

Worship

MUMIN 3362/7362

Fall 2014



Scott Aniol, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Church Music and Worship

Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary
Fort Worth, Texas

© Copyright 2013 Scott Aniol
All rights reserved

MUMIN 3362/7362 - Worship

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Professor Bio	1
Course Syllabus	2
Course Description.....	2
Course Objectives	2
Course Work Required	2
Required Texts	2
Additional Required Reading (each available on Blackboard).....	2
Attendance.....	3
Late Work.....	3
Contacting the Professor	3
Statement on Plagiarism.....	3
Disability Assistance	4
Health and Safety Concerns	4
Evaluation.....	5
Grading Scale	5
Course Schedule and Assignments	6
Book Review Guidelines	7
Book Review Rubric	8

MUMIN 3362/7362 – Worship
School of Church Music
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary
TTH 11:30 – 12:20
Fall 2014

Professor: Scott Aniol
E-mail: saniol@swbts.edu, saniol@gmail.com
Personal web site: www.scottaniol.com
Blogs: www.religiousaffections.org, www.artistictheologian.com
Facebook: www.facebook.com/aniol
Twitter: @ScottAniol
Phone: 817-789-0103
Office: C58C
Office Hours: By Appointment

Professor Bio

Scott Aniol is an author, speaker, and teacher of worship, church music philosophy, culture, and aesthetics. He is an Assistant Professor of Worship at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, he founded Religious Affections Ministries, he lectures around the country in churches, conferences, colleges, and seminaries, and he has authored two books and dozens of articles. He is also Managing Editor of *Artistic Theologian*, the peer-review journal of the School of Church Music.

Scott holds a Bachelor of Music in Church Music from Bob Jones University, a Master of Music in Musicology with an emphasis in philosophy and aesthetics from Northern Illinois University, and Doctor of Philosophy in Church Music with an emphasis on worship and culture from Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary. His dissertation was “The Mission of Worship: A Critique of and Response to the Philosophy of Culture, Contextualization, and Worship of the North American Missional Church Movement.”

Scott has served as a minister of music and an elder in churches in Illinois, North Carolina, and currently at Church of Christ the King in Fort Worth.

Scott travels around the country and internationally through the ministry he started in 2008, Religious Affections Ministries (www.religiousaffections.org), speaking in churches, Christian colleges, seminaries, and conferences.

Scott has written three books, *Worship in Song: A Biblical Philosophy of Music and Worship* (BMH Books, 2009), *Sound Worship: A Guide to Making Musical Choices in a Noisy World* (RAM, 2010), and *By the Waters of Babylon: Worship in a Post-Christian Culture* (Kregel, Forthcoming). He has also presented academic papers at various meetings such as the Evangelical Theological Society and has dozens of articles and book reviews published in scholarly journals.

Scott is married to Becky and has two children, Caleb and Kate.

Course Syllabus

Course Description

A survey of the scriptural, theological, and historical foundations of corporate worship.

Course Objectives

1. Students will learn the important biblical texts and theological truths that form the biblical/theological foundation of Christian worship.
2. Students will evaluate and learn from how God's people have worshiped Him through the history of the Church.
3. Students will discover principles and methods for developing a biblical methodology of congregational worship.

Course Work Required

1. Read the assigned readings each week. Be ready to summarize the discuss your reading in class.
2. Complete one book review as assigned. Students are required to [watch this video](#) if you have not already done so.
3. There will be three cumulative exams in this course. They will focus on class lectures and required readings. They will consist of objective short answer and essay questions.
4. Extra credit: Additional reviews of approved books will receive up to 2 bonus percentage points on the final grade (up to two additional reviews). Visit one doctoral colloquium (September 24, 11:30-12:20) and write a short paragraph description for 1 bonus point.

Required Texts

Aniol, Scott. *Worship in Song: a Biblical Approach to Worship and Music*. Winona Lake, IN: BMH Books, 2008.

Castleman, Robbie F. *Story Shaped Worship: Following Patterns from the Bible and History*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2013.

Shields, Bruce E. and David A. Butzu. *Generations of Praise: The History of Worship*. Joplin, MO: College Press, 2006.

