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# Editorial Forming Disciples through Corporate Worship

Scott Aniol[[1]](#footnote-1)

Many Christians today consider corporate worship as simply a Christian’s expression of authentic devotion toward God. Yet corporate worship is not merely expressive, it is profoundly formative. How a church worships week in and week out forms the people—it molds their beliefs, values, affections, and ultimately their behavior.

The recognition that corporate worship is powerfully formative is built upon several key ideas about which every leader of corporate worship should give careful consideration: First, fulfilling the Great Commission (Matt 28:19–20) requires that churches do more than just impart theological knowledge since being a disciple of Jesus Christ is learning “to *observe* all that [Christ has] commanded.” Discipleship is a set of Christ-like behaviors that must be transmitted and nurtured.

Second, we do not behave primarily based upon intellectual information, but rather based on the inclinations of our hearts. Proverbs 4:23 admonishes, “Keep your heart with all vigilance, for from it flow the springs of life.” Everything we do comes ultimately from what we love and how we love it. Thus, making disciples must involve shaping hearts.

Third, shaping the heart’s inclinations involves disciplining what otherwise might be disordered. C. S. Lewis described right affections as “emotions organized by trained habits into stable sentiments.”[[2]](#footnote-2) Christian discipleship necessarily involves helping believers cultivate spiritual disciplines and habits that progressively shape their minds, hearts, and behaviors into the image of Christ.

This is where corporate worship is so significant. It is primarily through a church’s liturgies—that is, its habitual corporate worship practices—that a church shapes the behavior of a people. Through practices that are regulated by God’s Word and art forms that embody right beliefs, values, and affections, corporate worship helps to discipline and train a Christian’s life.

This is why what is important about a corporate worship service is not only what is said from the pulpit or the lyrics of the songs we sing, as critically important as those are. Rather, since the hearts of Christian disciples are shaped mostly through repeated practice, we must also carefully evaluate how the art forms we use in corporate worship and the structure of the service itself are forming the inclinations and values of the people in our churches as they worship each week. Individual art forms—poetry, music, architecture, and rhetoric—each embody inarticulable aspects of Christian piety that inculcate those values through their use, and the overall shape of the service itself, especially those parts that repeat every week, both express and impact beliefs and values. Thus, how people worship weekly both *reveals* and *forms* their beliefs and values. As Prosper of Aquitaine observed, *Lex orandi, lex credenda*—“the law of prayer, the law of belief.” Corporate worship involves practices that occur in every service—they are habits that are forming the inclinations, and therefore behaviors, of worshipers, whether we recognize it or not.

Each of the articles in this volume of *Artistic Theologian* relates in some way to the critically important interplay between beliefs, values, and worldview on the one hand, and individual art forms or overall liturgies on the other. First, David Toledo examines 1 Corinthians 14 to discern principles that will help navigate the often perplexing tension between form and freedom in planning corporate worship, making certain that our services are conducted “decently and in order.” Shawn Eaton explores the relationship between Enlightenment philosophy and Haydn’s oratorio, *Creation*, revealing an essential connection between the two. Through a series of first-hand accounts, Will Bishop uncovers how the cultural climate of Southern Baptist youth in the 1960s influenced the publication of the first youth musical, *Good News*, and how that musical, in turn, has impacted music in worship to this day. Finally, Jacob Sensenig discusses the nature of repetition in worship, both on the large scale of corporate liturgy and on the small scale of individual art forms.

We hope that each of these articles will remind you of the formative nature of Christian worship and music, and we welcome both article and book review submissions for our next volume, scheduled for publication in April of 2018. The deadline for submissions is October 1, 2017.

# Freedom and Order in Worship: Paul’s Instructions in 1 Corinthians

David M. Toledo[[3]](#footnote-3)

There is no lack of discussion and controversy regarding the worship of the Christian church historically and in the present age. These arguments are cast in terms of contemporary versus traditional, urban or suburban, hymnals or screens, or evangelical or liturgical. At the heart of these struggles is the question of the balance of form and structure in the corporate worship gathering and the dynamic freedom of the Spirit of God to enliven and energize the worship of the Body of Christ. This difficulty is not foreign to the New Testament church, as seen in the letters of Paul to the Corinthians. In his first letter, the apostle Paul addresses a host of controversies and overall dysfunction within the Corinthian church and offers rebuke, correction, and edification through the continued exaltation of Christ, desire for unity in the Body of Christ, and the supremacy of the Gospel.

My purpose for this paper is to examine the critical issues at play within 1 Corinthians 14 in light of current research and frame them within the context of the Free Church tradition of worship. Specifically, I discuss how 1 Corinthians 14 provides the rationale and scriptural basis for the balance of form and freedom that is cherished by those in this Free Church tradition.

Admittedly, this is a daunting task, requiring an appropriate approach through which to view and interpret these passages. My study begins with a thorough analysis of the text including discussion of the theological thrusts of the first epistle to the Corinthians. I address the seeming tension inherent in the Corinthian worship practice between the ongoing work of the Spirit through charismatic gifts and expressions and the Apostle’s desire to circumscribe this outflow within the context of the edification of the entire worshiping community.

With this exegetical and hermeneutical process completed, I then examine several parallel passages in both the Old and New Testaments that work together to complete the picture that 1 Corinthians 14 paints with regards to both form and freedom in worship. Christ’s reflections on worship in the Gospel of John serve as a representative schema through which to view these complementary passages.

Following this analysis, I seek to ground this scriptural reflection within the theological framework of the Free Church tradition. Specifically, I examine the role of the Scriptures, spontaneous prayer, and the corporate response of the people within this tradition and how these emphases draw impetus and example from the 1 Corinthians 14 passage.

Finally, I offer suggestions for current liturgical practice based upon these reflections. These correctives seek to reframe the questions that many worship leaders, church musicians, and ministers ask when they begin to plan worship anew each week. My hope is that they will take from this examination a renewed desire for worship that is empowered by the Spirit of God, rooted in the Scripture and the organic, vital faith of the people of God, and expressed in the diversity of gifts within the congregation.

## Background of the Corinthian Church

As we begin this journey of discovery of the interplay between form and freedom, attention must be given first to the text at hand. To label the Corinthian church as troubled is to exercise great charity. Its location within the city of Corinth placed this young congregation within a confluence of a variety of socioeconomic, religious, political, and moral forces. Ciampa and Rosner describe the city with specific clarity:

Roman Corinth was prosperous, cosmopolitan, and religiously pluralistic, accustomed to visits by impressive, traveling public speakers and obsessed with status, self-promotion, and personal rights. From a Jewish or Christian viewpoint, as with any pagan city, its inhabitants were marked by the worship of idols, sexual immorality, and greed.[[4]](#footnote-4)

Gordon Fee likewise describes the city as “at once the New York, Los Angeles, and Las Vegas of the ancient world.”[[5]](#footnote-5) These pithy descriptions of Corinth alert the reader to the great potential for controversy and dysfunction in the church. The first epistle to the Corinthians clearly denotes that this was, in fact, the case.

Paul’s letter to Corinth was occasioned by reports he received from the church regarding controversial issues as well as a specific letter from the congregation with questions of theology and practice. The issues Paul deals with in this epistle range from questions of authority over the church assembly, immorality, litigation between believers, marriage and singleness, food sacrificed to idols, gender roles, and—the topic at hand—the worship service and the free expression of the spiritual gifts by the gathered community of faith.

## Exegesis and Analysis of 1 Corinthians 14

In the chapters leading up to fourteen, Paul addresses Corinthian concerns about the πνευματικῶν (*pneumatikōn*), or spiritual gifts. He details the variety of the gifts of the Spirit and their ultimate goal of good for the Body of Christ (12:7). He goes on to describe the Church through the metaphor of a physical body and utilizes this concept to argue against prejudice and division and to argue for compassionate care (12:25) between the individual members. He concludes the chapter by exhorting the believers to “earnestly desire the higher gifts” (12:31), but then moves to show them “a more excellent way.” This way, of course, is the path of love beautifully captured in the thirteenth chapter of the epistle. In this passage, Paul demonstrates the supremacy of love over the spiritual gifts and places it alongside the great anchors of the gospel: faith, hope, and love.

It is not inconsequential then that Paul would pivot from a discussion of the spiritual gifts, the body of Christ, and the essence of charity to admonitions and instructions of worship in the Corinthian church. These concepts frame the specific mandates and provide clarity to Paul’s intent. The fourteenth chapter of 1 Corinthians can be divided into two primary sections: a discussion of the spiritual gifts, specifically speaking in tongues (14:1–25), and the orderly expression of these gifts in worship (14:26–40).

### Spiritual Gifts and Intelligibility

Paul connects his previous arguments by imploring the Corinthians to “pursue love” and to “earnestly desire” the πνευματικά. In this instance this term, often translated “spiritual gifts” in line with earlier passages, likely refers more broadly to “things of the Spirit.”[[6]](#footnote-6) Here Paul emphasizes the life-giving empowerment of the Holy Spirit within the Body of Christ and first uses the imperative διώκετε (*diṓkete*), meaning to “do something with intense effort and with definite purpose or goal.”[[7]](#footnote-7) For Paul, the Spirit’s work among the Corinthians was not blissful happenstance, but rather was something to be pursued and eagerly sought.

This emphasis is tempered with the corresponding call to seek after the gift of prophecy in order to build up and encourage the body (14:3). This is our first glimpse into the seeming tension found between the free work of the Spirit and the structured limitations of that freedom through the grounding of worship in the edification of the congregation. D. A. Carson connects this tension with the failings of the Corinthians themselves:

At least some Corinthians wanted to measure their maturity by the intensity of their spiritual experiences, without consideration of other constraints, such as love’s demands that brothers and sisters in Christ be edified, and thus they become “mature” or advanced, wittingly or unwittingly, in evil, and immature in their thinking.[[8]](#footnote-8)

This description is helpful in orienting our journey through form and freedom. Either position in this spectrum is not a badge of maturity to be proudly displayed, but rather is one adopted in humility and deference to others in the Body of Christ.

The language Paul uses to describe the role of prophecy and interpreted tongues further demonstrates his reorientation of Christian worship in the post-Pentecost age of the Holy Spirit. He describes the role of prophecy as “upbuilding” of other believers (v. 3), speaking in tongues as building up of the individual (v. 4), and the supremacy of the gift of prophecy so that the church itself might be built up (v. 5). Each of these verbs come from the Greek root οἰκοδομέω (*oikodomeō*), which itself is a compound word of δῶμα (*dōma*), meaning “dome” and οἶκος (*oikos*), meaning “house.”[[9]](#footnote-9) Together these terms show us Paul’s concern for the Body of Christ to “grow into a holy temple in the Lord” (Eph 2:21).

We see an immediate connection between Paul’s words here and Christ’s words to the Samaritan woman in John 4. In this well-known dialogue, Jesus radically reorients worship away from a physical location (whether that be Jerusalem or Mount Gerazim) and into the metaphysical realm of “spirit” and “truth.” While there is debate over the precise meaning of both terms, we can unequivocally identify the Holy Spirit as the source of “spiritual worship” regardless of the identity of the πνεῦμα (*pneuma*) (either the spirit of the worshiper or the Holy Spirit). Truth finds its ultimate anchor and reality in the person of Christ (John 14:6) and therefore New Covenant worship finds its locus in the nature and actions of Jesus.

With this new situation in mind, we turn back to the Corinthian church and see these two concepts in dramatic tension. Because the Corinthian believers did not have elaborate temple systems or physical locations for worship, they interpreted their collective worship service in spiritual terms. Larry Hurtado describes this corporate identity:

They did not have temple structures or the elaborate rituals familiar in the larger religious environment, but (perhaps, indeed, therefore) the gathered group was itself a living shrine and their praise and worship spiritual sacrifices pleasing to God. They did not have a priestly order; instead, they saw themselves collectively as a priesthood, all of the them thus specially sacred and their gathering a holy occasion.[[10]](#footnote-10)

One camp saw the manifestation of the Spirit as the true sign of authentic worship, whereas others saw the communication of biblical truth and exhortation through prophecy as the hallmarks of truthful worship. While acknowledging and encouraging both, Paul elevates the proclamation of truth over the free exercise of the Spirit. The freedom of the Spirit was to submit to the form of prophetic utterance so that Christ would be magnified through the corporate worship experience and the continued building up of his body. It is helpful to remember, however, that these prophetic and didactic utterances were themselves manifestations of the Spirit.

Following a discussion of the potential for confusion through the exercise of the gift of tongues in the corporate worship setting, Paul reframes his opening admonitions and exhorts the congregation to “strive to excel” in building up the church (v. 12). The distinctive feature of Paul’s concept of the assembled worshiping community is one of mutual submission for the greater good. In Ephesians 5:18–20, Paul equates the infilling of the Holy Spirit with speaking in “psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs,” offering prayers of thanksgiving to God, and ultimately submitting to each other as a fearful response of worship to Christ. We see the practical application of this Pauline worship theology at work in the Corinthian church as a means of correction, rebuke, and instruction.

### Order in the Exercise of Spiritual Gifts

Following his detailed instructions regarding the exercise of two specific spiritual gifts, Paul turns his attention toward the totality of the worship experience and seeks to offer guidelines and principles. He gives a non-exhaustive list of liturgical actions for the assembled body including the singing of hymns, teaching, revelation, tongues, and interpretation (v. 26). Perhaps the most insightful detail in this passage is that he says “each one has” one of these gifts, thereby implying the radical participatory nature of the Corinthian worship practice. In Chapter 12, Paul identified each individual as a vital member of the body and having an important role to play in the successful function of the assembly.

What on the surface appears to be a positive reflection on the vibrant diversity of gifts at work in the Corinthian church actually serves as a polemic against their selfish ambition and chaotic exercise. Garland describes the situation in this manner: “Paul’s wording suggests a ‘superabundance’ of gifts, the allocation of these gifts among a wide variety of persons, and a gathering buzzing with excitement.”[[11]](#footnote-11) Paul paints a picture of a congregation filled with individuals eager to prove their spirituality through the sharing of their particular gift. He has already rebuked the church for the selfish manner in which they partook of the Lord’s Table, with each person eating without respect to the others at the table (11:21). This same disregard for others can be seen in this description of Corinthian worship.

Paul seeks to correct this misappropriation of the work of the Spirit by imposing a general order and rubric of the exercise of the gifts of the Spirit. Taylor offers a helpful reminder that this type of guideline does “not preclude spontaneity, but even sudden impulses are subject to the principle of peace and order.”[[12]](#footnote-12) Whereas Paul’s early discussion concerned the primacy of the gift of prophecy above tongues on the grounds of its very essence, these instructions are concerned with the actual practice and utilization of the various gifts in worship. Paul provides regulations for both tongues and prophecy and emphasizes the singular expression of each done in an orderly manner. Furthermore, the prophetic utterances are to be evaluated by others in the assembly.

It is at this point where our examination of Paul’s instructions journeys into uncertain exegetical and hermeneutical waters. Verse thirty-two curiously states “the spirits of prophets are subject to prophets.” While the exact meaning of this statement is not entirely clear, it appears that Paul seeks to distinguish the empowerment of the Holy Spirit from the pagan practices that were common throughout Corinth. Fee provides a beneficial description of this practice:

The Spirit does not “possess” or “overpower” the speaker; he is subject to the prophet or tongues-speaker, in the sense that what the Spirit has to say will be said in an orderly and intelligible way. It is indeed the Spirit who speaks, but he speaks through the controlled instrumentality of the believer’s own mind and tongue.[[13]](#footnote-13)

These passages seem to indicate a scenario in which competing prophets attempt to usurp the other in displaying the gift through interruption and spontaneous outburst. Paul corrects this behavior by affirming that just as those speaking in the Spirit will declare Jesus is Lord (12:3), likewise Spirit-empowered speakers will only work to edify the church and show humble deference to others.

Paul concludes this line of reasoning by stating that “God is not a God of confusion but of peace” (14:33). The term ἀκαταστασίας (*akatastasias*), translated “confusion,” implies the concept of “open defiance to authority, with the presumed intention to overthrow it or to act in complete opposition to its demands.”[[14]](#footnote-14) Garland describes the disorder present as “not attributable to the workings of the Holy Spirit but to narcissistic exhibitionism, disdain for others with ‘lesser’ gifts, and disregard for the common good.”[[15]](#footnote-15) Paul makes reference to God’s nature to argue for the characteristics that those empowered by that same Spirit should manifest in the assembly.

The next section of Paul’s instructions provides the modern reader with a host of interpretive problems. Here are Paul’s instructions that women “are not permitted to speak” (v. 34) and that if they desire more knowledge should “ask their husbands at home” (v. 35). It is beyond the purpose and scope of this study to examine in detail the meaning of these passages. These specific verses have been the source of great debate within the church for centuries, but they do offer insight into Paul’s attempt to balance issues of form and freedom.

One important point of question is the location of the phrase “as in all the churches of God” at the end of verse thirty-three. Some translations place this phrase at the beginning of Paul’s injunction against female speech (NIV, ESV) whereas others link it with the argument of God’s orderly nature (NASB, KJV). Fee argues convincingly that this phrase should connect with the earlier passages because it corresponds with three similar appeals in the letter (4:17; 7:17; 11:16) and like the other appeals it appears at the end of the sentence.[[16]](#footnote-16) This placement strengthens Paul’s argument for order by making it within the larger context of the other Christian churches in Asia Minor and the surrounding regions.

The varying schools of interpretation concerning the vocal participation of women in Corinthian worship express widely divergent ideas about the source of this offensive participation. Some commentators such as Patterson see this as an injunction against women speaking in tongues.[[17]](#footnote-17) Maier furthers this idea by interpreting this passage in light of a similar passage in 1 Timothy 2 and stating that Paul is instructing them to avoid a “particular kind of speaking” where “each be a separate tongue speaker or be a separate prophetess who herself communicates the word of God to the others present at worship and serves the teacher of the truth to men.”[[18]](#footnote-18) Others interpret this speech as the women evaluating the prophecies, with Hensley appropriating this evaluation of prophecy as prophetic speech itself.[[19]](#footnote-19) Jervis notes that “in all probability Paul’s chief concern was the peaceful exercise of prophecy rather than the subordination of women.”[[20]](#footnote-20)

The diversity of reflections on this passage lends credence to the thought that Paul’s primary concern was to put specific guidelines and limitations to the free exercise of the gifts. Namely, he posits an orderly procession of speakers, the necessity of interpretation along with evaluation, and the absence of women speakers. In total these stipulations support Paul’s overarching concern for the edification of the congregation and the submission of the individual to the whole.

Paul concludes the chapter as he began it with the instruction to ζηλοῦτε (*zēloute*), or “earnestly desire,” but in this case he lists prophecy as the object of that desire rather than all the spiritual gifts. He does however instruct the Corinthians not to forbid tongue speaking. His final instruction is that “all things should be done decently and in order” (v. 40). Eὐσχημόνως (*euschēmonōs*), translated “decently,” implies “with propriety fittingly, properly, with an implication of pleasing.”[[21]](#footnote-21) Τάξιν (*taxin*), from which we derive the word taxonomy, indicates a sequence and orderly succession. Both instructions connect with Paul’s desire to edify the congregation, evangelize the unbeliever, and ultimately glorify God. As Ciampa and Rosner note,

Paul’s instructions in this chapter have all been intended to guide the Corinthians to a more orderly and fitting approach to the use of spiritual gifts in worship so as to better reflect the glory of God. It is God’s glory which is to be our preoccupation in worship, and that can be honored only when we maintain an atmosphere that does not distract people from his glory. Some Corinthians had manifested attitudes and behaviors which had drawn attention to themselves rather than to God, and which reflected a greater concern for self-edification than the edification of others.[[22]](#footnote-22)

## The Free Church Tradition

Now that we have examined the text of 1 Corinthians 14, it is critical to apply the truth and thrust of that text to contemporary practice. What follows attempts to connect specific practices of the Free Church tradition with Paul’s instructions to the Corinthians and demonstrate how these traditions are informed accordingly. This process of examination, interpretation, and ultimate application to the corporate worship experience falls broadly within a discipline of liturgical theology. Modern liturgical theology began in the nineteenth century with the work of Benedictine revivalists, most importantly Dom Prosper Guéranger. It was later championed by theologians, liturgists, and scholars from a diversity of Christian traditions including Roman Catholic (Dom Odo Casel), Anglican (Gregory Dix), and Russian Orthodox (Alexander Schmemann).[[23]](#footnote-23) Schmemann’s writing influenced an entire generation of liturgical scholars because of his adept fusion of worship practice and theology. He describes liturgical theology in the following manner:

But then liturgical theology . . . is not that part of theology, that “discipline,” which deals with liturgy “in itself,” has liturgy as its specific “object,” but, first of all and above everything else, the attempt to grasp the “theology” as revealed and through liturgy.[[24]](#footnote-24)

Writing concerning doxology and liturgical theology, Lutheran scholar and minister Frank Senn provides a helpful framework with which we can move from exegesis to practice when approaching texts such as 1 Corinthians 14.

Liturgical theology, like exegetical theology, stands between a “text” and its use in theology. This may involve, first of all, the historical critical task of establishing the “text” in its context. This includes the elucidation of the content and provenance of liturgical books and the comparison of one ritual order with another. Theological reflection will be based on this kind of historical and comparative work.[[25]](#footnote-25)

These concepts drawn from the Corinthian situation serve to inform and shape all Christian worship practice.

As we now turn our attention to the Free Church tradition and the influence of the logic of 1 Corinthians 14, it is important that we identify the distinguishing characteristics of this group of worshipers. The Free Church tradition developed in the nineteenth century in England but has its roots in the Radical Reformation, pietist congregations, and the Moravian Brethren.These congregations were “free” from the officially mandated state religious practices and functioned in a largely autonomous manner. Contemporary denominations considered “free” would include Baptists, various forms of Pentecostalism and Charismatic churches, and Evangelical Free. While no list of characteristics would be exhaustive, several distinguishing common features of Free Churches are helpful for the present discussion.

### Local Autonomy

At the heart of the tradition is the adjective “free.” By this these faith groups claim independence from ecclesiastical hierarchies that would seek to order their worship practices. These congregations exercise great freedom in their worship design, elements, and liturgical actions. They lack prayer books or other liturgical documents, often relying upon tradition and other pragmatic reasoning in their worship structure. At the core of this independence is the Reformation doctrine of the priesthood of the believer and the freedom of each congregation to define its polity, organization, and ministry practice. The largest Free Church denomination, the Southern Baptists, encapsulate this priority in Article Six of their belief statement, *The Baptist Faith and Message*:

A New Testament church of the Lord Jesus Christ is an autonomous local congregation of baptized believers, associated by covenant in the faith and fellowship of the gospel; observing the two ordinances of Christ, governed by His laws, exercising the gifts, rights, and privileges invested in them by His Word, and seeking to extend the gospel to the ends of the earth. Each congregation operates under the Lordship of Christ through democratic processes. In such a congregation each member is responsible and accountable to Christ as Lord.[[26]](#footnote-26)

Each Southern Baptist congregation voluntarily cooperates with likeminded congregations that share a common statement of doctrine and participate in the task of missions and evangelism in the United States and abroad, theological higher education, and moral and ethical initiatives.

While there is a consensus of core beliefs by Southern Baptists, the denominational agencies have no direct influence on the practice and ministries of each local congregation. In rare cases, congregations may be disassociated from the national denomination, but there is a diversity of congregations that worship under this umbrella. Each congregation is free to worship in the manner of their choosing, but clearly the practices of other congregations influence their decision-making process. These influences can be likened to Paul’s appeal to the Corinthians to align their worship practices with those “as in all the churches of the saints” (14:33).

Outside governmental polity, freedom extends to the worship practices of this tradition. Many of these congregations reject formality and defined liturgical patterns as symptomatic of mainline denominational traditions of moderate to liberal theological persuasions. Gene Bartlett describes this position succinctly:

After all, our free churches have had a deep-rooted suspicion of “formalism.” Though the passing generations have left us vague about the actual historical reasons for this suspicion the feeling is real and present. Without defining it clearly, we carry the haunting feeling that worship which takes on much form is “too Catholic” or that it somehow hampers the free movement of the Holy Spirit among our people. We have associated the growth of outward form with the loss of inward spirit.[[27]](#footnote-27)

This desire for the free movement of the Spirit echoes the Corinthian situation, albeit without the charismatic manifestations in many congregations. The loosely structured worship elements of this tradition mirror the Corinthians where each “had a hymn, a lesson, a revelation” and other spiritual contributions (14:26). This passage demonstrates another value of the Free Church tradition—namely, active participation by the laity in worship. Many congregations utilize laypeople in a large diversity of worship leadership positions. Even the prized role of the proclamation of the Gospel through the sermon is not infrequently filled by “lay preachers,” or those “sensing a call to ministry.” While largely led by ordained ministers, the celebrations of the ordinances of baptism and the Lord’s Table are occasionally celebrated by laity. In many congregations, the only role which must be filled by someone ordained and recognized as clergy is that of senior pastor.

In this manner, the Free Church tradition embodies the core positive Corinthian worship practice of active congregational participation. Obviously, this value is shared by other traditions that order their worship through defined liturgies and prayer books, but the democratic nature of this tradition led by spiritual ministers and pastors typifies the Corinthian custom. In his comprehensive examination of the theology and worship of the Free Church tradition, Christopher Ellis defines the freedom that is so cherished by these congregations:

This freedom is the freedom of local congregations to order their own gatherings for worship; it is the freedom of spontaneity which is open to the extempore guidance of the Holy Spirit; and it is the freedom of a particular worshiping community to respond to the reading and preaching of Scripture addressed to them as God’s living Word.[[28]](#footnote-28)

### Supremacy of the Word in Worship

This freedom of polity and worship is balanced in the Free Church tradition by a fierce commitment to the supremacy of the Word of God in all matters of practice and theology. The majority of these congregations employ a rigid hermeneutic which views the Scriptures as authoritative for practice and doctrine, often employing modifiers such as “infallible” and “sufficient” when describing the Scriptures. When discussing the freedom of these congregations, James White captures the heart of the commitment to Scripture: “Behind this autonomy is a deeper concern, the desire to be free to follow God’s word. This has often led to a deep suspicion of all that is not provided for in Scripture, including the refusal to use fixed prayer, hymns, and ceremonies.”[[29]](#footnote-29) The Word of God serves to provide structure and limits to the freedom of expression in these churches.

While most Free Churches would reject the notion of a regulative principle in Scripture concerning worship, they would look to the Bible as the basis and guide for their services. This emphasis upon the Word of God is seen in the prominent place of the sermon in the order of service. As the sermon increases in importance, the ordinances and other traditional liturgical responses decline in frequency of celebration and priority. The historical pattern of Word and Table is replaced with one of music, sermon, and response. In this “ordo,” music is often imbued with sacramental power as a means by which the presence and power of the Holy Spirit is communicated to the congregation.

While the elevation of Scripture as the authority and priority for worship is necessary and laudable, pitfalls can emerge. Just as the Corinthians fell prey to the tendency to value one type of gift to another, Free Church traditions tend to value the intellectual understanding of the texts over others, such as intuition, emotion, and embodiment. Melanie Ross identifies another potential obstacle, “the fact that different parts of the church read Scripture in profoundly different way compounds the difficulty of writing an ecumenical liturgical theology.”[[30]](#footnote-30) The guiding principles in Scripture are mitigated by an often inconsistent interpretation and application.

Despite these challenges, the Word of God retains its shaping role in Free Church worship. This same emphasis emerges from a careful reading of 1 Corinthians 14. Paul’s insistence on the priority of prophecy over tongues is, in reality, a commitment to the communicated Word of God in worship. According to 14:3, prophecy “speaks to people for their upbuilding and encouragement and consolation.” This language is strikingly similar to Paul’s description of Scripture in 2 Timothy 3:16-17, where he declares it to be “profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for training in righteousness, that the man of God may be complete, equipped for every good work.” The interpretation, proclamation, and teaching of the Word of God serve as the means by which the freedom of worship and practice are guided and provided a form in the Free Church tradition.

### Spontaneous Prayer

The third pillar of Free Church worship that parallels the Corinthian situation is the commitment to spontaneous prayer. In their rejection of rubrics and prayer books, these congregations rely upon the cultivation of daily habits of prayer, Scripture reading, and individual piety to guide the members of the congregation to lead in public prayer. Paul Fiddes distinguishes between “free” prayer and “extempore” prayer:

Extempore prayer draws spontaneously resources of Scripture, memory, and spiritual experience from within those praying in the very moment that they speak to God. “Free” prayer may be distinguished from this, as requiring a “pre-meditation” which involves the preparation of the heart as well as a deliberate reflection on the subjects for prayer.[[31]](#footnote-31)

This description is helpful in our examination of the relationship of the Corinthians to the Free Church tradition. The close connection between the private devotional practice of prayer and the public exercise of prayer finds a parallel in the prayer in tongues in 1 Corinthians 14:2.

While there is considerable disagreement on the nature of the type of *glossolalia* experienced by the Corinthians and its relationship to the practice in Acts 2, Paul at least affirms the value of the practice of tongues as a means for private communion with God. The problem arose as this devotional practice made its way to the assembly of the saints. In his eloquent comparison between the use of the spirit and the mind in prayer and praise (vv. 13–19), Paul grounds his logic again in the edification of the congregation. Paul encourages the freedom of this type of prayer, but limits its form by requiring interpretation (v. 13) or silence if there is no interpretation (v. 21).

These words provide a helpful guard to the extemporaneous prayer found in many “free” congregations. It is the author’s personal experience in divergent congregations that there is a deficiency of understanding and exercise of corporate prayer in these churches. The desire for spirituality and personal expression found in many of these prayers fails to capture the essence of corporate prayer—to guide and offer collectively the prayers of the saints to God. As Ellis again states concerning this type of prayer, “it exemplifies a spirituality which expresses not only freedom from central control, but dependence upon divine guidance and help.”[[32]](#footnote-32) This desire for Spirit-led expression and guidance is a noble one, but it must be tempered by an understanding that the other members of the congregation must be able to offer their affirmation and endorsement of the spoken prayer. Too often this is hindered by a lack of consistency in the logic of prayer, repetition of various addresses to God, and the disconnect between the other elements of the corporate worship experience. Like the Corinthians, the private prayer is offered up in the midst of the congregation without great thought or concern for each member of the Body. Again, we see that the freedom found in this type of prayer finds its limits and structure in the need for edification.

## Promise, Potential, and Peril of the Free Church Tradition

As we conclude our examination of 1 Corinthians 14 and its synonymous patterns in the Free Churches, I offer several comments that point to the promise, potential, and peril of this tradition. These insights draw from Paul’s words to the Corinthians and apply them to contemporary worship practice. The goal is to gently correct and adjust perspectives with regard to the issues and realign our liturgical expressions to the pattern of Scripture.

One of the dangers found in many congregations today is the growing divide between the pastors, worship leaders, and ministers and the congregations which they serve. Worship has become a spectacle in which eager congregants observe with hopes of gaining some vague sense of intellectual understanding, emotional connection, and communal experience. The introduction of the various trappings of contemporary worship that mirror those of popular culture concerts, including theatrical lighting, darkened auditoriums, expensive sound systems, and elaborate video projection, reinforces the distance between those on the stage and those in the audience. The giftedness of the preacher or musician is elevated, packaged, and sold in the church bookstore.

Sadly, this dichotomy is the natural result of the revivalist tendencies that dominated the Free Church tradition in the previous two centuries. The dynamic pairing of musician and minister was duplicated for generation after generation. These “heroes of the faith” have received near mythic status in the minds and hearts of many believers. In some ways, these attitudes reflect the Corinthian view of the superiority of the so-called miracle gifts to the exclusion of others for the equipping of ministry. Our congregations must recover the appreciation of the giftedness of the entire assembly, not just the obviously gifted leadership. In this new framework, we approach each member of the Body of Christ as a potential contributor and vehicle for the work of God rather than a mere spectator.

Secondly, we must strive against the radical individuality that permeates our age and our corporate worship services. The same elements that contribute to the view of worship as spectacle reinforce the individualist attitudes of many in the congregation. Paul repeatedly puts forth the vision of a fully functioning body of believers exercising its giftedness under the power and impetus of the Holy Spirit. The continuing edification of each member of the Body of Christ is the standard to which the Corinthian church and those who minister in the present are held.

This individualistic emphasis is clearly seen in the often-expressed desires of many to have the form of worship reflect their personal preferences and stylistic choices. These opinions are frequently held without regard to the greater good of the congregation or expressed with the attitude of mutual submission. Ralph Martin powerfully describes what is at stake with this attitude: “The thought that the Church at worship is an accidental convergence in one place of a number of isolated individuals who practice, in hermetically sealed compartments, their own private devotional exercise, is foreign to the New Testament picture.”[[33]](#footnote-33) Fostering awareness of the larger congregation and its needs would pay great dividends for churches in the Free Church tradition. What is lost in many cases with the choice of freedom over form is the specific engagement as an assembled body rather than individuals in need of conversion.

The covenantal nature of the Free Churches should be a tremendous aid in this struggle against self-centeredness and individualist myopia. The mutual submission to one another as members of a specific congregation reminds each member of their created goal and enables them to fulfill this ultimate purpose. Grenz observes,

As Christians we enjoy not only a personal goal but also a shared identity. This identity becomes ours as we exemplify the goal for which we were created. God desires that we reflect his own image — that we exemplify the pattern of life which characterizes the triune God. . . . Because God is a social reality, it is only in relationship—in community—that we are able to reflect the divine nature. . . . For this reason, we are dependent on the community of Christ in the task of reflecting the image of God.[[34]](#footnote-34)

By developing an understanding and appropriation of the truth of our communal identity, we can fulfill Paul’s mandate to do all things for the edification of the Body while maintaining the freedom of the individual to exercise his or her spiritual and natural giftedness.

Lastly, Free Churches have a great deal to learn from their more liturgical sibling traditions. It is possible to reject stodgy, structured liturgical formulas while adopting the heart of the dialogical nature of many of these worship patterns. By giving greater attention to matters of spiritual and liturgical functionality, Free Churches can enliven and rejuvenate worship services. These attitudes have the refreshing quality of freeing congregations from the unspoken need to “climb the mountain” each week and to surpass the previous gathering’s spiritual, intellectual, and emotional contributions.

Sadly, this is the very trap into which many congregations fall. Harold Watkins captures the essence of this failing: “There has, unfortunately, been more ardor than understanding, more aping than intelligent learning and adoption of meaningful forms.”[[35]](#footnote-35) Leaders must take to heart Paul’s words to “let all things be done decently and in order” while maintaining the space in which the Spirit can move and work freely. Byron Anderson offers a helpful warning of the pitfalls of succumbing to excess in one position or the other:

We must avoid idolatries of the book—that is, of form—in which we believe that nothing in the book or in the tradition is dispensable from the liturgy. We must also avoid the idolatries of freedom, in which we believe that everything is dispensable. Somewhere between the two lies the truth of our life together.[[36]](#footnote-36)

It is with those words that we bring our study to a close. Christian worship truly is a journey of “life together.” To this journey we bring with us the twin virtues of freedom and form. Each allows for connection with God, spiritual growth, and proclamation of the Gospel. Both must be tempered with a view of the overall good of the congregation to the deference of individual preferences and expressions. Anderson continues,

Form and freedom. One without the other is unfaithful to the gospel and denies the life-giving character of the good news. Form without freedom spurns the grace-filled life. Freedom without form spurns the character of discipleship, of following the way of Christ when it goes against our nature or character. The discipline of worship—our public wrestling with form and freedom—fights against our tendency to transform everything into our own image.[[37]](#footnote-37)

Ultimately we are called to be a “royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for his own possession” (1 Pet 2:9) so that we will be faithful witnesses to the inspiring empowerment of the Holy Spirit in the proclamation of the Gospel and the ongoing power of form to guide our practices, shape our spirituality, and inform our intellects. We need both form and freedom more than perhaps we can even imagine. 1 Corinthians opens the door and gives a vantage point into the purpose of the church—we must have the courage to hold these virtues in dynamic tension for the sake of the Gospel and the good of the church and the world.

