymmetry: it is women who should be defended and protected as they have a history of being ignored and oppressed by men. It is this history and the obligation not to repeat it that is referred to as the gender problem. The following quote shows the assumed asymmetry of the relationship between the sexes:

---

[28] Mary Bucholtz and Kira Hall, "Identity and interaction: a sociocultural linguistic approach," *Discourse Studies* 7:4-5 (2005): 585-614.

[29] Yvonne Benschop, *Van lippendienst tot tegengas: Een kritische benadering van gender in organisatieverandering,* (Nijmegen: Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen, 2007); Berger, *Gender Differences.*

Chris: Yes, but, eh, eh, is shyness a bad characteristic, then?
Jeanne: Well, for men it isn't.
Sarah: Shyness often is wrongly ex, ex,
Chris: What did you say?
Bob: For men it isn't, Jeanne says. (laughter)
Sarah: No, it is,
Dave: Well that is also indeed my question. If this would have been about a man would it have been problematic or not?
Bob: No, then, that would be a different story. This,
Sarah: Yes, that would be a different story.
Will: Shyly Joseph looks,
Sarah: When a woman does not immediately, eh, eh, very often people give her the predicate shy.
Bob: This confirms a role model.
Sarah: It does.
Bob: And Mary is,
Dave: But does that role model still exist?

As we see in the final sentence of the above quote (by Dave) the actual accuracy of this asymmetry is put into question. At this point, especially in using the word 'still', Dave introduces another section of his identity: his age. This becomes even more clear when several sentences later he states:

Dave: Well it is, eh, look, as if as a man one cannot say that actually nothing is going on. But sometimes I eh do get that feeling since this eh gender trouble, well, honestly I think that this hardly matters to my generation.

Obviously, Dave does not challenge the particular way the notion of gender is filled with meaning: it is about men and women and their mutual (oppressive) relationships. As a man in his thirties, however, he challenges the actual potential and relevance of this notion. Here gender and age intersect. Although in other discussions each editor now and then refers to their age, in this debate it is only Dave, the youngest man present, who does so. We will return to this observation in our conclusion.

Demotic Definition of Gender

Whether or not they thought it still relevant, not one editor objected to the use of the notion 'gender' to refer to the problematic binary relationship between men and women. Objections were definitely raised against another meaning that was attached to this notion in the meetings. We encounter that other meaning in this brief evaluation, started shortly after Sarah and Jeanne had exchanged glances in response to the decision to incorporate the Kyrie-litany in the hymnal's 'Kyrie' section.

Sarah: Strange, that now for the second time the women oppose a proposal,
Mark: Yes.
Sarah: And both of the times,
Chris: It does not appear to me that gender is at issue here.
Sarah: Well, I am beginning to, eh be a little eh, well, yes,
Chris: Oh, yes of course, one can,
Sarah: Yes, since you are, you state 'I am in favor' and then everything is fine. But we are opposed. Should I then simply say: 'okay, but we are opposed'?
Mark: No, Sarah, but what is your argument?

Mark, Sarah and Chris end up reiterating what was said during the previous discussion. Then the chairman interferes. He 'is trying to argue how this [Kyrie] could be used'. He then decides to call for a vote:

Will: Those in favor?
(Mark, Dave, Chris, Bob and Ben raise their hands)
Jack: What is it that I can favor or oppose?
Will: Well, whether we should incorporate this like that.
Mark: Whether it can be used as a Kyrie,
(Jack raises his hand)
Will: People are opposed, so we should eh hear the disagreement, eh, what can it be,
Jack: Yes yes, no, that is,
Will: Those opposed?
(Sarah and Jeanne raise their hands)
Will: Two people. Then we will accept it anyway.

In these parts of the interaction, Sarah applies a definition of gender we argue belongs to a demotic discourse. She introduces the way the participants enter into the discussion as somehow related to gender. Initially she seems to refer to the familiar concept of gender, in labelling herself as a part of the group 'women'. Then, however, she shifts attention from talking about men and women to the talking done by and between men and women, most succinctly when she is quoting Chris. In doing so, Sarah connects the notion of gender to the notion of power, especially the power of setting the agenda and making decisions.

She is immediately told to be wrong. Chris uses the dominant definition of gender and thus can literally state that ‘gender is not at issue’. When calling and counting the votes, Will explicitly labels the board members as ‘people’, even when it is clear that these people are female. This also denies Sarah’s interpretation that the women are left unheard in the discussion; it is not women, it is simply two board members. Paradoxically, these refutations show she is right. When Sarah is denied the power to define gender as related to the behavior of the editors, the power of definition comes into play and exhibits itself as gendered. This not only concerns the power of defining what gender is, but equally the definition of other notions, as we will come to show by exploring in depth one floating signifier from each of the studied transcripts.

TWO FLOATING SIGNIFIERS

In the first case, it is the notion *verlegen* (‘shyly’) that has to be defined. The editors agree that this word has many connotations in Dutch, they call it ‘a broad spectrum’. Sarah perceives this word to present Mary as powerless and she figures it does not value Mary like it should. The male editors try to convince her of other possible meanings of the word. In the following part of the discussion we clearly encounter the power of definition, when Sarah is addressed:

Will:	But you are strongly against *verlegen* and I do not really understand that.
Ben:	That is not shared by all. No.
Will:	That, eh, what is the point. You hold to one meaning, whereas in a dictionary eh,
Sarah:	Well, I think,
Will:	There are many more connotations.

And, a little later:

Will:	So, when I ask,
Sarah:	But ‘surprised’, is that not an option?
Will:	No, I am really ending this discussion now. So, now eh I simply want to ask eh, we, I provided an interpretation here and you have, yours is opposite to it. I propose to maintain the word *verlegen.* Who agrees?

Still further on, it is suggested that the word should be given some credit, some space for interpretation. It is obvious that the broad spectrum of meanings the word is told to have, does not include the meaning Sarah attaches to it. Her interpretation is just ‘opposite to it’. She is the one who should give shelter to other meanings, whereas her meaning finds itself homeless. As Jeanne pointedly remarks in the afternoon when looking back at the morning's discussions:

> Jeanne: I, I think it was controversial and both sides were nagging a bit, I thought. Why can it just not be 'surprised', what is wrong with that? Yes, tssss. Yes so eh, yes. (laughs) So we have to give some leeway huh. That is eh,
> Will: Yes exactly.
> Roy: Yes, yes.
> Jeanne: I believe we have to do that more often don't we. So eh yes.

In this case, the men could powerfully make the case for *verlegen* to be a word with a broad spectrum, forcing Sarah to provide latitude for another meaning and at the same time exclude her meaning. Here we see that the power of definition is gendered. This decision, by the way, was revised by the editors a number of weeks later: they then preferred the alternative 'surprised'.

