JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY

VOLUME 36 JUNE 1996 NUMBER 2

CONTENTS

CHILDREN OF GOD, BUT STILL IN THE WORLD*

John Lau

* The "President's Address," at the Graduation Service of Immanuel Lutheran College, Eau Claire, Wisconsin, May 18, 1996.

TEXT: 1 Corinthians 10:11-13 - Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples; and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come. Wherefore let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall. There hath no temptation taken you but such as is common to man; but God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able, but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it.

———————————————

Our Lord gives wondrous encouragement to those whom He has made His own through faith in His Son, Jesus Christ. This is made clear when we review the name or title which He bestows upon us: "Children of God, and if children, then heirs, heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ." How comforting it is to keep this in our minds and hearts, especially on this day of graduation and departure from our beloved school, that our Lord has given us the spirit of adoption, whereby we are enabled to call Him our Father. No matter where we are, no matter what calling we have, to know God as our Heavenly Father and to know Jesus as our Lord and Brother, our Immanuel who is with us, gives us the courage and will to carry out our tasks in this world.

It is indeed a blessed thing to have confidence that we are children of God, and that we enjoy God's blessings, that we are eternally saved and are heirs of God. This confidence is a fine thing when it results in our living up to and in accordance with the position we have. But if it works the other way, namely that we think we are safe and secure and that nothing bad can possibly happen, so that like the foolish virgins we go to sleep and let our lamps go out for lack of fuel, then what ought to be a blessing may easily become a bane.

This is the particular point that our text on this occasion makes. You graduates are indeed aware that you have been accompanied to this important day of your lives with the steadfast prayers of those who are dearest to you, your parents, family and friends. During the time you have spent here at ILC, your teachers have added to those prayers daily instruction in the teachings of God's Word, so that you have been assured of your status as children of God and inheritors of His grace. As you have experienced in your own

lives and in those of your schoolmates, this is not a perfect place, a Garden of Eden, where there is no temptation or sinful activity; but it is a place where, with the help of God, you have been sheltered, at least to a great extent. Now, as you are about to depart from ILC, some for a rather short time, some for a longer time, and some forever, I want to give you some parting thoughts in regard to the status you have as CHILDREN OF GOD, BUT STILL IN THE WORLD.

I. Illustrated by a number of Old Testament examples.

The epistle in which our text appears was written to the Christians of Corinth, of whom comparatively few were Jews. In this flourishing congregation, which Paul had founded, difficulties arose. False teachers had come in; parties had arisen, and a factious spirit was running high; and at least a few of these people had fallen back into the impure ways of the world.

We do not and cannot know what these Greeks in Corinth knew about Jewish ancient history. But in that history of the Jews there were some good examples of warning, and for that purpose Paul used them in writing this epistle. Let us remember, first of all, that Israel was God's chosen people. Not so long before the events of which Paul wrote, the Israelites had experienced a wonderful deliverance from their Egyptian bondage. They had all come through the Red Sea, and they had received great spiritual blessings. But the Israelites had not lived up to their high calling. With most of them God was not well-pleased, and they were overthrown in the wilderness. Paul related some of the circumstances in his letter.

In the first place, he cited the idolatrous practices at Sinai, where the Israelites caused Aaron to make a golden calf, which they worshipped in the manner Paul described: "The people sat down to eat and drink and rose up to play." This certainly had a special bearing on some of the Corinthians, who went into pagan temples and partook of the sacrifices offered to idols. But these words, "They sat down to eat and drink and rose up to play," are certainly also descriptive of much in our modern life and consequently must be considered also as a warning for us. The next instance to which Paul referred is the account of fornication related in the book of Numbers. The point in this example was that it was not only the breaking of a recently given commandment but involved a compromising with the heathen who did not know God. This, too, is a warning for our times. Another instance Paul related was that of a case of gross murmuring against God and His dealing, also told in the book of Numbers. The Israelites had forgotten all about God's gracious deliverances. They had lost sight of the Promised Land before them and all the promises this involved; they thought only of their stomachs. Paul spoke of this, under the circumstances, as a tempting of the Lord. The final example Paul cited was a listing of cases of ecclesiastical rebellion, which, when it is against rightfully constituted authority, is rebellion against God. These last two illustrations also describe our day.