# 

# How the Composer’s Worldview Shapes Musical Meaning: Haydn’s *Creation* and the Enlightenment

Shawn T. Eaton[[38]](#footnote-38)

Haydn’s *Creation,* composed in 1798, is one of the most successful oratorios of all time. This is demonstrated not only by its positive reception, but by its longevity in performance even to the present day, including performances in theologically orthodox churches, universities, and seminaries. Interestingly during the eighteenth century, European society saw dramatic changes in musical style and culture, as well as religious and philosophical thought. These changes were fueled by (1) the acceptance of natural theology, a theology based entirely upon rationalism that denied tenets of revealed truth as was commonly held by proponents of the Christian Church; and (2) the shift in musical patronage from that of the aristocracy and the Church to that which was created primarily for the growing middle class. In this new structure, the influences of a middle-class, consumer-driven system of musical economics increased the desire for music as a form of expression that was accessible to all.

Haydn’s *Creation* represents a musical response to, or outworking of, certain tenets of Enlightenment thought, reflective of the aforementioned cultural shifts. In this light, Haydn’s *Creation* may be said to represent a considerably different set of compositional goals and musical values from those of earlier major choral works with biblically based libretti, most notably oratorios by George Frederic Handel. The libretto of *The Creation* clearly drifts away from the Christian apologetic perspective of Handelian oratorio[[39]](#footnote-39) and towards a deistic representation of truth through its revision of the biblical account of creation.[[40]](#footnote-40) Accompanying this shift away from orthodoxy in the libretto, *The Creation* changes musically from the contrapuntal emphasis of the oratorios of the Baroque to the use of a multiplicity of styles, including “the past’s enlightened classicism—in its double fugues, extended arias, Baroque musical rhetoric, and sonata aspects —and the future’s Romanticism.”[[41]](#footnote-41) These two shifts run parallel to each other in their representation of naturalism: the former is a manifestation of naturalist theology, the latter a move toward natural expression of emotions as sought by Haydn and his contemporaries.

This article examines and seeks to document the influences of an eighteenth-century orthodox Christian worldview, the natural theology and deist worldview popular during the period, and the literary models of Milton and others in the shaping of the libretto and the music of Haydn’s *The Creation*. The author will (1) discuss the theological, philosophical, and literary background relevant to the composition of *The Creation;* (2) discuss the musical background including relevant philosophies of music; (3) provide analysis of the libretto and music of *The Creation* within the aforementioned context with emphasis upon the architectural framework of the music; and (4) make conclusions based upon a synthesis of this material.

## Governing Worldviews and Source Material: Theological, Philosophical, and Literary Background

For the purposes of this study the importance of worldview cannot be overestimated. “Worldview” is defined by James H. Olthuis as

a framework or set of fundamental beliefs through which we view the world and our calling and future in it. This vision need not be fully articulated: it may be so internalized that it goes largely unquestioned; . . . it may be greatly refined through cultural-historical development.[[42]](#footnote-42)

As Olthuis’s definition implies, worldview is fundamentally shaped by a person’s understanding of reality or truth. Thus worldview powerfully affects one’s thoughts and actions in every arena. The pursuit of truth shifted during the Enlightenment from agreements between theology and philosophy (representing the historic Christian worldview) toward a scientific derivation of truth—that which was solely understood through reason (rationalism) and experience (empiricism). Since God’s revelation through both Scripture and creation was held as objective truth by most in Western society until the Enlightenment, Andrew Hoffecker is correct that this change in the pursuit of truth represented a subjective turn—a turn from God-centered thinking (*theocentrism*) toward man-centered thinking (*anthropocentrism*).[[43]](#footnote-43) Hence, in order to understand the robust meaning of Haydn’s *Creation,* it is vital to understand certain tenets of orthodox Christian theology, eighteenth-century naturalist philosophy, and the worldviews of Haydn and his librettist. Although the original librettist is unknown, the oratorio’s libretto is purported to have been written in mid-eighteenth century England, where the principles of natural religion were conceived. These principles eventually reached Haydn’s Austria under the reign of Joseph II (1780–90), just prior to the composition of *The Creation*.

### Orthodox versus Deist Worldview

The two target audiences for Haydn’s *Creation* were England and Austria, which were respectively Anglican and Roman Catholic. A study of the historic Thirty-Nine Articles[[44]](#footnote-44) of the Anglican Church and historic documents of the Roman Catholic Church, including those of The Council of Trent[[45]](#footnote-45) and its catechism,[[46]](#footnote-46) yield an understanding of the eighteenth-century orthodox Anglican and Roman Catholic worldviews. As pertains to the purview of this paper, these have been determined to be very similar. Representatives from each would see all matters of existence in this life and the next as a function of dependence upon God. God is creator and preserver, working in all things at all times. Furthermore, this dependence includes the dependence upon Christ for salvation—enabling a restoration of the moral capabilities of man present before the stain of original sin.

Study of the core philosophies of the leaders of the English Enlightenment reveals a stark contrast with the orthodox Christian worldview. Matthew Tindal’s *Christianity as Old as the Creation* was the highest expression of English deism and so was nicknamed “the deists’ Bible.” “He changed the nature of the religious apriority from glorifying God to doing good: ‘to do all the good we can, and thereby render ourselves acceptable to God in answering the end of our creation.’”[[47]](#footnote-47) The English Enlightenment philosophers moved away from the aforementioned orthodox beliefs toward the belief that God is essentially a cosmic watchmaker. In their view God created the universe with natural laws in place and then stepped back to allow everything to operate by these laws.[[48]](#footnote-48) Tindal believed that since the natural order and laws that God set up “always and exclusively determine the events in nature neither mystery nor miracles exist,”[[49]](#footnote-49) hence the title of his book. Thus man’s use of reason exercised in doing good—rather than faith in and dependence upon Christ to make man good—was the essential measure by which all men would be held accountable. The reader should note that for the scope of this study, the terms “deism” and “naturalism” and their derivative forms serve as theological synonyms with regard to naturalism in its eighteenth-century context.

### Franz Joseph Haydn’s and Baron Gottfried van Swieten’s Worldviews

Joseph Haydn (1732–1809) collaborated closely with Viennese impresario Gottfried van Swieten (1734–1803) in the composition of *The Creation*. Swieten’s role in working with the libretto was primarily to fit the original English libretto to work in both German and English versions of the score.[[50]](#footnote-50) However, he was also involved in the entire compositional process of *The Creation*—as evidenced by the libretto manuscript at the Esterházy archives at the National Library in Budapest—confirming that he made musical suggestions regarding text setting in the margins to Haydn, many of which Haydn employed.[[51]](#footnote-51) Haydn’s and Swieten’s operating worldviews can be determined through their words and actions—indicating where they stood in relation to the spectrum of orthodox Christian theology and deistic natural theology of the period.

Haydn by many accounts was a devout Roman Catholic;[[52]](#footnote-52) however, Maria Hörwarthner’s groundbreaking 1979 dissertation[[53]](#footnote-53) notes that Haydn’s library as recorded in his estate documents of 1809 shortly after his death contained no Catholic devotional literature. She therefore questions what other influences worked upon the composer. She concludes that the secularizing influences of the Enlightenment bore heavily upon him:

[W]e know that between 1782 and 1796 he produced hardly any religious compositions; this suggests that Haydn did not shy away from the secularizing tendencies of the Enlightenment in the age of Joseph II, but rather that the intellectual spirit of the Enlightenment—as seen in the Masonic circles around Imperial Councillor Greiner—greatly influenced his mode of living and his musical creativity.[[54]](#footnote-54)

Haydn himself was a Mason signifying his identification with Enlightenment ideology, including concepts of religious tolerance and innate moral ability. Haydn’s lodge, *Zur Wahren Eintract* (For True Harmony), intersected heavily with the literati of the day and was distinguished among all others in Vienna regarding its connection to Enlightenment political and social ambitions.[[55]](#footnote-55) However, there is no better indication of literature that influenced Haydn’s thinking than the 1809 list of books in his library. Among this literature were volumes by Anthony Ashley Cooper, the third Earl of Shaftesbury (1671–1713), and Christian Gellert (1715–1769).[[56]](#footnote-56) According to David Schroeder, these writers likely influenced Haydn to embrace ethical, intellectual, and religious tolerance [[57]](#footnote-57) toward the acceptance of Enlightenment morality—morality based upon the belief that harmony, or goodness, “is the state towards which the universe in all respects gravitates.”[[58]](#footnote-58) As I will outline, this belief was key to Shaftesburian “moral aesthetics.”[[59]](#footnote-59)

Of foremost concern for Shaftesbury was support for the wondrous and perfect system of order that the universe displayed—a system that necessitated belief in God. Man’s chief responsibility in this order was virtuous behavior. Shaftesbury ascribed to natural religion.[[60]](#footnote-60) Followers included Georg Sulzer (*Allgemeine Theorie der schöne Kunstwerk,* 1771–74), who strongly influenced Gottfried van Swieten,[[61]](#footnote-61) and believed that through virtue, individuals, but most importantly society as a whole could achieve a blissful state—a foretaste of heaven.[[62]](#footnote-62) This state would come as the result of “identify[ing] completely with the universal system of which we are a part.”[[63]](#footnote-63) This was the ultimate end of naturalistic (scientific) man. However, this state would not be reached without pairing the rationalist goal of virtue with a motivating or actuating means. Art, especially texted music, was believed to be the means. Music’s beauty and emotion were seen as the keys to wooing man’s sentiments to nobility of heart and action. For Shaftesburian Neoplatonists, goodness, truth, and beauty were one and the same. Thus to be trained by beauty in art was akin to being trained in morality and thus true religion.[[64]](#footnote-64) Historic Christianity also stressed the importance of goodness, truth, and beauty, but the means to their completion in man was Christ, and their end was the glory of God.

Shaftesbury’s method for carrying out his didactic role for the arts was a rhetorical process with “new potential for intelligibility which, when taken up by a composer like Haydn [even] in instrumental music, has far reaching implications.” Through this rhetorical process, various modes of persuasion were used, such as humor, surprise, and the juxtaposition and resolution of forces. Humor strengthened the author’s rapport with the audience.[[65]](#footnote-65) Poets thus would strive to “recommend wisdom and virtue . . . in a way of pleasantry and mirth.”[[66]](#footnote-66) Surprise, or “manipulation of audience expectation,” was linked to humor, and involved the irony of lightly handling weighty subjects, or the use of paradox. The juxtaposition and resolution of opposing forces such as good (represented by “beauty,” “proportion,” and “harmony”) and evil (represented by “deformity,” “disproportion,” and “dissonance”) could provide a backdrop for the larger harmony of moral optimism. Again, good was equivalent with harmony, which was “the state towards which the universe in all respects gravitates.” For example, Haydn’s Symphony No. 103 presents an amalgamation of “opposing forces” that permits the listener to receive these as a new whole. As Schroeder notes, “It is in this way, consistent with the thinking of Shaftesbury, that he [the listener] is able to embrace morality in the sense of the Enlightenment.”[[67]](#footnote-67) Later Schroeder asserts,

Tolerance, that key manifestation of enlightened morality, had for over a century been official policy in England as a result of the Toleration Act of 1689. Shaftesbury had argued for intellectual as well as religious tolerance, and subsequent thought in England reinforced this view.[[68]](#footnote-68)

“Shaftesbury’s connection with Ignaz von Born and the Freemasons as well as his influence upon the contemporaneously popular Christian Gellert, were very likely the greatest vehicles for his impact upon Haydn.”[[69]](#footnote-69) Haydn imitated Gellert’s populist approach to literature with his approach to music.[[70]](#footnote-70) According to Swedish diplomat Fredrik Samuel Silverstolpe, a personal friend of Haydn, among his collection of Germany’s finest poetry, “it seemed Gellert was his hero.”[[71]](#footnote-71) In 1766, it was published in the *Wiener Diarium* that “in short, Hayden [*sic*] is that in the music which Gellert is in poetry.”[[72]](#footnote-72) Gellert often used Shaftesburian terms such as “moral sense” and likened this sense with beauty. As Schroeder states,

In Gellert’s scheme of things a special relationship existed between the writer and his reading public or audience. Gellert believed that literature should educate, entertain, and improve society in matters of morals, taste, and intellect, all of which were intimately bound together.[[73]](#footnote-73)

Gellert strove to be attractive to those in society “whose morals and intellect he believed to be exemplary, and the audience had its morals, intellect, and sense of taste reinforced by the writer’s literary characters, situations, and moral writings.”[[74]](#footnote-74) As a populist, this direction spawned new literary genres, such as the novel and the sentimental comedy, which Gellert helped create. These were fused with a natural manner of expression stemming from the middle class, as well as an enduring sense of moral values. Within these were plots in which moral characters faced ethically unsolvable situations. For example, in Gellert’s novel, *Leben der Schwedischen Gräfin* (1746), resolution to the drama demands that characters are forced to make concessions to evil actions regardless of which way they turn. Thus, similar to Shaftesbury, these fostered a proliferation of a certain level of tolerance in regard to ethics.[[75]](#footnote-75)

How does all of the above in Gellert’s writing relate to taste? In the twenty-first-century West, taste (especially in regard to art) is regarded as almost entirely subjective. In the eighteenth century, however, taste was a much more substantive concept than it is today, enveloping “reason, feeling, virtue, and morals, and consequently was the cornerstone of social relevance.”[[76]](#footnote-76) Taste was to Gellert, “‘eine richtige, geschwinde Empfindung, vom Verstande gebildet’ (a genuine, immediate feeling, shaped by intellect).”[[77]](#footnote-77) Taste worked in individuals to achieve balance between feeling and thinking, between impulse and adherence to conventions or rules. According to Schroeder, Gellert believed

that the creation of great works of art precedes the rules, and hence, the rules are derived from the works themselves. While a knowledge of the rules was essential to the artistic process, an assiduous following of them would probably yield nothing more than a dull, insipid work.[[78]](#footnote-78)

Although Gellert was very devout in his faith, his Christian goals became interwoven with that of the Enlightenment, yielding their “most convincing expression in secular forms.” Similarly, “In devising a musical language to achieve his goals, . . . [j]ust as Gellert developed a more natural language in his writing, Haydn gradually drew more heavily on musical source material which could appeal to a broad social spectrum.”[[79]](#footnote-79) Haydn’s “populist” style is confirmed in a letter to William Forester regarding his *Seven Last Words:* “Each Sonata, or rather each setting of the text, is expressed only by instrumental music, but in such a way that it creates the most profound impression even on the most inexperienced listener.”[[80]](#footnote-80) The above leads to some unavoidable conclusions.

The influence upon Haydn of a wide social structure infused with Enlightenment concepts encouraged him to compose in a universally appealing way. In this, Haydn was clearly a product of his culture. However, Christianity, though universally applicable to mankind, stands upon non-negotiable truths, which may not be reasoned to fit theological trends or tastes built upon man-centered principles, no matter how intellectually refined these tastes may be. As will be demonstrated, Haydn’s violation of this principle in his composition of *The Creation* indicates that his worldview consisted more of an Enlightenment brand of Christianity than an orthodox one.

Now I examine the worldview of Haydn’s collaborator in the composition of *The Creation*. Early in his career Baron Gottfried van Swieten was an Austrian diplomat (1755 to 1777), when he was often abroad. He served in Brussels (1755–57), Paris (1760–63), Warsaw (1763–64), and England (1769). In the 1780s, during Joseph II’s reign, he was President of the Court Commission on Education and Censorship, working to implement the emperor’s liberal platform.[[81]](#footnote-81) He visited Voltaire in 1768, and in 1770 was likely rejected as a proposed imperial ambassador to Rome.[[82]](#footnote-82) Visconti, the papal nuncio, noted Swieten’s intellect but remarked disapprovingly that it was filled with “modern filosofismo.”[[83]](#footnote-83) Swieten therefore was sent to Berlin on what would be his longest appointment, from 1770–77, to negotiate with Frederick the Great, a quintessential Enlightenment ruler. In addition to being a career politician, Swieten was an accomplished composer and patron of music.[[84]](#footnote-84) His political reputation for the endorsement of Enlightenment philosophy was matched by his educational reforms and musical activities.

During the 1780s, Swieten made the writings of Shaftesbury and Sulzer mandatory holdings in the libraries of the Austrian university system. His educational reforms made philosophical studies in aesthetics and the arts compulsory before studies in law, theology, or medicine. He then put staff in place to chair departments for these subjects.[[85]](#footnote-85) But Swieten’s influence in the musical realm, including his role in the composition of Haydn’s *Creation,* saw his greatest impact as an Enlightenment reformer, as the philosophy that he promoted was directly applied.

Swieten affirmed the eighteenth-century understanding that reason, morality, and thoughtful taste are highly connected. Wiebke Thormählen’s article[[86]](#footnote-86) lends valuable insight into Swieten’s musical influence. Swieten encouraged the use of small-scale arrangements of Handel’s oratorios in performance in his Viennese salons and at the Imperial Library. These arrangements served to give singers and players an opportunity to thoughtfully and physically engage with the beauty and goodness of the works and thus develop their rational and moral sentiments as they related to taste.[[87]](#footnote-87) In the eighteenth century, the emotions or passions were understood to be housed in the body, rather than the mind. Music affected the passions as it stimulated nerves in the body. Similarly, Sweiten encouraged the performance of music based upon the understanding that “as taste and moral sentiment were understood to be based in physical sensation, an actual physical engagement with art would enhance their effect.”[[88]](#footnote-88)

In the eighteenth century, moral education through music was tied to texted music, since the text provided clear moral concepts.[[89]](#footnote-89) Concern was expressed that music not well correlated to the text or “concerted instrumental music” could arouse harmful emotions.[[90]](#footnote-90) However, Swieten contributed to a shift in understanding in this regard, believing that taste for morality could be trained by instrumental music. Swieten’s understanding was that reason and moral sensitivity should be trained through the use of inner senses. He correlated the outer senses of “hearing and seeing” with the related inner senses of “taste and the imagination.” Therefore, Swieten and other theorists like him wanted to train moral sense independent of the precision of the text.[[91]](#footnote-91) Thormählen explains the significance of this:

As long as this moral education remained dogmatically tied to precise concepts conveyed in words—ultimately the virtues of Scripture—and as long as these words and concepts were to present reason with a means to control the innate passions, instrumental music’s effects could be considered on a scale from meaningless to pernicious. If, however, such moral concepts became brittle and questionable values, then instrumental music would take on new significance by virtue of its immediate appeal to the inner sentiments, guided by the individual’s innate sense of taste.[[92]](#footnote-92)

Although arrangements for smaller ensembles described above provided a variety of opportunities for direct engagement with the archaic larger-scale works that Swieten deemed appropriate for his educational plans, by 1786, Swieten formed the *Gesellschaft der Associierten Cavaliere* with members of the upper class of Vienna. The concerts sponsored by this organization were the large-scale versions of Handel’s oratorios then popular in England, including Mozart’s version of *Messiah*. Similarly, for the *The Creation* Swieten sought to use older musical models to create a new “classic.” Taking full advantage of Haydn’s prowess as an instrumental composer, he incorporated Haydn’s genius into the form of Handel’s oratorios which was already proven to spark the imagination. This approach ensured the audience’s anticipation of a work in which the message of the music superseded the message of the text. According to Thormählen, by the late eighteenth century, formerly preeminent vocal models employing instrumentation were becoming “subsumed into the compositional material as large-scale topics; within a musical language that was highly conventionalized, each gesture had acquired emotive meanings that no longer needed textual clarification.” Thus Haydn’s *Creation* was a work that served as an “intermediate step between the early eighteenth-century desire for the cognitive content of the words and the Romantic abandonment of conceptuality in favor of music as the artistic companion to man’s unstable soul.” [[93]](#footnote-93)

If Swieten had merely created a German translation of the original libretto of *The Creation*, the importance of his worldview for this discussion might be of limited interest. However, he was integrally involved in the entire compositional process of *The Creation,* as the musical suggestions regarding text setting that he made to Haydn in the libretto manuscript at the Esterházy archives at the National Library in Budapest confirm. What, one might ask, is the significance of this? Swieten’s Enlightenment reforms encouraging reliance upon aesthetic taste to develop morality independent of scriptural concepts resonated with deism’s adherence to the sufficiency of mankind’s innate moral ability. Although historic Christianity also tied together the good, true, and beautiful, these concepts were always defined by Scripture.

### Primary Libretto Sources

While the theological, philosophical, and literary background above is essential in understanding the cultural environment and worldviews that influenced Haydn and his librettist, the libretto’s primary sources are also key to this study. The main sources for *The* *Creation* libretto were the creation story in Genesis 1:1–2:3 from the Authorized King James Version of the Bible, 1611; the adaptation of this story in John Milton’s *Paradise Lost* (1674 edition); Psalms, particularly Psalm 19:1–5 and Psalm 104:27–30;[[94]](#footnote-94) and excerpts from Thomson’s *The Seasons*.[[95]](#footnote-95) In order to limit discussion of these sources, rudimentary familiarity with the biblical account of creation is often assumed, while aspects of Milton’s *Paradise Lost* that outline essential theological or philosophical elements are discussed. While several elements from Milton’s epic are brought to light in the following analysis of the libretto and music of Haydn’s *Creation*, a central point should be addressed here. An examination of *Paradise Lost* in conjunction with the study of Milton’s summary of theology, *De Doctrina Christiana,* clearly and interestingly reveals that his epic rests on a Pelagian, rather than Augustinian,[[96]](#footnote-96) view of original sin and the Fall—in that it holds to man’s moral goodness in his ability to choose salvation.[[97]](#footnote-97) Moving an even greater step away from post-Reformation traditions, *The* *Creation* libretto’s omission of the Fall altogether—which contrastingly is included in both the Genesis account as well as the *Paradise Lost* version of the creation story (which, indeed, emphasizes it by its very title)—results in a libretto with much greater resemblance to natural theology than orthodox theology of either England or Austria.[[98]](#footnote-98) This point will be more fully discussed in the following analysis of the oratorio.

## Musical Background

As has been discussed, the transformation in worldview that took place during the Enlightenment was expressed not only through shifts in theology, philosophy, and literature, but also through changes in approaches to music. Of great importance to this study, therefore, are shifts in musical meaning and the values at play in the compositional process that supported these shifts. Both relate to changes in musical style and rhetoric. During the Classical period, older styles were still performed alongside the new and combined with them in interesting ways. Amid this period of great change, Haydn composed *The Creation*. Although he was greatly inspired by Handelian oratorio, the influence of the shifting musical philosophy—as evidenced by Haydn’s own approach to style, aesthetics and musical rhetoric—is equally clear.

### A Shift in Musical Meaning

Of particular interest to this study is a shift in musical meaning associated with style mixture in the classical symphony, as revealed in Melanie Lowe’s recent studies of the Mozartean symphony.[[99]](#footnote-99) In regard to established conventions, in the Classical era the accessibility of aesthetic meaning begins to break down due to greater subjective desires and uses for music. The minuet in what has been described as Mozart’s “Great G-minor symphony,” K. 550 serves as a prime example. In Mozart’s time, the minuet was heavily associated with the aristocracy, in this case the Austrian Empire, while the use of the learned style of canon usually symbolized the Catholic Church. With these two styles of composition, Mozart did something that never would have happened in the Baroque. He combined the sacred learned style of canon with the aristocratic social dance of the minuet in such a way that it provided a “clashing . . . of musical symbols.” Lowe contends that contemporaneous audiences would have disassociated the meaning of these two conventions as they were heard in this movement. In citing other similar instances of style mixture such as those in Haydn’s symphonies, she asserts that “new and distinct meanings” were implied by the composer.[[100]](#footnote-100)

### A Shift in Values in the Composition of Music

A marked contrast can be seen between values in music making that existed in the Baroque and previous historic periods compared with those that developed in the Classical period. This contrast is corroborated by the primary eighteenth-century musical treatises and featured a move away from polyphonic styles—generally categorized to be mathematical, rational, and objective in meaning—towards the development of homophonic styles, which were more emotional and subjective in meaning.[[101]](#footnote-101) Clearly Plato’s philosophy regarding music relates to this, whereas he essentially reduced music to two types: “one, the true music, rationally based and logically developed, exemplifies the structural principles of all reality, including the human mind; [while] the other music, impressionistic and fantasticated, merely imitates the sounds of nature and the passing show of temporary feelings.” Secondly, a correlation may also be drawn between Plato’s two types of music and the early Christian understanding of (1) an “exalted, intellectual, vocal, sacred music” and (2) a “low, sensual, instrumental, secular music.”[[102]](#footnote-102) The homophonic styles of the Classical period demonstrated a shift from music that encouraged a particular emotional state in man, “conceived as rationalized, discrete, and relatively static states,”[[103]](#footnote-103) toward that which was more individualistic, utilizing a “progressive view of human psychology based on recent English philosophy.”[[104]](#footnote-104) Eighteenth-century musicologist Johann Nikolaus Forkel expressed this latter view and “regarded the affections not as remaining constant until acted on but as inherently mobile and subject to an infinite number of modifications.”[[105]](#footnote-105) Thus, music shifted from the Baroque practice of using every musical means available (i.e., established figures and conventions) to portray the meaning of the text, towards affects in the Classical period that were “considered entirely subjective and highly personal.” Hence, “each piece reflect[ed] the inner character of its composer.”[[106]](#footnote-106)

This shift demonstrated a significant change in musical rhetoric that was worked out in the compositional process. The polyphony of the Baroque period utilized an often rich harmonic texture produced from the interweaving of two or more melodic voices that could sustain one emotion (or affection) and the interest of the listener for extended amounts of time—in part because the “working out” of the melody in its entrances in various voices at various pitch levels takes more time. Therefore, Classical composers including Haydn would use polyphony when they wanted to prolong or sustain more serious and profound emotions. However, their use of homophonic styles required them to change keys and introduce other melodic patterns to keep the music interesting, maintaining a sense of forward motion.[[107]](#footnote-107) To elaborate, because of homophony’s relative simplicity in its basic structure—as a chord-accompanied melody—and its often slow rate of harmonic rhythm common in the Classical period, it required continual innovation, exciting frequent changes in the emotions of the listener. Again, due to rising middle-class influence, music was being crafted increasingly in light of its popular reception by the general public. Interestingly, these changes in composition very likely continued the shift, begun in the Renaissance,[[108]](#footnote-108) away from correlations of ratios found in musical intervals to those observed in the orbits of heavenly bodies, which for centuries cast polyphony (emphasizing harmony) with cosmic significance.[[109]](#footnote-109)

Furthermore, one of the prominent features of the Classical period was the development of the symphony orchestra and symphonic forms, with Haydn as one of the most influential proponents. This can be interpreted in two ways. Although an increase in the size of the orchestra was necessary to fill the need for more volume in the large public concert halls built during the period, the development of the symphony also could be seen as a means to boost the entertainment value of the orchestra. All of this history points heavily to the conclusion that music was moving away from that which was more profoundly functional toward that which was designed for greater entertainment—hence market—value.

### The Influence of Handelian Oratorio: The Sublime

While the secular genre of symphony unmistakably influenced Haydn’s *Creation*, the influence of Handelian oratorio is equally clear, particularly in its marked emphasis upon the musical sublime as a result of its borrowings from *opera seria*. The anonymous eighteenth-century treatise *On the Sublime* (incorrectly attributed to Longinus) describes the sublime (as excerpted by Ruth Smith) as

‘Boldness and Grandeur in the Thoughts’; ‘the Pathetic, or the Power of raising the Passions to a violent and even enthusiastic degree’; ‘a skilful Application of Figures, which are two-fold, of Sentiment and Language’; ‘a noble and graceful manner of Expression . . . not only to chuse out significant and elegant Words, but also to adorn and embellish the Stile, by the Assistance of Tropes’; and ‘the Structure and Composition of all the Periods, in all possible Dignity and Grandeur.’[[110]](#footnote-110)

Handel’s sublime included both biblical and musical aspects. In the eighteenth century, biblical prose and poetry were considered among the most sublime examples of literature. *On the* *Sublime* supported this belief and “profoundly influenced English literature and criticism.”[[111]](#footnote-111) It is important to note that the audience of Handel’s oratorios would have recognized a strong connection between music and text representing the sublime. For examples of these text-music relationships we may listen to the polyphonic choruses of Handel’s *Messiah*, such as the “Hallelujah” chorus, and “For unto Us a Child Is Born.”

### Haydn’s Pastoral Style, Aesthetics, and Rhetoric

An important contrast to the sublime in Haydn’s *Creation* is his pastoral style. Historically a pastorale is “a work of literature or music that represents or evokes life in the country-side, especially that of shepherds.”[[112]](#footnote-112) As James Webster[[113]](#footnote-113) and Herman Danuser[[114]](#footnote-114) attest, the lightness and lower style of the beautiful or “idyllic” in *Creation* as represented by Haydn’s pastoral style contrasts the weight and profundity of the sublime polyphonic choruses. In the case of *The Creation,* the pastoral takes the shape of idealistic images or “illustrations” that Webster terms as “plastic, in the best sense: vivid, *Gestalten*, of . . . directness and immediacy.”[[115]](#footnote-115) The use of the idyllic in Haydn’s pastoral is symbolic in the larger architectural form of *The Creation*. It is important to understand “the word-paintings’ role in articulating the optimistic deism of *The Creation*” since they draw us to connect with nature in a manner that reflects the innocence and bliss of its original unfallen state.[[116]](#footnote-116)

Study of Haydn’s approach to aesthetics[[117]](#footnote-117) and rhetoric[[118]](#footnote-118) reveals that he effectively mixed rational and emotional content in his musical language, with the use of many extra-musical associations, including text-painting and imagery of the Baroque. Yifat Shohat’s excellent dissertation reveals that Haydn also used “digression from [musical] conventions” as a rhetorical device. As one of Shohat’s concluding chapters asserts, “the wealth of Haydn’s digressions surveyed in the course of this study—from his rich Ciceronian-like expressions to humorous aspects, topical mixture, and deflections from overall patterns—may all be viewed as *refutatio* of stylistic norms.”[[119]](#footnote-119) Thus Haydn’s use of refutation resembles Cicero’s definition:[[120]](#footnote-120) “that part of an oration in which arguments are used to impair, disprove, or weaken the confirmation or proof in our opponents’ speech.”[[121]](#footnote-121) Aspects of Haydn’s rhetoric worked to convince the listener concerning previously stated material that “the assumption is correct, yet the final conclusion is not.” Thus Shohat states, “the basic ‘assumptions’—or regulated musical procedures—are being referred to, yet the ‘conclusion’—or commentary on specific procedures—produces a different result than expected.”[[122]](#footnote-122) Knowledge of these aspects of Haydn’s approach to musical style, aesthetics, and rhetoric are essential in understanding the full meaning of *The Creation.*

## Analysis of the Libretto and Music of *The Creation* in its Theological, Philosophical, Literary, and Musical Context

Building upon the background provided in the previous sections, I will establish the degree to which Enlightenment culture, including philosophy, theology, literature, and musical influences, directly impacted Haydn and Baron van Swieten in their work with the libretto and music of *The Creation.* This analysis therefore is not comprehensive, but designed according to the scope of this article. First will be a discussion of the purpose of *The Creation*, as evidenced in Haydn’s own words; second will be an analysis of the libretto, specifically in regard to revisions in theology from that of both Scripture and *Paradise Lost*; and third will be an analysis of the music, focusing upon the significance of the structural framework regarding Haydn’s use of multiple styles and text-music relationships. The robust message of the oratorio will be revealed at the end of this process. Final conclusions will relate how this message developed as a function of the operative worldview of Haydn and Swieten. Before proceeding, we should be reminded of James Olthuis’s definition of worldview as stated in the opening paragraphs of this article:

a framework or set of fundamental beliefs through which we view the world and our calling and future in it. This vision need not be fully articulated: it may be so internalized that it goes largely unquestioned; . . . it may be greatly refined through cultural-historical development.[[123]](#footnote-123)

### The Purpose of Haydn’s *Creation:* An Oratorio for the Virtuous Man

Martin Stern gives evidence that the purpose of the work, according to Haydn, was the “pleasure” and “happiness” of others.[[124]](#footnote-124) While these might seem very innocuous aims for his work, contrasting this purpose with that of Milton’s *Paradise Lost—“*tojustifie the ways of God to men”[[125]](#footnote-125)—or the Christian apologetic nature of Handel’s oratorios reveals its ring with the Age of Reason. As mentioned previously, the two principal audiences that Haydn intended for the work were England and Austria. Eighteenth-century English culture—held in esteem by representatives of the Enlightenment everywhere—placed a high value upon pleasure and happiness,[[126]](#footnote-126) and according to Shaftesbury’s aesthetic moralism, society’s happiness would ultimately be gained through moral virtue. Joseph A. Gall, whom Swieten recruited to teach Enlightenment reforms, taught that the very purpose of God’s relationship with mankind was the latter’s happiness. Gall’s *Liebriche Anstalten und Ordnung Gottes die Menschen gut und glückselig zu machen* (God’s Loving Arrangements and Order to Make Men Virtuous and Happy)teaches:

Let us look at our earth, and see how God has made it into a beautiful and well-appointed dwelling; how the sun lights it up and warms it; how the air, the fertile rains, the springs, brooks and rivers cool and moisten it; how the plants in infinite variety, beauty and fertility grow out of the earth. These conditions make it possible for countless creatures to live on land, in the water and in the air. They find food and, as we can see, they enjoy their existence. But we human beings have cause to take special delight in our existence, since of all living creatures on earth we enjoy most of the good things. For this was God’s chief purpose with us human beings, to make us his noblest creatures on earth and to make us exceedingly happy. God is our most *benevolent* father.[[127]](#footnote-127)

In reference to Haydn’s *Creation*, Austrian historian Ernst Wangermann comments, “If we were looking for a brief summary of Swieten’s text, I do not think we could do better than to take this passage of Joseph Anton Gall.”[[128]](#footnote-128) With the arrival of Part 3 of the oratorio, Wangermann’s statement rings true. In No. 30, “By Thee with Bliss, O Bounteous Lord,” the story turns from the wonders of God’s creation to the happy couple and the delights they share in paradise. The arc of the work contextualizes this turn. Parts 1 and 2 of the work chronicle God’s creative acts from days one through six and praise Him in light of these wondrous works. Part 3 represents a focus upon the life of Adam and Eve in paradise and God’s praise in light of this blissful state.[[129]](#footnote-129)

Related to Gall’s teaching is a quotation from Haydn that reveals another part of the purpose of his oratorio. This excerpt is from a defense of the work written in an 1801 letter to his friend Charles Ockl, the rector at a parish church in the village of St. Johann:

The story of the creation has always been regarded as most sublime, and as one which inspires the utmost awe in mankind. To accompany this great occurrence with suitable music could certainly produce no other effect than to heighten these sacred emotions in the heart of the listener, and to put him in a frame of mind where he is most susceptible to the kindness and omnipotence of the Creator. And this exaltation of the most sacred emotions is supposed to constitute desecration of a church? . . . No church has ever been desecrated by my *Creation*; on the contrary: the adoration and worship of the Creator, which it inspires, can be more ardently and intimately felt by playing it in such a sacred edifice.[[130]](#footnote-130)

This statement serves as a personal acknowledgement from Haydn of the influence of the Enlightenment upon himself.[[131]](#footnote-131) Haydn emphasizes the reception of “kindness and omnipotence of the Creator” and the “exaltation of the most sacred *emotions*.” It is not hard to see the resonance of these two statements to Gall’s and Shaftesbury’s thinking.