In the second case, we saw 'Kyrie prayers' become a floating signifier. On the one hand, some editors assumed that a litany is the 'primal form' of Kyrie prayers, that the song under debate reflects that form and thus should be incorporated in the hymnal's 'Kyrie' section in order to 'offer people a standard they can rely on'. On the other hand, the two female editors argued that in liturgy's history, Kyrie prayers and intercessory prayers initially used to be intermingled at the end of a service. They then were separated: the brief Kyrie prayers at the beginning of a service and the longer intercessory prayers at the end. Therefore the song in question is not a good sung Kyrie prayer since it is too long and too static.

The two groups thus are opposed to each other. In congruence with our approach in this contribution we are not so much interested in who is right in this conflict, but instead in who wins. Since this song is incorporated in the Dutch protestant new hymnal as a part of the 'Kyrie' section, the men have obviously won. This is also indicated during the meeting by several phrases stating that this is 'typically a Kyrie prayer', 'its primal form', 'obviously Kyrie-like', et cetera. Most illuminating on the power of definition is, however, the part of the conversation that follows immediately after the quote introduced in the very beginning of this section of demotic definition. It reads:

> Sarah: Well, it was mentioned eh the function, functionality in the liturgy, wasn't it. Where is this being placed, when, how will it be used?
> Chris: But that has been said already. As a sung Kyrie. That's it!
> Mark: At the beginning of a service.
> Sarah: But objections have been raised as well.

Mark: Then what can be raised against it? Just a sung Kyrie at the beginning of a service.

Both Chris (‘that’s it’) and Mark (‘nothing can be raised against this’) indicate that they have provided the final answer behind which there is no room for an alternative. They possess the power to decide when a discussion is ended, with their definition as the winning alternative. Here, again, the power of definition is gendered. As becomes even more clear from this second example, the notion that needs to be defined does not have to be related to gender understood according to its dominant definition in order to be the playground for gendered power.

Since gender joins power – in the context of a meeting that involves the power of setting the agenda, of raising a majority and of defining key notions – in both debates gender is relevant. The same goes for the question whether these debates are indeed gender-relevant. In limiting the notion of gender so that it does not incorporate the power play in a meeting, especially the second debate is played out as not related to gender. This playing out, however, is exactly where gendered power yields.

Conclusion and Discussion

The present paper has sought to contribute to an analysis of debates involving gender in the context of Dutch Protestantism, especially in the field of liturgy. It has done so by focusing on one particular setting, namely the editorial board of the 2013 hymnbook. On the basis of a close study of the meaning generated in the interaction, we have argued that the dominant definition of gender considers it a synonym for sex. Thus, it repeats the definition of gender that prevailed in the field of gender studies early on. Taken this way, gender is indeed reflected upon by the editors, and sensitivities connected to language use in liturgy are acknowledged.

However, we wish to state that this is not the only way the notion of gender is filled with meaning. In line with current developments in the field of gender studies and on the basis of an illustrative critical incident during the editorial board meetings, we have argued that a demotic definition of gender connects it to power processes at play in a meeting, for example when beginning or ending discussions or when establishing definitions. This concept of gender is recognized by the female editors but not by the male editors and thus is in fact not recognized as gender. We wish to evaluate this denial of gender as second-order gender blindness.

As the discussion we described in our opening paragraph indicates, with men claiming the power of definition and saying that the Oosterhuis song should not be interpreted as potentially hurtful, this blindness to that power and its gendered nature are not unique to the hymnal's editorial board. Despite the etymologic affiliation of demotic to demos (the people), one could even argue that in this case the demotic discourse is present anywhere but with the people. Everyday conversations are colored by a dominant discourse, whereas scholars in the field of gender studies work with a concept of gender that can be called demotic.

Our analysis also indicated that the identity categories of gender and age intersect. It will be worthwhile exploring this relationship more profoundly since we have established that only the youngest among the board members introduced his age as intersecting. At this time we merely want to take a pot-shot at explaining this: the dominant definition of gender acquired its right to exist in the seventies and eighties, a period the youngest editor did not consciously live through. In mentioning his age he expresses his unease with how gender is defined, trying to label it as an outdated notion.

It is outdated, indeed. The solution, in our opinion, however, is not to pretend there is no use for the notion anymore, but, like that has been done in gender studies, to move the discussion about gender both in liturgical studies and in liturgy to the level of power of construction and definition. That will be useful in assessing debates and addressing unease and it will prevent gender from becoming a harmless, shallow, simplified and useless notion in liturgical debate.

BIBLIOGRAPHY TO CHAPTER 6

Acker, Joan (1992). 'From Sex Roles to Gendered Institutions,' in *Contemporary Sociology* 21 (5), pp. 565-569.

Benschop, Yvonne (2007). *Van lippendienst tot tegengas: Een kritische benadering van gender in organisatieverandering.* Nijmegen: Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen (Inaugural speech).

Berger, Teresa (2011). *Gender Differences and the Making of Liturgical History: Lifting a Veil on Liturgy's Past.* Farnham: Ashgate.

Boydston, Jeanne (2008). 'Gender as a Question of Historical Analysis,' in *Gender & History* 20 (3), pp. 558-583.

Bucholtz, Mary and Kira Hall (2005). 'Identity and interaction: a sociocultural linguistic approach,' in *Discourse Studies* 7 (4-5), pp. 585-614.

Butler, Judith (1990). *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity.* New York etc.: Routledge.

Decoene, Anneleen, *Vrouwen houden huis - Geloven in duurzame economie,* http://vrouwensynode.nl/images/stories/synodedag2014/lezing_8mrt2014_adecoene.pdf, last time accessed 28 October 2014.

Dijk, Denise J.J. (2001). 'Celebrating Women's Power: *Oecumenische Vrouwensynoden* in the Netherlands,' in Teresa Berger (Ed.). *Dissident Daughters: Feminist Liturgies in Global Context.* Louisville: Westminster John Knox, pp. 69-86.

Francis, Becky (2012). 'Gender monoglossia, gender heteroglossia: the potential of Bakhtin's work for re-conceptualising gender,' in *Journal of Gender Studies* 21 (1), pp. 1-15.

Groot, Ger (2013). 'De nieuwe benepenheid,' in *Trouw,* 28 May.

Hoving, Sanne and Gerrit-Jan KleinJan (2013). 'In nieuw Liedboek is veel veranderd, maar niet alles,' in *Trouw*, 25 May, p.3.

Interkerkelijke Stichting voor het Kerklied (2006). *Een nieuw liedboek*.

Kelan, Elisabeth K. (2009). 'Gender Fatigue: The Ideological Dilemma of Gender Neutrality and Discrimination in Organizations,' in *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences-Revue canadienne des sciences de l'administration* 26 (3), pp. 197-210.

'Letters to editor', in *Trouw*, 28 May 2013, p.19.

Lodewijks, Jaap (2013). 'Liedboek: 'Hij gaat ons in en uit','in *De Stentor*, 29 May, p.3.