Now, concerning all these instances Paul wrote to the Corinthians: "These things (namely the punishments for them) happened to them by way of example, and they were written for our admonition." And it is clear that this indeed applies to us as well as to the Corinthian Christians. Therefore, dear graduates and friends, let us ponder our subject: CHILDREN OF GOD, BUT STILL IN THE WORLD, because the old evil foe, Satan, is still at work. Let us receive Paul's words as

II. A warning against self-sufficiency.

There are people who think they know everything. They will not accept advice and never feel the need of it. May our Lord preserve us all from this attitude, for it is truly dangerous in all walks of life!

For instance, the pilot of a ship may know the theory of his craft perfectly. He may know his course and hold to it steadily. He may know the location of all the dangerous reefs and the course of the treacherous currents. But still he must keep his wits about him. A sudden storm may arise. If in northern waters, he will listen to the advice of those whose business it is to keep him informed as to icebergs. Or again, the engineer of a swift train knows his route. There are tracks on which his train runs. But still he has to keep awake and alert. There are stops to be made. Besides that, something may happen along his run. In fact, only an engineer who has demonstrated watchfulness and great care, will be entrusted with a fast train.

It is not much different with the Christian pilgrim in this world. There are signs all along the line which he must take the time to read and study. And there are dangers, both those that are expected and also those that are unexpected. Consequently, it is poor policy to overestimate our own ability. Even in the ordinary walks of life, most of us have no time for the "know-it-alls" or "do-it-alls." On the other hand, just as it is poor policy to overestimate our own ability, it is also poor policy to underestimate the keenness and

strength of our adversary. In a war, for instance, it would be fatal for a commander to think so poorly of his enemy that he would not take the necessary precautions for the safety and final victory of his army. It is far worse in the spiritual warfare in which the Christian is engaged. Let us always remember that our opponent is not flesh and blood, but principalities and powers; it is Satan himself, with all his host of evil angels, that seeks to mislead and destroy us. Carelessness and indifference is extremely dangerous under the circumstances. The disposition to let things shift for themselves is not only hazardous in the ordinary things of life, but especially so in spiritual things.

One of the most deadly things in the Christian life is to get the idea that Christian life just takes care of itself. Some seem to have the notion that because they are members of the church they can break God's law and get away with it. Still others seem to think that they can run with the godless world and do as it does, without harm to themselves. Can it be that such individuals believe that the Lord can be deceived because He is a God of love? Can they believe that it is not possible for them to forfeit the position of children and heirs of God? What terrible danger lies in such folly!

Paul encouraged the Corinthian Christians to recognize their own sins and weaknesses and to know the dread power of Satan and the world of which he is still the prince - and then to be strengthened by the Lord's promise to be their Redeemer, their Immanuel, and their Preserver. That encouragement is ours also as we remember throughout our lives that

III. God has provided the means to escape temptation.

Our text declares: "There hath no temptation taken you but such as is common to man; but God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able, but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it." How are we to understand this saying? There is really only one way, and that is to simply take it just as it reads. After all, there is nothing unusual about any of us when it comes to temptation and sin. These are common to man; in other words, "All have sinned and come short of the glory of God." Most of us would prefer to find someone or something else to blame for our condition. The natural mind all too readily lays the blame on parents, environment, bad choice of friends, the enmity of the world; but seldom do we, with David, declare: "I acknowledged my sin unto Thee (the Lord) and mine iniquity have I not hid." There is no compulsion from God toward sin: He created everything and declared it good, including Adam and Eve, and yes, even Satan. And now that sin has come into the world, the only compulsion toward sin is our evil and sinful nature. "God indeed tempts no one," as Luther declared. Nay, more! He provides the way to escape temptation.

We know how weak we human beings are, and how frequently and sorrowfully many fail. As you graduates must also admit, your lives here at ILC have not been without temptation and sin. Is there any chance of improvement for you and for the rest of us as well? Praise God, for in His grace and mercy He has provided us with great hope.

First of all, let us realize that God knows the whole sad story. "He knoweth our frame; He remembereth that we are dust." He knows the fever that rages in the blood. He knows the allurements that beckon so enticingly. And He also knows very well that our wills, as much as we may boast about them, are without strength. Physically strong and intellectually capable men have been known to sit and weep like children at just this in their lives, that they are incapable of taking hold and doing the thing that they know they should do, or of letting go of the thing that they know to be sinfully wrong. In a sense this is true of everyone of every age. St. Paul confessed it in himself when he wrote: "The good that I would I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do!"