Haydn’s purposes for *The Creation* reveal a shift in worldview and musical values in sacred music as displayed in the genre of oratorio. While Handel’s oratorios (and the cantatas of J. S. Bach) linked rational thought and emotion (affection) regarding the sublime truths of orthodoxy, Haydn’s *Creation* relied upon Shaftesburian aesthetic moralism to lead listeners to contemplate Enlightenment ideals. Baroque sacred music appealed to the fear of God as rooted in God’s holiness and justice—the revelation of God in Scripture. Scriptural revelation—*special* revelation—was artistically and rhetorically presented *through* the beauty and order of generalrevelation via cultivated music. In the Baroque, the doctrine of affections was appropriated to complement the revelation of absolute truth as represented in Christian orthodoxy. Conversely, employing an array of musical tools, Haydn’s *Creation* focused upon the topic of general revelation—revelation through nature—while employing Scripture, also affording an ideal opportunity to proliferate aesthetic moralism, a message clearly resonating with deistic naturalism and fulfilling artistic purposes of Gottfried van Swieten.[[132]](#footnote-132) Gall emphasized moving the mind to the praise of God (a moral action) based upon rational appraisal of his benevolence to mankind through the delights of creation. Similarly, Shaftesburian aesthetic moralism stressed the importance of moving the soul with beautiful art and training moral discretion through the development of musical taste. Each were part of Enlightenment reform that relied upon the discernment of beauty as tied to the good and true (God’s brilliant designs in nature) as the means to a better society.

Furthermore, Wangermann’s studies of Austrian Enlightenment Reform Catholicism reveal that during the 1780s the benevolence of God was emphasized at the expense of the fear of God. A rational derivative of Gall’s instruction was the deterioration of the doctrine of original sin in the minds of many young students. God’s benevolent purposes for man glowed so brightly that hereditary sin was becoming unthinkable.[[133]](#footnote-133) Also, deistic moralism taught that special revelation was unnecessary for man to fulfill his created purpose. Hence the story of creation was ideally suited to inspire the worship of God based not upon his holiness or justice, but upon a rational appraisal of his power at work in loving actions toward mankind through the created order.

### Textual Analysis: Revisionist Handling of Orthodox Theology and *Paradise Lost*

The evidence of revisionist theology in the text of *The Creation* begins with the opening symphonic movement, the “Representation of Chaos.” This movement’s tonal ambiguity, resolution, and musical meaning are all significant. Indeed, it was an immense musical achievement and work of originality—a milestone in music history. Chaos in Milton’s *Paradise Lost* refers to the space between heaven and hell, a great expanse in which God the Son created the universe out of “formless matter”[[134]](#footnote-134) and marked off its boundaries. Book I contains the first reference:

Sing Heav'nly Muse, that on the secret top  
Of Oreb, or of Sinai, didst inspire  
That Shepherd, who first taught the chosen Seed,  
In the Beginning how the Heav'ns and Earth  
Rose out of Chaos.[[135]](#footnote-135)

Milton borrowed the theme of chaos before creation from classical literature, e.g., Hesiod’s *Theogony*, Plato’s *Timeus*,[[136]](#footnote-136) and Ovid’s *Metamorphosis*.[[137]](#footnote-137) However, Orthodox Christian doctrine clearly states that God created the world *ex nihilo* (out of nothing). Although the term *chaos* does not appear in the Authorized King James Version of the Bible in relation to the creation narrative, Genesis 1:1–2 gives a key to Milton’s heterodox position. The passage states,

In the beginning, God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness *was* upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.

Milton and other theologians influenced by classical (Greco-Roman) studies worked to harmonize stories of the origins of the universe from classical cosmology with Scripture. This tradition harmonizes the words “without form and void” in Genesis 1:2 with classical cosmology’s “formless matter” or *chaos*. Haydn’s “Representation of Chaos” seems to align with this eclectic tradition, positioning it at the outset as a more Universalist representation of creation. However, Tovey’s[[138]](#footnote-138) and Kramer’s[[139]](#footnote-139) musical analysis of the movement also suggests that it represents an evolutionary process more akin to naturalism.[[140]](#footnote-140)

*The Creation’s* revisionist theology is most evident, however, in its lack of portraying Adam’s Fall in the libretto and its restriction of the powers of darkness from their work in the world. In the second aria, “Now Vanish before the Holy Beams,” the shadows of hell’s spirits are cast into the deep abyss by the creation of light. According to University of London Lecturer Mark Berry in his excellent article, “Haydn’s *Creation* and Enlightenment Theology,” this aria is a metaphor for the eradication of the “supernatural from nature.” Thus man was “rescued [via the light of rationalism] from the clutches of Satan and the Fall”—which were increasingly seen as ridiculous notions of the past.[[141]](#footnote-141) It should be noted that the neglect to portray the Fall and the eradication of Satan and demons from the world contrasts not only withScripture but *Paradise Lost* as well.[[142]](#footnote-142) In aligning *The Creation* with Enlightenment thought based entirely upon rationalism, the need for Christ’s atoning work is also eradicated, which according to eighteenth-century orthodox belief was essential in reestablishing both man’s moral ability and right standing with God. Although some may look to musical symbolism in the tonal structure of Haydn’s *Creation* as a representation of the Fall*,* thorough examination of the key structure assisted by the work of several authors leads to other conclusions.

Prominent scholars disagree as to whether the overall key scheme of the oratorio moving from C to B-flat has symbolic significance, and those that assign it significance disagree regarding its meaning. Due to the prevalence of symbolism related to key in the eighteenth century it is likely that this progression carries some importance. Although H. C. Robbins Landon[[143]](#footnote-143) and Siegmund Levarie[[144]](#footnote-144) stated that the key structure contains a symbolic representation of the Fall, more recent scholarship brings new interpretation of this tonal progression. Georg Feder’s book on Haydn’s *Creation* notes that the same keys that Landon and Levarie claimed symbolize the Fall in Part 3 (B-flat and E-flat) are keys already used in Parts 1 and 2. Contrastingly, Feder believes that C major and B-flat major make up “two tonal poles,” in which C major is “Creation’s joyful approachable key, and B-flat major is a key that—at least in the choruses—piously approaches the creator.”[[145]](#footnote-145) B-flat is the key of the two statements of “Achieved Is the Glorious Work” in Part II, as well as the final chorus in Part III. Berry’s recent assessment also resonates with this, identifying the key of B-flat in the final number as symbolic of man as the lower part of the divine-human hierarchy.[[146]](#footnote-146) Also, it is noteworthy that of the six final masses of Haydn, four are in B-flat. Webster suggests a simply practical reason for this key of the final number, noting that the frequency of Haydn’s use of it may have been because B-flat was commonly the highest pitch he wrote for soprano choral parts.[[147]](#footnote-147)

Landon argued, “the tonal construction of *The Creation* is of great intricacy, and is inextricably connected with the symbolic nature of Swieten’s text and, even more, Haydn’s music.”[[148]](#footnote-148) Although this may be true, it should be reiterated that extensive research by this author has revealed no statements of corroboration by Haydn in relation to a musical representation of the Fall. At any rate, if intended it would be a subtle reference for such a cataclysmic event as the Fall. It seems much more plausible that Feder’s and Berry’s interpretation of the key scheme is correct—yielding an understanding that is clearly congruent with the rational goals and environment of Austrian Enlightenment Catholicism—aspects of the contemporaneous culture that Swieten himself was instrumental in establishing.

### Architectural Framework of the Music

Danuser, in his 2008 article “Mishmash or Synthesis? On the Psychagogic Form of *The Creation*,” seeks to “explore how and in what ways the spiritual effect . . . of Haydn’s music, confirmed by the work’s rich and diverse reception history . . . may be said to be based upon a structural foundation.”[[149]](#footnote-149) Georg Feder observes that *The Creation* contains a mixture of literary styles including epic, dramatic, hymnic, poetic, as well as biblical texts.[[150]](#footnote-150) In 1801 Karl Friedrich Triest wrote that *The Creation* includes a mixture of “sacred and theatre styles,” likely referring to the distinction between counterpoint and operatic styles.[[151]](#footnote-151) These various combinations are what have led some to see it as a “mishmash” of style.[[152]](#footnote-152) However, this mixture of styles carries significant meaning when one understands the architectural framework of the oratorio. Examination of four scholars’ writings—James Webster[[153]](#footnote-153) (Haydn scholar and Cornell professor), Hermann Danuser[[154]](#footnote-154) (Professor Emeritus of Historical Musicology at the *Berlin Brandenburgische Academie* *der Wissenschaften*), Siegmund Levarie[[155]](#footnote-155) (musicology pioneer), and Lawrence Kramer[[156]](#footnote-156) (Distinguished Professor at Fordham University)—serves to demonstrate the foundational understanding of the architectural framework of Haydn’s *Creation*.

Thearchitectural framework of the music is of primary importance to this study on several structural levels. It is important on a simple level regarding the pattern of arias, recitatives, and choruses and the types of texts and music sung in each. The framework is important on a more complex level in regard to an alternation of style between what Webster refers to as Haydn’s “sublime and pastoral”[[157]](#footnote-157) or what Danuser refers to as the “sublime and idyllic.”[[158]](#footnote-158) These structural features of *The* *Creation* are integrally valuable to the overall message of the oratorio.[[159]](#footnote-159) Text-music relationships result in many representational aspects in the music of Haydn’s oratorio. These aspects are of course related to their respective individual numbers and to the larger structure and its respective content. In this section, I will: (1) further define these aspects of the structural framework and how they provide an aesthetic foundation for a robust interpretation of the oratorio;[[160]](#footnote-160) (2) provide musical examples illustrating the “sublime-idyllic” effect of stylistic contrasts within the structural framework; and (3) provide summative statements regarding the significance of the structural framework as a whole.

Webster states, “In Parts I and II, although there are many variations and the First Day is altogether different, each remaining Day (or pair of Days) is based on the following ideal sequence:”

1. Prose narrative from Genesis (recitative), leading to . . .
2. Commentary in verse (aria or ensemble), [followed by . . .]
3. Narrative (recitative), leading to. . .
4. Chorus of praise.[[161]](#footnote-161)

Here we see the typical eighteenth-century pattern of recitative-aria, or recitative-chorus. Also each day progresses to a sublime chorus in praise of God for his creation. Thirdly, the most prominent choruses of the entire work appear at the end of Parts 1 and 2. However, the placement of the sublime instrumental opening of the oratorio, the “Representation of Chaos,” is an exception to this pattern. As mentioned above, the musical sublime has particular symbolic significance in this oratorio. It is a representation of that which shocks or startles us with its immensity—bringing us a sense of awe and wonder at the greatness and majesty of God and his works.[[162]](#footnote-162) As explained in the preceding background, in the eighteenth century, developments in literature often paralleled or inspired developments in music. Similarly, in *The Creation,* a majestic text based upon Scripture—considered among the most sublime of literature in the eighteenth century—correlates with sublime expressions of music forming the choruses of praise.[[163]](#footnote-163) For example, this occurs in No. 13, “The Heavens Are Telling the Glory of God,” with text from Psalm 19. However, the sublime is represented with instrumental music as well. According to Webster, Haydn’s *Creation,* along with *The Seasons* and his late masses, are located precisely in the center of a progression in music history as part of Kant’s “dynamic sublime,” a contrast to the usual eighteenth-century sublime, which also included “Mozart’s and Haydn’s late symphonies, *Don Giovanni* and *Die Zauberflӧte*, and Beethoven’s third and fifth symphonies.”[[164]](#footnote-164) Webster identifies Haydn’s chaos “not literally chaotic,” but paradoxical. It is chaos depicted through the disrupted order of music,[[165]](#footnote-165) which finally “resolves an unstable C minor into the radiant purity of C major.”[[166]](#footnote-166) The presentation of the sublime climaxes at the words from Genesis, “and there was light,” as part of a

progression across three separate movements (overture, recitative, chorus), from paradoxical disorder to triumphant order; it offers a perceptible and memorable experience of that which is unfathomable, unthinkable: the origins of the universe and of history. The remainder of Part I takes place as it were during the reverberation of this event.[[167]](#footnote-167)

Secondly, as previously mentioned, choruses emphasizing the sublime generally alternate with solo numbers in Haydn’s pastoral style, resulting in a powerful contrast in mood and aesthetic. Here Haydn’s pastoral (his lower, more natural musical style) is characterized by orchestral pictorializations, which serve to “idealize nature.”[[168]](#footnote-168) Webster comments:

These effects soon become anathema to “absolute” musicians. But it is famously a characteristic of pastoral that its naivety is only apparent; those sweetly mourning shepherds know more than they can say. And it was notoriously the fate of pastoral that from the mid-eighteenth century to the mid-twentieth, critics by and large marginalized it as a “conventional” or “artificial” genre (parallel to the traditional denigration of comedy in comparison to tragedy). Formerly considered naïve, or merely humorous, in fact they reveal profound compositional shaping and even psychological insight.[[169]](#footnote-169)

As Webster states, “Equally important, however, is the word-painting’s role in articulating the optimistic deism of *The Creation* because they induce us to identify with nature while it is still the original ‘Arcadia.’”[[170]](#footnote-170)

Danuser has provided a most straightforward and comprehensive structural analysis of Haydn’s *Creation* regarding this mixture of styles. He terms the sublime as “‘Model I’ [which] drives—rhetorically—toward a climax,” identifying this with contrapuntal choruses. Secondly, he terms the “Idyllic” or pastoral as “‘Model II’ [which] moves away—anti-rhetorically or lyrically—from climax,” identifying this with the arias and recitatives. He explains that the “antagonistic” concepts of the “sublime” and the “beautiful” (idyllic, or pastoral) were pervasive in the philosophy of aesthetics around the time of the composition of Haydn’s *Creation.*[[171]](#footnote-171)Both Webster and Danuser associate the pastoral with Haydn’s images, although Danuser also believes there exist “higher order images” (which are still subsumed into the idyllic) which are a lower order of the sublime than the choruses.[[172]](#footnote-172) Music-aesthetician Christian Friedrich Michaelis (1770–1834) asserted:

The sublime moves us profoundly, touches our inner being, unsettles us, defeats us, so as to bestow upon us the joy of manly aspiration and self-ennoblement. In contrast, the beautiful moves us more easily and gently, touches us more on the surface than within, enlivens us without unsettling us, and holds us in harmonious balance and sweet calm of the spirit.[[173]](#footnote-173)

While Model I tends to dominate in Parts 1 and 2, in Part 3 Model II is emphasized. Thus, “Parts 1 and 2 are analogous to the sublime, and the whole of Part 3 is analogous to the idyllic.” Danuser clarifies the shift in the emphasis, asserting that in Part 3, “the spheres of sublime and idyllic have been changed into the human, and the paradisiacal is elevated to a prolonged moment.”[[174]](#footnote-174) One may note again that this “moment” excludes the Fall, as omitted by the librettist from Milton’s epic. Danuser continues:

On the one hand, [here] the models are individualized, “humanized”; on the other hand, they are raised yet another step higher. Model II becomes retrospectively basal and gains a certain importance with respect to content through the complementary gender opposition of husband and wife.[[175]](#footnote-175)

The chart in Figure 1 below demonstrates the alternating stylistic pattern between Danuser’s Model I and Model II movements as they appear throughout the oratorio. Furthermore, related to this larger level contrast between the sublime and idyllic,[[176]](#footnote-176) Levarie earlier asserted that the length of Part 3, several times curtailed in performance as advocated by Tovey,[[177]](#footnote-177) was created by Haydn to accomplish a roundness of form, presenting both aspects of man’s nature.[[178]](#footnote-178)

Figure 1.[[179]](#footnote-179) Danuser’s “schematic overview”contrasting

the sublime (Model I) and idyllic (Model II).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| First Part | | | | | | |  |
| II | 3. Recitative |  | 6. Aria |  | 12. Recitative |  | | |
| I |  | 4. Solo and Chorus |  | 10. Chorus |  | 13. Chorus | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Second Part | | | | | | | |  |
| II | 15. Aria |  | 21. Recitative | 24. Aria |  |  |  | | |
| I |  | 19. Chorus |  |  | 26. Chorus | 27. (Trio) | 28. Chorus | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Third Part | | | | | |
| II | 29. Recitative | 30. Duet and Chorus[[180]](#footnote-180) | 31. Dialogue and Recitative[[181]](#footnote-181) | 32. Duet |  | |
| I |  |  |  |  | 34. Chorus | |

In reference to the hymn of No. 30 and the duet of No. 32, he states:

To Haydn, man was the crown of all creation. Man, therefore, has to be shown in both his aspects as partaking of divinity and succumbing to worldly pleasures. . . . He is heroic but also pathetic. He is the protagonist but also his parody. The two halves of Part III demonstrate the point in clear musical terms. . . . The first and second halves of Part III follow and illuminate each other like main and secondary plots in a play. They necessarily supplement each other. The heroic action is immediately repeated but in parody. To Haydn and the audience, which first heard *Die Schӧpfung*, this technique was standard. It answered well-established expectations. The *commedia dell’arte* abounds in situations in which the fate of the serious lovers is comically mirrored by that of the ‘lower’ couple. *Opera buffa*, by origin and definition a kind of parody of *opera seria*, used the double plot as a stock device. Haydn showed his affinity to the Neapolitan style by choosing librettos by Goldoni for three of his operas.[[182]](#footnote-182)

Levarie also cites Haydn’s opera, *Le Pescatrici* (1769) (on a libretto by Goldoni), where Haydn demonstrated this “stock device” in his musical writing. Albeit, Levarie admits, *Die Zauberflӧte* seems to be “the closest model for much of the general attitude of *Die Schӧpfung*.”[[183]](#footnote-183) As *Die Zauberflӧte* is noted for many Masonic connections, a thorough comparison with *The Creation* would prove interesting. Scholars such as Chailley,[[184]](#footnote-184) Landon,[[185]](#footnote-185) and Schroeder,[[186]](#footnote-186) it seems, have only begun such study.

Again, the stock device of parody is related to the larger-level contrast between the sublime and the beautiful (or idyllic). In *Die Zauberflöte*, Pamina and Tamino represent the “higher” couple, whereas Papageno and Papagena represent the “lower.” As Danuser noted, in *The Creation* one sees a shift from a sublime emphasis in Parts 1 and 2 upon God and his creative actions to an idyllic emphasis upon Adam and Eve in Part 3. Therefore this contrast in emphasis may also be seen as a sort of parody. However, due to its *comical* shift, the most notable example may be *within* Part 3, as Levarie noted, where the contrast between “higher” and “lower” styles is presented between duets, Nos. 30 and 32. This contrast is seen foundationally in the text of each, as he notes, “The first duet in Part III addresses itself to God and praises His creation”:

Heaven and earth are full of Thy goodness, O Lord.   
This great wonderful world is Thy work.   
All creation worships Thee eternally.[[187]](#footnote-187)

The second duet is focused upon the joys of human love and earthly delights:

Dearest spouse, at your side every moment is bliss. Precious husband, near you my heart swims in joy. What would be fruit, flowers morning dew, evening breezes without your company? You make me enjoy everything double.[[188]](#footnote-188)

As Levarie explains, the music compounds this contrast exhaustively. The first duet uses the chorus (heavenly choir) while the second does not. The brass choir is subtracted in the second duet and key structure is simplified, not to mention that the “slow lyrical section, oriented toward triple metre [of the first], leads to a faster joyous section in duple time [in the second].” Also the second “display is very characteristic of the Vienna popular song of the time.” The phrasing of the second is square (four bars) while that of the first includes “six, seven and more complex numbered measures. The second includes country dance styles including the écossaise rhythms.”[[189]](#footnote-189) Also Levarie claims there were several musical devices that the Vienna audiences associated with *opera buffa* and *Singspiel* rather than oratorio:

The reversal of the reiterated *‘ohne dich, ohne dich’* to *‘mit dir, mit dir’* (cf. the duet of Susanna and the Count); the playful breaking up of a phrase by rests (bars 138 f.; *cf.* ‘Silberglöckchen, Zauberflӧten’ of the Three Ladies); the jocular imitation of a short phrase (bars 148 ff.; cf. Papageno-Papagena); the sentimental preparation of the final cadence of each strophe (cf. similar tempo changes in the quartet from *Die Entführung aus sem Serail*); the effusive accents on an inarticulate exclamation (bars 78, 86, 180, 188; cf. Fiordiligi and Dorabella at the beginning of the first finale in *Così fan tutte*); and so forth.[[190]](#footnote-190)

One can clearly hear how this second duet is an expression of musical naturalism in the Neapolitan style. Webster argues convincingly that these are not “worldly pleasures” as in the sense of *sinful* sexuality, however, because sexual union in Eden’s paradise was holy. As Webster states, “Swieten and Haydn portrayed Adam and Eve as human in both senses: as created in the image of God, and as our parents; but they did not portray them as subject to the fall, certainly not in this love-duet.”[[191]](#footnote-191)

As a general commentary on Haydn’s use of contrasting high and low devices in this oratorio, Webster states:

*The Creation* too is not an oratorio in either primary sense: a religious drama entailing characters and a storyline; or a lyric, cantata-like work intended for performance in divine service. The dominant modes in both are narrative, contemplation, and celebration. . . . Both works [*The Creation* and *The Seasons*] reflected and revalorized the enlightened-conservative sensibility of the Viennese elite at the turn of the nineteenth century. Both are essentially deistic in outlook; both “speak” of high *and* low, sacred *and* secular, in a way that only Haydn’s “popularizing artistry” or “artful popularity” could articulate. Most importantly, both are organized in terms of a mixture of two aesthetic modes ordinarily thought of as contrasting: the sublime and the pastoral. (Beethoven aptly characterized both librettos as *Lehrgedichte,* “didactic poems,” a characterization that Swieten would surely have endorsed.)[[192]](#footnote-192)

So we must ask, what exactly is the full message of Haydn’s *Creation*? What indeed is it teaching, as Beethoven suggested? Key to this discussion is Kramer’s article, “Recalling the Sublime: The Logic of Creation in Haydn’s *Creation*,” asserting that proceeding from the most sublime point of the oratorio, the creation of light, the sublime is “rescinded.” He claims that “the sublime in the *Creation* is incendiary, but it burns out fast. . . . What really matters about it are its embers.”[[193]](#footnote-193) Further he asserts:

The withdrawal of the sublime gradually becomes coextensive with the creation itself and the place of humanity in the order of creation, reflecting (and refashioning) a historically specific understanding not only of the sublime but also, and more weightily, of the conditions of possibility for knowing the world and defining the human.[[194]](#footnote-194)

These thoughts relate to the shifting worldview of the eighteenth century. Kramer states, “The withdrawal of the sublime is the precondition for a creation narrative from which the Fall, too, has been withdrawn—the first chapter of what in Haydn’s day would have been called a universal history, the last chapter of which had yet to be written.”[[195]](#footnote-195) He defines three steps in which the “recalling” takes place, explaining that “the work as a whole, like the divine work it describes, unfolds on a principle of cosmos as analogy”:

First the withdrawal of the sublime reveals a logic of essence disclosed in the activity of Adamic naming. The medium of that logic is the image, in its primary or primordial form. Subsequently, the withdrawal of the primary image reveals the same logic of essence as a property of music. Music fills the void left by the departed image just as the image has filled the void left by the departed sublime. The result is the emergence of a higher-order image that visualizes—musically depicts—a portion of the order of creation that cannot otherwise be seen.[[196]](#footnote-196)

In developing the steps above, Kramer explains that part of “Adamic naming” in this case is the musical creation of “transparent” images. This musical characterization of animals via text-music relationships creates a concreteness or “transparency” through images, which tear down the presentation of the sublime that precedes them. Secondly, Kramer explains that in Part 2 of the oratorio musical expression essentially replaces the images of Part 1, but with the same type of transparent “essence” as the images evoked.[[197]](#footnote-197) An exception to this step would certainly be Raphael’s recitative, “Straight opening her fertile womb,” where the images of Part 1 return. In Part 3, the “higher-order image” is then materialized in No. 30. Here the emphasis turns toward the human, as Kramer states:

Where the sublime is withdrawn, the human appears. And the form in which it appears is the prototype of community, or that which was rapidly becoming this prototype in the nascent bourgeois order of Haydn’s Europe, namely the domestic couple, realized musically in forms of reciprocity that exclude the disruptive otherness of the sublime, including that of human sexuality.[[198]](#footnote-198)

The rescinding of the sublime may be correlated on some level with the aforementioned parody technique as introduced by Levarie, and especially with the contrast between the “sublime” and the “idyllic” as provided by Webster and Danuser. The trend of these analyses demonstrate significance in the move from the “higher” to the “lower.” Similar to Webster’s interpretation, Kramer asserts that with the images, “there is an effect of miniaturization, as if we were hearing the musical equivalent of a bestiary, or of Milton’s own pseudo-bestiary, a series of illustrations, as for a children’s book or an illuminated Bible.”[[199]](#footnote-199) He argues that everything occurring after the sublimity of chaos and light are representations of a rescinding of the sublime.[[200]](#footnote-200) Finally, Danuser and Kramer both note the emphasis upon mankind in paradise in Part 3. Thus, the rescinding of the sublime represents the overall picture expressed by a combined understanding of these authors’ studies. All of this relates to a deistic representation of creation as will be discussed further.[[201]](#footnote-201)

Although clarification regarding Danuser’s and Kramer’s above observations on the sublime in *The Creation* will be discussed, a notable difference and introductory conclusions are presented here. Although Kramer does not remark on the sublimity of the contrapuntal choruses, he does observe the more sublime nature of the depiction of the sun in No. 12 and its contrast with the pastoral nature of the depiction of the moon in the same number.[[202]](#footnote-202) As previously mentioned, Danuser observes these type of stylistic contrasts between “higher” and “lower” images within numbers, which are subsumed into the “idyllic.” The rescinding of the sublime is thus observable on three levels: (1) on the larger level, especially between Parts 2 and 3; (2) between individual numbers—as Levarie noted between numbers 30 and 32—and as seen in Danuser’s chart on page 42; and (3) within particular numbers, such as No. 6 (see below).

### Illustrations of the “Sublime-Idyllic” Effect

It is important to recognize that there are two very different types of musical sublime present in the oratorio: (1) the sustained sublime of the choruses, and (2) the sublime represented by imitative images in the arias and recitatives.[[203]](#footnote-203) The analysis of the following represents the movement from sublime to idyllic or pastoral as it is most apparent within individual numbers in the *The Creation.* Model II (A: sublime—B: idyllic) in Parts 1 and 2 is represented by Nos. 3, 6, 12, 15, 21, and 24.[[204]](#footnote-204) The opening stanzas of “Rolling in Foaming Billows,” No. 6, are as follows:

Rolling in foaming billows   
Uplifted roars the boist’rous sea.  
Mountains and rocks now emerge   
Their tops into the clouds ascend,   
Thro’ th’open plains outstretching wide   
in serpent error rivers flow.  
Softly purling glides on   
thro’ silent vales the limpid brook.[[205]](#footnote-205)

In this aria, the sublime or “epic” is clearly represented by lines 1–6 of the poetry and the

corresponding music as seen in in the excerpt in Example 1. As Danuser explains:

The sublime topics are consistently foregrounded in three successive phrases: the music for lines 1–2 which includes the orchestra introduction paints the storm-ravaged sea (D minor, mm. 1–12, 13–26); in lines 3–4 “the peak of the mountain” [“*der Berge Gipfel*”] is illustrated by upward striving (F major, mm. 27–49); and the musical setting of lines 5–6 represents the flow of the broad river with sculpted melodic figures (F major modulating back to D minor, mm. 50–72).[[206]](#footnote-206)

Conversely, the music and the text of lines 7–8 are a representation of the pastoral, or idyllic:

When the dominant imperfect-cadence resolves into the parallel key of D major, the music is led to the final lines (7–8) of the aria, in which the return to the D tonality opens a new realm to the listener: the sphere of the idyll. A simple exchange between tonic and dominant harmonies serves as the harmonic background as a steady stepwise melody sets a repeat of the opening setting (mm. 73–93, 93–113), corresponding to the aesthetic topic of the text (D major, mm. 73–121).[[207]](#footnote-207)

Thus, beginning with the D section (Example 2), we see an example of a Model II aria with musical structure moving from sublime to idyllic, which corresponds with the textual pattern proceeding from epic to lyric.[[208]](#footnote-208) No. 24, the aria “In Native Worth and Honor Clad,” also proceeds in this pattern as the text exhibits below:

In native worth and honour clad,

With beauty, courage, strength adorn’d

To heav’n erect and tall, he stands a man,

The Lord and King of nature all.

The large and arched front sublime

Of wisdom deep declares the seat,

And in his eyes with brightness shines the soul,

The breath and image of his God.

With fondness leans upon his breast

The partner for him formed,

A woman, fair and graceful spouse,

Her softly smiling virgin looks,

Of flow’ry spring the mirror,

Bespeak him, love, and joy, and bliss.[[209]](#footnote-209)

As seen below, Haydn’s text-music relationships here correlate with the vivid change between the first and second parts of the aria, varying from the description of man to the description of woman. Although the melodic material of this section is at first the same as that which accompanies the creation of man (Example 3), by measure 60 the music is transformed from the sublime to the beautiful (Example 4).[[210]](#footnote-210)

In summary, the significance of the structural framework in *The Creation’s* grand design is that: (1) it demonstrates that Haydn’s oratorio was not a “mishmash” of styles as Schiller wrote, but that it was done in line with Haydn’s idiosyncratic tendencies to compose works of “artful popularity”; (2) it demonstrates how *The* *Creation* was influenced by *opera buffa,* and thus how Haydn’s composition of sacred music was influenced by contemporaneous techniques that represented an increase in the communication of values at play in the “lower,” naturalistic, emotional, and subjective side of secular entertainment; and (3) it demonstrates what Kramer calls a “rescinding of the sublime”[[211]](#footnote-211)—further substantiated in the writings of Webster and Danuser regarding Haydn’s use of alternating styles in the oratorio.

Example 1.[[212]](#footnote-212) Haydn, *The Creation*, No. 6, “Rolling in Foaming Billows,” excerpt from introduction and A section: measures 7–18, voice and orchestra (piano reduction).



Example 2.Haydn, *The Creation*, No. 6, “Rolling in Foaming Billows,” excerpt from D section, measures 73–85, voice and orchestra (piano reduction).



Example 3. Haydn, *The Creation*, No. 24, “In Native Worth and Honor Clad,”

measures 10–24, tenor and orchestra (piano reduction).



Example 4. Haydn, *The Creation*, No. 24, “In Native Worth and Honor Clad,”

measures 53–68, tenor and orchestra (piano reduction).

****

### The Meaning of Haydn’s *Creation*

Mark Berry helps to frame concluding thoughts regarding the above analysis and the complete meaning of Haydn’s *Creation*:

Alongside *The Seasons*, Haydn’s *Creation* stands as one of the final monuments to Enlightened Catholicism. *The Creation* is the product of an environment very different from that in which Bach assembled the Mass in B minor, but also quite distinct from that in which Beethoven composed the Mass in D. . . . Throughout Swieten’s libretto, deistic thoughts inspired by contemplation of nature are converted into direct prayers of thanksgiving and praise to the living God. . . . It is not the theology of the later Hegel or of romantic Christianity, but the moralism of the later eighteenth century: one can imagine those who dwelled beneath the heavenly canopy praying, after a fashion similar to the subjects of Hegel’s Kantian kingdom, that all rational creatures should have no law other than that of their moral conscience.[[213]](#footnote-213)

An understanding of the message of *The Creation* may be based upon knowledge of (1) the purpose of the work according to Haydn; (2) its revisionist theology; (3) its use of a mixture of musical styles resulting essentially in what Kramer calls a rescinding of the sublime; and (4) the weight of text-music relationships. From the author’s studies, all seem to position it as a work in which both text and music were thoroughly influenced by the Enlightenment.

The influence of humanistic moral optimism, a component of natural theology, is the primary element of this Enlightenment influence. According to Haydn, the purposes of the work were essentially (1) the “pleasure” and “happiness” of others; and (2) “to heighten . . . sacred emotions in the heart of the listener, and to put him in a frame of mind where he is most susceptible to the kindness and omnipotence of the Creator.” Historical studies of English Enlightenment culture place pleasure and happiness at the center of importance, and according to Wangermann, Austrian Enlightenment Reform Catholicism emphasized the benevolence of God at the expense of the fear of God. The de-emphasis of God’s just nature is expressed in *The* *Creation* primarily by its lack of mention of the Fall and the promised punishment incurred by mankind. Its leaning toward natural theology is also expressed by the libretto’s great restriction of the influence of Satan and demons in the world, when compared with their depiction in both *Paradise Lost* and the Bible.

An emphasis upon naturalism, or what Kramer calls “rescinding the sublime,” can also be seen in the work’s musical display as presented in its mixture of musical styles. Kramer associates the musical sublime with the orchestral expression of chaos and the appearance of light, while Danuser associates the sublime with Haydn’s use of contrapuntal choruses. Webster affirms both of these associations. These sublime musical expressions may be associated with the biblical sublime. Thus a parallel may be seen between an expression of the biblical sublime (representing Christian orthodoxy) and the musical sublime, and a contrasting parallel between the natural theology expressed in the libretto (restriction of Satan’s influence in the world, and the representation of man in paradise and apart from the Fall) and the naturalistic expression of music through images that “idealize nature” and *opera buffa* (*style galant*) solo sections in Part 3. As Webster asserts, “the word-paintings [have a] role in articulating the optimistic deism of *The Creation* because they induce us to identify with nature while it is still the original ‘Arcadia.’”[[214]](#footnote-214) When these are seen in the context of “recalling” or “rescinding” the sublime, the ultimate message of the oratorio is more closely oriented with natural theology.

A clarification should be made here between Danuser’s and Kramer’s thinking. According to Danuser, each successive chorus in Parts 1 and 2 intensifies the amplification of the sublime.[[215]](#footnote-215) On one level this would seem to contrast Kramer’s assertion of continual rescinding of the sublime, as Kramer makes no mention of the choruses (after the creation of light) as being part of the sublime. However, considering (1) the humanistic shift of emphases, postulated by Danuser between Part 2 and Part 3; and (2) the lack of presentation of the Fall, the cumulative “spiritual effect” would seem to be one of Enlightenment optimistic theology. This effect is created by a counterpoint between (1) rescinding of the sublime through the celebration of earthly images peaking with an emphasis upon mankind and his life in the beauty of the created world; and (2) a magnification or celebration of God through the use of sublime choruses as the one who has initiated these great wonders—especially at the close of Part 3, as mankind remains in paradise. In this sense, the use of the sublime assumes an Enlightenment cast in its celebration of a humanistic vision.[[216]](#footnote-216) This was, after all, the intended purpose of Swieten’s moralizing artistry.