Nieuw Liedfonds, http://www.nieuwliedfonds.nl last time accessed 28 October 2014.

Stringer, Martin D. (2005). *A sociological history of Christian worship,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sunderland, Jane and Lia Litosseliti (2008). 'Current Research Methodologies in Gender and Language Study: Key Issues,' in Kate Harrington, Lia Litosseliti, Helen Sauntson and Jane Sunderland (Eds.). *Gender and Language Research Methodologies.* Hampshire/New York: Palgrave Macmillan,pp. 1-18.

Van Andel, Nienke, Martin J.M. Hoondert and Marcel Barnard (2014). 'We is Plural: Identity Construction in Hymn Book Editorial Meetings,' in *Journal of Empirical Theology* 27 (2), pp. 214-238.

– (under review). 'Remembering '73: Collectively Constructing a Liturgical History by a Hymnbook Editorial Board'.

Van den Berg, Harry (2004). 'Discoursanalyse,' in *KWALON* 9 (2), pp. 29-39.

Van Heusden, Alex (1983). 'Het mannelijke Liedboek: Overzicht van een diskussie in Hervormd Nederland,' in *Werkschrift voor leerhuis & liturgie* 4 (1), pp. 133-136.

Vernooij, Anton (1999). 'De taal van een smekeling: Over het lied 'Een smekeling, zo kom ik tot uw troon',' in *Jaarboek voor liturgie-onderzoek* 15, pp. 253-266.

Wekker, Gloria and Helma Lutz (2001). 'Een hoogvlakte met koude winden: De geschiedenis van het gender- en etniciteitsdenken in Nederland,' in Maayke Botman, Nancy Jouwe and Gloria Wekker (Eds.). *Caleidoscopische visies: De zwarte, migranten en vluchtelingen-vrouwenbeweging in Nederland.* Amsterdam: Koninklijk Instituut voor de Tropen, pp. 25-50.

West, Candace and Don H. Zimmerman (1987). 'Doing Gender,' in *Gender & Society* 1 (2), pp. 125-151.

Yancey Martin, Patricia (2003). '"Said and Done" versus "Saying and Doing": Gendering Practices, Practicing Gender at Work,' in *Gender & Society* 17 (3), pp. 342-366.

CHAPTER 7

GENERAL CONCLUSION, DISCUSSION AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

INTRODUCTION

The preceding five chapters have each introduced one notion that we argue is central to the editorial process of the new Dutch Protestant hymnal. These notions are ‘hymnal’, ‘ecumenism’, ‘history’, ‘professional identity’ and ‘gender’, successively. Thus, they can be considered to be the answer to the first part of our overarching research question which reads: *what notions are identified as central in the meetings of the editorial board of the new Dutch Protestant hymnbook and what kind of discourses are (re)produced in the process of giving meaning to these notions?*

By using a discursive approach to these five notions we have been able to show that each of them is meaningfully constructed in social interaction. In doing so we have introduced an approach into the area of Liturgical Studies that has not been used to that extent before, the evaluation of which we will return to later in this chapter. Even a notion that seems to be so self-evident and undisputable as the notion of ‘hymnal’, turned out to be a contested field where several discourses are at play. In the present chapter we will put the clues given in the five articles together and formulate an answer to the second part of our main question, which is indeed more of a question to be dealt with in a complete thesis than in a single article. Below we will introduce the kinds of discourse that were (re)produced in the editorial process, only after we have clarified two relevant notions necessary for understanding what we mean by ‘kinds of discourse’. The first will be the term ‘discourse’ itself, in addition to what has already been written about it in our opening chapter. The second is the notion of power, as we already previewed in our first chapter. The chapter will conclude with some suggestions for further research.

DISCOURSE

As we have already repeatedly indicated, using the notion of ‘discourse’ in a study is not without risks. A wide range of scholars and disciplines use that notion in a description of their activity and/or their field of interest and/or their tools for analysis. ‘The word [discourse] has become ubiquitous. The terms *discourse, discourses* and *discursive* as a modifier are appearing everywhere’ (Bacchi 2005, 198). This easily leads to a confusion of tongues. What is more, the perspective of discourse itself requires a careful and critical approach of any definition, even that of discourse. Therefore we have not provided a steady and stable definition in our first chapter, but instead listed four advantages offered by a discursive approach. At this juncture we return once more to the approach we have taken. This time, with an eye to what we have done and written in preceding chapters, we will clarify our own position and discuss it once more.

It should be underscored once again that we prefer not to speak of this thesis’ approach as discourse analysis, although it could be caught under that large umbrella notion covering many approaches. The name of discourse analysis, however, is also applied to one of these approaches in particular, which has a radical critical, change-oriented approach and is related to Marxist tradition. That is not what we aim at and therefore we prefer to speak of ‘a discursive approach’. We thus offer a discursive approach of ‘hymnal’, ‘ecumenism’, ‘history’, ‘professional identity’ and ‘gender’, respectively.

From the previous chapters, it can be derived that we consider a discourse as a meaning-generating network. We follow sociologist Martin Stringer (2005; 2008; 2013) who is inspired by both philosopher Michel Foucault and sociologist Gerd Baumann, and who proceeds from the assumption that a discourse is a group of actual statements. These include but are not confined to words. Gesture, sound, place, space and dress, for example, should also be considered as statements in this sense. These statements belong to a specific domain, referred to as discursive field, such as medicine, academics or economy, while at the same time setting the limits to that field. Discourses are namely inextricably linked to power: ‘[t]he distinguishing feature of any discourse is that it is restrictive; it controls and in many ways even determines what can and cannot be said within it’. It also limits ‘in many cases who can say it and in what context it is appropriate to be said’ (Stringer 2005, 12). At this point we wish to add that we indeed take ‘the liturgical landscape’, within which the present thesis is positioned, to be such a discursive field.

The capacity of discourse to generate and authorize meanings, which once constructed become part of the discourse as well, is central to the present study. We have proceeded from the assumption that the best way of getting to know what the intention, the effect and the reception (usually short-handedly referred to as meaning) of central concepts are is not taking a normative or dictionary look at them, but instead looking at how they are negotiated and constructed in social interaction. An argument indicating that it is actually constructed meaning we are after, is the fact that *Chapter 3* on ecumenism was published even before the hymnbook concerned was released. This timing shows that we are not interested in how ecumenism ‘really’ is caused (or stymied) by the hymnbook. Instead, we assume that the meaning of the notion ‘ecumenism’ is not established beforehand but is negotiated during the editorial process. We are interested in such negotiations. They sometimes are left undecided, as *Chapter 2* on the meaning of ‘hymnal’ shows, while at other times one discourse is undoubtedly favored, which we have argued to be the case with ‘gender’ (*Chapter 6*).