It is then that the blessed word of our Lord comes to us with the greatest comfort, reminding us of the great love with which He loved us and sent Jesus Christ, His Son, to pay the supreme penalty for the sin of the world, so that, believing in Him, we may not perish but have everlasting life. Our dear Lord urges us to bear temptation when it comes to us, as it surely will and does, by remembering His promise not to leave us comfortless; for the Holy Spirit is with us to sustain us in the struggle and provide the only means which prevails, the blessed Gospel of salvation. That is the means to escape temptation. And it is my prayer for you graduates, for all who are departing our campus, and for all here present, that you will take God at His Word, for it will sustain you throughout your lives and into eternity. For Jesus' sake. Amen.

CHURCH MUSIC, SACRED OR SECULAR?

Robert Dommer

FOREWORD

An issue that is vital to the effective working of every church musician is the whole matter of sacred and secular. What is sacred music anyway? Is there a difference between sacred and secular music? Is church music perhaps something different from both? These questions must be answered if an organist is to choose music, or a choir-master an anthem, or if either is to evaluate the liturgical worth of the music of the church service. Eric Routley states the matter effectively when he writes:

> The musical mode of the conversation—how sacred music is related to secular music . . . It is not possible to be an effective and creative church musician without having faced that conversation and taken some part in it, even if the part one takes is no more than making up one's mind where one stands . . .[1]

There are really a number of points that need to be considered:

(1) What attributes does music need to qualify as sacred music?

(2) What can we learn from history about the relationship of sacred to secular?

(3) What should our attitude be regarding sacred music today?

I. Church Music As Art

It is very difficult to set up criteria that will simply and directly enable one to evaluate music as church music or art, and yet there are some obvious observations that can be made. If church music is to be art, it must communicate; it must have a message. Routley suggests: "I wish to talk of church music as a mode in which the church speaks within itself and to the world . . ."[2] And the message that the church has to the world is the message of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the message of inner peace, of purposeful living and man's ultimate destiny.

> The criterion of true church music will always be an awareness of its service to the Word of God on which it is based. Its purpose is to proclaim, with its peculiar means and capabilities, the exuberant reality made manifest in the Word of God; and this is accomplished when, God granting His grace, it translates the Word of God into the proclamatory form of the *viva vox*, the living Word . . .[3]

How does the church use music to proclaim this message? It does this most directly by being joined with the Word of God. It adds a dimension of expressiveness and intensity and illumination that may either aid or hinder the Christian in understanding the word. But it has been repeatedly demonstrated that music without the association of the word does not communicate clear verbal concepts.

> If art were to function <u>as</u>, not <u>in</u> proclamation, it would have to be capable of communicating verbal concepts. For the gospel is a message with definite content. It has been established that music, per se, does not have this capability. But song with its union of word and tone does. What can be said of the text of a song, however, cannot be applied casually to the music also. It is the verbal form through which the gospel is proclaimed: a verbal form, however, made more intensely expressive by the addition of music . . . In the proper theological sense, art cannot be revelatory, for its communication of designative meaning is always ambiguous.[4]

Not only, as Routley suggests, is church music a mode in which the church speaks to the world, but also within itself. One of the principal reasons that the church sings is to express joy. This was recognized by Luther over 400 years ago.

> And in the second place, it is anthropological—music should evoke joy, and more, it should transform a person through this joy. I quote . . . from Luther's writings (1530): "I love music, and I am displeased by the enthusiasts who condemn it. Because it is a gift of God and not of man, because it delights the soul, because it drives the devil away, because it awakens innocent joy. Fits of anger, evil desires, and pride vanish before it." Indeed, the main purpose of music for Luther . . . is to expel Satan, the originator of all "natural" sadness and melancholy, of all of life's and the world's fears, and to free the heart for Christ, the Master of joy.[5]

What was recognized by Luther in 1530 is repeated by thoughtful church musicians in 1968. Read what Eric Brand has to say:

> . . . Singing is more appropriate than speaking for several reasons but the most important has to do with joy. Most people sing, whistle, or hum when they are happy. Singing is a more adequate expression of joy than speaking, and it also serves to intensify joy . . .[6]

It is obvious, then, that at least one quality that church music ought to possess in its proclamation is that of joy, vigor, and freshness. The implications of this truth we will consider in our discussion of sacred music in relation to contemporary life.