## Conclusion

A synthesis of the above material leads to additional conclusions regarding the meaning and importance of the work. As aforementioned, Haydn’s *Creation* was one of the most successful oratorios of all time. This is demonstrated not only by its positive reception, but by its longevity in performance from the time of its premiere until the present day. Its ultimate message of Enlightenment optimism was the result of both its religious tolerance and musical inclusivity.[[217]](#footnote-217) The message of religious tolerance is plainly seen through the libretto’s omission of the Fall, yielding a more universal account of creation. Its message of musical inclusivity can be seen in its mixture of styles that crossed the boundaries of normative standards for the setting of sacred texts. When evaluated together, both text and music point to deism, as the sublime is recalled or rescinded [[218]](#footnote-218) into the beautiful or “idyllic” in what Webster terms the “pastoral” in reference to Haydn.[[219]](#footnote-219) Understanding patterns in Haydn’s musical rhetoric makes this even more evident. Haydn’s approach to composition can be seen, according to Shohat, as a “*refutation* of stylistic norms,” allowing him “commentary on specific procedures—produc[ing] a different result than expected.”[[220]](#footnote-220) Secondly, according to Lowe, Haydn likely mixed sacred and secular styles such as canon and minuet to produce “new and distinct meanings,” albeit intended for “attentive, knowledgeable and reflective listeners.”[[221]](#footnote-221) It is easy to see how *Creation* could be interpreted as a refutation not only of theological norms, but also of music as a partner to sacred text. It would seem that Swieten’s “moralizing artistry” was the perfect match for this unique vision, as it was based upon the concept that taste for instrumental music could form taste for morality. It is vital to make a distinction between moralism within the context of orthodox Christianity and moralism as a tenet of natural theology in regard to Haydn’s *Creation. Creation’s* implied moralism falls short of orthodoxy in its failure to articulate the Fall and in its leaving man in a state of paradise. These qualities of the libretto and of the oratorio as a whole demonstrated via text-music relationships and the alternation of “high” and “low” styles signify a leaning toward the belief that humankind is sufficient in and of itself to make good moral choices. This belief is squarely in line with natural theology. Therefore theology, morality, and music were becoming more important with respect to fellow man than with respect toward God and His Word, since God was, after all, “benevolent.”

Regarding Haydn’s compositional efforts in *The Creation,* it is important to recognize the difference between his Roman Catholicism and his operative worldview. Although Haydn was by several accounts a devout Roman Catholic, at least in his composition of *Creation*, his operative worldview evidenced that his Christianity was more an enlightened brand than an orthodox one. Again, worldview serves as our construct of reality through which we think, form values, and act. Again, related to this, Olthuis stated that worldview is

a framework or set of fundamental beliefs through which we view the world and our calling and future in it. This vision need not be fully articulated: it may be so internalized that it goes largely unquestioned; . . . it may be greatly refined through cultural-historical development.[[222]](#footnote-222)

Haydn was undoubtedly influenced by several factors in his composition of *Creation.* One of these was almost certainly Gottfried van Swieten, whose worldview was unquestionably enlightened. Swieten’s political reputation for the endorsement of Enlightenment philosophy was matched by his educational reforms and musical activities. He formed the *Gesellschaft der Associierten* to proliferate taste in art and morality, believing that these were sufficient to form an ideal society. In fact, his *Gesellschaft der Associierten,* commissioned Haydn to compose *The Creation.*[[223]](#footnote-223)Certainly he may have influenced Haydn to produce meaning in the work of which Haydn was not fully aware. However as Schroeder convincingly argues, Haydn was also significantly influenced by the writings of Shaftesbury and Gellert held in his own library. Together these influences prompted Haydn to demonstrate an operative worldview that created the deistic message above in at least three ways: (1) It created Haydn’s purpose for *The Creation*, as derived from his own words—which was a departure from the apologetic purposes of Handelian oratorio and resonant with deism and aesthetic moralism; (2) It prompted him to use a libretto that accommodated the “Representation of Chaos,” an aspect of creation that was universalist rather than orthodox in nature—and neglected to portray the event of the Fall; and (3) It prompted his use of a mixture of musical styles and text music relationships that idealize nature and portray a rescinding of the sublime as demonstrated from the combined studies of Danuser, Kramer, Webster, and Levarie. Although many studies including this one note the significant impact of the Enlightenment upon Haydn’s compositional activity, his love for God was also clear. His contemporaneous biographer wrote, “All his larger scores begin with the words *In nomine Domini*, and end with *Laus Deo* or *Soli Deo Gloria* [In the name of the Lord, Praise to God, To God alone the glory].”[[224]](#footnote-224) However, these two aspects of his personality were certainly compatible with enlightened Catholicism.

Besides being a landmark in the history of western art music, Haydn’s *Creation* was part of a massive shift in musical meaning and the transformation of relationships between text and music as exemplified within the genre of oratorio. Other religious vocal works, such as Stillingfleet and Smith’s *Paradise Lost* (1760),[[225]](#footnote-225) C. P. E. Bach’s *Auferstehung und Himmelfahrt Jesu* (1777–78),[[226]](#footnote-226) and Benedict Kraus’s *Creation* (before 1790)[[227]](#footnote-227) also contributed to this transition.

The transformation did not end with Haydn. As the succeeding Romantic era unfolded, it would ultimately, in Yifat Shohat’s words, effect the “replacement of the mechanistic model [based upon cause and effect] with idealist. . . . Idealism sets music apart from its previous rhetorical ties since it avoids any particular messages that are targeted directly at an attentive listener.”[[228]](#footnote-228) Haydn’s *Creation* is positioned in the crossroads between a formalist approach to music in which musical meaning—especially in texted music—is tied to rhetoric, and the idealist approach in works composed to be “absolute and autonomous,”[[229]](#footnote-229) in which meaning ultimately would be received subjectively by the listener. *The* *Creation’s* seeming refutation of normative standards regarding music as a partner to sacred text places it squarely at this juncture.

Haydn’s *Creation* clearly demonstrates that the manner in which a composer combines sacred text and music is a function of his or her operating worldview, and that the composer’s approach to text-music relationships sends a theological message. Thus, it would seem sacred music cannot be viewed as autonomous—as held by Romantic composers and some ancient Greek thinkers—as taking place in a “self-contained world of sound,” but rather must be viewed as that which is “rationally based and logically developed, exemplif[ying] the structural principles of all reality, including the human mind.”[[230]](#footnote-230) Hence, the comprehensive dynamics of theology, philosophy, science, literature, history, music, and aesthetics—the entire cultural environment—must ultimately be taken into consideration in the creation of sacred music, in order to ensure orthodox integrity in the robust meaning, i.e., the functional theology, of a given work. It would seem that for those concerned with functional theology—the true devotional impact of sacred music—that the timeless principles of Scripture must be applied in the consideration of these complex dynamics, as it is these dynamics that influence the music’s ultimate effect upon the listener. It is hoped that the present study will have implications for composers as well as scholars, and that contemporary writers of sacred music will seek to exemplify scriptural worldview and values in their works and circumspectly avoid cultural influences and values that may distort an otherwise orthodox Christian perspective and message.

# “We’re Gonna Change This Land”: An Oral History Commemorating the Fiftieth Anniversary of *Good News: A Christian Folk-Musical*

Will Bishop[[231]](#footnote-231)

On Thursday, June 1, 1967, Bob Oldenburg finished work on a new eighteen-song musical that he and a team of amateur song writers had been writing and arranging since the previous fall. Nine days later, on Saturday, June 10, 1967, a hastily assembled volunteer choir of one-hundred young people, after only six days of practice, gave the premier performance of the fifty-five minute long work to the campers at Glorieta Baptist Assembly in New Mexico. The musical was titled *Good News: A Christian Folk-Musical*.

*Good News* was unlike any other evangelical church music that had come before. Instead of traditional piano and organ accompaniment, *Good News* featured students playing folk and rock-influenced rhythms on guitars, banjos, piano, electric bass, and drums. The songs and drama in *Good News* dealt honestly with taboo issues of the day such as hypocrites, skeptics, hippies, and the “generation gap.” That first performance of *Good News* in the hot summer New Mexico desert launched a new and influential, albeit short-lived, genre of evangelical church music: the Christian youth musical.[[232]](#footnote-232) Moreover, it introduced pop-styled music to Southern Baptist churches. Many of the common elements of today’s evangelical church music (such as the use of pop-styled music in worship, the use of rhythm instruments, the use of a praise team singing with microphones in front of the choir, and the use of sound amplification and stage lighting to name a few) can be traced back to *Good News*.

Though labeled a “musical,” *Good News* is better classified as a compilation of eighteen Christian-themed folk songs for choir and soloists accompanied by rhythm instruments. A character, known in the script only as “The Reactor,” serves as a protagonist. At several points during the work “The Reactor” addresses the choir from the crowd as if he were a heckler. After considering the gospel message given by the choir, “The Reactor” chooses to reject Christ and walks out of the performance.

Far more interesting than the actual music of *Good News* is the story of its creation. *Good News* was birthed in the mind of an ambitious sixteen-year-old guitar player who longed for a medium to communicate the joy of Christ in a way that would appeal to fellow teens. It was crafted by an unlikely team of amateur musicians who, in spite of opposition, worked tirelessly to complete the work. No one, not even those who created it, could have conceived then how this experimental “musical” would go on to alter the course of evangelical church music.

What made *Good News* a major milestone in the history of evangelical church music is not the music itself. The real reason is two-fold. First, *Good News* led to mass numbers of teenaged Baby Boomers getting involved in their church youth choirs, as *Good News* allowed them to communicate the gospel message through their own music and their own language. Many of those youth are still serving in church music ministries today. Second, Broadman’s publication of *Good News* helped introduce and legitimize pop-styled church music and the use of guitar, bass, and drum set in church music. Had *Good News* been released by another publisher it might not have had the widespread acceptance among conservative evangelicals that it enjoyed. By virtue of being published by Broadman Press, conservative evangelicals, especially Southern Baptists, were more open to accepting this new type of musical drama.

To commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of this groundbreaking and historically significant work, the author has compiled quotations from many who were involved in the creation of *Good News*, sang *Good News* in their church youth choirs, or were directly impacted by the legacy of *Good News*. Each quotation, unless otherwise noted, was taken from recorded telephone interviews conducted by the author between May 2013 and October 2016. The quotations have been edited for grammar and some words have been inserted by the author in brackets for clarity. The title in parenthesis beside each speaker’s name reflects their position or role in 1966 and 1967.

It is the author’s goal that this article will shed light on the historical impact of *Good News* as well as preserve the thoughts, memories, and opinions of those who were involved in its production so that future church music historians can better understand their motivations and intentions.

## Youth Choirs Before *Good News*

ELWYN RAYMER (Music Editor, The Baptist Sunday School Board Church Music Department): [Music for youth choirs before *Good News* was] pretty bland—most of the time it was music written for adult choirs with no regard for youth voices. It was pretty much a bland diet, I think that’s the reason why some of the youth musicals [did so well], because it was fresh and new.

BILLY APPLING (Minister of Music): I remember when I first started there was nothing written for kids. You did things that adults did. The kids didn’t come, and we weren’t reaching kids singing what the adults were singing.

## Up with People

The musical motivation most directly tied to the creation of *Good News* was not the Beatles, Bob Dylan, or any other pop-music super act of that era. Instead, *Good News* was based on the music and performance style of Up with People, a traveling singing group established in 1965 by the quasi-religious group Moral Rearmament that featured a trio of young, guitar-playing singers backed by a large choir of teenagers. The songs performed by Up with People were upbeat, energetic, and catchy and featured lyrics emphasizing positive thinking, morality, and patriotism. When Up with People performed in Nashville in January 1966 they established a local spin-off group called Sing Out South.

EDDIE LUNN (*Good News* co-creator): Up with People did five shows that week [early January 1966] in Nashville. Out of those shows they spun off a group in Nashville called Sing Out South. The trio for that group was Cabot Wade, Ted Overman, and myself. Bill Cates played piano, and his brother Bob Cates played drums.[[233]](#footnote-233)

STEPHEN HALL (Youth Choir Member, later, Church Music Historian): In Southern Baptist churches ministers working with youth were just as confused as those in any other church in 1966. Where could they turn next in an attempt to interest their young people? They had already used over and over the ideas of hootenanny, youth services, youth cantata and even choir trips and tours. Youth had been fed a steady diet of Billy Graham movies (*The Restless Ones*, *For Pete’s Sake*, etc.), the Spurrlows and similar groups and still youth interest and participation was sagging—badly. Even youth revivals did not excite them much anymore. And to top everything else, there was something new outside the church (as if there was not already enough competition) attracting many young people. The “Up with People” movement was in full swing in 1966 and was making its presence nationally known through the group “Sing Out ’66.” How were ministers of music supposed to compete with the folk sound and moral message of “Sing Out” without the young people involved rejecting them as negativists who were more concerned about losing their youth choirs than not having any youth to whom they could minister?[[234]](#footnote-234)

BOB OLDENBURG (*Good News* Co-Creator and Arranger): I moved to Nashville in January of 1966. At that time, Up with People was just beginning its real impact on the youth culture of the day. And all across the country, where the Up with People groups would sing, they would leave in their path a group formed. Now the young people they impacted were not the regular kids off the street—these were kids in the church. All of the sudden, the ministers of music in Nashville discovered that the kids were leaving the church in droves, and the youth music programs were going down the drain. . . . [They] started saying something to the [Church] Music Department “Hey, we’ve got to do something!” and they said, “Just do what you’re doing—they’ll come back.”[[235]](#footnote-235)

## The Germ of An Idea: Spring 1966

Eddie Lunn (b. 1949) was just 16 years old when he approached Baptist Sunday School Board employee Cecil McGee (1917–2007) in the spring of 1966 with his idea to create a religious version of Up with People. McGee, who was the Drama Consultant for the Baptist Sunday School Board’s Church Recreation Department, knew that he lacked the musical skills needed to create Lunn’s vision; however, McGee thought that Bob Oldenburg (1935–2004), who had just been hired by the Church Recreation Department a few weeks earlier, might be interested in what Lunn and fellow Sing Out South leader Ted Overman (b. 1946) were proposing.

EDDIE LUNN: When Sing Out South was, in the words of Genesis 1, without form and void, there were auditions for the trio and rhythm players. I was picked to play guitar and Ted played bass. Ted came over to my house and we were talking about how to lead this group and keep it together. So as we started talking, time starting flying and we came to this statement in the wee hours of the morning; “Isn’t it a shame that the church doesn’t have something like this.” Not just the church in general; the specific Southern Baptist church that we both went to. We started talking about that and I said, “You know, I’ve got a friend named Cecil McGee that I’d like to run this by” and he said, “Oh yeah, let’s do that.” That’s what led to my call to Cecil which in turn led to Cecil’s brilliant decision to forward the idea to Bob Oldenburg and ultimately to the first meeting with Bob, me, Cecil, and Ted. The fact that Cecil took my ideas seriously is a credit to Cecil. Cecil and I met in 1960 and I did some dramas for him when I was a kid. Cecil and I had a great relationship. I felt like I could pick up the phone and call him and he would always answer. When Cecil heard the idea, he was smart enough to know that he should turn it over to the new guy at the Board, Bob Oldenburg.

BOB OLDENBURG: They came to Cecil and said, “Hey Cecil, we like what we’re doing in Sing Out South. We like what’s happening [and] we’re able to express good morals and good things and we have an excitement about ourselves. We’re able to express ourselves in the language and the music that we can understand. Why can’t we do something like this in the church?” Well Cecil, when you say something like that to him, it’s like saying “sic” to a dog—he went after it. Of course, Cecil’s music ability (cough) lacks a little bit (laughter in the room). But, he knew that I had some music training, so he turned to me and said, “Bob, why don’t we think about this as a possibility?”[[236]](#footnote-236)

BILLY RAY HEARN (*Good News* Choir Director): Bob [Oldenburg] was the natural one to do it. He had been trained as a musician and a youth worker in college and seminary. He had served several large Texas churches as organist and as youth director. He was now employed by the Southern Baptist Sunday School Board as a church recreation consultant. He was in touch with young people every day. He and several other young composers had already begun composing songs with the new “folk sound.”[[237]](#footnote-237)

EDDIE LUNN: Our thought was, “What if there was a tool out there that could enliven youth church music?” We wanted it to be more attractive than a cantata and involve a lot of people. What we came up with was basically a copy of Up with People. If you look at the staging it’s a twin. We had a trio, two guitars and bass out front and two-hundred kids behind with choreography. Literally, it’s a twin.

## Testing Christian Folk Music at Glorieta: Summer 1966

In the spring of 1966, the team of Oldenburg, McGee, Lunn, and Overman presented their idea for a folk music-styled evangelistic musical work to Dr. William J. Reynolds (1920–2009), the second-in-command at the Baptist Sunday School Board’s Church Music Department. Reynolds was reluctant to commit to the idea (there were no songs written yet; only vague ideas) and suggested that since this project was coming out of the Church Recreation Department, they should conduct a test at Church Recreation Week at both Glorieta Baptist Assembly in New Mexico and Ridgecrest Baptist Assembly in North Carolina that summer to see how young people would respond to religious folk music. They agreed to meet again after the test.

It was during the folk music “test” at Glorieta in the summer of 1966 that Billy Ray Hearn (1929–2015) met Oldenburg and learned of his plans to write Christian folk music. Hearn, who would later go on to become one of the founding fathers of the Contemporary Christian Music Industry, was at this time serving as Minister of Music at the First Baptist Church of Thomasville, Georgia.

EDDIE LUNN: I can’t remember now exactly how that went down, but I’m pretty sure the conversation went something like this. Reynolds said “The Church Music Department isn’t putting a penny into this thing. If you guys want to play with it during your weeks at Ridgecrest and Glorieta, go for it and we’ll see what the results are. Then we’ll talk dollars.” So that summer [of 1966], the Recreation Department decided to experiment with a large number of young people singing contemporary-folk and gospel songs accompanied by guitars, basses, drums, etc. rather than the traditional piano and organ. The experiment took place during Recreation Week at Glorieta and Ridgecrest.

BOB OLDENBURG: We didn’t put it in the regular schedule—it was an afternoon activity. We said “if you want to come and learn some new songs and sing together, come over to the little auditorium.” So they started coming into the little auditorium, about 40 or 50 of them, and we learned several of the songs that Eddie Lunn taught them. Now Eddie was one of the leaders of Sing Out South . . . and Eddie taught them those songs along with some other folk songs. At the end of the week, we presented them as a fellowship. The audience just went wild, and, of course, they wanted to know ‘Where can we get this?’ “How can we take this home and teach it to our kids?”[[238]](#footnote-238)

BILLY RAY HEARN: I remember sitting in “Room N” at the Glorieta Baptist Assembly in New Mexico with Bob Oldenburg and several other Baptist recreation consultants from Nashville. I had just rehearsed about fifty high school young people who were attending the youth conference in a musical program using a daring new style—“religious folk music.” There were ten or twelve guitar players, a tambourine, and a make-shift electric bass. The enthusiasm of the group and the excitement they created brought about a serious discussion by the leaders. The result was that Bob Oldenburg would put together a complete program of original music and drama that would give Christian youth a statement of their faith using the new singing style.[[239]](#footnote-239)

## The Creation of *Good News*: Fall 1966–Summer 1967

The folk music “tests” at Glorieta and Ridgecrest in the summer of 1966 were a resounding success. However, the leaders of the Church Music Department were still reluctant to take on the risk of publishing pop-styled music for the church. Despite this, the team of Oldenburg, McGee, Lunn, and Overman pressed on, and in the fall of 1966 began writing songs for what would become *Good News*.

Work on *Good News* continued from November 1966 until June 1967. During that time it was decided that *Good News* would be premiered at Glorieta in June of 1967 and then performed there every Saturday night throughout the summer. In the spring of 1967, the team of Oldenburg, McGee, Lunn, and Overman choose Billy Ray Hearn to conduct the premier performance.

BOB OLDENBURG: [The folk music test at Glorieta] was at the end of the summer [1966]. From September to the first of November we approached the music department and said, “Hey, we need to come up with some sort of an instrument—a tool that the kids can use in their churches that is of this type.” They said, “Well, it’s more of the fellowship type of music so you all do it.” And we said, “That’s what we wanted to know.” . . . The four of us sat down and we just brainstormed for several hours on a Thursday afternoon up there in Nashville—cold, windy, nasty weather—and we asked the Lord to give us the direction for it. Those days went fast because a lot of things developed quickly.[[240]](#footnote-240)

BOB BOYD (Secretary of the Church Recreation Department): Bob Oldenburg came into the department around the time that I became head of the [Church Recreation] Department. He was a real talented guy and a good musician. In my mind, the Church Recreation Department was an agency that developed programs and then trained churches to utilize those programs to reach youth. So when Bob and Eddie Lunn and all them started talking about it, I said, “It sounds good to me.” From then on, Bob and Cecil McGee, and to some extent, Frank Hart Smith,[[241]](#footnote-241) all worked to develop this thing. It had little spurts and starts, but eventually you could see that it was going to be a real product. I wondered if the Church Music Department would want to take it over completely, but then they didn’t want it at all.

BOB OLDENBURG: [Our] purpose was to create, compose, and compile a folk musical with a Christian theme expressing the excitement of sharing Christ. One driving desire seemed to fill their minds . . . to express the joy of abundant living through the medium of teen-age musical expression. It wasn’t difficult to think of ideas. They came in torrents and floods. The problem was pinpointing priorities—what were the most important things to say and sing. Slowly and surely, through the leadership of the Holy Spirit, ideas crystallized, concepts cemented, and a progression developed.[[242]](#footnote-242)

EDDIE LUNN: There were no assigned topics or even an idea of what topics to cover or any kind of script when we got started writing. I had never written a song in my life—neither had Ted or Cecil. Only Bob had ever written songs prior. There was no plan or form—it was without form and void. Most of the actual arrangement came together during the six days of rehearsal at Glorieta. I had zero contribution to the music writing prior to co-writing one of the songs and co-writing the music to another while we were at Glorieta. My main job during the song writing process was to add the guitar chords to the score.

BOB BOYD: There was an enormous amount of resources that were given to creating *Good News*. Bob Oldenburg gave nearly all of his time to the project and Cecil gave a considerable amount of his time. Frank Hart Smith worked on it here and there. There was a lot of time that went into testing it at Rec Lab and at Glorieta. I doubt that there were many pieces of music produced that ever took that much time. The resources that the Sunday School Board put into it were enormous. Looking back, I’m amazed that I didn’t panic and stop it.

EDDIE LUNN: There were a whole bunch of people who contributed lyrics or music to *Good News*. Betsy McCully and Bill Cates were both with Up with People. Betsy later married Ted Overman. Johnny Fullerton was a Nashville trumpet player who knew Bob from Belmont Heights [Baptist Church] in Nashville. Frank Hart Smith worked with Bob and Cecil at the Church Recreation Department. Rick Watley and Roger Copeland were friends of Bob and they submitted a song to us at Rec Lab in February 1967. I believe they were both recreation ministers from Texas.

BILLY RAY HEARN: It was only eight months later [April 1967] that he [Oldenburg] called me to come to Nashville to preview the complete new program to be called “*Good News,” A Christian folk musical*. He wanted me to direct the first performance.[[243]](#footnote-243)

EDDIE LUNN: When we played *Good News* for Billy Ray the first time we finished with the very last song and turned to Billy Ray and said, “What do you think?” He said “Well . . . well . . . well . . . I just don’t like it.” He had a different idea—his idea was not based on Up with People. Instead, he saw it as a select group of ten or twelve kids with a banjo, piano, etc. He didn’t see the need for the mass choir. Billy Ray saw it more as pure hootenanny.

BOB BOYD: When I heard the first dribs and drabs of *Good News*, the one thing that I could not abide with was drums. I just could not imagine drums in my church by my pulpit. I grumbled and mumbled about it, but I didn’t do anything about it because they were integral to the product itself.

## Test at “Rec Lab”: February 1967

In February 1967, Bob Oldenburg and Eddie Lunn took the songs that had been written to that point and previewed them to a group of church recreation leaders and youth pastors at an event called “Rec Lab” held at Highland Lakes Baptist Encampment. Oldenburg passed out photocopies of his handwritten scores to the attendees and led them in sight-reading the songs from *Good News* while he accompanied from the piano and Lunn played the guitar. As it happened, Dr. William L. Howse (1905–1977), a prominent leader at the Baptist Sunday School Board, was in attendance.

BOB OLDENBURG: By February [1967], when we had Rec Lab down here at Highland Lakes, we had about ten numbers that we brought down there to youth ministers, recreators, and so forth, and we presented it to them. And several of them got involved in it. They sang them—and it just so happened that Dr. Howse was going to visit Rec Lab the last night of the week. And we presented to him those songs we had learned . . . and he said, “Man, that is something else!—we’ve got to do something with that.” He went back to the Board—of course he at that time was over all of the church programs services: Church Music, Church Training, Sunday School, and all of them—and he went directly to [the] Church Music [Department] and said, “Y’all listen to what Church Recreation is doing—they’ve got something, so you better take note of it.”[[244]](#footnote-244)

EDDIE LUNN: I was there with Bob [Oldenburg] at Highland Lakes. I was invited for the purpose of “previewing” this new church music form. There was a curiously positive interest from the group. There were even two guys who pitched a song to us: “Stand Amazed.”[[245]](#footnote-245) It made it in.

## The Roles of the Church Recreation Department and the Church Music Department

From the beginning, the Baptist Sunday School Board’s Church Music Department did not want to be involved in the creation of *Good News*. This caused a major problem for Oldenburg and McGee as the Church Recreation Department was not allowed to publish any music; any and all music produced by the Baptist Sunday School Board had to be produced by the Church Music Department. In the end, the conflict was resolved only when Dr. James L. Sullivan (1910–2004), the President of the Baptist Sunday School, forced the Church Music Department to produce *Good News*. Reynolds assigned Church Music Department Music Editor Elwyn Raymer (b. 1935) the task of making *Good News* a publishable product.

EDDIE LUNN: In the early thinking of the vision, Bill Reynolds and some other people in that department were thinking, ‘Are y’all trying to do a Beatles thing or a rock thing?” And we really weren’t. We’d already asked ourselves that question and we knew that was too much of a jump. It wouldn’t have made sense; the people would have rejected it summarily without even listening. Up with People was the model, and the genre was hootenanny.

PHILLIP LANDGRAVE (Composer and Church Music Professor): The Music Department was not the father of *Good News*—the Sunday School Board Recreation Department gave birth to it. They went to the Music Department and asked them to publish it, and they said, “Not on your life! We don’t do that kind of music.” But James Sullivan, who was the head of the Sunday School Board, liked the idea, so he went to the Music Department and said, “You *will* publish *Good News*.”

BOB BOYD: I talked with both [Dr. W. Hines] Sims (1908–1997) and [Dr. William J.] Reynolds, and they had very similar reactions.[[246]](#footnote-246) They both thought, “We don’t think this is church music and this is not something that church choirs should be doing.” They thought it was downgrading the kind of music that they were trying to promote. The final “yes” came from Dr. Sullivan. He said, “This is good, we ought to do something with this,” and of course Church Music went with it and they assigned it to Elwyn Raymer to work on it because we [Church Recreation] were not a music producer, but our staff were the ones who wrote it. If Dr. Sullivan had been hands off and said, “Music is the Music Department’s business; that’s it. They’ve decided so forget it,” that would have been the end of it. Had that happened, he [Oldenburg] might have gone somewhere else to get it produced. I’m just guessing at that based on his personality.”

BOB OLDENBURG: It [*Good News*] did not start in the Church Music Department. Let me set your mind straight on that—in fact, the Church Music Department *refused* to let it start there. We were in the Church Recreation Department.[[247]](#footnote-247)

ELWYN RAYMER: We [the Church Music Department] weren’t really enthused about it because it didn’t seem to be good music. That’s the position I took. I didn’t want to do it or get involved with it.

## Rehearsals at Glorieta: June 1967

In the summer of 1967, Glorieta hosted twelve consecutive weeks of summer camps. Each week was for a particular Southern Baptist entity: Church Training Week, Sunday School Week, Church Music Week, WMU Week, etc. Oldenburg, McGee, Lunn, and Hearn arrived just days before the start of the first week of summer activities.[[248]](#footnote-248) They, with the help of Glorieta Staff Activities Director Jim Stanton (1938–2016),[[249]](#footnote-249) worked to assemble a choir from the college-aged “staffers” who worked at the camp. The team only had six days to teach the new songs to the make-shift choir before the scheduled premier concert on Saturday night, June 10, 1967.

EDDIE LUNN: A letter was sent to all the staffers explaining the concept of *Good News*. Everybody signed it: Bob, Billy Ray, Cecil, and myself. I think it was sent on Baptist Sunday School Board letterhead. We also said in the letter, “If you play an instrument, bring your instrument.” The kids knew something different and fun was going to happen, and they came in excited.

BOB OLDENBURG: We finished it, took it out to Glorieta at the last of May/first of June, and taught it to 90 staffers. During that week of teaching it to them, it went through a lot of changes because by that time we didn’t even have the instrument or the vehicle by which it was going to be communicated to the audience, whether it was dialog or what. And the guy who is now in the Church Recreation Department [Don Mattingly] was our first Reactor. During that week we threw out two songs and added another song.[[250]](#footnote-250)

DON MATTINGLY (Glorieta Staff): I graduated from Baylor and then got in my car and drove straight to Glorieta for my job. My first afternoon there, Oldenburg found me and said, “I’ve got something I want to talk to you about. Meet me upstairs in New Mexico Hall tonight at 6:30.” So the first night I got there they introduced the idea of *Good News* to me. Some of the manuscripts they had of the music were just pencil—they weren’t published or typeset at all. I just saw some legal-size-pad pieces of paper with words on it. They said, “There’s a part in it called ‘The Reactor’ and we want to ask you if you would be willing to play this part.” I said, “Absolutely.” They said, “We need you to go through these practices, and we need you to learn the music because we haven’t decided whether the Reactor should become a Christian at the end of it, or whether he doesn’t. You think about and let us know which way the Reactor should act.” By the first time we practiced it, I was completely assured that the Reactor character should walk out and reject Christ.

EDDIE LUNN: The part of “The Reactor” was inserted at Cecil’s request to fill the need for a theatric continuity line. All the music sung by the Reactor was written at Glorieta. I think Bob wrote all those tunes and lyrics in one night during the rehearsal week.

LOU STANTON (Glorieta Staff, Wife of the late Jim Stanton): Jim and I met at Glorieta in 1966 and married in 1967. On our honeymoon we stopped in Nashville to call some friends. One of the people he called was Bob Oldenburg, and that was when we first heard of *Good News*. We still didn’t know what we were getting into when we left to go back to Glorieta for that summer married as staffers. Jim was the Director of Staff Activities and also directed the staff choir, which was one of the optional staff activities. It was put out there as “come if you want to.” He usually had about fifty or sixty kids who, had it not been for *Good News*, would have just been singing the normal songs that you would normally find for youth choir.

EDDIE LUNN: Rehearsals for the staff choir began Monday, June 5, 1967, and the first presentation came on Saturday, June 10, 1967. These dates are significant in that they are the exact dates of the “Six Day War” in the Middle East.

DON MATTINGLY: The feeling among the staffers in the choir was growing excitement as we got closer to that first presentation. We had never sung songs like that! As we started putting it together and practicing it more and more they really got into it.

EDDIE LUNN: There was an excitement in that room that you couldn’t describe. The rehearsals had to occur all day long because of the staffers’ work schedules. Bob and the production team would begin rehearsal at 5:30 am with the breakfast staff and end at 10:00 pm when all the staffers had curfew. On that first day, every two hours or so, we’d have to go back through the description of the musical and explain what we were going to do to every new group who came in. We generally had about twenty to thirty singers at a time in each group. That first day was really weird, but the enthusiasm and buy-in from the staffers was 100% from day one.

DON MATTINGLY: Rehearsals were a come-and-go kind of affair. We started with who was there and people would join as they could get there and leave when they had to.

EDDIE LUNN: We were unaware of the rehearsal arrangements until day one. That first night it hit us that we were not going to have the whole choir together until Saturday night. So on day two we told the staffers, “Hey guys, we’re not going to be all together until Saturday night so we’ve got to be good in rehearsal.”

EDDIE LUNN: The rehearsals with the Glorieta staffers revealed that several songs had to be rearranged or rewritten. Some songs rehearsed on one day would be completely different the next day. The song “Sunday’s Child” had to be rewritten because the music just didn’t work. The third night of rehearsals Billy Ray and I said “Let’s rewrite this song.” We spent from about 1:00 to 3:00 am rewriting the music for Frank Hart Smith’s lyrics. Another song that had to be totally rewritten was “Wake Up and Live.” Billy Ray rewrote that one. You can really hear his enthusiastic spirit in that song.

BILLY RAY HEARN: In sixty-something years in the music business, that song [“Wake Up and Live”] was the only song I ever wrote.

DON MATTINGLY: Billy Ray, when he was around, was leading. But [Jim] Stanton had a strong drama background, and he was the guy that we leaned on after all those other guys left. A lot of the way *Good News* evolved that summer was due to Jim. He made a big contribution by making that choir really good.

EDDIE LUNN: Bob was the keyboard accompanist for rehearsals and the first performance. He also led devotionals during rehearsals. Billy Ray was the choir director during the rehearsals and the first performance as well as the recording a few weeks later. He had a good sense of what songs “worked” and which didn’t, and if a song didn’t work with the staffers in the choir he’d recommend that we rewrite it. Cecil was the theatrical advisor and also led some of the rehearsal devotionals, Jim Stanton was the unsung hero of *Good News*. He was tasked with producing *Good News* every Saturday night after we all left. My job was to lead the instrumentalists. I rehearsed the instrumentalists just like we did the staffers in the choir. The instrumental rehearsals went on all day due to staff work schedules.

LOU STANTON: Jim was very excited about the possibilities that he saw and heard in *Good News*. He felt that he was not creative enough to take part in the actual composition of it, but, when they told him what they planned to do, he could sense that it was unique. However, when he heard it, he had to admit that he was a little bit nervous because of the drums and the guitars.

EDDIE LUNN: Jim worked tirelessly to make difficulties disappear for other people without ever thinking about personal recognition. No, he did not have any input into the creative or production side, but he, nonetheless, took on the job of making sure God’s will in *Good News* was carried out flawlessly. Jim took over the staff choir from Billy Ray Hearn just like a champion Olympic 4x100 relay team hands off a baton—brilliantly! And he did it without ever thinking about where the awards stand was located.

## The Debut Performance at Glorieta: June 10, 1967

After just six days of rehearsal, the staff choir and instrumentalists premiered *Good News* late in the evening of Saturday, June 10, 1967, in the Holcomb Auditorium at Glorieta. Despite fears that the audience might reject this new form of pop-styled church music, those in attendance loved the new musical and gave a standing ovation at its conclusion.

It is hard to overstate the historical significance of this event. All pop-styled church choir music written for the evangelical church in the past fifty years can trace its lineage to this first performance of *Good News*. Had the audience’s response been negative, it might have dramatically changed the history of contemporary church music, especially for Southern Baptists.

PHILIP H. BRIGGS (Youth Pastor): In June 1967, staffers of Glorieta Assembly began rehearsing the music. On Saturday night of Church Training Week, *Good News* premiered—without printed scores or scripts. Thereafter, on Saturday nights throughout the summer, the staff choir presented the musical.[[251]](#footnote-251)

EDDIE LUNN: On the night of the premier, there were three hours of programing in the chapel ahead of the performance. Right before we went on stage, because the night’s activities had gone longer than planned, we had to scramble backstage to get permission for the staffers to stay up past curfew. Jim [Stanton] is the one who got the permission for the staffers to stay out past curfew for the premier. Some of the Glorieta leadership really didn’t like the concept of *Good News* or the extra burden that it was putting on Glorieta and the staffers. They made their position clear, but Jim got them to concede to letting the staff stay out that night. Had Jim not been there to do that—you talk about a train wreck!