An important presupposition to our study, connected to what we listed in our opening chapter as one of the advantages of using the notion of discourse, is that the discursively constructed meanings and their contests that we have introduced to the reader, are not confined to the meetings of the editorial board we analyzed. Meanings do not arise *ex* *nihilo*. In *Chapter 5* we introduced the notion of repertoires, whereas in *Chapter 4* the same idea of available resources came by the name of time maps, or scripts. The discursive contests each of the five preceding chapters have introduced, should be understood as nourished by existing networks of meaning, while at the same time contributing to these networks. This latter aspect can be derived from an important characteristic of discourses: each new contribution they make possible becomes part of them – exactly this characteristic ensures that discourses are not stable and static and that their borders are fluid: 'often when people do introduce new and incongruous elements into the discourse, or if somebody speaks out of turn or in the wrong place, (…) discourses change and develop' (Stringer 2005, 12).

Discourses are therefore flexible, dynamic and multiple and, what is more, they can be analyzed at distinct levels: '[w]e can be as specific or as broad as we choose to be, and the level of discourse we choose will depend on the specific nature of the analysis we are undertaking' (Stringer 2008, 499). Exactly how broad the discourses we have introduced in the past five chapters are, is a matter of discussion to which we will return below, under the heading of *embedding.* First we will highlight another topic central to our understanding of discourse and relevant for answering the second part of our main question: *power*.

POWER

In *Chapter 1* we introduced the involvement of the notion of power ('who is in charge') as one of the backgrounds to this research and at the same time as one of the advantages of taking a discursive approach, since power and discourse are inextricably connected. Whereas *Chapter 6* most explicitly deals with the concept of power, it can in fact be considered to be a theme which connects all of this thesis' chapters to each other. We will first introduce our understanding of 'power' and then move on to show how we have gone over the five central notions relates to this understanding.

Power in a study like ours should, obviously, not be taken as physical coercion. Neither does our account of power match how this concept is usually understood in all kinds of social sciences, where '[m]ost conceptions of power are based on Weber's classical definition that power is the probability that a person can carry out his or her own will despite resistance' (Bacharach and Lawler 1980, 12). Both physical power and social power present an image of power that to our understanding makes it too visible, too traceable and too controllable.

In contrast, we are looking for an image of power that relates it to discourse. Such an image is to be found in the writings of Michel Foucault. Foucault stresses the pervasiveness, the impersonality and the invisibility of power by focusing on its 'capillary form of existence' (Foucault 1980, 39). This is an incredibly strong image by which to portray power. We should only recall that capillary action, for example, can be observed when laying a tissue paper onto a fluid. Instead of drowning in it, the tissue paper will soak itself with the fluid. Indeed, Foucault studies power from the perspective of its mechanism. What is more, he studies power as a mechanism that engages in a dialectical relationship with knowledge: 'I have been trying to make visible the constant articulation I think there is of power on knowledge and of knowledge on power' (Foucault 1980, 51). We think there are at least two benefits this image of power yields for us: (1) In stressing the pervasiveness and (thus) ordinariness of power, it prevents us from thinking of power as something huge, something bad or something extraordinary, and (2) The focus on constant articulation between power and knowledge makes us alert to an inverted movement, based on the independency that 'things' which spring from knowledge, such as concepts, subjects and morals, acquire once known. We will return to that movement in more detail in the following paragraph. In spite of these benefits, the Foucaultian approach to power and knowledge must be handled with care. Although Foucault stated that power 'functions in the form of a chain' and that it indeed 'is employed and exercised through a net-like organisation' (Foucault 1980, 98), we should be careful not to ascribe power to the chain, the net or the discourse itself as if it were an agent by default. Such an essentialist argument would prevent the discursive approach from being self-referential. 'We should (…) not make the error of allocating agency to discourse *as a matter of definition*' (Iedema 2011, 1169. Italics ours). The relationship between network and power the way we understand it is, for example, characterized by sociologist Manuel Castells, who, although aiming at another kind of network, argues that '[media] are the space of power making, not the sources of power holding' (Castells 2007, 244). The same applies to discourses and their nodes.

The constant articulation between power and knowledge, already referred to above, is important for our study. More than that, this articulation is exactly why power should be considered as an integrative concept to the present thesis. The discursively constructed meanings of the various concepts we have explored, are not only powerfully applied to these concepts by actors in the particular discursive field. Once settled, these meanings in turn exert power on the actors as well as on the field and its borders. We wish to relate this to current observations that indeed any work of art could 'gain autonomy vis-à-vis its creator. The product of your creativity is looking at you instead of the other way around' (Barnard 2007, 9). This observation applies to everything produced by (and producing) culture. The reifying of cultural artifacts anthropologist Roy Rappaport has aptly described as 'the great inversion': 'If, as agents, people act, and perhaps can only act, in terms of meanings they or their ancestors have conceived, they are as much in the service of those conceptions as those conceptions are parts of their adaptations' (Rappaport 1999, 9). A similar effect is echoed in the way dominant discourse works, a notion we will come to introduce more profoundly below.

> It is only the dominant discourse, as used by the local authority, which appears to provide a means to discuss the neighbourhood as a whole (…) therefore (…) any social group that wishes to engage with the whole has to use the dominant discourse of the authorities (this is what makes it a 'dominant' discourse). (Stringer 2013, 21)

As a matter of fact, the way we now have defined power is not the same as it was initially introduced to our study by the question 'who is in charge?'. The latter question asks for legal power, whereas our approach brings to the fore that such a question itself presupposes and continues divisions between (groups) of people, the legal power attributed to them and a (theologically motivated) questioning of it.

This perspective of power has several implications for an evaluation of the preceding five chapters. First, it must be argued that the selection of 'hymnal', 'ecumenism', 'history', 'professional identity' and 'gender' as notions central to the editorial process, is an action both constituting and made possible by discourse. It is a scholar's way of exercising power, be it limited by the discourse both researchers and researched are positioned in and by. Scholars in Liturgical Studies stand in the same field as people performing, discussing or inventing liturgy. They just look for different things, or in this thesis' vocabulary: in the discursive field they are engaged in they are different kinds of actors. Second, it should be noted that the involvement of 'power' in the preceding chapters comes from their discursive approach, more than from our particular engagement with power as a topic. It is therefore, by default, somewhat hidden in the text of the chapters. A first attempt to undo that invisibility will be ventured in the following paragraphs.

The editorial board discussions we discussed in *Chapter 2* can be understood as discursive power at work. It is possibly exactly because these discussions, as we have shown, were not settled in favor of one of the alternatives, that we were able to show power at work. Since the question as to what is/should be a hymnal was not (yet) answered, none of the alternative meanings of hymnal could manifest itself as the only possibility and by that powerfully decide which hymns could be included and which were simply unthinkable, given the agreed upon definition of hymnal.