Additional Required Reading (each available on Blackboard)

[Bauder, Kevin. "A Prelude to a Christian Theology of Culture." In Glenn, W. Edward. *Missions in a New Millennium: Change and Challenges in World Missions*. Kregel, 2000. \[9 pgs\]](#)

[Hustad, Donald P. "Baptist Worship Forms: Uniting the Charleston and Sandy Creek Traditions." *Review and Expositor* 85, no 1 \(1988\). \(13 pgs\)](#)

[McMahon, Matthew C. "The Regulative Principle in Worship." \(5 pgs\)](#)

[Priest, Gerald L. "Revival and Revivalism: a Historical and Doctrinal Evaluation." *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* 1, no. 2 \(1996\): 233–252. \(29 pgs\)](#)

Attendance

Students are expected to attend all meetings of all classes in which they are enrolled. A student's grade will be penalized for absences. Students absent from more than 20% of the class sessions will not receive credit for the course. This means that students missing more than six (50-minute) class meetings of a two-hour class will not receive credit for the course. Tests missed for an excused absence must be made up by the next class period.

Late Work

Late work will be penalized 10% per day.

Contacting the Professor

Please do not call or email the professor except for emergencies or private matters. The professor wants to meet your needs, but he would like for others to benefit from the discussion.

Ask the professor your question in the "Questions for the Professor" forum. From the main class menu, choose "Discussion Board" from among the buttons on the left of the screen to go to the forms. Then click on the forum entitled "Questions for the Professor."

First, take time to read the questions from other students since your question may have already been asked and answered. The professor will try to answer your question within 24 hours (weekends excluded).

Cell Phone Policy

Cell phones are to be turned off and stored out of sight during class. If a student uses a cell phone during an exam, he/she will receive an immediate F on the exam.

Statement on Plagiarism

Plagiarism is the act of taking credit for ideas and words that are not one's own. Exploiting the work of another person without attribution and appropriate documentation involves both theft and deception. Plagiarism occurs when a writer does not give credit when borrowing an idea, opinion, or thesis of another writer, reproducing another's argument or line of reasoning, quoting a brief phrase or lengthy section from another source, slightly or thoroughly paraphrasing a passage, or completely restating a passage. Even when cited

appropriately, verbatim quotations, no matter how brief, must be identified by quotation marks.

As a form of intellectual dishonesty, plagiarism is condemned throughout the academic community, and under certain conditions in the public sector it can be a felony. Students who commit it may receive a failing grade for an assignment or for an entire course or be expelled from school; professional scholars may permanently ruin their academic reputations or lose their jobs. As Christian scholars, we are called to a high degree of academic, moral, and spiritual integrity and must be vigilant in guarding against committing this offense. Claiming ignorance or innocence in intent does not rationalize the behavior.

When a professor determines that a student is guilty of plagiarism, a conference should be held with the student to explain the charges of plagiarism and the severity of the offense. The professor may give a failing grade for the assignment. Repeat offenses will require conferences with the Dean of the School of Church Music and the Vice President for Student Services.

For additional information on what constitutes plagiarism and for techniques to avoid it, visit www.plagiarism.org.

Disability Assistance

Southwestern Seminary is in full compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and is committed to helping students with disabilities to be successful academically. Please contact the Office of the Registrar to provide documentation of disabilities. All academic assistance requests should be worked out with the individual professors at the beginning of each semester. At the request of the student, the Registrar's Office will provide summary information to instructors specified by the student. Please consult the catalog for the complete policy.

Health and Safety Concerns

As a musician, you use your body in very specific ways as you hone your craft as a student and perform for a lifetime as a professional. It is crucial, therefore, that you be aware of the physical hazards that musicians face on a daily basis and that you make appropriate and well-informed decisions to protect your body. The School of Church Music pledges to support you in this endeavor through education, guidance, and in providing a safe environment for music studies.

If you believe any environment on campus is aurally unhealthy, please discuss this with your ensemble director, private teacher, or music administrator for a possible remedy. If you are aware of any pain you experience as you practice or perform, your private teacher can help guide you to appropriate solutions. It is important not to delay seeking help before permanent damage takes place.

More information and resources are available online on the Current Students page on the School of Church Music website that will help you in your journey of becoming a safe and

healthy musician. It is important that you become well informed of risks and solutions and that you assume an active role in staying healthy for a lifetime of music making.

Evaluation

Reading/Contribution	20%
Book Review	20%
Exams	60%

Grading Scale

Grades for the course will be calculated as follows:

A+	98-100%	B+	88-89	C+	78-79	D+	68-69
A	93-97	B	83-87	C	73-77	D	63-67
A-	90-92	B-	80-82	C-	70-72	D-	60-62
						F	0-59

The professor reserves the right to amend the syllabus as needed.

Course Schedule and Assignments

The following schedule is subject to the professor's revision. Adequate notice will be given to any significant changes.