Once that was taken care of, we said, “What are we going to say?” And so Cecil went out and said “We understand it’s late—we did not plan on having to start so late. We understand that there are children here and if you need to leave please feel free to get up and leave. We’re going to take some time to get set up, but if you want to stay, we’ll be presenting it in about fifteen minutes.” Bob and I—Billy Ray was backstage with the cast—we were looking out and we were both scared that 50% of the people would leave. When Cecil came back up on the stage [fifteen minutes later to start the show] I couldn’t tell that there was any difference. I turned to Bob, because by then he was away from the door, and I said, “Bob, nobody has left!” He said, “What?!” and he came over to the door and looked and he was stunned!

LOU STANTON: Jim was a little fearful about how it would be accepted.

EDDIE LUNN: We were all so excited that we started that first song about twenty or thirty [beats per minute] faster than it should have been!

DON MATTINGLY: It took the crowd a little bit before they really got into it because it was so different. But by the time it was over they were clapping and really experiencing something new.

LOU STANTON: It was stunning! It was so different from any church music that we had ever done or I had ever heard before. Then, as we began to let it develop over the next several weeks and began to see the impact that it was having on the lives of the staffers, we really felt like this was something that God was going to be able to use.

DON MATTINGLY: I think we all were nervous that first night. I don’t think it really hit us that we were in on something that might change youth ministry or the type of music done in churches. We were just a group of high school and college students at Glorieta that got into something that we really enjoyed.

LOU STANTON: I really don’t remember any negative reactions. I remember a little bit of maybe shock when it begins with the choir all running down the aisle. But by the time it was over they were very much into it.

PHILIP H. BRIGGS: This author was in attendance at both Highland Lake and Glorieta when *Good News* was presented and was startled by what he heard and saw. Opposition was not absent, but sounds of protest were lost among the positive notes of “give us more!” It was a never-to-be-forgotten happening that spread like a prairie fire across the Southern Baptist Convention and into the publishing of new youth musicals.[[252]](#footnote-252)

EDDIE LUNN: Bob Oldenburg, Cecil, Billy Ray, and I all left Glorieta the next day [June 11, 1967] and left it [*Good News*] in the hands of Jim Stanton.

DON MATTINGLY: In weeks one and two people hadn’t heard about it. But as the summer went on, the excitement really grew. There was a buzz out in the audience before it even started. We started sensing that before the first beat in weeks three, four, five, six, and so on. They had heard of it, and the word about *Good News* was getting out. In the early weeks it was kind of a dead hall—the hall wasn’t always full in those early weeks. But as the summer went on the crowds got bigger and bigger and bigger until it got to where there were just as many people in there for *Good News* as there would be for the main nightly service prior to the performance. I don’t know how the word got out . . . maybe the people working at Glorieta told the people “be sure not to miss this!”

## Recording the Demonstation Album: July 1967

When the Church Music Department became involved in the production of publication of *Good News* in the spring of 1967, they scheduled a recording to take place in August 1967. When Dr. Reynolds heard the report of the positive response from the debut performance on June 10, he decided to move the recording date up to July 15 so that it could be recorded right before the start of Church Music Week. This decision was most likely made because Reynolds and Elwyn Raymer were already planning to be at Glorieta for Church Music Week. Reynolds’s decision had historical ramifications as well. At the mid-point of summer a new group of staffers came to work at the Glorieta and replaced those who had served in the early weeks. The decision to move the recording to mid-July meant that the original cast is the cast heard on the recording.

BOB OLDENBURG: The audience response was positive and it continued to build until the middle of the summer when the Church Music Department said, “Ok, we’ll go ahead and record it—we’re not saying we’ve got a product—but we’ll go ahead and record it.” We spent all night after the sixth week of the summer, just before Church Music Week started and recorded it with the staffers out there.[[253]](#footnote-253)

EDDIE LUNN: The recording was made on July 15, 1967. JoAnn Shelton from the Radio and Television Commission was the producer of the recording. Elwyn Raymer was there but at the time he was not too excited about the whole concept. As Music Editor for the Church Music Department it was his job to transcribe the work into a useable form for publishing.

DON MATTINGLY: The hardest thing that happened was when they did the recording. We stayed up all night. It just killed everybody because then they had to go back to making beds in the dorm buildings and working in the kitchen. That’s one of the longest nights that I can remember.

LOU STANTON: I remember when they made the recording. They made it at night so the auditorium would be quiet. Of course, the staffers had already worked hard all week long and they were so tired they could hardly stand up when they were recording. I remember one of the girls stood up and said, “Ok y’all, come on and stand up! We’re going to do some calisthenics!” So she led everyone in calisthenics so they would wake up to finish the recording.

EDDIE LUNN: Yes, they recorded us literally all night! If you listen to the recording of the song “The Greatest Miracle” on the record, you will notice on the second bridge the acoustic guitar fades out and then fades back in about eight bars later. That is because we recorded it around 3:00 am and during the take my left hand just went numb. Oldenburg, who was on keys, looked over at me like “What happened?!” all I could do was show him my hand trying to regain feeling. When it did, I started playing again. That ended up being the take they put on the album.

## Publishing *Good News:* January 1968

The recording and score of *Good News* were released on January 2, 1968. An astounding 72,576 copies of the score were sold in 1968 alone, making it the highest selling choral product sold by Broadman Press that year.[[254]](#footnote-254) While LifeWay, the successor to the Sunday School Board, has never released official sales totals for *Good News*, Oldenburg later estimated that it sold between 300,000 and 400,000 copies. Due to Baptist Sunday School Board policies, Oldenburg did not receive any royalties from sales of *Good News* because he was an employee of the Board at the time it was written.[[255]](#footnote-255)

BILLY RAY HEARN: Elwyn Raymer from the Baptist Sunday School Board came to Glorieta to write it down and put it in a form that could be sent out to the churches so they could perform it.[[256]](#footnote-256)

ELWYN RAYMER: There’s nowhere where you’ll see my name on *Good News*—because I didn’t want any identity with it. I thought, I have to do this, but I hate it, I think it’s trite, it’s intellectually boring . . . anything you want to say negative I said. It’s filled with imperfections if you rake through it—it’s got a lot of terrible mistakes in it, but no one cared—it hit a nerve. That’s where I had to come face to face with the impact that that little imperfect work was having on young people. It changed my life.

BOB OLDENBURG: [The] Church Music [Department] went ahead and started taking orders in the bookstore; by about the second after they started taking orders, they said “We’ve got more than enough orders to pay for the production of this piece,” and they went ahead and produced it. And they had to go into the tenth printing before they had enough to fill the orders that had already come in before it was released in January [1968]. So it was a product that developed out of a felt need.[[257]](#footnote-257)

## Churches Performing *Good News*

Even before its publication in January 1968, churches across America began performing *Good News* from photocopies of the original scores given to the staff choir members at Glorieta. Though the creators of *Good News* never designed the work to be performed as church music—they thought of it as music for fellowships or evangelistic events—many churches performed *Good News* as part of worship services. For the majority of these churches, it was the first time guitars, drums, or bass had ever been used in their sanctuaries. Other churches did not allow *Good News* to be performed in their sanctuaries—or at all!

BILLY RAY HEARN: We saw youth choirs go from ten to a hundred in a matter of weeks. And it was because of the music.[[258]](#footnote-258)

BOB OLDENBURG: When *Good News* first came as a piece that churches could use, our church in Nashville was one of the first ones that got it . . . our young people learned it quickly and took it out to the State Fair of Tennessee. And there on the midway . . . they had a flatbed truck and they put up a huge guitar behind it, similar to the symbol that was on the recording of *Good News*—and right there on the midway, they sang *Good News* to thousands and thousands of people for the fourteen days [of the fair].[[259]](#footnote-259)

LOU STANTON: When we came home [to Greensboro, Alabama,] after we had finished our summer work [at Glorieta], there were several students from Alabama—some in Tuscaloosa, some in Birmingham, some in Mobile—they all wanted to do it again. They all came to Greensboro and practiced and performed it for Greensboro Baptist Church. That was truly breaking the mold for that church! It was accepted very well. And then that group performed in Tuscaloosa—still without written music. After we performed it in Tuscaloosa there were several of the [University of Alabama] BSU kids who wanted to know if they could come and sing it with us. Our group grew and changed a little—it was no longer strictly Glorieta people. We performed it around the state five or six times between September and Christmas 1967.

LLOYD BELL (Minister of Music): I listened as I looked at the music and—as many other church musicians might then have done—mentally shook my head. What would everyone think about us doing that kind of thing? Why, I had even heard that some groups actually were going into places like shopping centers and making spectacles of themselves! The group was called together and the recording played. They responded electrically to the idiom! What was I to do? They *did* like it. But something also changed me. The youth in the church who had never been in a choir came to join us. We now had one hundred in choir. If that was their language, leading many to first-time testimonies, then I simply had to relent—and away we soared! Who was I to sit so squarely on traditional ideas? If God was speaking—really speaking—whatever the way, we must not hinder it. That was a wonderful year! We took out *Good News* to more than twenty locations. Before long I had entered into the spirit of it all so that the happiness radiated from me as well as the other singers. A new closeness sprang up among the entire group, and I felt a true bond with each individual.[[260]](#footnote-260)

AUBIE McSWAIN (Minister of Music): The World’s Fair was in San Antonio, Texas. The year was 1968. I was minister of music at North Side Baptist Church in Weatherford, Texas. We had a good youth choir. They were invited to sing at the World’s Fair. . . . A fellow music minister suggested that we sing *Good News*, the new youth musical that was doing great things in reaching people for Jesus. I already had said, “I can never do that kind of music in a service in an auditorium where people have assembled to worship God.” You see, my problem was that *Good News*, with its beat, guitars, and drums reminded me of my past. I had been a nightclub entertainer. . . . When I accepted Jesus as my personal Savior, I felt the only songs I should sing were traditional anthems, sacred hymns, or gospel songs and that my duty as a minister of music was to lead choirs to do the same. . . . Now, I searched for the nerve to play the recording of *Good News* to one of the youth choirs, and I was amazed to find that they wanted to learn it. We then combined the two youth choirs and began our rehearsals. . . . The choir grew to over 188 voices, and we saw scores saved who were in our own church and youth program. Among those were two electric guitar players, two drummers, and an electric bass player, all of whom formerly had played in their own dance bands.[[261]](#footnote-261)

FENTON MOREHEAD (Youth Pastor): *Good News* was a hit with our people [at First Baptist Church, West Palm Beach, Florida]. More than that, it was a springboard into the rest of the youth musicals, which God used in a powerful way.

HARLAN HALL (Minister of Music): I checked it out, and I knew instinctively that the youth would love it. And then I started hearing that everybody in Texas was doing it, and I said, “Well, we’ll give it a shot,” and it took off. It did what I wanted it to do; it pulled kids in off the street and into our choir.

GEORGE GAGLIARDI[[262]](#footnote-262) (Youth Choir Member): Back then I thought that if I was going to play guitar, the only way I could play was in a local garage band. Our church was pretty staunchly conservative so I was dealing with all kinds of false guilt about playing. But there was no other place to play! When *Good News* was finally presented in our church, it was understood after the fact that it was one of the things that contributed to the minister of music being fired—there was quite an uproar. In my town [Paris, TX] in the 1960s, people thought “this is outrageous!”

DAVID O. DYKES[[263]](#footnote-263) (Youth Choir Member): I grew up in the First Baptist Church, Florala—named because the town is on the Florida-Alabama line. We had never sung anything other than choral music and cantatas, but our new music minister wanted us to do *Good News*. Because it had drums and guitars, the deacons wouldn’t let us do it in the sanctuary so we did it in the high school auditorium, which turned out to be a good thing because a lot of unchurched people came. Now, looking back at it as a pastor, I would have loved to have been in that meeting where the pastor was talking to the four or five deacons in that church about doing *Good News*. I can just hear one of those old deacons saying, “Ain’t no way we’re gonna have them drums and guitars in *our* church!”

HARRY COWAN (Minister of Music): In New Orleans [First Baptist Church, New Orleans] I did *Good News*. We had guitars and drum set and some brass and piano. This was a breakthrough in the church. It ruffled some feathers—I had a seminary professor [from New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary] whose son played guitar in my youth choir and that man wouldn’t let his son play with the group because he didn’t think the guitar should be used in church.

DON MATTINGLY: When I got to Southwestern Seminary, I wound up getting to be the youth director at Sagamore Hill Baptist Church [in Fort Worth]. . . . The first year I was at Southwestern Seminary [1968] we did a thing called “Youth Lab”—it was for college students who were youth ministers and other young youth ministers. I got the idea that we would bring the kids from Sagamore Hill out to do *Good News* and I would be Reactor. That was the last time I ever did the Reactor—at Southwestern Seminary with my kids singing. They were blown away by that 100-voice youth choir. This was the first Youth Lab ever held at Southwestern.

## Reactions to *Good News*

PHILLIP LANDGRAVE: The real breakthrough for Southern Baptists, for example, came in 1967–1968 with the publication of the “folk musical” *Good News* by Bob Oldenburg and others, published with some fear and trembling by Broadman Press. For the Baptist publisher to put its stamp of approval on the folk-pop-rock styles was indeed a *coup d’église*. The howls of protest were drowned out by the clamors for more of the same. The quiet debates concerning appropriateness were overwhelmed by the thunder of people walking aisles and the roaring of choir lofts bulging with new faces and old faces carrying brighter looks. Everyone wanted to get in on the act, and quite a significant number did.[[264]](#footnote-264)

MARTHA OLDENBURG (Wife of the late Bob Oldenburg): Right away the kids loved it just because it wasn’t a hymn. At that point, we were listening to other things on the radio and nothing we did in church sounded like that. The grandmas in the church didn’t like it because it put them out of their comfort zone. Most pastors were on the fence—they knew what it could do for young people, but they needed to keep their jobs and make all their folks happy.

BOB OLDENBURG: There was a resistance to the type of music that [*Good News*] was. This is noticed all across the country, where pastors have even stood up after the young people have started a presentation, *Good News*, for instance, and stopped it and said, “We will not have this in our church.” [Other] church youth groups [had] to go outside of their church buildings in order to do it. In other places it wasn’t allowed in the church at all.[[265]](#footnote-265)

EDDIE LUNN: In hindsight, the fact that some churches wouldn’t allow it to be performed in their sanctuaries was great! That was a totally unintended benefit that probably contributed to its popularity and its effectiveness as an evangelistic tool.

## The Effect of *Good News* on the History of Church Music

BILLY RAY HEARN: I believe this was the birth of a new form in the history of musical style. However, it was not meant to be a serious musical form in its beginnings. I don’t think anyone in those days thought it should be performed as a service in the church. This is the reason everyone connected with it was from the Church Recreation Department.[[266]](#footnote-266)

BILLY RAY HEARN: When we did *Good News* we never said it should in the church service—we said this is something to do after church at night as a fellowship or as a special event, but it didn’t take long for pastors to want it in the church.

DON MATTINGLY: After *Good News*, the purpose and the music done by youth choirs changed. It changed the direction of youth choir music forever.

EDDIE LUNN: There was never a vision of it changing church music for young people. It was only our desire to draw young people closer to the church by having something they actually enjoyed and could be enthusiastic about.

FENTON MOREHEAD: Those youth musicals were the catalyst of the revolution of church music in the Jesus Movement that is Contemporary Christian Music today. Jesus Music, as it was called then, really started out of those musicals. God used those youth musicals, and *Good News* was the first one.

MARTHA OLDENBURG: *Good News* has broadened our horizons as Southern Baptists to accept different kinds of music.

HUGH T. McELRATH (Church Music Professor and Hymnologist): History will probably judge a principal turning point in the story of Baptist church in recent decades to be the performance and publication of the message musical *Good News* in 1967. This work represented a culmination of the various secular trends influencing the music of Baptists during the 1950s and 1960s. . . . The influence of the lighter musical styles which *Good News* represented has pervaded all present-day areas of church music: vocal solo literature and older children’s choral music as well as music for youth and adult choirs and instrumental ensembles.[[267]](#footnote-267)

MARTHA OLDENBURG: I know that at that point he [Bob Oldenburg] was not worried about or even ever considered what this might do to the history of church music, he was concerned about the kids who were unreached right then. He was always focused on how it was going to bring God glory and edify the folks who are here on the earth. Everything he ever wrote was like that.

EDDIE LUNN: I think *Good News* changed the objectives of the creators of church music—let’s write something that will reach people outside of the four walls of the church. It also took church music to a younger age of people.

LOU STANTON: I was talking to my son the other day. He is the music director at a church here. His style is about as far as you can get from Jim’s style. Jim was a very formal church music person—pipe organs and the whole bit. But his son kept telling him, “Dad, what I am doing in church now is the equivalent of what you did back then with *Good News*. You broke the ice—you’re the one who started all this! I’m just following in your footsteps but going in a little bit different direction.” Jim had to admit that he was right; he could see exactly where he was coming from.

MARTHA OLDENBURG: When my two sons went on the staff of Fellowship Church in Grapevine [Texas], Bob and I went out there one Sunday when Bob was on vacation. We were sitting in the auditorium and the music started—and it was loud and “in-your-face.” He looked at me and rolled his eyes, and I leaned over and said; “You started it—you started this.” He just grinned. Later when we got outside he said, “I’m pretty sure I never intended it to sound like this.”

## The Lasting Legacy of *Good News*

EDDIE LUNN: [*Good News*] became very popular very quickly. I think partly because of the guitars and drums. Interestingly, the guitars and drums forced it out of church sanctuaries. It was performed in many secular venues; high school auditoriums, city squares, and public places like that. Due to that, you weren’t just drawing from your Baptist church youth population—you were drawing from those kids and their friends and other bystanders who happened to see it. To me, that helped create its popularity. That enabled it to reach more non-Christian or non-churched people. Also, *Good News* brought in youth other than just singers. In my youth choir in the mid-1960s it was guys and girls singing with a trained director and a trained pianist—that was it. *Good News* brought in different kinds of instrumentalists. It also brought in off-stage people: sound technicians, lighting people, choreographers, gaffers, logistics handlers, even make-up artists. Kids could be a part of this and experience the same joy and benefit as the singers, but never have to sing a note.

BOB OLDENBURG: As a writer, I have sort of ambivalent feelings [about *Good News*]. I was excited about being in the beginning of the development of it. But it’s sort of like having a baby in your family and then letting everybody else raise it. Because you have no control after it leaves your hand. And it just started happening all over the country. I’d get letters, I’d see bulletins from churches, [and] I’d read state papers and see where groups were doing it. It just seemed to be taking the Baptist churches and others that related to them by virtual storm.

ELWYN RAYMER: I consider *Good News* a really trite piece of work, but at the same time, if you’re a realist, you can’t just dismiss it because it met a need in a lot of people even with all those imperfections.

BILLY APPLING: When folk musicals came, the choir rooms began to be full. They could play the acoustic guitar and that was cool. This transformed youth choirs and it made the music accessible to the kids. Sunday afternoons were an exciting time because they had something to sink their teeth into. . . . The musicals allowed kids to be kids and to do tuneful and lively songs that had a message.

FENTON MOREHEAD: Through *Good News* the church began to recognize this new form of music and recognize it as valid. Because youth choirs did these youth musicals, the traditional church began to see the light that the old way isn’t always the best way to reach people. I believe God used *Good News* to open the eyes of the traditional church that a new kind of music was coming that could not be denied.

STEPHEN F. HALL: First, it [*Good News*] gave young people an opportunity to involve themselves in an exciting activity which could be used as a vehicle for sharing their lasting decisions for Christ made either at a performance of this musical or as a direct result of its performance. This would include both members of the audience and members of the cast. Finally, with its predominance of folk idioms as the overall style of the musical, *Good News* proved to be at once interesting to the young people and at the same time relatively inoffensive to the adult members of the churches. This point should not be overlooked, for had the door not been opened gradually through folk music in the church, as typified by this material, it is doubtful that subsequent musicals using rock, soul and other idioms could have knocked the door down without considerable difficulty even with the huge volume of sound produced by their monstrous amplifiers.[[268]](#footnote-268)

BOB BOYD: I hope somewhere that church musicians today will be able to get a glimpse of the development of today’s church music and the part that *Good News* played. It has blown my mind to think that *Good News* was a part of great sweep of the development—or some might argue the de-development—of church music.

MARTHA OLDENBURG: The words that [Bob] wrote remain true—the harmonies and beat have changed, but the truth has not changed. The truth has to stay the same, but you have to write for today. The ultimate goal is to bring God the glory. We have to write for the times in which we live, but the words have to remain constant. He was writing for the young people of that day.

## Conclusion

*Good News* was the highest-selling piece of choral music published by Broadman Press in the 1960s. While today the music of *Good News* has largely been forgotten, its legacy lives on as one of the very first pieces of contemporary church music written for evangelical churches. While some church music historians have noted the historic role that *Good News* played in bringing about contemporary church music, most of those involved in the creation of *Good News* never received their due recognition. Most continued their lives and ministries post-*Good News* in obscurity.

Bob Boyd served in various positions for the Baptist Sunday School Board until his retirement in 1990. He and his wife still live in Nashville.

Frank Hart Smith continued working for the Church Recreation Department of the Baptist Sunday School Board until retiring in 1990. He is today remembered as one of the pioneers of church recreation and sports ministry. He died of kidney disease in 1991.

Dr. William J. Reynolds succeeded Dr. W. Hines Sims as Secretary of the Church Music Department in 1971 and remained in that position until 1980. He was the editor of the 1975 *Baptist Hymnal*, the first denominational-published hymnal to include songs from Christian youth musicals. Among them was “Do You Really Care?” from *Good News*. Reynolds later taught hymnology at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary and remained an active teacher, writer, and scholar until his death in 2009.

Elwyn Raymer worked at the Church Music Department until 1973, when he left to work for Buryl Red’s Triune Music. Raymer, who was initially hesitant to work with the pop-styled *Good News*, helped produce Buryl Red and Ragan Courtney’s hugely successful musical *Celebrate Life!* Raymer still lives in the Nashville area.

Cecil McGee continued to serve as Drama Consultant for the Church Recreation Department for several years after *Good News*. Later in life he moved to Titusville, Florida and operated a Christian retreat center. He died in 2007.

Jim Stanton served as a minister of music at several churches in Alabama before working for the Alabama Baptist Convention and, later, the Baptist Sunday School Board. He retired from ministry in 2001. Stanton passed away in April 2016. His wife, Lou, still lives in Alabama, and his son is a minister of music.

Billy Ray Hearn’s involvement in *Good News* propelled him to a position at Word Music in Waco, Texas. He consulted with Ralph Carmichael and Kurt Kaiser as they were writing their first Christian youth musical: *Tell It Like It Is*. Hearn went on to establish Myrrh Records in 1972, the first record label devoted to “Jesus Music” and Christian rock. Hearn remained active in the Contemporary Christian Music industry well into his 80s. He passed away in Nashville in April 2015.

The Church Music Department asked Eddie Lunn and Bob Oldenburg to write a follow-up musical to *Good News*. The work, titled *Happening Now!*, was a commercial failure. After graduating from Baylor University, Lunn returned to Nashville to lead his family’s business. He and his wife, Saralu, who was a member of the *Good News* staff choir at Glorieta in 1967, live in the Nashville area. Fifty years after being the lead guitar player for *Good News*, Lunn still plays his guitar every Sunday morning for the Kindergarten Sunday School classes at Brentwood Baptist Church.

Bob Oldenburg left the Church Recreation Department in 1969 to return to First Baptist Church, San Antonio, Texas, the same church he had served before coming to the Sunday School Board in 1966. In 1971 Ralph Carmichael asked Oldenburg to write a new youth musical for his publishing house, Lexicon Music. The musical, *Real: A Soul Experience*, was co-written by Oldenburg and his close friend and FBC San Antonio co-worker Lanny Allen. *Real* was the last of three youth musicals that Oldenburg helped create. Oldenburg went on to serve in several other churches before his death from cancer in 2004. His wife, Martha, lives in the Dallas area. Several of his sons are active in church ministry.

The men who wrote *Good News* fifty years ago never intended to change the direction and history of church music. Instead, they were simply men of God who sincerely desired to create a vehicle that would enable Christian teenagers of their era to communicate the gospel in their own language and musical style. In accomplishing this goal, they *did* change the direction of evangelical church music by introducing pop-styled music and rhythm instruments to evangelical churches. Every contemporary worship leader, songwriter, media volunteer, choral arranger, praise team member, and youth worship band player serving in the field of church music today owes a debt of gratitude to pioneers like Cecil McGee, Ted Overman, Jim Stanton, Billy Ray Hearn, Eddie Lunn, and Bob Oldenburg, who paved the road to contemporary worship music fifty years ago.

# In Defense of Repetition: A Philosophy for Planning Music for Corporate Worship

Jacob Sensenig[[269]](#footnote-269)

“Worship is best when the actions of worship are second nature, when we don’t have to be constantly asking ourselves, ‘What do we do now?’ As long as we are thinking, ‘What comes next?’ or ‘Do we stand, sit or kneel?’ we are not worshipping. We are still learning to worship.”[[270]](#footnote-270)

Carl Schalk, the composer, musicologist, and author wrote the statement quoted above in 1998 after nearly seventy years of being deeply and intentionally formed by Lutheran liturgy. Although significant changes were undoubtedly made to the liturgy during the course of his lifetime, there seems to have been an obvious thread of consistency that would lead Schalk to such recognition. For Schalk, it seems that the “best” worship takes place when the participants are familiar with the pattern of the liturgy. “Best” worship happens when the actions of worship have become habitual, when they are ingrained in the very DNA of the congregants. If one were unaware of Schalk’s background it might seem as though he were arguing against anything new in worship. However, as Schalk is a composer of hymn tunes and choral anthems, he would be arguing against his own livelihood and creative impulse to suggest that nothing unfamiliar has a place in worship. It can thus be inferred that Schalk is not arguing against contemporary elements (in the timely sense of the word), but instead he is suggesting that they must fall within a familiar structure. People can best join in worship that is hospitable and allows for maximum participation without the elements of the service standing in the way of the formation of deep spiritual connections. This leads to the question, how does familiarity happen?

In one word: Repetition. Nothing in life is learned without repetition. Repetition is a powerful teacher, and what is repeated will stick with us, whether we like it or not. Think about that annoying commercial jingle that plays over and over, that even with the best attempts to silence it, finds its way into the soundtrack of life when trying to go to sleep at night or concentrating on a task. Certainly the advertising industry is aware of the inherent power of repetition!

Another prominent role for repetition is in education. It should be noted that repetition is not simply used in the educational process; *repetition is the educational process*. Students of any age learn by reading, hearing, and writing information over and over until it becomes a part of their collected memory. Elementary math students are sent home with pages upon pages of multiplication problems until they know that 7 x 7 = 49. Then they come back to class and have board races, pop quizzes, and tests until they have mastered the foundational concepts and are ready to move on to the next challenge. Likewise, students of any instrument are forced to learn scales and to practice them until they no longer have to look at their hands or consciously think about technical fingerings. Why should the teaching of the truths of faith be conceived of any differently? Why do we create a dichotomy between learning in different arenas of life?

These questions have recently been at the heart of the thinking and research being pursued by James K. A. Smith, a philosophy professor at Calvin College. His ponderings have appeared in a series of books examining the concept of liturgical formation, and his work is having an impact among a diverse group of writers and practitioners. In a statement from *Imagining the Kingdom: How Worship Works*, Smith points out the inconsistency of belief among many Protestants.

We, especially we Protestants, have a built-in allergy to repetition in worship, though we are quite happy to affirm the value of repetition in almost every other sphere of life, from study to music to sport to art. We affirm the value of ritual repetition if we’re learning piano scales or learning to hit a golf ball but are curiously suspicious of repetitive ritual in worship and discipleship.[[271]](#footnote-271)

It should be argued here that Smith verges upon using the term Protestant too broadly, as Carl Schalk represents a branch of Protestant faith that falls within a liturgical tradition. However, the point that he is making stands without contention. To further limit the scope of this paper, the following conversation will primarily discuss Free Church Protestants.[[272]](#footnote-272) Churches within the Free Church tradition have been guilty of neglecting the value of repetition, or as many have argued, have too quickly surrendered to vain repetition.

This paper will examine the concept of repetition in relation to church music biblically and historically in order to set the foundation for a discussion of the value of repetition in current Free Church worship practices. This paper will not seek to make prescriptive statements for how much repetition of texts and/or tunes should take place in a particular local congregation, but instead the goal will be to foster a deeper appreciation for habit-forming repetition among those who are responsible for planning worship within a local context. However, these discussions also bear consideration for those who lead worship in conference settings and in the hallowed halls of theological education. Ultimately, worship planners in any venue must recognize that worship is a formative practice, and those in positions of power must ask what they are forming people into and how valuable tools such as music are being used in the process.

## Liturgical Renewal

D. G. Hart suggests,

The solution, of course, is not for evangelicals to rediscover the value or appeal of liturgy. Rather it is for evangelicals to take stock theologically of what constitutes biblical worship, the real purpose and ministry of the church, and genuine Christian piety. But that kind of stock-taking would undo evangelicalism. For it would send evangelicals off to the riches of the Reformed, Lutheran, and Anglican traditions where these matters have been defined and articulated and where worship is the logical extension of a congregation's confession of faith and lies at the heart of the church's mission. And it would get rid of those awful praise songs. Keep that thought.[[273]](#footnote-273)

Regardless of Hart’s feelings about those “awful praise songs,” he expresses a longing for evangelicals to rediscover the riches of the liturgical tradition without adopting the moniker of liturgical. Hart makes a common mistake that only recently has been examined at length by liturgical scholar Melanie Ross in her text *Evangelical versus Liturgical?: Defying a Dichotomy*.[[274]](#footnote-274) Ross argues that liturgical theologians and lay people alike have been guilty of conceptualizing a “well curve”—one that pits evangelical churches against the liturgical renewal movement and allows for little ground in between. Her unique task is to bridge this divide and to remind thinkers on both ends of the spectrum that they have more in common than is believed and more to learn from one another than they ever could have imagined.

Unfortunately, Hart and other leading evangelical voices continue to fall prey to the dichotomy that Ross highlights. To make her point, Ross quotes the liturgical theologian Aidan Kavanagh who reminds Christians of all varieties, “An aliturgical Christian church is as much a contradiction in terms as a human society without language.”[[275]](#footnote-275) All worship services have some sort of overarching structure, and most free churches follow a more standard pattern than they would often admit or immediately recognize. Ross and Smith are a part of a new generation of scholars who are helping the “non-liturgical” churches to discover the wealth of historical worship practices, as well as to imagine what might be to come.

Worship renewal will ultimately require moving past issues of contention that have caused congregations to remain stagnant for far too long and have specifically led to the “burnout” of those individuals responsible for the church’s song.[[276]](#footnote-276) The issue of repetition has been one of those stagnating contentions, and arguments have been heard over and over against the “7-11” sorts of songs.[[277]](#footnote-277) Many individuals who have made such overarching claims have often not looked closely at the music they deem to be worthy or inspired and have ultimately lacked honesty.[[278]](#footnote-278) At the same time, it must be realized that this is a pastoral issue at heart and cannot be dealt with through sweeping declarations. Discussions of this nature take time and patience, as does the renewal of worship.

## Repetition in Scripture

As good Protestants have done since the early sixteenth century, we must return *ad fontes,* to the sources and to the ultimate authority for Christian faith and practice, God’s Word. The Bible is a book full of examples of repetition. However, few would claim that any of this repetition is in vain. Each retelling enlightens a new meaning and contributes to the polyvalent nature of Scripture. Just like any great orator or writer, the Bible uses repetition as a tool to provide emphasis. Simply think of the power of repetition in one of the most famous examples from the twentieth century, Martin Luther King Jr.’s “I Have a Dream” speech. Not only is this a shining example of repetition used purposefully, but also King, being the consummate preacher that he was, brings numerous scriptural passages to life through his oration. In this section we will briefly discuss the use of large-scale and small-scale repetition and then examine a few passages of Scripture that have implications for the use of repetition in congregational music.

There are several portions of Scripture that repeat almost verbatim entire narratives. Think of the four gospels: Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. Why do we need four books in the Bible that tell essentially the same sequence of events? Two important principles can guide readers. First, the use of repetition in the Bible usually emphasizes the importance of a person, theme, or event. The multiple recountings of the life of Jesus speak to his importance as the Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the End. Likewise, the Ten Commandments are repeated in Exodus 20 and Deuteronomy 5 because of their importance to Israel’s understanding of God’s law. Astute biblical scholars will have no trouble finding other such passages, like the longer narratives in Kings and Chronicles.

Second, the repetition of the Gospels and other such passages allows for stories to be told from multiple perspectives. Each of the evangelists is telling the story to a slightly different audience with a unique purpose in mind.[[279]](#footnote-279) Matthew is writing to Jewish readers, and so the book spends a considerable amount of time referring to Jesus as the fulfillment of Jewish prophecy. Luke does not spend time with the genealogy of Jesus as Matthew does, as it seems he is writing to a primarily Gentile audience. The books of Kings and Chronicles function similarly as 1 and 2 Kings are believed to have been written before Israel’s exile to Babylon, and 1 and 2 Chronicles are written after the Israelites return from the Babylonian Exile.[[280]](#footnote-280) While this type of repetition might not be exact, word-for-word repetition, it is nonetheless valuable. Thematic repetition of this sort in a worship service might mean that a certain song is repeated with a different framing in mind.

Small-scale repetition also abounds in Scripture and is likely most visible for many Christians in the book of Psalms, which has been central to Christian Scriptures, both literally and figuratively. The Psalm texts have held great significance for both Jewish and Christian worship. It is likely that the Psalm texts were used extensively in Jewish worship, and this carries over into the worship of the early church. John Witvliet says it this way: “the Psalter is the foundational and paradigmatic prayer book of the Christian church. Time and time again, worshiping communities have returned to the Psalter for inspiration and instruction in the life of both personal and public prayer.”[[281]](#footnote-281) The Psalms have been a significant part of every major liturgical reform from the sixth-century monastic communities, to the sixteenth-century Calvinists, and even to the Liturgical Movement of the twentieth century. They truly deserve much more attention than we can give them here.

While there are formalized Psalm types as set forth by Old Testament scholars like Herman Gunkel, there are also generic forms like refrain-psalm. Examples of this type of Psalm are Psalm 42, 46, 59, 80, 107, and 136, among others. These texts heavily utilize repetition and the repetition certainly had a liturgical function when the text was compiled. Likely the most familiar example is Psalm 136 where the phrase “His steadfast love endures forever” is repeated after each line, totaling twenty-six times. Each brief statement serves as the Psalm’s refrain, and they play a significant interpretative role. This type of small-scale repetition, which is so often found in songs in the “praise and worship” genre, provides the worship planner with the opportunity to utilize them with such thematic development when used in tandem with other elements of the liturgy.

Looking outside the Psalms we continue our investigation of Scripture with Isaiah 6. This passage has greatly influenced the way many worship leaders plan and lead services. Donald Hustad writes, “This account of Isaiah’s worship experience is replicated in the order of a Sunday morning service in many Christian churches and also in the macrocosm of God’s self-revelation and human response in all history.”[[282]](#footnote-282) In this significant narrative, we hear the angels proclaiming to one another, “Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts; the whole earth is full of his glory” (Isaiah 6:3). The importance of this repetition must not be overlooked. In Hebrew grammar there is not a comparative way of dealing with adjectives “such as saying good, better, best—and so in order to place emphasis on a word the word is repeated. A triple repeating of a word would be equivalent to the superlative way of looking at it in the English language. For us, the expression would be that God is the “holiest of all.”[[283]](#footnote-283) In his article “In Defense of ‘7-11 Songs,’” Zac Hicks points to Revelation 4, which indexes Isaiah’s vision, where the living creatures incessantly chant, “Holy, holy, holy” over and over again.[[284]](#footnote-284) While Hicks does not provide a musical example of a “7-11 song” that exhibits the incessant quality of the Revelation 4 passage, “I Could Sing of Your Love Forever” certainly comes to mind as an example of a praise and worship song that fits this paradigm. There are also numerous examples from Taizé and global songs that would function as equivalents, reminding us once again that repetition is not an issue to be conflated with musical style.