Chapter 3, then, most clearly relates to formal and visible power since it elaborates on church polity: who is asserted the formal right to decide what can be sung anyway? At the same time, this chapter shows the percolating of such issues into the final ends – that is: the small social units of the congregation, the believer, the theologian – when we state, in the conclusion, that 'in 1973 it was self-evident that the church orders involved recognized the power of a general synod to decide which hymns would be allowed'. It is this self-evidence we would argue in this final chapter which is the capillary working of power, the discursive power of making some statements impossible and others not only possible but even self-evident with a whole network of beliefs, actions, institutions, et cetera geared towards verifying them.

The inverted working of power is also illustrated in *Chapter 4.* That chapter clearly shows that not only do several perspectives on history circulate, but that each of these perspectives sets the limits as to what can be said about it (historiography) and by whom (scholarship). Incidentally, out of the chapters offered in this thesis, it is *Chapter 4* that most directly addresses Liturgical Studies as a discipline since it not only offers an innovative approach and introduces a field of study not drawn into Liturgical Studies before, but it critically analyses the story scholars in Liturgical Studies tell about themselves and their discipline as well. A story, we must stress once again, that is not only told by them but by which they are molded as well. This latter remark is even more true for *Chapter 5.* The identity repertoires introduced in this chapter not only compete with each other in establishing what is the most favored professional identity-in-relation-to-users for the editors, but each repertoire also for example influences what kind of arguments editors can use in the meetings, how the editors relate to each other, what authorities they appeal to, even how easily they can decide to skip (part of) the meetings. The repertoires, in sum, are powerful networks of meaning which on the one hand are shaped by the editors as agents while on the other they shape the editors as subjects.

Chapter 6, finally, most plainly deals with the mechanism of power. It argues that gender should not be reduced to a topic involving masculinities and femininities. Instead, gender is better considered as a relationship of power, of which the power of definition is a part. This also involves defining what gender actually is. That chapter most critically shows what it takes to take a discursive approach to any topic. It allows – or forces – scholars to devote attention both to the statements uttered and to their framework: the rules making these statements possible. In doing so, the chapter in question challenges scholars in Liturgical Studies to continually investigate the meanings of the notions they are working with, even when – or rather: most succinctly when – they assume these meanings to be obvious and self-evident.

Subsequently, we argue that the most valuable contribution of this thesis to the field of Liturgical Studies is its approach. The discursive approach each of the five preceding chapters has applied, allowed for a new area to be included in this field's interests. Besides existing – and ever growing – attention for performances of liturgy and ritual which has replaced the study of prescriptions and (participant or observant) descriptions, this thesis argues for the relevance of the existing and continually (re)created networks of meaning participants are engaged in and with. Thus editorial board meetings can be an interesting area for a liturgical scholar's field work – to say the least.

The perspective that makes such meetings an interesting area is the meaning they produce and reproduce. To be sure, in the end this includes the meaning of 'scholarship', 'thesis' and 'objectivity' as well. Our approach does emphatically not position the scholar outside or above the field in question. Consequently, in accordance with what we have written in our opening chapter, this thesis should not be considered as an explanation of what actually happened in the meetings of the *Liedboek*'s editorial board. That would imply a researcher's position apart from the field under study and, what is more, it would suggest that something like objectivity would exist independent of a discourse. Instead, we agree with political scientist Ernesto Laclau who asserts that objectivity is a relationship, and that relations are constituted through discourse, so 'discourse is the primary terrain of the constitution of objectivity as such' (Laclau 2005, 68).

EMBEDDING

In the above section we have given extensive thought to the concept of power, which proceeds from our understanding of discourse, and which we have argued is a theme that connects the preceding chapters. The introduction of the notion of power was a first step in answering the second part of our main question, which asks what kind of discourses are (re)produced in the meaning-generating processes described in chapters 2 through 6. As we already stated in *Chapter 1*, our interest is not in labelling the discourses according to their theological orientation, such as to arrive at 'the evangelical discourse' or 'the confessional discourse'. Such an answer, we have argued in our opening chapter, would not satisfy our curiosity as to who is in charge when it comes to liturgy. Therefore our main question in its final phrasing does not read 'what discourses' but asks for 'kinds of discourses'. When distinguishing discourses according to their character, the concepts of demotic and dominant discourse, which we already introduced in *Chapter 6,* come in as a very useful starting point. We will however, in continuation of our critical remark in the conclusion and discussion of *Chapter 6* ('the demotic discourse is present anywhere but with the people'), come to question the image of dominance that is implicitly present in this distinction.

These notions are meant to categorize a discourse by its roots and influence. In order to understand what a dominant discourse is, we quote Martin Stringer introducing eleventh century Christianity as a dominant discourse: 'I want to suggest that Christianity permeated (…) into the very fabric of the way people thought of and perceived the world, the way they understood their being and their senses, the way the world was' (Stringer 2005, 121). Demotic discourses, by the same author, are described as discourses 'suitable for internal consumption', that is, internal to a 'particular religious or social group' (Stringer 2005, 151).

For both of these notions Stringer relies on research into London religious groups by sociologist Gerd Baumann who had noticed that, depending on who was talking, to whom and for what purpose, key notions could gain different meaning. Baumann introduced the concepts of dominant and demotic discourse to explain this. He also suggested that people possess a dual discursive competence: 'the idea that each individual was able to switch between two or more different discourses at will, depending on context' (Stringer 2005, 151). The demarcation between dominant and demotic discourse, however, is not as unproblematic as it appears to be at first sight: 'demotic discourses are, up to a point at least, distributed along the lines of the dominant discourse' (Stringer 2013, 141).

These theoretical remarks lead us to several questions and suggestions concerning the present study, most pregnant the question as to how broad is the group that shares or recognizes the discursively constructed meanings we have introduced in the past five chapters. Are they limited to the editorial board, in a way that they can be said to be demotic? That would urge us to assume that the board is a social group with its own code of conduct, dress, talk and arguments, in short: its own discourse. We think that such could indeed be argued. However, we will also shortly defend an analysis which is more layered than that. One could also ask whether the opposite is true: are the meanings of 'hymnal', 'ecumenism', 'history', 'professional identity' and 'gender' constructed in the editorial board in a way that nothing but reflects how these notions are constructed in the social context surrounding the board? Did our study merely capture dominant discourse at work, perhaps caused by the presence of the researcher? In *Chapter 5,* we introduced the notion of an unseen gallery. Could the unseen academic gallery be a reason for the editors to avail themselves solely of dominant discourse? Or, conversely, is it better to consider the researcher as part of the social group and thus as involved in the demotic discourse? Again, we think it could be argued that this study indeed introduces dominant discourse at work, although we aim at presenting an analysis which is more layered than that. Indeed, in this series of questions the notions of demotic and dominant discourse have switched places in relation to how they were introduced in the previous paragraph. According to their formal position in the liturgical discursive field, the board of editors could be expected to produce dominant discourse. At this point, we must leave it at this remark and refer back to what we have written in our *Chapter 5* about current models of authority and leadership.