What is true of word-oriented music, namely, that it serves as a joyful expression of the glory of God to the glory of God, is also true of absolute or instrumental music. Whether or not it is liturgical in function or always belongs to the church service proper is not the question here, but whether it can serve the Christian in glorifying God. About this Buszin writes:

> Must a text be present to lend a sacred quality to music? Consider the 150th Psalm, which calls upon us to praise the Lord, yet mentions only musical instruments and the dance and says not a word about the human voice, words, or texts . . . The praise of God is not mere sound or tone; it is rather an expression of the heart and mind . . . Together all are to make a joyful noise unto God, all are to present unto God the countless compositions God enables them to produce.[7]

Buszin not only exonerates instrumental music as just one of the marvelous gifts with which we may glorify the Lord, but he also intimates one of the qualities that instrumental music ought to possess to be good church music—it ought to be the expression of a Christian heart. This does not mean that one ought to conduct a psychological study of the hearts and attitudes of all composers to know whether their music is sacred or usable in the church (it has been tried!), but it does mean that, in choosing or using absolute music as church music, our one purpose ought to be the true worship and glorification of the Lord.

What would seem, then, to be the deciding factor whether music can be used in the church, vocal music or instrumental, is its function: was it intended for use in the church, and can it serve the church today in its proclamation of the Word and the edification of its members? Eugene Brand writes:

> Stylistically nothing sets apart the music used in the liturgy. It is subject to the same laws and analytical processes, both technical and psychological, that all other music is subject to. The only real difference is a functional one. While it is true that the function for which a piece is intended is determinative of its character, that fact does not cause the composer to adopt different styles. Carl Halter's point is well taken: "The chief, and perhaps only, difference between the music of the Church and secular music is a difference in function. Where secular music is free to address itself to any one man's emotions, the music of the Church is restricted to serving the Word of God, its proclamation to man, and man's response to the Word." To state that the term <u>church music</u> is valid only on the basis of a distinction of function is not to suggest that music of any style can function in the church's worship. If all styles are not appropriate, there must be a norm for evaluation. That norm is the Word.[8]

The implications of the criterion suggested by Brand are far-reaching. First of all, they allow complete freedom. The Word has nothing to say about sounds being sacred or secular, and while it has everything to say about the spirit and content of texts set to music, there is no scriptural injunction on styles, techniques, instruments, or composers. It is this freedom that characterized the liturgical efforts of Martin Luther.

> All of Luther's reforms were simply revisions of the service then in use. He never engaged in liturgical research or reconstruction. That is one of the reasons modern scholars are apt to view with scorn his liturgical competence. But in the 16th century only the enthusiasts attempted to devise a completely new service . . . Neither Old nor New were ultimate values to him. He approached the tangled problem of tradition versus innovation with the freedom of the Christian man . . . Externals had become a fetish which the believer in Christ did not need and which would prevent the unbeliever from finding God. That is why Luther constantly stressed the freedom of the Christian man . . . the freedom to use or not to use them and to change them as the need arose.[9]

The same freedom that characterized Martin Luther's liturgical efforts also marked his attitude toward all music, instrumental, folk, and music by composers that were not Lutheran, such as Senfl and DePres. Sensitive scholars find in Luther a spirit to emulate. Herz writes: "Luther's liberal and loving attitude saw in music not an enemy of religion but a gift bestowed by God to be used in the church."[10] Peloquin describes Luther as "liberal" with a rather unique definition of the term.

> Church music may have to become "liberal," not merely conservative. "Liberal," but not isolatingly avante-garde . . . Liberal means knowing the past so that we understand the present better.

> Conservative positions frequently lead to stagnation—or turning back so lingeringly that we turn into salt. The time has come for us to sing Psalm 150 and take it seriously, or rather take it joyfully . . . From Martin Luther: Here it must suffice to discuss the benefit of this great art (music). But even that transcends the greatest eloquence of the most eloquent, because of the infinite variety of its forms and benefits. We can mention only one point (which experience confirms), namely, that next to the Word of God, music deserves the highest praise.[11]

Herz speaks also of the "worldmindedness" of Luther. "Luther's worldmindedness welcomed into the church not only any musical instrument, but also all sorts of secular song, substituting new, 'honest,' sacred words for the original secular ones."[12]

If it is function that gives church music validity, that is, its function in connection with the Word of God, then church music is not only free, but is also subject to the restraint of the Word. The Christian would not only avoid all evil, but every appearance of evil (1 Thess. 5:22). Music has not only designative, but also connotative value. If the connotations of music in a given age are so secular that they would not help the Word but hinder it in its proclamation and in interaction, then this music can not legitimately be considered church music, even if a subsequent age would at that time no longer find the connotations offensive.