## Repetition in Pre-Reformation Worship

In the Roman rite of the Catholic Church the term for the chief service is “Mass” (Missa), which is derived from the dismissal at the end of the service: *Ite Missa est.* Luther even retains this term in his first translations of the service into the vernacular, the *Formula missae* (1523) and the *Deutsche Messe* (1526). The Mass centers upon the celebration of the Eucharist, although the service is divided into two main divisions: the Liturgy of the Word and the Liturgy of the Table. There is evidence that by the fourth century, Christian worship was highly developed, and as Christianity was no longer forbidden by the Roman emperor, it was free to flourish.

The liturgy continues to expand from the fourth to the fifteenth centuries, and a large chant and hymnic repertoire develops alongside the expansion of the liturgy. The Roman rite reaches its greatest splendor in the 1500s and is revised and shortened at the Council of Trent in 1562 and again at the Second Vatican Council in 1962, partly in response to the Protestant arguments about the inaccessibility of the Latin language and the excesses of repetition. The Mass is celebrated in three basic formats in the four hundred years between these two councils. (1) The Low Mass or spoken mass, (2) The Sung Mass, the principal Sunday or holy day service in parish churches, and (3) The High Mass (Missa solemnis), which was also sung and frequently involved a choir.[[285]](#footnote-285)

The elements of the Mass are divided into two categories, the Ordinary and Proper. The ordinary movements included the Kyrie eleison, Gloria in excelsis Deo, Credo, Sanctus et Benedictus, and Agnus Dei. While the proper movements corresponded to certain times of the liturgical year and certain feast days, the ordinary movements are in nearly every Mass. The Mass therefore deeply embraces repetition. In addition to the same texts being repeated with each service, there is also significant repetition within some of the movements of the Mass ordinary. The Kyrie eleison is one such example. “Kyrie, eleison” (Lord, have mercy) is sung three times, followed by “Christe, eleison” (Christ, have mercy) sung three times, and concluding with “Kyrie, eleison” sung three more times. This repetition provides the worshipers with time to recognize and confess their own sinfulness while magnifying the call for Christ to have mercy. The triple repetition is also understood to be a reference to the threefold mystery of the Trinity.[[286]](#footnote-286) Other ordinary movements also include significant repetition such as the Sanctus, which utilizes the “Holy, holy, holy” texts of Isaiah 6 and Revelation 4 as discussed above. William Dyrness reminds us, “even for those who call themselves nonliturgical, the medieval shape of the Ordinary of the Mass . . . is surely foundational for all subsequent developments in worship, whether churches followed this order closely or at a distance.”[[287]](#footnote-287)

While the Mass includes some repetition, the greatest repetition to be found in Catholic worship takes place in the celebration of the Offices (also known as the Service of the Hours). This practice develops as a part of the monastic tradition, in which the Rule of St. Benedict eventually codified the Offices. However, the convention of praying at stated hours of the day undoubtedly stemmed from Jewish prayer practices. Office worship was the central work of monasteries, although it was also observed in cathedrals and collegiate churches. The monks sought to live out a life of *Ora et labora*, which meant seeking a balance between work and prayer. The daily Offices consisted of eight hours: Matins at 3 or 4 am, Lauds at sunrise, Prime after breakfast, Terce at 9 am, Sext at noon, None at 3 pm, Vespers at sunset, and Compline at bedtime. During the course of each week the monks would pray (chant) all 150 Psalms and the canticles. Catherine Bell argues that the most common characteristic of ritual-like behavior is the quality of invariance, which manifests itself as a disciplined set of actions marked by precise repetition and physical control.[[288]](#footnote-288) A comprehensive example of invariance would be the routines of monastic life, which encouraged the ritualization of all daily activities—dressing, eating, walking, and working.

It is important to remember James K. A. Smith’s observation that “Protestants have a built-in allergy to repetition in worship.” The source of that allergy surely is found in the reforms of the sixteenth century. Jeremy Begbie spends a chapter in *Resounding Truth* examining the contributions of the three key theologians of the Reformation: Luther, Calvin, and Zwingli. Here he points out Zwingli’s acerbic reaction to the repetition of Medieval worship.

Zwingli bemoans what he sees as the empty “babbling” of repeated prayers, phrases recited over and over again, for it encourages a degeneration of worship into hypocrisy and empty exhibition. The choral and instrumental music of the Catholic Church, of course, was full of the repetition of words, and it comes in for some of Zwingli’s severest condemnations.[[289]](#footnote-289)

Zwingli, despite being perhaps the most consummate musician of the three principal reformers, is the most extreme in his reaction to Medieval worship practices and takes literally Paul’s admonishments in Colossians 3 and Ephesians 5 to “sing with our hearts” as meaning not to sing with our mouths, but internally. Fortunately, Protestants have recovered in some ways from Zwingli’s fanatic zeal to reform. Hopefully now we can begin to recover an understanding of the necessity of repetition.

## Modern Thoughts on Repetition

Important to worship’s shaping of our theological perspectives are the elements of repetition and memory. In the free church tradition, where worshipers do not regularly read prayers, recite the Creed, or speak other liturgies, *music is the only element that benefits from frequent repetition*, and it is the only element beside Scripture that is frequently memorized.[[290]](#footnote-290) (emphasis added)

Randall Bradley highlights the theologically formative nature of liturgical worship practices by contrasting the practices to those who worship in the Free Church tradition. What he astutely observes is that while liturgical churches have an abundance of mediums through which to form memories, free churches have to rely heavily upon the medium of music to shape its congregants. Lest we bemoan our sorry state as people in the Free Church tradition, listen to this narrative:

Don Saliers asked a group of older adults which hymns meant most to them, and why. One factor was body memory: people remembered when they first sang the song, and memories of sight, hearing, smell, and touch associated with it. The songs that meant most had been learned in happy social situations and reinforced by being sung on different occasions, in different types of gathering.[[291]](#footnote-291)

Whether or not these people were brought up in the free church tradition is beside the point. What is important to note is that this group of older adults powerfully connected their experience of faith to embodied moments of singing. They did not just connect to the text of the song. There was a visceral memory that was shaped and reshaped with every repetition. It seems that spirituality is not just an invisible concept; it is an embodied reality. Robert Wuthnow, sociologist and professor at Princeton, says that spirituality needs “carriers,” and artistic objects such as music often serve as indispensible carriers of a person’s spirituality. He concludes, “Religious teachings are validated almost aesthetically, through repetition and familiarity.”[[292]](#footnote-292) Wuthnow’s findings validate and affirm the experience of worshipers and help those of us who plan worship to think twice before dismissing any congregant’s desire for greater repetition of those songs that have carried meaning for them.

Likewise, Clive Marsh and Vaughan Roberts caution us from disregarding those who might be receptive to popular music that seems full of trite repetition. They write, “Repetition is an important feature in all music, within a single piece, in the act of playing (practicing) and in the act of listening. To be critical of popular music’s repetitiveness fails to respect this feature of music per se and by extension disrespects ritualistic dimensions of human life more generally.”[[293]](#footnote-293)

Bradley’s quote above also mentions how repetition forms our theological foundations. Simon Chan clearly reminds readers of the ancient formula *lex orandi est lex credendi,* which is most often interpreted as “The rule of praying is the rule of belief.” This saying, often attributed to the fifth-century monk Prosper of Aquitaine[[294]](#footnote-294) can be taken in one of two ways: (1) the church’s practice of prayer/worship shapes the belief of the church, or (2) the belief of the church shapes the church’s prayer/worship practice.[[295]](#footnote-295) Aidan Kavanagh goes so far as to say “the liturgy is ‘primary theology’ from which ‘secondary theology’ or doctrines are derived.”[[296]](#footnote-296) In his own discussion of primary and secondary theology Chan writes, “Protestants are generally more favorably disposed toward the idea of doctrine’s shaping worship.”[[297]](#footnote-297) The idea that what we do in worship might shape our theology should cause many churches to reconsider their weekly worship practices.

While James K. A. Smith is writing about the concept of formation related to formal institutions of Christian education, a vast majority of his assertions have direct application to localized worshiping communities. Allow me to quote at length from a passage he uses to discuss how Christian worship has failed to recognize the formative powers of repetition.

Having fallen prey to the intellectualism of modernity, both Christian worship and Christian pedagogy have underestimated the importance of this body/story nexus—this inextricable link between imagination, narrative, and embodiment—thereby forgetting the ancient Christian sacramental wisdom carried in the historic practices of Christian worship and the embodied legacies of spiritual and monastic disciplines. Failing to appreciate this, we have neglected formational resources that are indigenous to the Christian tradition, as it were; as a result, we have too often pursued flawed models of discipleship and Christian formation that have focused on convincing the intellect rather than recruiting the imagination. Moreover, because of this neglect and our stunted anthropology, we have failed to recognize the degree and extent to which secular liturgies do implicitly capitalize on our embodied penchant for storied formation. This becomes a way to account for Christian assimilation to consumerism, nationalism, and various stripes of egoisms. These isms have had all the best embodied stories. The devil has all the best liturgies.[[298]](#footnote-298)

The truth is that we in the Free Church tradition would like to believe that our theology drives our worship praxis, but it could be argued that this is rarely the case. Smith calls out the fact that churches have neglected the habit-forming repetitive practices inherent in Christianity and instead have allowed secular liturgies to inform the way we worship.

## Application for Church Musicians

The final section of this paper will seek to provide some application for local church musicians in regard to creating habit-forming repetition. It must be recognized that there are a multitude of factors at play when designing or curating worship.[[299]](#footnote-299) In fact, shelves of books have been written in just the past few years about planning worship, and it seems that worship renewal as it has been described here is becoming a topic of conversation in Free Church and more broadly Protestant worship gatherings like the Calvin Symposium on Worship and the National Worship Leader Conference. However, in the many books recently published or the national conference gathering, very few authors and speakers have discussed building a canon of congregational song repertoire for a particular congregation with the concept of repetition in mind. This congregation might be in a local church context, a conference setting, or a seminary chapel that occurs weekly or daily.

Let us not simply ask if a song is too repetitive and therefore use repetition as a criterion for throwing songs out of the canon, but we might also need to ask how often are we repeating these songs? In a day when hymnals no longer hold the entire canon of what is sung in worship, possibilities of what could be sung in worship are seemingly limitless. While many worship leaders will understand this proliferation of congregational song choices to be a healthy step forward, it also brings with it a set of problems that must be discussed. Where do leaders find new songs? What attributes make a song suitable for congregational use? What criteria are used to determine if a song would be edifying for a particular congregation? As a worship planner’s knowledge of the broad spectrum of liturgical music expands, it becomes increasingly difficult to plan with repetition in mind.

Sandra Van Opstal, a leader in the movement toward multicultural worship in North America, has posed many related questions in her recently released *The Next Worship: Glorifying God in a Diverse World*. One of the arguments she makes is that “one of the greatest challenges of our generation is that people make choices based almost exclusively on preferences. We have hundreds of restaurant choices, and if we want to stay home we order online or call. The options are endless. And we view our Christian practices (church, podcast, worship) similarly.”[[300]](#footnote-300)

It must be noted that the principal responsibility for what is sung in worship falls to those in positions of leadership, and all too often leaders fall into the traps of eclecticism and contemporaneity. Mike Harland, director of LifeWay Worship, the music arm of LifeWay Christian Resources, published a blog post in 2010 lamenting that “They are Not Singing Any-more.” One of Harland’s main points is that congregations are not singing because they no longer know the songs they are being asked to sing. He writes, “by the time a worship leader brings a new song to the church, he or she will have lived with it for weeks and grown in their familiarity with it. The worshippers in our churches should have the same opportunity before springing it on them on a Sunday morning.”[[301]](#footnote-301) It must also be noted that musicians are trained to digest music by sight-reading quickly, performing, and then moving on to the next piece in the repertoire. Congregations are not trained in this way and enjoy the repetition that often drives worship leaders crazy.

To draw a few conclusions from our study of repetition in Scripture, it should be mentioned that worship planners must think with large- and small-scale repetition in mind. Large-scale repetition of congregational song would necessitate asking “what songs is my congregation singing over a given period of time?” What themes are being expounded upon? Planning with these sorts of questions in mind will mean that the worship planner must have in mind the goal of long-range sustenance instead of simply finding songs that match the sermon theme each week. A good practice for worship planners is to keep records of how often songs are used.[[302]](#footnote-302) This may seem pedantic, but the practice will ultimately allow leaders to monitor the frequency with which particular songs are used and manage thematic/musical content.

Small-scale repetition might refer to repetition of themes, musically and textually, within a singular service or even a particular song. Michael Hawn speaks and writes extensively about the value of cyclic musical forms. Cyclic forms are textually and musically compact and can be sung with little or no reference to printed text or music once the song has become familiar. Most congregations can quickly latch onto these simple melodies. Hawn writes, “one of the common misunderstandings about cyclic structures by those trained in Western classic hymn traditions is that they are repetitive. While this appears to be the case on the surface, I have observed that the enliveners of cyclic songs creatively vary nearly every cycle in some modest way.”[[303]](#footnote-303) Hawn uses songs from Taizé and songs from around the globe as examples of cyclic songs, exhibiting that cyclic song embraces a variety of musical styles.[[304]](#footnote-304) Many modern worship songs also incorporate cyclic structures, which can become the source of conflict as previously mentioned with 7-11 songs. It is important to note here that the form and function of cyclical songs is different from that of traditional hymnody with a strophic form. Worship planners should be careful not to attempt one form to perform the function of the other.

As previously mentioned, there are a plethora of concerns for church musicians, and repetition is simply one. Jeremy Begbie helpfully reminds us of the value of context when discussing repetition:

The way in which musical repetition will function and be received in any particular setting depends on a vast network of constraints—acoustics, expectations, the music people are used to hearing, biological makeup, the way the music is introduced, and so forth. We can properly highlight theological resonances in musical repetition in a way that is highly instructive for theology and, by implication, for the way music is used by the Church. But this does not mean that we can instantly translate our findings into a project which outlaws some types of music and promotes others in order to guarantee a specific theological “effect” on the hearers. Musical communication depends on a complexity of intersecting variables; any intelligent enquiry into the effects of music would do well to remember this complexity.[[305]](#footnote-305)

It is encouraging that church musicians in Free Church contexts are following in the trend to begin thinking deeply and intentionally about the habit-forming rituals inherent in Christian worship. Seeking to recognize the variety of contexts within and outside of this tradition, this paper has sought to raise questions instead of pose answers. However, these questions have been raised with the biblical and historical contexts of repetition clearly in view. Hopefully as the church embraces its memory and imagines a new future, worship planners can remember that as Debra and Ron Rienstra say, “Repetition is only meaningless when we don’t mean it.”[[306]](#footnote-306)

# Abstracts of Recent SWBTS School of Church Music Doctoral Dissertations

## A Performer's Perspective of Two Works by Ēriks Ešenvalds: *Passion and Resurrection* and *Songs of David*

Nataliya V. Bolgar, DMA

The purpose of this document is to serve as a resource for singers and teachers of singing in selecting repertoire for the soprano voice and to provide a performer's perspective of two compositions by Ēriks Ešenvalds: the oratorio *Passion and Resurrection* and the song cycle*Songs of David*. Both works represent modern-day sacred music that demonstrates the connection between Renaissance music and twenty-first-century compositional techniques.

The first chapter of Part I of the document outlines the composer's biographical sketch. Chapter Two discusses the history of the oratorio's journey from conception to performance. Chapter Three includes a brief overview of the biblical perspective in the oratorio on the suffering and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Chapter Four contains information on the motet *Parce mihi Domine* by Cristóbal de Morales, which serves as a unifying component within the four sections of the oratorio. Chapter Five summarizes some of the basic principles of compositional technique present in the oratorio. Also included in this chapter is a synopsis of how the composer utilizes Morales' motet and Mary Magdalene's thematic material in this composition.

Chapter One of Part II presents a brief history on the writing of *Songs of David*. A summary of the book of Psalms set by Ešenvalds appears in Chapter Two. Chapter Three investigates the interrelatedness between Psalms 23, 24, and 13 as depicted by the composer. Chapters Four through Seven discuss the musical and textual language of these three psalms.

Finally, a score of Morales' motet and the composer's adaptation of it are included in appendix A and appendix B. Appendix C contains a translation of an interview with the composer on the *Songs of David*.

# Review Article *You Are What You Love: The Spiritual Power of Habit*

Reviewed by Scott Aniol[[307]](#footnote-307)

*You Are What You Love: The Spiritual Power of Habit*, by James K. A. Smith. Grand Rapids: Brazos Press, 2016. 224 pages. $19.99.

For several years now James K. A. Smith has been helpfully speaking and writing on the subject of liturgical formation in education and worship. His first two volumes on this subject, *Desiring the Kingdom: Worship, Worldview, and Cultural Formation* (Baker, 2009) and *Imagining the Kingdom: How Worship Works* (Baker, 2013), have reintroduced several important biblical concepts regarding spiritual formation, discipleship, and worship to evangelical Christians. His most recent treatment of the matter, *You Are What You Love: The Spiritual Power of Habit,* repackages these key ideas in a readable book, accessible to a broader audience. Here he argues very similarly to his previous works that in order to live out their faith in their various cultural vocations, Christians must give careful attention to what they love and how their loves are being formed, because “you are what you love” (xii). In this short review article, I would like to briefly summarize Smith’s central thesis and then offer one way in which I think an element of his argument could be strengthened through utilizing the classical distinction between the affections and passions.

Smith carefully explains his underlying argument that we do not act primarily on the basis of belief, but rather that we are driven by our loves—our imagination of “the good life.” He bemoans the fact that, as a result of not understanding this fundamental idea, “we often approach discipleship as primarily a didactic endeavor,” when in reality discipleship “is a way to curate your heart, to be attentive to and intentional about what you love” (2). He argues that, contrary to our modern way of thinking, we do not acquire knowledge in order that we might love correctly; rather, using Philippians 1:9–11 as an example, “love is the condition for knowledge. . . . I love in order to know” (7).

Smith suggests that one culprit for the reversal of head and heart that permeates much of Christian thinking is the fact that modern culture has reinvested secular meaning in the idea of “heart” such that now it is “equated with a kind of emotivism” (8). On the contrary, Smith argues, both Scripture and Augustine consider the heart to be “the fulcrum of your most fundamental longings—a visceral, subconscious *orientation* to the world” (8).[[308]](#footnote-308)

As with his previous works, Smith argues that hearts are shaped and formed primarily through “the overwhelming power of habit” (4). These habits, he suggests, are virtues; “they are character traits that become woven into *who you are* so that you are the *kind* of person who is inclined to be compassionate, forgiving, and so forth” (16). These kinds of virtues are formed, not exclusively intellectually, but affectively through imitation and practice (18). He concludes this portion of his argument with a concise syllogism: “Because if you are what you love and if love is a virtue, then love is a *habit*. . . . And [if] love is a habit, then discipleship is a rehabituation of your loves” (19). Smith calls the “formative, love-shaping rituals ‘liturgies’” (22). This is why worship is central to discipleship: “The practices of Christian worship train our love—they are practice *for* the coming kingdom, habituating us as citizens of the kingdom of God” (25).

This perspective is very important, because as Smith points out in Chapter 2, secular liturgies in the culture around us are perpetually shaping our loves in ways contrary to the kingdom of God, a process that can often be “unconscious and covert” (32). Thus, being shaped in this way could very well lead to the reality that “you could be worshiping other gods without even knowing it” (37).

For true discipleship to take place, then, at least two things must happen: First, “pastors need to be ethnographers of the everyday, helping parishioners see their own environment as one that is formative and all too often *de*formative” (40). Second, pastors must give careful consideration to how their church’s worship is shaping their people. This means recognizing that “God is the first and primary actor in worship,” not the worshiper (71). Thus, worship is not primarily an “expressive endeavor,” which often leads to a “penchant for novelty” and creates a “questionable distinction between the form of worship and the content of the gospel” (75). On the contrary, “worship isn’t just something we do; it is where God does something to us” (77).

Therefore, according to Smith, “form matters,” and by this he refers both to “(1) the overall narrative arc of a service of Christian worship and (2) the concrete, received practices that constitute elements of that enacted narrative” (78). As to the former, Smith suggests following historic Christian tradition in which “the practices of Christian worship reflect the plot line of the gospel, that the lineaments of Christian worship rehearse the story line of Scripture” (90). As to the latter, we must concern ourselves not just with the “*what* of Christian worship,” that is, the content, but “also the *how*,” that is, the poetics (106).

Corporate worship in the church is not the only time this kind of formation takes place, however, and so Smith gives careful attention to the “liturgies of home” in Chapter 5, and then connects the two with a discussion in Chapter 6 of how we teach children and youth to worship. It is in this chapter that Smith presents a rather helpful analysis of modern church youth ministry (indicative of church ministry as a whole), which he suggests “we have turned . . . into an almost entirely expressive affair. . . . Instead of embodied worship that is formative, we have settled for a dichotomy: an emotive experience as a prelude to the dispensation of information, thirty minutes of stirring music follow by a thirty-minute ‘message’” (145). Even worse, “we have already ceded [our youth’s] formation to secular liturgies precisely by importing those liturgies into the church under the banner of perceived relevance.” The result, Smith argues, is that “we have effectively communicated to young people that sincerely following Jesus is synonymous with being ‘fired up’ for Jesus, with being *excited* for Jesus, as if discipleship were synonymous with fostering an exuberant, perky, cheerful, hurray-for-Jesus disposition like what we might find in the glee club or at a pep rally” (146–47). This has been true of youth ministry for at least the past 50 years, and so his description here could just as accurately describe the youth who grew up and now populate the worship services of many evangelical churches today.

In his final chapter, Smith extends his argument outside the church and the family to the rest of life, in which he explains that formation that takes place in the church then cultivates individual Christians who will go out into the world and actively live out their Christianity in their various vocations (180). Here I have a bit of a quibble with how Smith couches his language in “missional” and cultural mandate terminology,[[309]](#footnote-309) but inasmuch as he is referring to the particular callings of individual Christians within the culture, I certainly applaud his underlying argument.

Overall, *You Are What You Love* is a fantastic argument for the true essence of Christianity, how discipleship takes place, and what should drive the structure and elements of corporate worship that aims to form Christian disciples. Smith successfully popularizes many of the key insights from his earlier more scholarly books and also satisfies one central criticism of those books made by several (including me[[310]](#footnote-310)) regarding a lack of biblical support. *You Are What You Love* has no such lack; Smith carefully roots each of his main points in Scripture.

I have one primary criticism that I would like to expand here, which is not so much a criticism as it is a suggestion for something I think would actually strengthen Smith’s thesis. In an attempt to ground his argument in Scripture rather than (as he does in his previous two works) in secular psychology, Smith engages in an extended discussion of New Testament language for love. Having noted, as I cited earlier, that “the language of the heart . . . has been co-opted in our culture and enlisted in the soppy sentimentalism of Hallmark and thus equated with a kind of emotivism” (8), Smith seeks to reorient our thinking about love to match what the biblical language means, that the “heart” is not some sort of sentimental expression but rather an “orientation.” This supports his idea that our affections direct our actions. A biblical term he chooses as an equivalent to this conception of the affections is the word *splankna* (9). He notes correctly that this term literally refers to the “inner parts” but was used by the Greeks to metaphorically describe the seat of the affections. On this point I agree: for example, Paul commands Christians in Colossians 3:12 to put on the *splankna* of compassion, kindness, humility, meekness, and patience. These are orientations—affections—that should govern a Christian’s actions.

However, Smith continues by defining the *splankna*—the affections—as “gut feelings” and insists that “discipleship doesn’t touch just our head or even just our heart: it reaches into our gut, our *splankna*, our affections” (9). The problem here is that Smith incorrectly equates the affections with “gut feelings,” leaving out one significant category, also designated in the New Testament by a Greek anatomical term, that I believe would actually help enforce his central idea that the biblical idea of “heart” is not merely a kind of sentimental emotivism.

The Greek term that more accurately describes the “gut” is *koilia*, the lower intestines. This referred to human physical appetites, or “passions,” essentially equivalent to how Smith describes sentimentality. In New Testament thought, the appetites are God-given characteristics of humanity, but they must never be allowed to rule us lest they lead us to sin. Paul describes enemies of Christ in Philippians 3:19 using this term: “their god is their belly [*koilia*].”

By leaving out any attention to this important biblical and classically Christian category—the “passions”—and subsuming all “emotion” under this one rubric of affections, I think Smith limits the successful application of his arguments practically. How does one discern the difference between affections that are merely emotive or affections that are orientations toward what is good? By bringing the classic category of the appetites into his discussion, Smith could helpfully articulate how one avoids the “soppy sentimentalism of Hallmark.”

Notably, even though Smith roots much of his argument in the writings of Augustine, he does not take advantage of the fact that Augustine himself was careful to distinguish the affections from the appetites. As Thomas Dixon notes in his very helpful historical treatment of the subject, *From Passions to Emotions: The Creation of a Secular Psychological Category*, “St. Augustine of Hippo . . . produced models of the human soul in which the passions and appetites, which were movements of the lower animal soul, were distinguished from the affections, which were acts of the higher rational soul.”[[311]](#footnote-311) The affections were active movements of the will, similar to what Smith identifies as desires or orientations, while the passions were lower sensory appetites, reminiscent of Smith’s “soppy emotivism.” This necessary distinction dominated premodern Christian thought until the post-Enlightenment category of “emotion” was created and blurred any distinction between the two.[[312]](#footnote-312) In fact, I would suggest it is exactly this blurring of a distinction between passions and affections into the nebulous term “emotions” that is largely to blame for the very problems within Evangelical churches and worship that Smith so poignantly identifies.

A recovery of these biblical/Augustinian categories and integration into Smith’s argument would, I believe, give some needed clarity to his point. Jonathan Edwards in particular helpfully employed this distinction in his explanation of the nature of true religion in *The Religious Affections*, precisely during the period when such a distinction was disappearing and Christianity was beginning to be defined in terms of emotivism. Edwards argued,

The affections and passions are frequently spoken of as the same, and yet in the more common use of speech, there is in some respect a difference. Affection is a word that in the ordinary signification, seems to be something more extensive than passion, being used for all vigorous lively actings of the will or inclination, but passion for those that are more sudden, and whose effects on the animal spirits are more violent, and the mind more over powered, and less in its own command.[[313]](#footnote-313)

Edwards argued, in a very Augustinian fashion, that Christianity should not be defined in terms of external expression, but rather if over time a person’s life orientation evidenced the regenerative work of the Spirit of God.

Edwards ultimately lost the argument, of course, as Smith’s astute assessment of modern Evangelical worship demonstrates. Smith’s evaluation and solutions are helpful and necessary for churches to recover a biblical conception of what it means to be a Christian, how Christian disciples are cultivated, and the significant role corporate worship plays in such spiritual formation. However, correctly classifying the religious affections as distinct from emotive passions would only further strengthen what is already a must-read volume.

# A Review of Two New Hymnals

D. J. Bulls[[314]](#footnote-314)

In a period in which digital technology seems to rule the day, the hey-day of the hymnal seems to have long passed. However, two bold groups—one from Master’s Seminary, headed by Dr. John MacArthur and Philip Webb, and one from Grace Immanual Bible Church of Jupiter, Florida, led by Dan Krieder, have recently published two new hymnals.

## *Hymns of Grace*, ed. Philip Webb. Los Angeles: Master’s Seminary Press, 2015.

*Hymns of Grace*, published by Master’s Seminary,is a well-constructed book. It is printed on fine, thick, high-grade paper with superior binding and printing quality. The book is also printed with larger type at 6.75 x 9.75 inches. The typography of Reid Lancaster, a hymnal veteran, and his Dallas-based Micro Music is easy to read and clean. Those offering this hymnal made a wise decision in availing themselves of the services of R. R. Donnelly and Sons to print their hymnal. It is built to withstand great use and the test of time. Unfortunately, however, one could assert that this is the only characteristic of this hymnal that is built to endure.

*Hymns of Grace* includes 435 selections in total; “selections” is a most appropriate designation since they are not all hymns. These selections include 91 Scripture readings (from the *English Standard Version*) and 344 “hymns.” Of the included 344 “hymns,” there is what seems to be an overwhelming number of newer hymns. Some 98 of these 344 hymns are songs that have been composed after the year 2000. This makes up more than a fourth of the hymnal (approximately 28%). Over 40 of those 98 new “hymns” are associated with some combination of the Getty-Townend collaboration. Few would deny the impact of these song writers on our current hymnological state, however, to include such a large number of these particular titles is a statement in itself by the editors and publishers of the hymnal. The authors most represented in the hymnal are (alphabetically): Chris Anderson (9), Matt Boswell (7), Fanny Crosby (6), Keith Getty (40), John Newton (7), Stuart Townend (34), Isaac Watts (18), and Charles Wesley (16).

Eight main sections organize *Hymns of Grace*, each with a host of subcategories printed on the upper right corner of the hymn page. Those macro-categories are (in the order in which they appear in the hymnal): God the Father (94), Jesus the Son (221), The Holy Spirit (6), The Trinity (8), The Church (39), Living in Christ (56), Special Service Times-Thanksgiving (9), and Benediction and Doxology (8).[[315]](#footnote-315)

Indices make up the closing pages of the hymnal, the first of which is an index of Scripture readings in biblical order. For the hymn selections, there is a topical index consisting of some 37 topics. This is followed by an index of arrangers and composers and what is labeled as “an index of song resources.” The editors of this hymnal have partnered with LifewayWorship.com to provide orchestration and arrangement resources both now and an even larger group in a forthcoming release at a date that is yet to be determined at the writing of this review. (According to the publisher’s website, 186 titles will match with orchestra and instrumental parts available at www.lifewayworship.com.[[316]](#footnote-316)) This particular index provides suggested medleys of 2–3 songs along with their keys, their page numbers, and notes regarding which verses are to be included. Also denoted in this particular sub-index is a list of those selections with choral endings and lists of those songs with last stanza or refrain key changes or alternative arrangements. Noticeably absent from the indices, as well as from each hymn individually, is the presence of tune names or hymnic meters. That is not altogether surprising, however, given the preponderance of newer compositions that are missing or have yet to receive tune names. Still, the lack of tune names or meters for those time-honored hymns that have found their way into this collection is contrary to the historical practice found in many great hymnals that have preceded this one.

While this hymnal includes what many would consider to be the “top 100” of classic hymnody, something had to be sacrificed for the inclusion of so many newer titles. What was sacrificed seems to have been a wide variety of beloved hymns and gospel songs that the church has sung for decades, even hundreds of years in some cases. By eliminating such hymns and songs, this book has guaranteed itself as but a blip on the radar of hymnal and hymnological history.

## *Sing the Wonders: Hymns and Psalms for the Church*, ed. Dan Kreider. Jupiter, FL: Grace Immanuel Bible Church, 2016. 255pp. $7.00.

*Sing the Wonders* is a hymnal published by Grace Immanuel Bible Church of Jupiter, Florida. The hymnal’s editing and oversight came under the leadership of the elders of the church and was chaired by head editor and typesetter, Dan Kreider. A committee of ten co-editors worked alongside Kreider for this project.Kreider serves as the Minister of Music for Grace Immanuel Bible Church, a position he has held since 2013. Kreider studied music through the doctoral level, where he received his doctorate in music from the University of South Carolina. He has served as a music educator and teacher on both the secondary and the collegiate levels in addition to his years of experience in full-time music ministry. Kreider is clear in the preface to this hymnal that while a hymnal can be a large undertaking, it is something that is done primarily to serve the needs of the local church.[[317]](#footnote-317) With this fundamental principle clearly stated, Kreider then offers his work to the Church at large. It is the ability of this hymnal to be used by a broad spectrum of churches, along with the hymnal’s construction, contents, organization, and potential for universality, that will be reviewed herein.

Kreider’s *Sing the Wonders* is clean, easy to read, and printed well, even though it is slightly smaller in size than standard hymnals.[[318]](#footnote-318) As has been a trend with other recent publications, there are additional resources available through the publisher to all who adopt this hymnal. This hymnal consists of 255 numbered, musical selections including: thirteen psalm settings and a mixture of hymns, both old and new. Each hymn includes a Scripture passage below its title to assist to the user. Selections are organized topically by the following subjects: Adoration and Praise, Confession, Confidence and Comfort, Christ’s Incarnation, Gospel Grace, Christ’s Resurrection, Christ’s Ascension, Christ’s Second Coming, Eternity, Commitment and Consecration, The Church, God’s Word, The Holy Spirit, Thanksgiving, and Children. In the back of the hymnal, one can find the following indices: Tune Names; Authors, Composers, and Sources; Scripture Passages; Psalm Settings; and Titles/First lines.

At first glance, the hymns themselves might appear like they would in any other hymnal. But upon more careful observation, musically there are two critical items that are missing. First, there are no time signatures for any of the hymns. This seems to be a substantive omission. The book’s introductory material does not mention why this choice was made. It makes one wonder if it could have even been an editorial oversight, but that seems unlikely. Another item missing from each hymn, or at least from those hymns that have been published popularly in other hymnals, are hymnic meter designations and indices. Finally, the typesetting has also chosen to leave out slurs of multiple notes that span one syllable. To the casual user, such an omission will not be of great concern. But to one who relies on the printed notation to guide the way a hymn is to be sung and articulated, leaving out the slurs might pose an issue.

As to the choices of hymns themselves, one must be reminded that Kreider’s first purpose was to provide a hymnal for his local congregation. In the preface, he says, “while we pray it is edifying to the broader body of Christ, this hymnal is meant to represent the songs we sing, in the way we sing them. While many songs in it are widely known, some are specific to our church family” (Preface and Notes, 2). Any groups seeking to adopt Kreider’s hymnal are superimposing the vision and musical choices of another group onto their own. It is assumed that those who do not believe as Kreider and Grace Immanuel Bible Church do, and as much as those beliefs are reflected in *Sing the Wonders*, will not be choosing to use or adopt this hymnal. These salient points help to inform the lack of balance present in the choices included in the hymnal. For example, there are over 85 titles written after the year 2000. Of those 85 titles, 35 are composed by some combination of the Getty-Townend collaboration. There are also ten selections by Kauflin, ten by other Sovereign Grace authors, and ten by the editor. Alongside this plethora of new hymns by new composers are 19 titles by the Wesleys, ten by Watts, seven Winkworth selections, and seven titles by Newton, thus confirming a slant toward new material. Leaving out almost an entire genre of folk and gospel songs is a key omission as well. Any church looking to keep a balance of old and new will not find this particular hymnal to be of great use. One will, however, find a fair amount of old texts set to new tunes. Interspersed throughout are some sixty readings. These readings are unnumbered and not included in the overall numbering of 255 selections. One final observation on the choices for inclusion: one will not find any hymns by an author named Gaither, neither will one find any hymns by composers from the New English Renaissance movement of hymn writing, including Wren, Routley, Green, Leech, Kaan, or Dudley-Smith. These exclusions seem to be quite purposeful and such choices will contribute to *Sing the Wonders* having a limited imprint on mainstream hymnody.