Each of the preceding five chapters has shown interesting, almost paradoxical, dynamics at work. *Chapter 5* most clearly verbalizes this paradox. On the one hand, the meaning the editors construct concerning, in this case, professional identity, can be argued to be time-bound, acceptable for people not present in the board, shared by a large group, in short: to be dominant. On the other hand, repeating what we have pointedly introduced as a part of the problem context in *Chapter 5*, the editors themselves are suggested by dominant discourse to be engaged in a demotic – elitist – discourse. This paradox – editors who are constructed by dominant discourse as a group that avails itself of demotic discourse, are in fact applying meanings made possible by dominant discourse – we argue is central to each of the issues introduced in this thesis. For 'hymnal', 'ecumenism', 'history' and 'gender' we could also follow the same track. For each of these notions we could argue that the way the editors supply them with meaning is congruent with how dominant discourse allows them to do so. At the same time, for each of these notions documents such as letters to an editor or opinion articles in Protestant newspapers or popular journals could be quoted, asking rhetorically whether the editors are aware of 'what they have done to liturgy with this hymnal' for example, or 'the many groups and churches that should be represented', 'the important hymnologic history of the 1973 book they have just thrown out' and 'the opportunity they have missed in not making this hymnal a gender-neutral one'.

In summary: for the central notions this thesis has introduced, it can be argued that they are constructed in the editorial process according to dominant discourse. The editors are children of their times. They are embedded. It is only in confrontation with the dominant discourse which constructs the editors as ignorant and unworldly, that this conclusion can be said to be remarkable. The constructed dichotomy between editors and users, between liturgical elite and the laity, did not surface in this research design until this moment. But it probably has been there all the time, echoing a 'simplistic binary division (…) which our findings led us to question' (Cook, Pieri and Robbins 2004, 435). We should be aware that the figure of an editor and everything that is ascribed to them, even their importance for Liturgical Studies, is a discursive act. In echoing, and finally questioning, this binary, the present study is an example of how scholars in Liturgical Studies can never escape from the discourse their world (and their own presence as a researcher) is shaped by, but at the same time can slowly contribute to a change of that discourse in saying things that may seem totally out of place. Such a statement would be: 'the editors do not exist'.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

As has been argued throughout, the most important contribution of the present study to the field of Liturgical Studies is to be found in its approach. A discursive approach of key terms encourages scholars to ask why and how certain statements are possible. Since this approach not only applies to notions in the field one studies, but also to the notions by which one studies them – and even helps to question this very distinction – it could turn out to be valuable in the future in making Liturgical Studies an even more self-confident scholarly discipline. Notions that are currently in the focus of attention, such as 'participation', 'embodiment' and 'bricolage' for example, will definitely gain from a discursive approach. Such an approach would not only clarify that different, sometimes even contradictory, meanings are attached to these notions, but would also relate these notions to a larger network of collective resources.

Next, we would also like to encourage more research concerning the editorial process of the new Dutch Protestant hymnal, since some topics had to remain unexplored and questions are left unanswered. We have, for good reasons, chosen to focus on transcripts of the meetings of the main editorial board. It would be interesting to see if the notions we argue are central were central in the editorial working groups as well, and if so, what discourses were produced. Since the hymnal has been published and as such is now part of discourse(s), it also would be worthwhile to look at how and if the construction of 'the editors' has changed. By the same token it would be interesting to study if and if so, how the five central notions this thesis has composed as a canon, are constructed as central themes even outside the editorial process.

BIBLIOGRAPHY TO CHAPTER 7

Bacchi, Carol (2005). 'Discourse, Discourse Everywhere: Subject "Agency" in Feminist Discourse Methodology,' in *NORA, Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research* 13 (3), pp. 198-209.

Bacharach, Samuel B. and Edward J. Lawler (1980). *Power and Politics in Organizations.* San Francisco etc.: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Barnard, Marcel (2007). 'Naar een nieuwe protestantse avondmaalstheologie: Een reconstructie aan de hand van Rappaports *great inversion*', in *Jaarboek voor liturgie-onderzoek* 23, pp. 7-23.

Castells, Manuel (2007). 'Communication, Power and Counter-power in the Network Society', in *International Journal of Communication* 1, pp. 238-266.

Cook, Guy, Elisa Pieri and Peter T. Robbins (2004). ''The Scientists Think and the Public Feels': Expert Perceptions of the Discourse of GM Food,' in *Discourse & Society* 15 (4), pp. 433-449.

Foucault, Michel (1980). *Power/knowledge: selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977.* Brighton: The Harvester Press.

Iedema, Rick (2011). 'Discourse studies in the 21st century: A response to Mats Alvesson and Dan Kärreman's 'Decolonializing discourse', in *Human relations* 64, pp. 1163-1176.

Laclau, Ernesto (2005). *On Populist Reason*. London etc.: Verso.

Rappaport, Roy A. (1999). *Ritual and Religion in the Making of Humanity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stringer, Martin D. (2005). *A Sociological History of Christian Worship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

– (2008). 'Discourses, Institutions and Populations: Religion in an Urban Ecology,' in *CrossCurrents* 58 (3), pp. 495-510.

– (2013). *Discourses on Religious Diversity: Explorations in an Urban Ecology.* Farnham etc.: Ashgate.

NEDERLANDSE SAMENVATTING

EEN CANON MAKEN:
Het scheppen van netwerken van betekenis in het redactieproces van het *Liedboek, zingen en bidden in huis en kerk* (2013).

In dit proefschrift wordt van een vijftal begrippen geanalyseerd welke betekenis daaraan werd toegekend in de vergaderingen van de redactie van het in 2013 verschenen *Liedboek, zingen en bidden in huis en kerk.* Deze begrippen worden opgevat als knooppunten in een netwerk van betekenis, waarvoor in dit proefschrift de notie *discours* wordt gebruikt. Uitgangspunt is dat betekenis tot stand komt in sociale interactie. Dit betreft zowel de betekenis(sen) van de onderscheiden begrippen, als sec de vaststelling dát dit begrippen zijn die een rol spelen in het geselecteerde gebied van sociale interactie, in dit proefschrift besproken onder de noemer landschap of discursief veld. Beide invalshoeken – wat zijn de centrale noties en welke betekenis wordt daaraan toegekend – zijn onderdeel van de hoofdvraag van deze studie, die voluit luidt:

> Welke noties worden geïdentificeerd als centrale noties in het redactioneel proces van het nieuwe Nederlandse protestantse *Liedboek* en wat voor soort discoursen worden ge(re)produceerd tijdens het verlenen van betekenis aan deze noties?