DATE	LECTURE TOPIC	ASSIGNMENTS DUE
8/21	Introduction	
8/26	Creation/Fall	Bauder
8/28	The Patriarchs and Sinai	
9/2	Tabernacle/Temple	Shields 1
9/4	Davidic Worship	
9/9	Hebrew Cult and Culture	Shields 2, Aniol 2
9/11	Synagogue and Christ	
9/16	Epistles	Shields 3
9/18	Christian Worship	
9/23	EXAM	
9/24	The Development of Liturgy	Shields 4, 6
9/30	FALL BREAK	
10/2		
10/7	The Medieval Church	Shields 7-8
10/9	Reformation I	
10/14	Reformation II	Hustad, McMahon, Aniol 5
10/16	Baptists/Regulative Principle	
10/21	EXAM	
10/23	Enlightenment and Cultural Shifts	
10/28	<i>Guest Speaker</i>	Shields 9-10
10/30	<i>Guest Speaker</i>	
11/4	America/Revival	Priest
11/6	Revivalism and Pop Culture	
11/11	Twentieth Century Movements	Shields 11
11/13	Taxonomy of Worship Philosophies	Book Review due (11/14, 11:59pm)
11/18	Theology of Christian Worship	Aniol 17
11/20	Liturgy (<i>Guest Speaker</i>)	
11/25	THANKSGIVING BREAK	
11/27		
12/2	21 st Century Challenges	
12/9	FINAL EXAM (1:00-2:50pm)	

Book Review Guidelines

[Video: How to Write a Book Review](#)

Format

- Between 700 and 900 words
- Double spaced
- Otherwise, follow SWBTS style manual (margins, page numbers, etc.).

Heading: A full bibliographic reference to the book should be placed two inches from the top of the page, but it is not centered.

Author. *Title*. Place of publication: Publisher, Year of publication. Number of pages.
List price.

Aniol, Scott. *Worship in Song*. Winona Lake, IN: BMH Books, 2009. 261 pp.
\$17.99.

Content

- Briefly introduce the author of the book.
- In 1–5 sentences, state the author’s thesis.
- In 5–10 sentences, *briefly* summarize the contents of the book. This should not occupy most of your review.
- In as many sentences as necessary, *thoroughly* describe how the author argues and supports his thesis. This should occupy the greatest percentage of your review. The objective in this section is to identify the author’s primary arguments that support his main thesis. Cite concrete examples from the book, including page numbers in parentheses (p. 67).
- Identify parts of the author’s argument that were particularly strong. Explain and support your opinion. Indicate what topics are covered in more detail in the reviewed book than they are elsewhere, why the analysis is convincing, and/or why this is an important addition to the scholarly debate. Cite concrete examples from the book, including page numbers in parentheses (p. 67).
- Identify parts of the author’s argument that were particularly weak. Explain and support your opinion. Are the author’s claims and arguments well supported? Point out what the book does not cover (either by intent or by accident), where there are alternative interpretations of the material discussed by the author, and/or material that according to the book’s stated purpose should have fallen within the purview of the book but was left unaddressed. Does the author have certain presuppositions that limit the value of the work? Cite concrete examples from the book (pp. 99–100).
- In 2–3 sentences, *briefly* comment on why a book on this topic is important, timely, or otherwise of value. Conclude with a few comments about the “usability” and format of the book. Does it have many illustrations or just text? Could it be suitable as a textbook, or is it full of jargon of interest only to specialists? Is it intended as something to be read straight through or in pieces as a reference?

Book Review Rubric

Title Page and Header: (5 pts possible)

- 5—the title page of the review follows the SWBTS manual of style for a book review exactly and the header on the first page includes accurate and complete bibliographic information for the book and is formatted correctly
- 4—the title page of the review contains 1-2 formatting errors *or* the bibliographic header contains 1-2 formatting errors (or they contain 1 error each)
- 3—the title page and/or bibliographic header contain more than 2 formatting errors
- 2—missing either title page or bibliographic header
- 0—no title page included

Introduction: (5 points possible)

- 5—the reviewer draws the reader's attention to the book, includes correct and current biographical information about the author, and includes a thesis statement for the book at the end of the introductory paragraph
- 4—the reviewer includes bibliographic information and a thesis but fails to draw the reader's attention
- 3—the review is missing either bibliographic information or a thesis statement
- 2—the review does not contain bibliographic information or a thesis statement
- 0—no introduction

Thesis: (10 points possible)

- 10—the reviewer correctly identifies the thesis (the one central, overarching idea or argument) of the book and states this thesis at the end of the introductory paragraph
- 8—the reviewer correctly identifies the thesis of the book but does not place it at the end of the introductory paragraph
- 6—the reviewer gets close to idea of the thesis
- 4—the reviewer states an incorrect thesis, but some attempt at a thesis statement is made at the end of the introductory paragraph
- 2—the reviewer states an incorrect thesis and it is not placed at the end of the introductory paragraph
- 0—no attempt at a thesis statement in the review