Those who choose to use *Sing the Wonders* are like bystanders, overhearing a conversation nearby. It was never intended for their consumption in the first place, but they will have been able to make good use of it and take it to heart when all is said and done. Kreider is clear about the hymnal and its intent being for their local congregation. To offer criticism seems somewhat unfair as they did not set out to create a hymnal for all peoples and all places. Instead, when their product was completed, they decided to offer their hard work, labor, and service to the Body of Christ as a whole. For this, they are to be commended. However, because of the limited selection and overbearing amount of newer hymns, this collection will not achieve widespread use, nor should it.

# Book Reviews

*Eating Beauty: The Eucharist and the Spiritual Arts of the Middle Ages,* by Ann W. Astell. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2006. 296 pp. $29.95.

"Let us imagine that in the whole world there was but one bread, and it could satisfy the hunger of all” (168). Professor Ann W. Astell of Notre Dame University spent a year in research of medieval arts and literature relating to the Eucharist; the result of this near-monastic pursuit is the 2006 book, *Eating Beauty: The Eucharist and the Spiritual Arts of the Middle Ages*. Her purpose in writing the book is to examine the fall of man, predicated by the eating of forbidden fruit, and how the beauty of the Eucharist neutralizes this depraved state. The magnificence of this consumption is viewed through four medieval perspectives: St. Bernard of Clairvaux; St. Bonaventure; St. Ignatius of Loyola with Michelangelo; and the three Catherines—Catherine of Siena, Catherine of Genoa, and “Catherine” Rose of Lima.

As a Baptist I do not agree with the Catholic interpretation of the Eucharist stated in this book, nor do I accept its implied salvific nature. However, one would fully expect this bias to occur in a manuscript written with the above predisposition as this review’s summary will elaborate.

The opening premise is underscored by the proposition that the “Tree of Life” was not “an antidote for the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil [but to] foreshadow the Eucharistic sacrament” (33). However, the bulk of the book quickly moves from that to describing the following four Eucharistic interactions aesthetically.

St. Bernard of Clairvaux was cerebral in his monasticism described in the chapter, “Hidden Manna.” Profoundly intrigued by mnemonic techniques, he instructed the monks to construct ornate "memory palaces" in their minds where they could visit to remember important concepts of discipleship and Scripture (65). The beauty here is within, yet the visible worldly realm was to remain austere. The author’s implication is that the host has intrinsic internal value—it changes the communicant from the inside out.

Mysticism, *gematria*, and the *stigmata* of St. Francis govern the ensuing chapter “Adorned with Wounds.” Unlike the previous chapter, the Eucharist manifests itself externally through sacrificial works and the *stigmata*, which was the purported blemishes St. Francis mysteriously received on his hands and feet that resembled those of Christ. The strong undercurrent of mysticism and the beauty of external Eucharistic manifestation of the Middle Ages continues in the chapter titled “Imitate Me as I Imitate Christ” describing “the Catherines.” These ascetic ladies’s régimes are interwoven with the observed miracles that would later canonize them.

The following chapter about the kinship and logothetics between the penitent priest, Loyola, and the resolute sculptor, Michelangelo, is a brilliant visual and ontological parallelism that compares the spiritual exercises of the “father of the Jesuits” and four periods of work by the famed sculptor. Anachronistically, the penultimate chapter deals with the philosophy of art in the Eucharist through the eyes of Catholic philosopher Simone Weil and prominent Protestant philosopher Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel. To Hegel, the beauty comes more from the philosophical regard to the sacraments than it does from a moment of transubstantiation as Weil proffered.

*Eating Beauty* is targeted to an audience who is sympathetic to a form of Christianity that is built less on the authority of Scripture and more on mystery, penitence, and ritual. This interpretation yields weaknesses in the writing: the wholesale acceptance of medieval miracles, a weak defense of transubstantiation, and an unclear pursuit of the written purpose of the book, especially for a reader lacking in a knowledge of medieval history.

In *Eating Beauty* miracles are celebrated without any apparent inquiry to their veracity. “Adorned with Wounds” was so laden with miracle-reporting that the message of the Eucharist was all but lost, leaving the reader to search for direction in Astell’s narrative. Gory details of “the Catherines,” in “Imitate Me as I Imitate Christ” were far more about penitent life than about the importance of the Eucharist and the spiritual arts.

The doctrine of transubstantiation—the claim that the bread, upon consecration, of the priest, changes into the “substance of the body of Christ,” and the wine the “substance of His blood,”[[319]](#footnote-319) is feebly defended in a few lines on page fifty-two as “in answer to doubts about transubstantiation—often involved bleeding Hosts, disturbingly bloody signs of the mystery of the Mass.” Obscure miracles are seemingly the only defense *Eating Beauty* has for this sacramental transformation. Though not an adherent to this doctrine, I will admit that there are stronger and richer biblical defenses for this dogma that could have easily been employed than were stated in this book.

The final criticism of this work is the lack of cohesiveness to the book’s stated purpose. It is up to the reader to dig through the chapters to find relative meaning of the Eucharist as the emblematic antidote for Adam and Eve’s consumption of the forbidden fruit in the Garden of Eden. While the book’s stated purpose of man’s symbolic and literal redemption of eating sin by eating beauty is a noble claim, it is not clearly supported in the writing.

What is evident in the script, however, is the author’s research and thorough understanding of this time period—it is impressive, exhaustive, and unquestionable. The depth of information rendered portions of this reading a true delight; a worthwhile charge to a follower of Christ by any label. If the evangelical world had a tenth of the zeal for the *via pulchritudinis* (“way of beauty”) (228)of Communion that Astell has, our time at “the Table” would have a much richer significance.

Doctrinal weaknesses notwithstanding, the purpose of this book is somewhat fulfilled by vivid, studied, and well-documented writing, but it is left to the reader to make the necessary symbolic and spiritual connections. Despite this, the excursions off “the beaten path” were educational and enlightening. Eleven full-color plates accompany the tome, adding to the richness of the story.

*Eating Beauty* was a journey I enjoyed. As a Baptist, the manuscript definitely humbled me in my regard to this most beautiful banquet that all Christians enjoy and many times take for granted, the Lord’s Supper.

John L. Francis

Hannibal-LaGrange University

*Jonathan Edwards on Worship: Public and Private Devotion to God*, by Ted Rivera. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publication, 2010. 175 pp. $22.

What did worship look like in churches around the time of the First Great Awakening? Ted Rivera, associate professor of religion at Liberty University and PhD graduate from Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, attempts to answer this question. In *Jonathan Edwards on Worship: Public and Private Devotion to God*, Rivera discusses major themes that are found throughout Jonathan Edwards’s personal writings, letters, and sermons to determine Edwards’s views on public and private worship in a systematized fashion. Rivera argues that Edwards’s worship practices can be divided into three distinct categories: public worship, self-examination, and private devotion. Within these three categories, self-examination acts as a bridge between public worship and private devotion.

Rivera begins his book with a brief historical introduction regarding various opinions on Jonathan Edwards. The introduction also contains a small section regarding Puritan worship within the New England area and how Edwards’s writings provide a skeletal structure as to how Puritan worship was formed within their worship services.

Part one focus on the aspect of public worship in Edwards’s church. One of the first things Rivera does in this section is create an historical context for the reader to help him understand the worship practices through the filter of an eighteenth-century New Englander. Part two discusses the self-examination aspect of worship. Rivera discusses why this is the bridge between public and private worship. A great portion of the book is spent in these first two sections, and the author concludes with part three, private devotion. According to Rivera, this progression shows that Edwards believed worship began with public worship; the process of self-evaluation bridged the gap to help the congregant to draw closer to God, which leads to private devotion.

The book concludes with a brief section summarizing the way Rivera systematically works through Edwards’s thoughts brought forth within his writings. Within this conclusion, a thoughtful comparison of worship practices between the Puritans and modern-day churches is included, allowing the reader to reflect on the differences in a convicting manner.

To support his arguments, Rivera begins with a lengthy section on public worship in which he discusses various attributes of what worship services looked like under Edwards’s leadership. One attribute he discusses is Edwards’s preaching style, which was dry in its delivery. He quotes Edwards saying, “I think I can write better than I can speak” (27). Rivera concludes this section by mentioning Edwards’s primary concern was biblically sound preaching. Without the preaching of the Word the worship service would be without meaning or “hollow” (29). These pictures of worship within Edwards’s church helps one see the importance of Scripture in the Christian’s daily walk. This foundation then influences the individual in his self-evaluation and private devotion.

Among Edwards’s writings, the act of self-examination is discussed a great amount. Rivera chose to focus on this aspect in public and private worship more than the others because it is “the bridge between public and private acts of worship” (75). At this point, Rivera helps his modern reader to see more accurately what a worship service with Edwards would have looked like, a long tedious service in an unheated building. This is far removed from what most modern worshipers are used to today. To add to this uncomfortable environment, many times aspects of the service would have included times of self-examination. This was especially common during times of communion, but it was not limited to this time. Some critics would argue that too much self-examination could be harmful. The danger is that one is constantly uncertain of his salvation, which creates a lack of assurance in the believer. He mentions Karl Barth’s statement that “it is a bad theology which has no assurance of salvation.” However, Rivera defends Edwards. While this practice could cause uncertainty of salvation, it encouraged true believers because they could consider the work that has been done in them through their conversion (78). Rivera further defends Edwards by saying, once true believers have examined themselves, they have no choice but to put their faith in Christ that he has redeemed them from their sinfulness (79).

This book is easy to read, written in a way many can understand. Rivera also does a good job writing the book in a way the modern reader can better interpret Jonathan Edwards’s writings through the lens of an eighteenth-century New Englander. This book also gives validation for self-examination and its importance in the Christian life. It has practical aspects for the modern church as well. Common things seen in many houses of worship today are addressed from coffee shops to concert-like worship services. This book’s approach helps modern worshipers to consider what Edwards and many like him would think about churches today.

While the book concludes on a practical note, it falls short in explicitly supporting its thesis. Rather, the reader may implicitly realize that worship based around Scripture, leading to self-evaluation, will naturally affect how one worships God on the private level. This implicit conclusion may be realized in the amount of Edwards’s spiritual discipline brought to light within the private devotion part of the book.

This book would be a great addition to anyone interested in the worship practices of Jonathan Edwards and how self-evaluation played a role in his worship services. Pastors, church leaders, students of religion, and lay people can all benefit from reading this book.

Jessie C. Wigginton

Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

*Walking Where Jesus Walked: Worship in Fourth-Century Jerusalem*, by Lester Ruth, Carrie Steenwyk, and John D. Witvliet. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010. 160 pp. $18.42.

Lester Ruth is a research professor of Christian worship at Duke Divinity School. Carrie Steenwyk serves as the publication manager for the Calvin Institute of Christian Worship. John D. Witvliet is director of the Calvin Institute of Christian Worship and professor of theology, worship, and congregational and ministry studies at Calvin Theological Seminary and Calvin College. These authors argue that Jerusalem’s worship reinforced an emphasis on the activity of God within time and space. Consequently, a study of Jerusalem’s worship in the fourth century provides daily, weekly, and yearly patterns that are essential to comforting, affirming, and challenging our faith in God.

The book is divided into two parts: locating the worshiping community and exploring the worshiping community. The first part addresses the uniqueness of Jerusalem’s worship for the development of Christianity. Seven significant themes mark Jerusalem’s worship: piety, time, place, prayer, preaching, music, and people. These themes are explored in great detail in the second section about the worshiping community. In locating the worshiping community, the authors also address the hybrid of practices brought from around the Christian world through pilgrimage. Therefore, Jerusalem’s worship was also the result of cross-fertilization from other regions. Part two describes the community’s worship through three vital areas. The first area discussed is a travel diary kept by Egeria, a nun, considered the main source about worship in the fourth century after the legalization of Christianity. Secondly, the authors analyze Scripture readings, a lectionary, which provides details about the use of the Bible in worship. And the third section explores the early church’s ways of handling Scripture by studying a series of sermons preached by Cyril while he was still a presbyter.

In the accounts by Egeria, the authors significantly highlight worship rhythms reenacting God’s activity. First, singing of hymns, psalms, and antiphons followed by prayer, a message, and blessings were integral to every gathering. The Sunday service, beginning at the tomb of Jesus Christ, reveals that the resurrection is the starting point for the Christians sense of time in worship (48). Egeria’s account of Scripture in worship states that “at the beginning of the reading, the whole assembly groans and laments at all the Lord underwent for us, and the way they weep would move even the hardest heart to tears” (49). The authors emphasize how the weekly, lengthy reading of Scripture shows remembering Christ’s death and resurrection as an act of worship. Accounts about catechumens provide an intense experience of several dimensions, including prayers and teachings in which the bishop goes through the entire Bible, beginning with Genesis, for forty days. In essence, the ability to know the entire Bible in a Christian way was integral to participating well in worship in this period (60).

The authors make a strong case for the origin and observance of various forms of prayer in the fourth century. An outline of the communion prayer or anaphora, which is also known as St. James’s prayer, provides insight into the focus of prayers and also the Trinitarian and narrative qualities of the prayer. Rather than prayer being inwardly focused, the Eucharistic prayer is a classic Christian way of naming and remembering practices that are outwardly focused (87). The authors reveal that the anaphora used Colossians 2:14, 1 Corinthians 2:9, and Isaiah 64:4 to pray, and this made worship more scriptural and focused on God.

In the analysis of Cyril’s sermon, the authors make a strong case for a Christ-centered message. They state that “Cyril’s sermon never allows the spotlight to drift from Jesus Christ, who he is and what he has done. As Christ is the key to interpreting the whole breadth of salvation history, he is also the key to understanding Scripture, human need, and God’s provision for it, and ultimately, God the Father himself” (119). All of Scripture points toward Christ and does not consist of merely isolated narratives. Cyril’s sermon account contrasts contemporary sermons that are tailored solely to the people’s felt needs.

The authors were substantially thorough about their accounts of the yearly celebrations and Christian calendar; Scripture preached, read, and prayed; and the importance of prayer, but they provide little about music and singing by comparison. There are remarks made in Egeria’s diary about worship that are not significantly addressed by the authors, as they seem to reveal an imbalance and shift from Christ-centered worship in contemporary times. Although there are brief mentions of singing (47), singers, and probably a choir (99), the concluding sections lack details about music.

A study of Jerusalem’s worship in the fourth century is important for everyone. For those interested in Christianity as a religion, they would discover the impact that legalization of Christianity had on the church. In Christian worship, it is important to see what a strong, biblical spirituality in worship should be. Those interested in preaching would find these texts very useful because they reveal how early preachers made the gospel of Christ key to interpreting all of Scripture. *Walking Where Jesus Walked* will be suitable as a textbook both for the specialist and layperson.

Desmond Ikegwuonu

Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

*Jesus and the Jewish Roots of the Eucharist: Unlocking the Secrets of the Last Supper,* by Brant Pitre. New York: Image, 2011. 244 pp. $15.00.

Brant Pitre, the author of *Jesus and the Jewish Roots of the Eucharist: Unlocking the Secrets of the Last Supper*, is a professor of Sacred Scripture at Notre Dame Seminary in New Orleans, Louisiana. *Jesus and the Jewish Roots of the Eucharist* looks at the roots of the Last Supper through a historical Jewish lens. Pitre tries to discover the real meaning behind Jesus’ words “Take, eat, this is my body” by interpreting the words and deeds in their historical Jewish context. He argues that one cannot know who Jesus was and what he has said unless they understand the context it derives from, in this case, ancient Judaism. To do this, he examines the Old Testament, where he draws a parallel between the Passover in Exodus and the Last Supper that Jesus had with his disciples. He looks in depth at all the things that surround the events of the exodus including the Passover, the manna, and the bread of the presence through the lens of Jewish beliefs, which help to explain the significance of the Lord’s Supper and the meaning behind what Jesus said about the bread and the wine being his body and blood.

Pitre defends his case by continuously drawing parallels between the Old Testament Passover and the New Testament Lord’s Supper. In the Passover, each father from the twelve tribes was a “priest” over his family, an unblemished male lamb was sacrificed, the blood of the lamb was spread, and the flesh of the lamb was eaten (55). In the New Testament, the Passover that was once commemorated became the Last Supper, or Jesus’s New Passover as Pitre puts it, Jesus himself was the lamb. There would be a new exodus through Jesus. In this case he draws very clear similarities between the exodus Passover and new Passover as the old is a prototype of the new. The author discusses every similarity in order to support his claim. His strongest argument, in this section, was that the exodus Passover was not complete until the Israelites ate from the sacrificed lamb. He linked this to the Eucharist saying that believers must also eat of Jesus’ flesh in order to truly take part in the Lord’s Supper. As part of the Eucharist ritual the “flesh” and “blood” is consumed; however, Pitre argues that it is actually Jesus within these elements. He reasons that since it was Jesus’ command that we eat of his flesh, the bread that we eat in the Eucharist must then be Jesus himself (74).

Pitre also uses manna, given to the Israelites during their time in the wilderness, to represent quite a few things that supposedly reveal the mysteries of the Eucharist. First, Pitre argues that it is miraculous or supernatural, like Jesus. Second, it is given daily, which Jesus also mentions in his Lord’s Prayer; “Give us this day our daily bread.” Third, it is holy since it was from God and placed in the Tabernacle. Lastly, it gives a foretaste of the promised land as it is “like wafers made with honey” (84). All arguments seem correct at first glance. However, the interpretation that Pitre makes on every point is quite a stretch. He argues that the manna is supernatural because of how it was given and who it was from. He makes the claim that manna has existed from the beginning of creation and is still eternally kept in heaven, arguing that things on earth are just copies of heavenly things (88). What makes his claim hard to grasp is that his source is not the Bible, but other sources from ancient Jewish writings, such as the Mishnah and the ancient Targum. As believers in Christ, we hold that Scripture is the only Word that is God-breathed and true. These other sources are accounts that have been written by others who may have their own interpretation. Pitre supports his argument by saying that “ancient Jews believed that the Temple was an eternal reality that existed in Heaven long before it existed on earth, so, too, some Jews saw the manna as an eternal reality that existed in Heaven long before it rained down to earth” (90). These “evidences” come from unreliable sources that may have even come from pagan thoughts and interpretations in those days. Though Pitre stacks his ideas neatly, his references bring about empty validations as they come from sources that are unreliable for those who believe Scripture to be the one true source.

Pitre has shown light on the Last Supper and how it parallels with the Passover and the exodus in the Old Testament. While much of his evidence from the Old Testament is accurate, he stretches some of his interpretations with the use of ancient Jewish sources. Though these sources are helpful, to make concrete conclusions based on many ancient interpretations that may have been intertwined with pagan thoughts is a bit unsettling, especially if it is to make conclusions about God’s ordinance. His thought process was clear and manageable to follow because of the organization; however, I felt that many of his ideas were new and too large to grasp for this book’s size. Overall, this book helped me to see how significant the Lord’s Supper is, and it showed me a new view of the Eucharist, though I was a bit taken aback by his interpretations. After reading this book, I realize the importance of seeing it in this light. Therefore, I think it will be helpful for those who have prior knowledge of the Lord’s Supper, but want to see it in a new, Jewish perspective.

Ha Eun Yoo

Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

*Missional Worship: Increasing Attendance by Expanding the Boundaries of Your Church,* by Cathy Townley. St. Louis, MO: Chalice Press, 2011. 134 pp. $21.99.

Cathy Townleyseeks to offer a new perspective on the practical role of worship in the church as a means to growing its attendance. There is an ever-growing discussion on the topic of the missional church, but Townley, an ordained pastor in the United Methodist church as well as a worship and evangelism coach, adds to the conversation that the method to increase worship attendance and expand the boundaries of our churches is to adopt a worship lifestyle (2). Townley argues throughout the book that our congregants must first and foremost live a life of worship, invite others into our faith communities, and then proceed to create a relevant atmosphere in our churches to welcome and sustain the new worshipers.

Townley structures her book in two parts, dividing what she calls the spiritual and the practical aspects comprising this framework of worship practice (2). In her writing, she focuses on using worship to grow attendance; however, worship in her context is the practice of spiritual disciplines, the daily devotional worship throughout the week. Townley argues that the role of the worship leader also should not necessarily be vocational in the sense that we think of it today. She argues that today most music ministers see the worship service as the main aspect of church life; however, although the worship service is important, “it isn’t the goal or even the main focus. . . . That’s backwards. Daily life is the goal because that’s where we actually live out our faith. . . . Jesus leads us outside the church walls . . . [where] Christ draws us closer to him through our spiritual practices” (11). Townley focuses in the second part of the book on “how to incorporate the spiritual disciplines into the worship service” (12). In this part she details what should be the work of the worship leader: facilitating the experience (104). This experience includes the corporate use of spiritual disciplines, including sitting “intentionally in silence [to] listen for what God says” (104). She argues that it takes “significant personnel working a lot of hours to create and implement this type of experience each week” (87). This work includes planning, using teams of believers and nonbelievers, and choosing songs that work, because “only ‘what works’ to help your particular mission field experience God in worship matters. Worship services are arts driven. It is how God communicates with us” (74). These elements include the transitions, which are necessary in avoiding disjunct and chaotic flow, “making it hard to enter into God’s presence” (96). Another important topic she addresses is lighting; turning the lights down “creates ambiance without saying a word,” as well as bringing focus to the leader and the altar (100).

Furthermore, Townley argues that the more familiar the worship leader is with the order of service, the easier it is for them “to relax and relate to God’s presence as God reveals God’s self to the community in the moment” (85). The first goal of the worship service is transformation: “Transformation is what we’re after in the public worship service: that those who are there have an experience of Christ so strong that they’ll consider following Him right then”  (104). This following Christ back into the world is the aspect that Townley argues is most important for growing the worship attendance, as the worshipers go out and invite others into the faith community.

Townley bases her whole set of practices on the life of worship that she describes in the first chapter; however, throughout the book she defines worship in numerous ways, all differing from the first idea of a life of devotion and spiritual disciplines. Most of the definitions of worship she provides are vague, as are many of the key points that she attempts to make. To further complicate the reading, Townley is not clear on her definition of the worship leader; in some cases it is the up-front person. In other cases, the entire congregation is the worship leader. The absence of distinction regarding the focal points of her book renders many of her practical suggestions and conclusions less useful to the reader.

In the same vein, not only are the definitions inadequate, the understanding of her worship philosophy is fragmented. This book is by far a practical book; Townley does not claim it to be anything different. However, strewn throughout her chapters resembling coaching sessions are bits of her philosophy of worship. It is quite difficult to discern what her motives are behind the practices she promotes; through an encompassing evaluation, however, the bits of her philosophy can be pieced together, although imperfectly. A stronger philosophical foundation would be quite beneficial before diving into the practical suggestions, especially so the readers can be aware of whether or not these practices complement their philosophies of worship.

To further complicate the flow of reading throughout her book, the informal writing style used lends itself to very weak arguments and incessantly repetitive statements. Furthermore, on every page there is an interruption of flow, in which she gives the reader a task to follow, and only on few occasions do these tasks actually correspond with the idea that she is attempting to convey; these interruptions consist of googling images such as spider webs or venus fly-traps, watching videos on YouTube of fruit, or listening to urban hip-hop songs. In the same manner, she uses these page breaks to include times of reading Scripture; occasionally these readings correlate with her argument. However, they unfortunately function the same as the aforementioned unnecessary interruptions, taking away from their importance to her stated topic.

What is most troubling about this book is that not a single time throughout her writing does Townley use scriptural support, although in the introduction she states, “when I speak on worship in this book, Jesus is my focus” (4). On the same page, she states that she is “aware that practical applications for growth aren’t much different from how they were in biblical times” (4). Whether that is true or not, Townley fails to provide the biblical support to her methods of church growth. Even more, her rare use of citations hardly supports her arguments or lend to the credibility of her methods and coaching. Any book approaching the topic of the church and worship, even from a practical viewpoint, should be supported throughout with scriptural support.

Townley approaches the topic of growing the worship attendance of churches from a narrow viewpoint, as she mainly discusses her experiences with emergent churches. In attempt to avoid being classified by either the attractional or church growth models, Townley offers her argument to the missional world in a vague and informal manner. If one is searching for coaching in a how-to format on how to bring in numbers, this may be the book to check out; however, if one is looking for well-supported, Scripture-based arguments as to how to effectively reach the community, this book will not match those criteria.

Lyndsey Huckaby

Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

*Music, Modernity, and God: Essays in Listening*, by Jeremy Begbie. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013. 261 pp. $55.00.

“[Your] efforts were doomed to failure from the start, since music and theology were fundamentally incommensurable: one deals with the affective and connotational, the other with the conceptual” (206). This quote is an extemporaneous comment by an attendee at an occasion where Jeremy Begbie was addressing the topic of music and theology. In this book*,* he addresses the overarching discourse between music and theological language by examining historical-musical examples of *intellectual paradigm shifts* (he terms the shift “modernity”) (7). By citing musicians and theologians, he demonstrates that even the connotative ontology of musical sound can “contribute to the formation of theological language” (194) and proves that the existing “zero-sum” understanding of theology (144) can be altered by the “interpenetration” model (165).

Begbie tries to shake off the long-term zero-sum struggles (like a tug-of-war fight) between sound and word, harmony and melody, and musical denotation and connotation, and he suggests that the new approach of interpenetration understanding of sound not only benefits the musical realm but also theological controversies, such as temporal transience and eternity, God’s transcendence and immanence, and divine sovereignty and human free will.

As his first example, Begbie launches his sound-word discourse by visiting the prominent Reformation duo of Luther and Calvin. The former believes that music is supportive for people to acquire universals, such as divinity; the latter treats music as tempered and “subservient” to biblical texts on which the congregation should focus (24). Here, Begbie states that the two-fold differentiations between music and word, and divinity and humanity, do not need to be viewed as a zero-sum rival but parallel interpenetrated partners.

In another example, Begbie cites two Bach scholars, John Butt and Karol Berger, and their discussions on the temporal concept of Bach’s music. Butt proposes that Bach’s compositions were not following “an external, pre-given logic,” but they explore the form and potential of the materials (48)—a sense of continuation. Berger asserts that the pre-classical compositional concept of time was a “circularized” time, and Bach’s music was a model of “neutralizing” time (55–56). Here, Begbie rejects and criticizes the asserted dichotomy of God’s time and eternity (59–60). He further contends that the biblical concept of eternity does not dismiss “the successiveness, transience, and the openness of the future to the new,” in which they were all engaged in the incarnated Christ (60). In other words, instead of contention, Bach’s music demonstrates the simultaneous, transient, and eternal natures of Christ.

Begbie climaxes his argument by utilizing Victor Zuckerkandl and Roger Scruton’s concept of *audibilia* (sound-space) to provide an alternative to the zero-sum theological understanding (156). When two distinct musical sounds exist in the same space (not sharing the space) and same time, they are mutually and ontologically *interpenetrated* “without merging, self-abnegating, suppressing (either side), or self-emptying” (159). Begbie propels this idea to shed light on the classic notion of God’s transcendence and immanence, his there-ness and here-ness, and as sovereign and giver of free will. Furthermore, it empowers the contemplation of Christ’s divine-human nature as the “co-presence” of two spaces: “the Son sharing created space while yet remaining the Father’s eternal Son and thus primordially inhabiting God’s eternal Trinitarian space” (168).

As a conclusion to his book, Begbie recaps that orthodox Christianity’s default communication, in both experience and expression, has been verbal language that is deeply embedded in our finitude and cultural, social, and political inclinations. He challenges the notion that “the more doctrinal language can be isolated from non-linguistic media, the more faithfully it will render theological truth” (204): a serious revision of connotational theology and conceptual music dichotomy is needed.

In his writing, Begbie draws a pool of witnesses, both pre-modern and modern, musical and theological, into the roundtable of discussion. He builds his argument by detailing the *intellectual shift* of figures in theology and musicology, dissects some theological aporias in history, and explains how the ontological and structural understanding of musical sounds may benefit the discussion. Within this strong proposition, however, Begbie almost misguides his audience on the apprehension of the term “modernity.” Although he briefly explains his definition of the word—equating “modernity” with the shift of intellectual paradigm—it does not fully align with the contemporary understanding of the term; thus, “modern” or “modernity” plays an obscure role in his main thesis on “co-existence” and “interpenetration.”

Nonetheless, Begbie effectively and thoroughly examines the natures of both verbal and doctrinal languages that communicate and miscommunicate. Meanwhile, his discussions branch out to various disciplinary areas and create further applications to contrasting concepts, such as cosmology and anthropology, confinement and freedom, discovery and inventiveness, creation and human culture, eternity and transience, metaphysics and metalinguistics. The perspicacity to explore and expand the capacity of musical sound and its semantic applications certainly carries a huge impact on contemporary theological discourses. Begbie tries to leave an open end to each contemplation; yet, he always directs his readers back to the mandatory boundary of Christological soteriology and aesthetics: “*Can* music reveal the grace of the Creator directly? *Can* music without directly associated texts function as ‘iconic’ of the glory of God?” (216) This is the perimeter and purpose of this scholarly research that, at the same time, is an introduction leading to a farther and wider study.

Ian Hin-Kei Yeung

Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

*Against the Gods: The Polemical Theology of the Old Testament*, by John D. Currid*.* Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books. 2013. 141 pp. $17.99.

Over the last two centuries, archaeological discoveries in the Near East have uncovered a multitude of similarities between Hebrew culture and the surrounding pagan cultures. Surprisingly, many religious parallels have also been uncovered, leading many scholars and theologians to question the relationship between the Old Testament and the ancient Near East. Did the Hebrew authors borrow from pagan religion and change it to fit their beliefs, contextualizing the Bible to their time? Did the Hebrew God evolve from the gods of the surrounding cultures? Is Judaism merely the result of syncretism or worse, pure invention? John D. Currid, Professor of Old Testament at Reformed Theological Seminary and Project Director of the Bethsaida Excavation Project in Israel, offers a compelling alternative view that can help the reader better understand and interpret the Old Testament. He argues that the similarities between the biblical accounts and pagan writings were deliberate, carefully chosen parallels designed as a polemic against the Canaanite religions in order to reveal the true power and authority of the only God, Yahweh.

Polemical theology, a much neglected area of research, is “the use by biblical writers of the thought forms and stories that were common in ancient Near Eastern culture, while filling them with radically new meaning” (25). The trend of modern scholarship, Currid says, is to emphasize the similarities to the neglect of their foundational differences (23). Polemical theology attempts to highlight the profound distinctions, which reveal a deeper level of worldview, theology, and belief, drastically different from the surrounding pagan nations (57). Currid demonstrates that the biblical writers were thoroughly knowledgeable of the surrounding pagan cultures and religions, and they purposefully used parallels to critique pagan practice and contrast Yahweh, the one true God.

Unlike all the surrounding nations, which were rampantly polytheistic, the Hebrews were staunchly monotheistic. The gods of the pagan mythologies were created in the image of mankind, saw man as their slaves, and often behaved no better than humans themselves. By contrast, the God of the Hebrews created man in his image, values mankind as essential to the universe, and is the one who wills, initiates, and acts rightly (61). Furthermore, the religious literature of the Canaanites and Egyptians is written as mythology and accepted as mythology; the biblical writers wrote as recording actual historical events, “accentuat[ing] the work of Yahweh that was done in history over against what was merely accomplished in the imagination of the [pagan] writer” (126).

Currid compares the biblical accounts of Creation, the Flood, Joseph and Potiphar’s wife, Moses and the Exodus, as well as examples from 1 Samuel, Isaiah, and the Psalms, to newly discovered literature of the surrounding Canaanite and Egyptian nations. The similarities are so striking and numerous that Currid says it cannot be mere chance; rather, he argues that the biblical authors deliberately paralleled key elements of pagan religions not only to expose the false nature of the pagan gods and reveal the true God, Yahweh, but to mock and humiliate them as inferior impostors, revealing the Hebrew religion to be ultimately superior. Two examples of this are Moses’s staff and the serpent – two objects venerated in Egyptian culture as representing authority and power. Moses, however, carried a mere shepherd’s staff (the Egyptians hated shepherds), which he threw down to become a snake (like the one adorning Pharaoh), which then proceeded to swallow the snakes of the Egyptian magicians, symbolizing to them not only a greater power, but assumption of their own power and authority, all of which both the Egyptians and Israelites would have understood. Thus, the biblical author shows through polemic that the one true God, Yahweh, triumphs and rules over the Egyptian false gods and the entire universe (119).

Currid presents a wealth of ancient Near East texts and accounts of biblical parallels in this work, explaining the polemical significance of each example. He gives a thorough introduction to polemical theology and makes a convincing case for viewing the Old Testament through a polemical lens as a means of gaining deeper insight and understanding. However, although he alludes to it, he does not contend that the source of cultural and religious commonalities is a common origin, that because Yahweh created all mankind, it is natural to understand how similar accounts would be passed down through generations, and then God set the record straight in his revelation of himself to the Hebrews. Instead, he puts the weight of responsibility on the choices of the biblical authors drawing parallels, rather than God himself choosing to reveal himself in parallels to show his ultimate superiority. But perhaps Currid avoids this argument intentionally to limit his book to contrasting biblical writers with other pagan writers of the ancient Near East, emphasizing the reasons for the similarities.

*Against the Gods: The Polemical Theology of the Old Testament* is an important work for conservative Christians because it uses scientific study of archaeological findings to support the authenticity of the Bible. It is also instructive for those who take a more liberal approach to the Bible. This is invaluable at a time “when a considerable number of scholars seek to diminish the originality and uniqueness of the Old Testament” (141). Students and scholars, ministers and lay persons will find this volume informative, engaging, and compelling.

Sarah Teichler

Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

*Seeking the Face of God: Evangelical Worship Reconceived*, by J. Daniel Day*.* Macon, GA: Nurturing Faith, 2013. 287 pp. $18.00.

J. Daniel Day, longtime Baptist pastor and former Professor of Christian Preaching and Worship at Campbell University Divinity School, draws upon church history, experience teaching college-level worship classes, and decades of personal biblical study and pastoring to remind evangelicals that worship is about God, or, to use the King James metaphor, worship is seeking the face of God. As the book’s subtitle implies, Day believes evangelical worship needs to be reconceived to be less about us and more about God.

Day’s opening chapter confronts evangelicals with an accusation of worship confusion, likening today’s practices to a game without rules, and posits that recovering purposeful worship is essential to the Church’s vitality. Next, he evaluates four worship models, three that drew evangelicals off course and one offered as faithful to biblical intent and consistent with the Church’s historical practices. A third chapter reviews two millennia of Christian worship to ascertain enduring principles of worship. His fourth chapter proposes a worship model for the twenty-first century. Day concludes with a new definition of worship and describes its implications.

Day’s critique of today’s evangelical worship is on point with an analogy of a rule-less game and a striking comparison to the biblical observation that “all the people did what was right in their own eyes” (Judg 21:25, NRSV). He counters that authentic “worship is not simply a matter of personal taste” (6) but a “definable ‘thing’” (7) with characteristics that “incorporate enduring essentials” (7). In other words, Christian worship does have rules, and these rules “actually enable and enliven” worship (13). However, he warns when we re-discover these rules we may find that “all we like sheep have gone astray” (Isa 53:8).

Day ascribes our confusion to neglecting the vertical-dialogical aspect of Christian worship, asserting this stems from three movements within evangelical worship’s recent history: Charles Finney’s “New Measures,” Robert Schuler’s “Hour of Power” television program, and the Pentecostal movement. Day characterizes these as Worship as Evangelism, Worship as Inspiration/Entertainment, and Worship as “Experiencing.” A full chapter—a worthwhile read of its own—describes these three movements’ origins, philosophies, and practices, and their contribution to our current worship chaos.