Het antwoord op het eerste deel van de vraag bestaat uit vijf noties: achtereenvolgens ‘liedboek’, ‘oecumene’, ‘geschiedenis’, ‘professionele identiteit’ en ‘gender’. Elk van deze noties wordt in een eigen hoofdstuk behandeld, waarover hieronder meer. Het belang van het tweede deel van de vraag, naar het soort discoursen, is verbonden aan de probleemstelling van dit onderzoek. Naast de algehele toegenomen belangstelling voor (kerk)muziek in de liturgiewetenschappen en de spanningen die rond dat onderwerp waarneembaar zijn, speelt de vraag naar macht namelijk ook nadrukkelijk op de achtergrond van dit onderzoek. ‘Van wie is de liturgie eigenlijk?’, is de naïeve vraag waarmee dit onderzoek begonnen is, waarop bewust niet naar een normatief of theologisch maar naar een empirisch georiënteerd antwoord werd gezocht. Rondom het verschijnen van liedbundels in Nederland ligt namelijk altijd de spanning tussen samenstellers en gebruikers, tussen elite en volk. De insteek van dit onderzoek was dan ook om in de discussies van de samenstellers niet alleen te kijken hoe zij het liturgische discursief veld vormgeven, maar ook waar de begrippen en betekenissen die ze gebruiken vandaan (zouden kunnen) komen.

Hierbij bleken de begrippen dominant en demotisch discours van pas te komen, waarbij een dominant discours een netwerk van officiële betekenissen is, zoals gebruikt door bijvoorbeeld bestuurders, woordvoerders en andere machthebbers. Een demotisch discours, daarentegen, kan beter worden opgevat als een netwerk van betekenissen voor intern gebruik, binnen een bepaalde sociale groep. Dit onderscheid richt zich dus op de wortels van de discoursen, waar ze vandaan komen en waar ze worden gebruikt, en niet op hun specifieke inhoud. Bovendien is de veronderstelling van sociologen Baumann en Stringer, waar we deze begrippen aan hebben ontleend, dat mensen de capaciteit hebben – een duale discursieve capaciteit – om al naar gelang de context te wisselen tussen het ene en het andere netwerk van betekenis.

Interessant genoeg bleek uit het onderzoek dat in dit proefschrift wordt gepresenteerd dat het benoemen van een discours, en de groep waar het gebruikt wordt, als dominant of demotisch, zelf een discours-gebonden handeling is. De manier waarop met behulp van taal, in dit onderzoek in zo breed mogelijke zin opgevat, betekenis wordt gegeven aan de centrale begrippen, alsmede de erkenning dat de centrale begrippen ook werkelijk centraal zijn, bleek te worden gedeeld door de redactie en de critici daarbuiten die zich presenteren als 'de gewone mensen'. Wij kunnen niet anders dan daar twee conclusies aan verbinden, hetgeen in het laatste hoofdstuk van deze dissertatie dan ook is gebeurd: (1) samenstellers, gebruikers, critici, onderzoekers en wie er op wat voor manier dan ook betrokken is bij de totstandkoming van het nieuwe *Liedboek,* hebben allemaal een positie in hetzelfde netwerk van betekenis (2) de tegenstelling (dichotomie) tussen 'redactie' en 'gebruikers' die ten grondslag lag aan de opzet van dit onderzoek is door het onderzoek zelf in twijfel getrokken. Dit verleidt ons uiteindelijk tot een opmerking van filosofische aard: 'de redactie bestaat niet'.

Wat dit proefschrift tot een relatieve noviteit maakt binnen de theologie is dat dit een bundeling is van een aantal (vijf) eerder verschenen dan wel momenteel onder beoordeling zijnde wetenschappelijke artikelen. Hiermee wordt aangesloten bij recente ontwikkelingen in de geesteswetenschappen die zo het voorbeeld volgen van de exacte en de sociale wetenschappen. Elk van de artikelen behandelt een van de noties die samen het antwoord vormen op het eerste deel van de hoofdvraag. Deze lijst van vijf thema's alsmede de analyse in de vijf artikelen is gebaseerd op empirisch onderzoek. Van mei 2008 tot september 2012 heeft de onderzoeker als onderzoeker (dus niet als lid) de vergaderingen bijgewoond van de redactie en de redactionele werkgroepen van het *Liedboek*, aanvankelijk met pen en papier, later met een audiorecorder en nog later met een videorecorder als haar gerei. De lijst met vijf thema's is een extract van de veldaantekeningen. De analyse van de betekenis die elk van deze thema's heeft gekregen is gebaseerd op transcripten van een beperkt aantal vergaderingen.

Het eerste thema dat wordt behandeld, in *hoofdstuk 2*, is 'liedboek'. Dit hoofdstuk laat zien dat een zo basale term verrassend genoeg verschillende betekenissen kan krijgen. Achtereenvolgens worden genoemd: het liedboek als spiegel (reflecteren van bestaande praktijken en idealen); het liedboek als motor (aanjagen van nieuwe praktijken en idealen);

het liedboek als museum (een bewaarplaats voor het hymnologisch erfgoed); het liedboek als gebruiksvoorwerp (waarin alleen liederen en teksten staan die voor de gemeente anno nu nog van pas komen); het liedboek als hulpmiddel (voor het opzetten van de volledige liturgie) en het liedboek als bron (om de eerste gedachten te vormen rondom de opzet van de liturgie). Dit hoofdstuk laat zien dat deze verschillende betekenissen allemaal terug zijn te vinden binnen en buiten de redactie. Bovendien zijn deze betekenissen niet geheel 'onschuldig': al naar gelang welke betekenis van liedboek de voorkeur krijgt, worden de argumenten bepaald op grond waarvan een lied al of niet kan worden opgenomen in het boek en wordt dus de inhoud van het boek bepaald.

Hoofdstuk 3 gaat over 'oecumene'. Ook dat is een term waarvan misschien op het eerste gezicht niet wordt verwacht dat de betekenis daarvan kan verschuiven. Dit hoofdstuk koppelt een belangrijke ontwikkeling op ecclesiologisch en kerkrechtelijk gebied – namelijk de fusie van de Nederlandse Hervormde Kerk, de Gereformeerde Kerken (synodaal) en de Evangelisch-Lutherse Kerk tot de Protestantse Kerk in Nederland in 2004 – aan de verschijning van het *Liedboek* en die van zijn voorganger, het *Liedboek voor de Kerken* uit 1973. Dit hoofdstuk laat zien dat het liedboek uit 1973 oecumene opvat als consensus en dat het daarmee zowel ontwikkelingen die leidden tot de genoemde fusie weerspiegelde als deze versnelde en zelfs in gang zette. Het liedboek uit 2013, dat dus verschenen is na de fusie, geeft aan oecumene de betekenis van organische eenheid: binnen de kaften van het boek wordt een grote diversiteit bijeengehouden.