Summary and Arguments: (20 points possible)

20—the reviewer clearly and succinctly summarizes the main themes or arguments of the book, *tracing how the author develops his/her thesis*; summary shows generally that the reviewer has read the book in its entirety and with understanding

16—the reviewer summarizes some of the sections of the book clearly and succinctly but misses one or two important themes or arguments

12—the reviewer summarizes some of the sections of the book but both misses some important themes or arguments and also does not summarize clearly and succinctly

8—the reviewer summarizes some of the book's content but does not present the flow of the author's thesis development (i.e. misses the main points)

4—the summary of the book is incorrect and evidences that the reviewer did not read the book with understanding

0—no summary is included in the review

Critical Evaluation: (20 points possible)

20—the reviewer critically evaluates the author's development of the thesis and/or specific arguments made within the book, noting both strengths as well as weaknesses of the book; strengths and weaknesses presented reflect careful thought and evaluation and do not reflect the reviewer's personal opinions but instead interact with the arguments in a scholarly manner; strengths and weaknesses focus mainly on the book's information rather than the writing style of the author (though a mention of style is fine); evaluation shows generally that the reviewer has read the book in its entirety and with understanding

16—the reviewer presents both strengths and weaknesses of the book, but the critique does not show an understanding of the content of the book

12—the reviewer presents both strengths and weaknesses, but the critique is based on personal opinion or mainly the author's writing style rather than interacting with the thesis or arguments of the book

8—the reviewer presents only strengths or only weaknesses of the book, but the critiques presented are scholarly

4—the reviewer presents only strengths or only weaknesses, and the critiques presented are based on personal opinion or mainly the author's writing style rather than interacting with the thesis or arguments of the book

0—the entire review was summary; no critical review presented

Conclusion: (5 points possible)

5—the reviewer concludes the review with a brief section stating the reviewer’s opinion of the book as a whole and who would benefit from the book

4—the reviewer concludes the review with a brief section giving only his/her opinion of the book or only his/her recommendations of who would benefit

3—the conclusion simply summarizes the content again but does not insert the reviewer’s “voice” at all

2—the conclusion does not show respect to the author

1—the conclusion shows a lack of understanding of the book as a whole or indicates that the reviewer did not read the book

0—no concluding section

Citations: (10 points possible)

5—the review contains adequate citations (interacts with the thoughts of the author but does not use too many quotations); the parenthetical citations are all correctly formatted according to the SWBTS manual of style and the quotations are all correctly formatted and punctuated (capitalization, punctuation, ellipses, double and single quotation marks, block quotes, etc.)

4—the review contains adequate citations but includes 1-3 incorrectly formatted quotations or parenthetical citations

3—the review contains adequate citations but includes 4 or more incorrectly formatted quotations or parenthetical citations

2—the review does not contain adequate citations but the citations included are correctly formatted for the most part

1—the review does not contain adequate citations and the citations included are mostly incorrectly formatted

0—no citations included in the review

Organization and Length: (5 points possible)

5—the review follows the SWBTS manual of style and the professor’s specific instructions regarding organization (the professor’s instructions trump the SWBTS manual of style, where they differ) and includes appropriate section headings which are formatted correctly; the review meets the minimum and maximum length requirements as set by the professor

4—the review includes logical organization and section headings but does not follow the SWBTS manual of style and/or the professor’s specific instructions regarding organization and headings; the review meets the minimum and maximum length requirements as set by the professor

3—the review contains logical organization but does not contain section headings; the review meets the minimum and maximum length requirements as set by the professor

2—the review does not meet the minimum length requirement but contains some logical organization

1—the review does not meet the minimum length requirement and is not logically organized

Mechanics: (20 points possible)

20—the review contains few grammatical errors (1 per page or fewer detected); few spelling, capitalization, or typographical errors (1 per page or fewer detected); correct page numeration according to the SWBTS manual of style; correct font size and margins according to the SWBTS manual of style; and shows evidence of careful proofreading and editing

18—the review contains fewer than one error per page (or fewer than 5 total errors) but either page numeration, font size, or margins are incorrect

16—the review contains more than one error per page or 5-8 total errors but contains correct page numeration used and correct font size and margins

12—the review contains many errors throughout and/or contains some unintelligible sentences (more than one); page numeration is correct; font size and margins are correct

8—the review contains many errors throughout and/or contains multiple unintelligible sentences; either page numeration or font size or margins are incorrect

4—the review is unintelligible because of the amount and/or severity of errors

Subtotal: _____

On Time: (no points deducted from the subtotal)

Late: 10 points deducted per day (including weekends) _____

TOTAL GRADE: _____