Day argues that through adoption of Finney’s “New Measures,” evangelicals lost worship’s New Testament moorings; that under Schuler’s entertainment model worship “became no longer about God, but about the performers” (56); and that Pentecostalism’s model replaced seeking the face of God with seeking our feelings (80). Day thus finds evangelicals believing every service must be compelling enough to win the lost, inspirational enough to attract outsiders, and emotional enough to demonstrate the Holy Spirit’s presence. He finds this both an impossible task and one without biblical warrant (86–87).

Here Day concludes that our understanding of worship must be reconceived: “It is not about selling God, nor is it about inspiring people with God-ideas, or generating electric moments when God may be experienced” (87). In fact, he concludes worship has no utilitarian purpose at all and, to quote Marva Dawn, “is a sublimely ‘royal’ waste of time” (88). The remainder of his book argues his vision of authentic worship.

Day proposes an alternative “truer to the biblical intent of worship” that he calls “seeking God’s face” (90). He further aims to regain contact with our theological heritage, arguing such contact reduces our “conceit that the Spirit was doing nothing of true importance until our immediate forbears came on the scene” (111).

To support his point of view, he escorts the reader on a high-level survey of church worship history, drawing applicable principles from pre- and post-Edict of Milan eras, and discovering seven landmarks, or “rules,” that “qualitatively differentiate corporate Christian worship” (180). This survey leads him to wonder “if our present worship conversations are nearly radical enough,” (138) suggesting we ought to spend more time thinking about worship’s substance rather than its style.

Under the rubric of “seeking the face of God,” and armed with the seven historical landmarks, Day proposes a worship order “both new and ancient” (191): worship with a Christological focus, “worship in the shape of Jesus’ life” (193). Applying the overarching Gospel narrative, Day envisions a four-part worship order: a Bethlehem moment, a Galilee moment, a Jerusalem moment, and an Olivet moment. In other words: a call to worship, revelation, reconciliation, and mission. He argues that this structure focuses the church on Christ’s life, forms it in His image, honors Scripture, reinforces a theological framework of worship, contains a rational narrative, incorporates worshipers into the gospel story, and lastly, is also the church’s historical norm of gathering, Word, table, and sending. Elaborating at length on this structure, he provides a biblical rationale for each phase, and offers detailed, practical suggestions for their implementation in an evangelical setting.

Day concludes that “Ours is to offer worship that is about God” (279), and this work does much to help us achieve that end. Easily digestible, well-researched, and annotated, it deserves a place on every worship planner’s bookshelf as a worthy companion to Bryan Chapell’s *Christ-Centered Worship* for both inspiration and reference. The format, colorful inter-chapter “excursions,” and discussion questions also make it suitable for a college or discipleship class text. Indeed, as Day argues that congregations need to be “taught how to worship” (275), this book would be a good place to start.

Robert Myers

Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

*Ancient Christian Worship: Early Church Practices in Social, Historical, and Theological Perspective*, by Andrew B. McGowan. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2014. 262 pp. $29.99.

The phrase “Rome was not built in a day” is also fitting to describe early Christian worship, as it too was not established in one day. In Andrew B. McGowan's *Ancient Christian Worship: Early Church Practices in Social, Historical, and Theological Perspective,* he explores the beginnings of Christian worship in the first four centuries of the early church. McGowan, an Australian native, is an ordained Anglican priest, and he has held the position of President and Dean of the Berkeley Divinity School at Yale University since 2014. The purpose of McGowan’s book is to trace the roots of Christian worship; he argues that the origin of Christian worship was shaped by a belief that worship is formative and should therefore reflect a distinct Christian identity.

McGowan begins by defining worship as “practices that constitute Christian communal and ritual life” (7). He then divides elements of Christian worship into six parts and engages in a discourse with each element to explore its origin as well as its development in the Christian liturgy; these elements are meal, word, music, initiation, prayer, and time. In his second chapter on the meal, he examines how the Eucharist evolved from being a component of the evening banquet meal to being part of the morning service. Then in his third chapter, he explains the importance of reading the Word aloud and how the interpretation that followed eventually became its own entity, known today as preaching. Next, his fourth chapter addresses music in the early church. Even though it was not common to sing in worship, the origin of singing also emerged from the evening banquet meal. Following, his fifth chapter looks into the initiation rites of Christians that includes baptism, anointing, and foot washing. Then in his sixth chapter, he discusses prayer in the early church by summarizing writings from Tertullian, Origen, and the Apostolic Tradition for insight. Lastly, McGowan closes his study with time by investigating the development of feasts and fasts in the church year.

The majority of McGowan’s discussion on tracing the origin of Christian worship, which includes the Eucharist, reading, preaching, and singing, stems from the early church’s gathering for the evening banquet on the Lord’s Day. McGowan explains:

We begin consideration of these meals not because of the prominence the descendants have for some Christians now, however, but because of their place then. They were not merely one sacramental part of a community or worship life but the central act around or within which others—reading and preaching, prayer and prophecy—were arranged. (20)

Since gathering for a meal was communal, early believers would inevitably observe the Eucharist, read the Word, and sing. McGowan explains:

All these Jewish meals are useful for comparison with the evidence for Christian communal eating; none of them provides a simple model adopted or adapted for Christian use, however. The Eucharist emerges in the same world as these forms, aware of some of the earlier ones, but developing alongside rather than merely out of them. (25)

In other words, McGowan’s conclusion that the Eucharist was developed *alongside* rather than *from* Jewish meals is paramount to support his argument that the origin of Christian worship was anchored by a need to shape a distinct Christian identity.

Next, public reading of the Word was common in synagogue worship; however, McGowan defends a distinct difference in a Christian reading of the Word:

Thus the commonly held view that Christian liturgical reading of Scripture has its origins in the synagogue may be broadly right, but wrong in the ways usually envisaged; it was not an organic, immediate, or universal bequest to the fledging Christian movement but a later borrowing necessitated by a real (if sometimes exaggerated) ‘parting of the ways’ wherein relations changed sufficiently for the synagogue no longer to be an obvious locus for Scripture to be heard and interpreted for Christians. (83)

McGowan acknowledges that the public reading of Scripture was an aspect of Christian worship that derived from synagogue worship, but the major shift is that the interpretation comes from a Christian perspective. Hence, the reading of Scripture aloud followed by an interpretation later evolved into a preaching of the passage. McGowan’s examination of the origin of reading the Word supports his thesis for Christians to have a clear break from synagogue worship to form their own identity.

Although McGowan’s meticulous study on the origin of Christian worship is well researched, the only weakness in his book, from a Baptist perspective, is his discussion on infant baptism. Indirectly, McGowan makes a case for infant baptism by explaining:

Baptism is often referred to in ancient texts as a ‘seal.’ . . . Circumcision, with which baptism was at times compared and contrasted, was also termed a seal (cf. Rom 4:13); as a literal marking of the body, circumcision was also the sign of a covenant relationship, contract, or treaty. (153)

In other words, there is justification for infant baptism by reinterpreting it as the new form of circumcision. Furthermore, McGowan states: “Many infant baptisms were taking place by this time and had certainly been common in many communities for a century or more. Augustine himself provided impetus to that trend, or at least a clearer theological underpinning” (169). It was Augustine’s doctrine of original sin that gave prominence for the baptism of infants (169). Although McGowan’s Anglican background gives him reason to advocate infant baptism, he nonetheless does acknowledge there is limited evidence on the practice of baptizing infants in the first and second century, adult baptism was the norm (145).

McGowan’s book is essential for anyone interested in understanding the origins of Christian worship. His straightforward writing and organization makes it easy for the reader to grasp his thoughts. However, from the way McGowan engages with the facts in his book, it is recommended for the reader to have some knowledge as well as understanding of early church writings and history to serve as a foundation to comprehend the conclusions that he makes. Moreover, McGowan’s book would be wonderful as a course textbook for upper undergraduate, graduate, or doctoral classes to slowly study each chapter and discuss McGowan's arguments on the origins of each element of Christian worship.

Jessica Wan

Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

*Rhythms of Worship: The Planning and Purpose of Liturgy*, by Michael Waschevski and John G. Stevens. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2014. 92 pp. $15.00.

Michael Waschevski is currently an associate pastor of programming and pastoral care at First Presbyterian Church in Fort Worth, Texas, and has served Presbyterian churches in Michigan and Texas since 1999. Co-author John Stevens is Waschevski’s stepfather, also pastor of Westminster Presbyterian Church in Sacramento, California. Because Christian churches have many different worship styles, ranging from traditional to contemporary, Christians may ask themselves what constitutes proper worship and which elements are essential for a worship service. Waschevski and Stevens depict the shared perspective of Christian worship of Presbyterian churches (largely all major Protestant denominations) with liturgical orders, elements, and seasons in the book *Rhythms of Worship: The Planning and Purpose of Liturgy*. Recognizing the correlation of every liturgical order, significance of the worship element, and proper interpretation of the liturgical church calendar, the authors emphasize the importance of “excellence” on the matters that humans can control and plan in worship.

This book has fourteen chapters, which address the order of worship, music and the arts in worship, and the liturgical calendar. In chapter one, the authors introduce a four-fold pattern that most major denominations follow: 1) gathering in response to the love and invitation of God; 2) hearing and responding to God’s Word; 3) sharing the meal and giving thanks; and 4) departing to serve God in the world (2). The next four chapters discuss each section of the four-fold pattern including the orders of transition. Chapter six focuses on how music and the arts are used in worship and what they signify. The authors define worship as a multisensory event and argue that the elements of music and arts in worship deeply engage the heart, mind, and soul. Throughout chapters seven through thirteen, the authors investigate the origins, the implications, and the ways of appropriate celebration of the liturgical seasons, such as Christmas, Epiphany, Advent, Easter, Lent, Holy Week, Pentecost, and other minor seasons during ordinary time. Finally, the last chapter concludes with the question, “Is worship important?”

Waschevski and Stevens argue that successful worship should be a work of the Holy Spirit, and man cannot control it (xi). However, the authors underscore that there are certain elements that man can control and plan so that the Holy Spirit freely works during the worship service. The goal of this book is “to describe in clear everyday language why we worship as we do and to help equip worship planners and leaders for excellence in their ministry” (xii–xiii). Regarding the goal, the authors focus on two significant elements.

First, the authors emphasize excellence in preparation and planning. In chapter one, they describe the aforementioned historic four-fold order, its sequence, and the significant characteristics of worship, which are interactive, responsive, and participatory (3). In order to vitalize those characteristics of worship, the leaders need to understand “a sense of the feel and function of each segment of the worship service, and how it prepares for and flows into the next segment” (4). For example, the liturgy of gathering is important because it is a transition into worship from everyday life. The worship leader may welcome people and briefly share information, but the leaders should plan on the liturgy of gathering being “short and joyous,” since it is an invitation of God and is followed by other liturgical orders (7). The authors also ensure that the preachers or worship leaders should let church staff know the Scripture passages as early as possible so that other elements of worship (such as hymns and anthems) can be integrated with each other (11). The Lord’s Table should be coordinated as simple, communal, and joyful. It is joyful because the Table signifies not only Jesus’ crucifixion but also His resurrection, and it should be prepared in detail so that the time of worship may not be delayed for any unexpected reasons (19–20). Through the chapters about the church calendar, the authors still emphasize the importance of intentional preparation; they argue that the true meaning and messages of each season can be conveyed purely and fully only through the well-prepared and organized worship services.

Second, the authors highlight the excellence of the quality of music and the arts in worship in chapter six. They do not focus on choosing the genre or style of music in worship, but music that is “excellent and eclectic in style and genre (for vital and faithful congregations)” (26). Liturgical dance and visual arts also should be excellent as they represent worship itself (30). For example, there are certain colors and symbols that should be used in worship following the church calendar, and this form of art makes worship richer and more vital (30–31). Music and other artistic elements encourage the congregation’s participation whether they are professional or non-professional. These elements of worship “have the ability to engage the hearts, minds, and spirits of those who worship” (32).

The most important contribution of this book is the well-addressed and well-organized discussion of liturgical orders and seasons throughout the entire volume. First, the authors investigate each liturgical element in a worship service from the beginning of the order (gathering) to the end of the order (sending out). Then, they examine special church calendar seasons, including Christmas (and Epiphany), Advent (preparation of Christmas), Lent, Holy Week, Easter, Pentecost, and other minor seasons. These well-organized sequences help the readers understand the meaning of church liturgy and to think upon appropriate practices that Christians should do. Furthermore, the readers can discern how each worship service fits in a broader liturgical context. However, the relatively weak part is that the authors give little attention to churches that do not have a large membership or vast financial resources. It seems that many elements that the authors emphasize require certain amounts of human and financial support. Although one can apply the topics like “well-prepared” or “excellence” to any circumstance, no matter the size of the congregation, some small churches cannot help but spend their resources and energy to maintain the church or worship itself. It would be worthwhile to discuss the appropriate way to apply the authors’ ideas and insights to small or developing churches.

*Rhythms of Worship: The Planning and Purpose of Liturgy* is readable and not too intense as compared with other books about liturgy; not only pastors or worship leaders but also congregations can read it and understand liturgical worship forms with historical and theological perspectives. Also, the questions for reflection after each chapter can be used in a small group setting for discussion, and they help readers to practically apply what they have learned.

Eun Byeol Lee

Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

*Worship Wars: What the Bible Says about Worship Music*, by Robert Bakss. Port Orchard, WA: Ark House Press, 2015. 271 pp. $19.99.

Do “worship wars” still exist in evangelical churches? The answer is yes. While many would argue that the “worship wars” of the late 1900s solved this issue, Robert Bakss argues that “worship wars” have occurred over many centuries and will always continue as long as personal opinions occur in the local church. Robert Bakss, Senior Pastor of Lighthouse Baptist Church in Australia, explores this topic in his book *Worship Wars: What the Bible Says about Worship Music*. Bakss creatively develops this journey of biblical worship through the lens of George Lucas’s *Star Wars* series by using chapter titles such as “May the Music Be With You.” After having a personal “worship war” within himself, Bakss writes this book to investigate music and singing as it pertains to use in the local church after a careful observation of biblical texts (6–7). He intends this book to be “a biblical guide to worship music spanning early church history to the present day; providing clear, concise guidelines, Biblical principles and practical suggestions to support the implementation of a balanced blend of traditional and contemporary worship music in churches” (Back cover).

Bakss accomplishes the part of his thesis, which encompasses the majority of the book, to be a “biblical guide to worship music spanning early church history to the present day” in the first section of the book “The Rise of Music.” He does this by providing the reader a biblical foundation of why people worship because, “If we get so focused on how we worship, its easy to forget why we worship” (12). This statement is vital to today’s discussions on worship because often the “why” takes a backseat to the best way on “how” to worship. Bakss begins this discussion on why people are to worship by examining specific commands of Scripture relating to biblical worship, paying special attention to the Psalms. Secondly, Bakss provides the reader with a philosophy of worship in the second section of the book. In this section, Bakss discusses topics including drums in church, the morality of music, and if rock music is appropriate for worship within the context of biblical worship. He pays specific attention to the role of drums in biblical worship by tracing their function from early Hebrew worship in chapter seven to the present, further supporting the first point of his thesis. As additional support, the third section of the book focuses on new music in worship by taking a historical approach to new music in worship, examining the movement from psalmody to hymns, to a more modern shift from hymns to Contemporary Christian Music.

In support of the second statement of his thesis, “providing clear, concise guidelines,” Bakss provides these guidelines in chapters fifteen through twenty. He covers topics including “When does the worship music become entertainment?” and “What should I do if my choice of music offends my brother?” Specifically in chapter twenty, Bakss provides biblical guidelines for selecting worship music.

Bakss covers the final section of his thesis, “biblical principles and practical suggestions,” in the final major section of the book. He does this by providing examples from the Psalms and other biblical passages discussing music in the service of the church.

Overall, there are many positive aspects to this book. Bakss does an excellent job in his research for this book because he approaches the topic of worship from a legal perspective (6) much like Lee Strobel does in his book *The Case for Christ.* Bakss also understands that “the need to focus on the biblical texts is especially needful in the area of music, since subjective feeling and cultural bias have historically clouded the truth” (7). Because of the legal approach to his writing, he writes with a level of objectivity, which is missing in many contemporary books on the topic of worship, especially the preferential treatment on worship. He fully supports his thesis by providing the reader with a historical, biblical history of worship, biblical principles to abide by, and practical suggestions for implementation in worship services.

*Worship Wars* provides the church a dialogue of topics that are still debated in the local churches. Bakss gives a good, solid foundation for churches to look at a biblical model of worship. This book is an excellent entry-level book for pastors and lay people to begin a conversation about worship, its foundations, and many of the problems that churches encounter today.

Matthew Phenix

Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

*Creating Missional Worship: Fusing Context and Tradition*, Tim Lomax. London: Publisher’s Church House Publishing, 2015. 192 pp. $22.70.

“God is not found exclusively in the church—he is out there” (102). With his strong conviction on the importance of creating missional worship, Tim Lomax, a member of the Liturgical Commission of the Church of England and Chair of its Evangelical Worship Consultation, asserts that worship should be a blend of the liturgical tradition and the context of the worshipers.

The book outlines two sections in its eight chapters. The first four chapters explore the roles of context and tradition in worship. Each subject is examined separately after having addressed briefly the debate that is going on regarding the two matters. The second four chapters of the book present ways that the marriage between context and tradition might be kept alive. This section offers building blocks for creating missional worship, and it explains how these building blocks could be applied in practice.

The author makes his point through several means. First, Lomax anticipates the possibility to fuse context and tradition in worship. He states that “liturgical tradition is the liturgies, ritual, practices, and frameworks that we have inherited and developed over the years. The context is contemporary culture and local community” (3). By putting the natures of context and tradition in such a way that there are elements that the two could share, though they may be often held in opposition to one another, the reader can see the potential to tackle these two aspects of worship as one. Also, by mentioning the strong and weak points of both aspects (58), the author clearly states that neither of them is perfect, but a better solution could be brought about by fusing them together.

Second, the author provides reasons why worship should be contextualized. Perhaps, one of the most prominent reasons to support this would be his theological conviction on contextualization as it is found in the communal life of the Trinity (18-20). By illustrating the interpersonal relationships between the persons of the Godhead, the idea of giving space for particularity, while moving collectively toward salvation, is clearly highlighted. It also emphasizes the Church’s role in missions as reflecting the communal life of the Trinity.

Third, Lomax presents the advantages of keeping traditional worship elements in contextualized worship. He elevates the meaning of liturgical acts in the Church of England by pointing out the fact that God’s narrative lies in them (48). Also, by reminding readers that the liturgical tradition is heavy with the expression of mission (55), the place of tradition in worship is clearly established.

Lomax continues to assert that worship can be contextualized within the frame of the Anglican liturgical tradition. Creativity, he suggests, is an essential device for blending old and new. This notion is accentuated by the biblical truth that God is the Creator. Since everyone is made in God’s image, they ought to be creative in forming missional worship (97). The author also suggests keeping a balance to avoid worship wars. Terms such as “bend it like Beckham” (60) and “freedom within a framework” (62) are used to support the idea of keeping the context and tradition in balance.

Continuing the concept of fusing the two, the author writes on the concept of “worship that goes out” (77). By addressing the need to provide various worship acts for people with different learning styles (96), the idea of engaging with people from all kinds of backgrounds is emphasized. In opposition to worship that only serves church members, throughout the book the author frequently uses the terms “concert worship” and “one-size fits all worship” in order to avoid creating the kind of worship the terms represent. The idea of engaging with a diversity of people is also supported by several building blocks that will promote blending of context and tradition (78-103). Such building blocks include thoroughly Trinitarian, disciple-making, expressing generosity, inspiring creativity, attractively authentic, etc. All these aspects strongly reinforce the author’s standpoint that worship should draw individuals with different backgrounds to the church.

Finally, the author presents the picture of how missional worship should be in practice. A number of examples for alternative worship is provided within this content, the author claiming that “worship, prayer, and fellowship are by no means confined to our church building and services” (127). With such a strong conviction on reaching out to unchurched people, Lomax offers mission-oriented styles of worship, such as Liquid Worship (20), Eucharist in café-style worship (116), interview in worship (122), using movie clips (124), etc. These examples clearly reflect the author’s argument for creating worship that engages with people where they are.

The author puts a heavy emphasis on creativity in missional worship, and he does this very effectively. Throughout the book, several suggestions and examples of creative styles of worship are provided, some of which, if not all, appear to be usable and practical. An example of this would be an outdoor men’s retreat, which he calls “Band of Brothers” (69), that is designed for men to spend time learning about how they can meet with God in the wild.

Although a multitutde of creative ideas for worship are presented well, these ideas appear to be rooted in the author’s own suppositions. Focusing on the subject of Christian public worship, a book like this could have explored more on the biblical foundations of worship. Apart from stating that missional worship should reflect the characteristics of the triune God, the reader is not informed about worship according to biblical norms. Every time the issues rising from contextual or traditional aspects of worship are discussed, blending the two with creativity is taken as the sole solution for solving those problems. Again, the reader’s expectation to see what the Bible says about these issues is not provided.

One other concern is that the author seems to take inculturation to an extreme level in some of the contexts presented in the book. While creativity is given great weight in missional worship, some of the provided suggestions seem to be focusing too much on attracting people instead of leading people to experience Christian values through worship. One example would be worshipers texting their confessions to a central number and receiving back an absolution in the form of a text message (68). Even in outlining the contents of the book, only the question of how much weight should tradition be given in fusing the two is taken into consideration, but the same question is not raised for contextualization. This appears to contradict the important concept of balance between context and tradition in fusing them.

Despite the weaknesses mentioned above, the book is a useful resource for evangelism, and it is readable and very practical. An appendix includes programs of the worship styles presented throughout the book allowing for the service orders to be seen clearly. Because some of the subject matters discussed in the book appear to be revolutionary, it should be read with some caution. Other than this, many ideas displayed in the book can be a fresh insight for church ministers and worship leaders in creating worship that engages people from both inside and outside the church.

Ruth Aung

Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

*Awe: Why It Matters for Everything We Think, Say, and Do*, by Paul David Tripp*.* Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2015. 198 pp. $14.27.

“No matter how hard I try, I just cannot seem to get it right!” Many people hear this phrase in common, everyday life. If one were to quickly discern the issue and was also a believer, he or she would be able to deduce that this person is trying to earn his or her righteousness. However, there is another issue at play: placing their awe, hopes, and trust in *themselves.* In his book, *Awe*, best-selling author Paul Tripp contends that all humanity is wired to be in awe of God alone. Placing awe in anything or anyone but Him will ultimately lead to failure, dissatisfaction, confusion, and inevitable destruction.

Tripp informs his readers that humanity was specifically designed by God to be in awe of Him alone. The Creator God specifically designs all desires, thoughts, words, tastes, and actions. When man tries to replace God with other means that serve to remind him of the Creator, he will become frustrated, confused, angry, disappointed, and blinded because he has placed his hope in something that cannot withstand the weight of worship. Tripp brings a refreshing view that one who finds his identity in the world finds worry and short-lived satisfaction; however, when one finds his identity in Christ alone, he will find hope, peace, and joy.

Tripp supports his thesis by presenting examples of how humanity is amazed in the world today: the thrill of catching the biggest fish, the astonishment of a flawless performance, starting a business, and seeing a film in IMAX 3-D (13-16). He argues that it is not wrong for human beings to want to be amazed because they were designed to be amazed. The problem is human beings are far too easily entertained; when they place their ultimate hope of being amazed in the means, the things that are designed to remind man of the glorious God, they will find themselves disappointed because they have transgressed against the Creator. Tripp uses the Fall and the story of Cain and Abel as examples of awe gone wrong. Eve, seeking to have the knowledge of God and getting what she was forbidden to have, ate the fruit of the garden out of pride and lustful desire for the unknown. Tripp says, “We want godlike recognition, godlike control, godlike power, and godlike centrality” (28). As Adam and Eve sought to be like God and govern their own choices, so does man in his treadmill search of amazement in the world when it can only be found in God. The principle that Tripp wishes his readers to grasp from the tragic historical account of Cain and Abel is, “awe of God is very quickly replaced by awe of self” (29). Cain sought his own good and killed his brother because his offering was favored over his own. Tripp calls this misplacement of awe *“awe-wrongedness* (AWN)” (26). This sickness can cause ministers to shift their purpose from proclaiming God’s name among the nations to agendas being completed (44). The process of replacing the end to where the awe is directed will lead to self-centeredness, horizontal addiction, and disappointment.

Tripp asserts that what he calls horizontal addiction will lead to amnesia of vertical awe. In the realm of horizontal addiction, the creature replaces the Creator in regard to what is worshiped. Take food, for example: when the taste, smell, and texture serve to remind man of a good God who gave us the biology to sense all of these, it could become the focus of everything for man. He also addresses one concept that affects how man views everything from ministry to parenting to the workplace: worldview. Tripp references Isaiah 40 to show how that particular passage so adequately presents the sovereignty of God. Tripp brings this to a level of understanding with topics of parenting and work for the general layperson. He places awe into the big picture of parenting and work by directing his readers towards the great chief end of man: to glorify God and enjoy Him forever.

The strength of Tripp’s argument lies in the chapter on worldview (131–44). He presents two types of worldviews: “Two-Drawer” and “Here’s Your God.” The “Two-Drawer” worldview has two drawers. The first drawer, “real life,” has everything that man encounters on a daily basis, and this is the drawer that dominates his life (135). The other drawer, the “spiritual” drawer, has everything to do with God and the spiritual life (135). Tripp argues however, that this worldview is contrary to Isaiah 40, which illustrates God as one who cannot be isolated in a small drawer. In fact, Isaiah 40 is what he calls “worldview literature” or the “Here’s Your God” worldview (136). Tripp’s treatment of this passage reveals why God is the ultimate glorious end where every relationship and circumstance must be brought under the lens of His inspired Word. Looking at the world through an Isaiah 40 lens, he or she will see that everything was created by God and for God. Those without this worldview will experience disappointment, confusion, selfishness, and anger. Having an understanding of this worldview provides strength because this worldview draws from the inerrant Word of God. Tripp supports his argument by using the universal concept of parenting. He recounts experiences of parents who come to him confused and broken because they hate their relationships with their children. He goes on to explain that he believes it is because their worldview is to produce “good” children. However, Tripp addresses that the problem is that children are born with an idea of autonomy and self-sufficiency (161). While Tripp does say that the law is important to establish in the home, he also addresses the heart, which is blinded by sin and self (162–64). Tripp says that the role of the parent is to do everything they can “to put the glory of God and His grace before our children so that the awe of God would rule over their hearts” (163). The comfort gained from this quotation is that God has already done this through creation. Parents must direct the children’s discovery and awe to God and pray for the salvation of their souls (163).

The weakness in *Awe* is Tripp’s address towards “awe-fickle” hearts (70). He states, “Only when we admit that we have awe-fickle hearts will we begin to reach out for and cling to the forgiving, transforming, rescuing, and delivering grace of Jesus” (70). This seems to be a hazy version of confession and repentance. Tripp’s argument would be clearer and more concise if he clearly stated that sinners must confess and repent of their sin and believe in the Lord Jesus Christ.

*Awe* is a refreshing call to refocus awe towards the Creator and is applicable for the worship team, layperson, parent, coworker, or unbeliever who has “awe-wrongedness.” This a great book to read in the context of a small group, worship team, or leadership team.

Benjamin T. Bickley

Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

*The Music Architect: Blueprints for Engaging Worshipers in Song*, by Constance M. Cherry. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2016. 272 pp. $22.99.

Constance M. Cherry is a professor of worship and pastoral ministry at Wesleyan University and holds a Master of Music degree from Bowling Green State University and a Doctor of Ministry in Christian Worship from Northern Baptist Theological Seminary. Cherry’s ministerial experience includes being a musician, worship leader, and pastor at churches that range from small to mega-church sizes. These churches have presented Cherry with various styles, people who have been musically literate and not, one race majority, culturally diverse, in rural areas and in metropolitan. The author clearly has both academic and vocational training and experiences that have prepared her to write on the topic of worship. By writing *The Worship Architect*, Cherry seeks to assist people who have been charged with musical leadership in a local church with carrying out their duties in a way that will glorify God and edify the worshipers. Throughout this book, Cherry seeks to help leaders understand their role in the music for worship, and she gives steps that will encourage the worshiper to engage in song.

Cherry takes the reader through the many different facets that are involved in using music for worship and what she feels is necessary to engage the worshipers in song. To begin she claims that it is not the music minister or worship leader alone who are to be considered when constructing a worship service. Each person who has a hand in the planning process and execution of the music in the worship service is what Cherry calls a “worship architect.” Cherry also gives a new title to the worship music leader, pastoral musician, which she feels more accurately implies the roles associated with this position.

The book then proceeds through the many aspects of music for worship beginning with the foundation, God-focused song. In the subsequent chapters, Cherry presents the reader with the roles of music in worship, creating a logical flow with the songs chosen, and creating a canon of songs for the local church. The perspective of the book changes a bit in the remaining chapters, focusing on the music for worship and engaging the congregation rather than the liturgical perspective from earlier. Cherry covers the topics of maximizing song forms (both long and short), the local church’s individual worship voice based on context, leading the congregation in song, helping the congregation realize their role in worship to encourage them to engage, the formative nature of music in worship, and the pursuit of spiritual leadership through excellence.

Cherry’s organization of the book follows a systematic process that allows the reader to easily understand her main point and purpose. The strength lies in the foundational beginnings that Cherry presents. She first allows the reader to understand the roles of the music leader, and she defines worship and builds upon it to show how the leadership can engage the worshiper in song when it is constructed in the manner she presents. Also, it is organizationally fitting that the first and last chapters address the music “architect” since that is the intended readership.

With the idea of the worship architect in place, Cherry claims that it is not just the educated music minster that should engage the ideas of this book. According to Cherry, those who are musicians, tech/media personnel, and pastors are meant to engage in these thoughts as well. However, Cherry does not give much scriptural basis for many of the things that she claims. For example, when Cherry gives her definition of worship, she gives no foundational Scripture on which to support her definition. This happens throughout the book with other claims. It is dangerous for the uneducated reader, who is one of the many this book is for, to not have this scriptural foundation because without it their views are based solely on Cherry’s word.

Particularly helpful were the chapters that address the engagement of the congregation and the formative role that music has on worshipers. These chapters clearly spell out the worshiper’s role in the worship service. To help encourage the congregation’s engagement, Cherry provides the reader with information about the congregation’s proper role in worship. Her summary gives the reader or music leader the proper tools to educate their congregation and encourage them to engage in the songs of worship with proper intent. They then participate fully for the sake of others in singing with understanding.

Overall, this book was well-written and proves to be very helpful to those who lead music for worship in the local church. Cherry’s organization flowed from foundation to application well, and she leads the reader to many thought-provoking conclusions. The thoughts presented by Cherry are clear and each gives one part of the blueprint to engage the congregation in song. If the two books that came before this, *The Worship Architect* and *The Special Service Worship Architect*, are as informative as this volume, they would be well worth reading.

Matthew Stringfellow

Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

*The Temple and the Tabernacle: A Study of God’s Dwelling Places from Genesis to Revelation*, J. Daniel Hays. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2016. $19.99.

“The temple and the tabernacle serve as the dwelling place of God himself, and this ‘tabernacling’ presence of God among his people, relating to them in his gracious covenant love, is, without doubt, one of the most central and important themes in the Bible” (185). J. Daniel Hays, Dean of Christian Studies at Ouachita Baptist University, makes this powerful statement in his book *The Temple and the Tabernacle*. The purpose of this book is for the reader to gain a greater appreciation and understanding of God’s tabernacling presence. By tracing through the “Bible chronologically, examining theologically how God’s presence, power, and holiness engage with people through ‘temples,’ or ‘temple-like’ places,” Hays aims to elucidate how “God dwells among his people and encounters them in relational presence” (10–11).

Hays opens with a brief explanation of the temple and tabernacle, and he examines the Greek and Hebrew words used to express them. He then traces God’s dwelling in the Garden of Eden, the tabernacle, and Solomon’s temple. God’s departure from the temple and an examination of the second temple follow. Hays closes by elucidating the New Testament dwelling of God, and he explains what it means for Christians today.

Hays attempts to defend his thesis in many ways. First, He clearly explains the presence of God in the Garden of Eden. By examining God’s dwelling in the garden, Hays fulfills his goal of showing how the power, holiness, and presence of God dwelt among Adam and Eve. He argues that Eden carries temple-like qualities. Hays states that “the garden . . . is a place where God’s presence dwells in a special kind of way so that his people can be with him and worship him,” thus the Garden of Eden fulfills the “function of a sanctuary or temple” (21). Hays explains how God dwells personally with his people stating that “just as the tabernacle and the temple will become the residence of God and the place where God meets his people, so the garden functions in the same manner” (22). Hays makes a strong argument for the Garden of Eden being a temple where God’s relational presence dwells among Adam and Eve.

Another way in which Hays attempts to fulfill his telos is by examining the dwelling of God in the tabernacle. Hays provides evidence by illuminating the divinely prescribed items of the tabernacle. For example, he clearly expresses how God’s holiness, presence, and power is seen in the ark of the covenant. The “focal point of God’s presence” is the item that is the “most central and the most holy, the ark of the covenant” (36). The table of shewbread is another strong example given by Hays because it likely represents how God chooses to fellowship with his people (43–44). Similarly, with the altar of incense, “the smoke and fire combination fills the holy place and signals clearly that one is entering into a very sacred place and drawing near to the very presence of God” (51). The tabernacle’s purpose was to house the special, holy presence of God, and in it God powerfully dwelt among his people and traveled with them.

In addition to God dwelling in Eden and the tabernacle, Hays also argues that God’s special presence can be seen in the New Testament. Hays explains that Christ is the temple, and he uses John 1:14 as evidence that Christ tabernacled among his people. Because the Holy Spirit dwells within every believer, the individual Christian is a temple of God’s holy presence. Hays argues that the church is also the temple of God stating that “believers as a group (i.e., the church) function together as a temple as well, with Jesus Christ as the special cornerstone for this new temple, and the presence of God dwelling within the temple to empower and bless his people” (179). Hays clearly defends his thesis by examining God’s powerful New Testament dwelling in Christ, the Christian, and the church.

The aforementioned arguments and evidences are particularly strong. His explanation of how Christ fulfilled the tabernacle is informative and biblical. Also, his examination of God’s presence leaving the temple is thorough, and his archeological, historical perspective on Herod’s temple is informative. Overall, Hays was successful in achieving his aim.

Though written quite well, Hays’s book has room for improvement. His argument that Eden parallels the tabernacle and temple would have been enhanced by exploring Adam’s role as a priest in the Garden. He possibly stretches a couple of symbols, for example, the cherubim’s swords symbolizing lightning (23). The author’s statement that God “[did] not initiate the construction” of Solomon’s temple is problematic because he places Solomon’s building of the temple in a negative light, making inferences that are not clearly stated in Scripture (73). In contrast to Hays’s claim, 1 Chronicles 28:6–8 expresses that God chose Solomon to build the temple instead of David. Hays states, when examining 1 Kings 6:12–13, that “God does not respond to Solomon with praise or explicit approval, but rather with cautionary warning” (74). God’s warning does not provide proof that God did not initiate the building of Solomon’s temple, thus it seems that Hays’s claim is more speculation than sheer fact.

This book is highly recommended for those interested in Hebrew and Christian worship, history, and archeology. It includes helpful pictures and charts, which aid in the understanding of the topic at hand. Hays’s book is well written and informative: a great addition for any bookshelf.

John Gray

Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary
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