De notie 'geschiedenis' komt aan bod in *hoofdstuk 4*. Dit hoofdstuk sluit aan bij de recente belangstelling binnen liturgiewetenschappen voor collectieve en culturele herinnering als een onderwerp van onderzoek. Het neemt echter niet een fenomeen in de omringende cultuur onder de loep, maar wendt de blik naar binnen en kijkt hoe het liturgische discursieve veld zichzelf een verleden construeert. Specifiek kijkt het hoofdstuk naar hoe het *Liedboek* wordt verbonden aan de voorloper uit 1973, maar tegelijkertijd laat het zien dat deze manieren van verbinden – beschreven als navolging, imitatie, emulatie en mutatie – en het verhaal over 'de' geschiedenis dat zij vertellen, ook buiten de redactie te vinden zijn. Bijvoorbeeld in de liturgische historiografie.

De laatste twee thema's hebben betrekking op de redacteuren zelf en hoe zij zich in de vergaderingen positioneren. Eerst gaat *hoofdstuk 5* in op hun professionele identiteit: hoe zien de redacteuren zichzelf ten opzichte van de gebruikers? Van de zes gebruikte posities – redacteuren, professionals, ervaringsdeskundigen, voorhoede, 'pleasers' en gelijken – bleek de positie van voorhoede het meest geliefd en geaccepteerd te zijn. Niet alleen binnen maar ook buiten de redactie is dat een houding die van redacteuren verwacht wordt: niet vertellen hoe het moet, maar laten zien hoe het zou kunnen. Een specifieke sectie van identiteit, namelijk gender, komt ten slotte aan bod in *hoofdstuk 6.* Dit hoofdstuk stelt de vraag welke betekenis van gender gehanteerd wordt in de redactie. Dit blijkt dezelfde te zijn als buiten de redactie: gender heeft te maken met mannen en vrouwen en hun onderlinge relaties. Gesteund door recente ontwikkelingen op het gebied van *gender studies* daarentegen stelt het artikel dat gender beter gezien kan worden als een vraag naar macht – en biedt daarmee een tegendraadse analyse van de interactie in de redactie die het best beschreven kan worden als een gender blindheid van de tweede orde.

Deze vijf thema's – liedboek, oecumene, geschiedenis, professionele identiteit en gender – en de manier waarop zij in de sociale interactie binnen het redactieproces van betekenis worden voorzien, geven samen aan hoe het huidige liturgische discursieve veld eruit ziet – of althans: welke discoursen er momenteel op dat veld te vinden zijn.

LIST OF CO-AUTHORS,
LIST OF PUBLICATIONS,
DANKWOORD,
CURRICULUM VITAE

List of Co-authors

Marcel Barnard (*Chapters 2,4,5,6*) is professor of Practical Theology at the Protestant Theological University (Amsterdam, the Netherlands), professor of Liturgical Studies at VU University Amsterdam, and Professor Extraordinary of Practical Theology at the University of Stellenbosch (South Africa). He is research leader of Practical Theology at the Protestant Theological University.

Martin J.M. Hoondert (*Chapters 2,4,5,6*) is Assistant professor 'Music, Religion & Ritual' at the Tilburg School of Humanities.

Leo J. Koffeman (*Chapter 3*) is professor of Church Polity and Ecumenism at the Protestant Theological University (Amsterdam, the Netherlands), Extraordinary Professor of Systematic Theology and Ecclesiology at the University of Stellenbosch (South Africa), and Extraordinary Professor of Church History and Church Polity at the University of Pretoria (South Africa).

Heleen Zorgdrager (*Chapter 6*) is professor of Systematic Theology and Genderstudies at the Protestant Theological University (Amsterdam, the Netherlands), and visiting professor at the Institute of Ecumenical Studies, Ukrainian Catholic University in Lviv (Ukraine).

List of Publications

Academic

Nienke van Andel, Martin J.M. Hoondert and Marcel Barnard (2014). 'We is Plural: Identity Construction in Hymn Book Editorial Meetings,' in *Journal of Empirical Theology* 27 (2), pp. 214-238. (= this thesis, Chapter 5)

Nienke van Andel, Martin J.M. Hoondert and Marcel Barnard (2014). 'Images of a Hymnal: Criteria for selecting songs derived from constructed meaning of a hymnal,' in *Jahrbuch für Liturgik und Hymnologie* 53, pp. 143-158. (= this thesis, Chapter 2)

Nienke van Andel and Leo J. Koffeman (2012). 'Singing together the song of diversity: Liturgical and Ecclesiological Reform in Dutch Protestantism,' in *Questions Liturgiques/Studies in Liturgy* 93 (3/4), pp. 236-250. (= this thesis, Chapter 3)

Nienke van Andel (2011). 'Onaantastbaar of bijzonder geliefd: Twee discoursen rondom de sacraliteit van het kerklied,' in Petra Versnel-Mergaerts and Louis van Tongeren (Eds.). *Heilig, heilig, heilig: Over sacraliteit in kerk en cultuur*. Heeswijk: Abdij van Berne, pp. 97-113

Nienke van Andel and Marcel Barnard (2009). '"Discourses in Liturgy": De totstandkoming van het nieuwe protestantse liedboek (2012) vergeleken met de totstandkoming van het Liedboek voor de Kerken (1973) - een onderzoekspresentatie,' in *Jaarboek voor Liturgieonderzoek* 25 , pp. 55-70.

Marcel Barnard, Mirella Klomp, Ronelle Sonnenberg, Stefan Belderbos and **Nienke van Andel** (2009). 'Dots on a Blank Sheet: Procedures in Ritual and Liturgical Research,' in *Jaarboek voor Liturgieonderzoek* 25, pp. 35-46.

Popular

Nienke van Andel (Ed.) (2015). *Iedere dag een nieuw begin: Dagelijks op weg met het Liedboek.* Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum.

Nienke van Andel, Riejan de Winter and Henk de Winter (2014). 'Door jouw ogen', in *Laetare* 30 (4), pp. 24-27.

Nienke van Andel (Ed.) (2013). *Van horen zingen: Wegwijs in het nieuwe Liedboek*. Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum.

Nienke van Andel (2013). 'Losbladig is losbandig: De oecumene van het nieuwe Liedboek', in *In de waagschaal* 42 (10), pp. 14-16.

Nienke van Andel (2013). 'Herkenning of verrassing: Het Liedboek als spiegel of als motor,' in *Laetare* 29 (3), pp. 57-63.

Nienke van Andel (2011). ''Zitten de echte deskundigen niet zondags in de kerk?' Over de samenstelling van het nieuwe Liedboek,' in *Theologisch Debat* 8 (4), pp. 33-39.

Nienke van Andel (2010). 'Gender en diversiteit in het nieuwe liedboek', in *Fier* 4, pp. 20-21.

Nienke van Andel (2009). 'Het nieuwe liedboek is geen tweede Liedboek voor de Kerken', in *PThUnie* 3 (3), pp. 6-7.

DANKWOORD

-

CURRICULUM VITAE

-