> . . . not every possible musical style is equally capable of a genuine liturgical expression and experience . . . We have been conditioned by history, tradition, and personal experiences. We think and make judgments and form opinions on things outside ourselves—things that we relate to our past and present conditioning and that we recall from concrete experience. Add to this the strong feeling and emotion of music with its melody, rhythm, and mood, and the identification becomes even stronger. So much so that it could be impossible for a certain style or piece of music to be a real liturgical expression.[13]

Church music is not a static thing; we readily recognize that each generation expresses itself in a different way, but each generation has to face the secular connotations of its own age. For example, the Italian style of dramatic aria in the Baroque may have borne with it secular connotations that may have led people to be rightly suspicious of its use in liturgical worship (Herz suggests that Bach himself tempered his use of this very form as his style matured),[14] and yet this does not mean that today his (Bach's) music must be held under suspicion. Carl Helter expressed this quite clearly:

> Sacred music, like any other kind of music, is subject to changes in fashion. Perhaps no better example of this can be found than Bach, against whom there was a considerable contemporary reaction . . . The Italian style of the Baroque era was looked upon with great suspicion in Germany when it was applied to the music of the church . . . Today we can hardly conceive of music which breathes the spirit of sacred things more surely and truly than this very music. The fashion has changed and the connotation has been established.[15]

The converse, however, that connotation makes music sacred is only partly true. That some very poor music has become sacred to many people by its use in liturgical worship, and that this music has even aided the proclamation of the Word cannot be denied. And it would take a very callous and uncharitable church musician indeed to tell such people that their worship was faulty. Regarding such connotations, Tangemann writes: "Church music in particular is susceptible to sentimental attachment or memories, leading us to suspend taste when recollection of non-musical events is evoked."[16] Halter writes very directly:

> This process also works sometimes in ways that are disturbing to those who have the welfare of the church's worship most nearly at heart. Notice that the wedding march from *Lohengrin* has become "sacred" for many people by the same process. The tawdry tunes of the gospel songs have also become "sacred" for many people simply by their association over a long period of time with holy words.[17]

The problem here is not so much connotation as artistry. I think that little ground can be gained by telling people that their sacred music is not sacred, but rather by advising them that the music they have chosen for a given wedding or funeral does not present the best image to the world. For the image of the church is and has always been an image of artistry, that is, ideally.

> . . . the opinion is nevertheless widely prevalent that the performance of music in church is principally a matter of the heart, . . . and it is asserted that this inner participation is brought into question if the singer or instrumentalist concentrates on an artistic result . . . When the apostle exhorts us in Colossians 4:16, "Sing with thankfulness in your hearts to God," he hardly intended to add the thought, "no matter how bad this may sound." On the contrary, we will surely all agree with the statement by R. Barilier in

> his study "Le Chant d'Eglise": We presuppose the validity of the principle that whatever is done for God ought to be done well and that anything consecrated to God ought to be as beautiful as possible. This is a principle which controls all religious arts—We may simply observe that the Protestant tradition in the area of church music is indeed a tradition of quality.[18]

What Soehngen has written in the above quoted paragraph finds affirmation from nearly every church musician, some of them going so far as to state that any well-written music apart from a text or connotation could serve as church music. This is obviously an overstatement; Carl Halter puts the matter in its right perspective when he describes excellence as a requisite, but along with it insists that the music be able to serve the Word.

> It will be found that the "sacred" music which has stood the test of time and has proved its capacity to symbolize and transmit the Christian message effectively is good music even apart from its sacred words or sacred connotation. The music is worthy apart from the "sacred" label. . . Sacred music, then, is any music which by its excellence as music proves capable of accepting religious meaning into its substance and of serving as a symbol and transmitter of such meaning.[19]

Routley, along with Soehngen, recognizes that the church should foster artistic talent and "must be neither less exacting nor less generous than the secular public and must be strict in its requirements for practicing musicians."[20] In fact, Routley's definition of sacred music is "pure craftsmanship set in the context of the intimate joy of the church in its daily routine of worship."[21] But Routley in his book, *Music Leadership in the Church*, seems to feel that excellence can be found only with the professional musician and that the amateur has, in history, impeded true craftsmanship. He writes:

> It looks, moreover, as if church music periodically suffered injections of secular music, through the influence of professionals, yet between those periods it settled down into an amateur period during which it assimilated, benefited from, and then grew tolerant (in medical terms) of, the injection.[22]

Moreover, it is his feeling that because of the complex nature of our contemporary music, the future of music in the church lies with the professional, which may be true to an extent; but what Routley seems to forget is that it takes more than a professional to write music that serves the Word. It takes a man of faith most of all, for music is a gift of God. Soehngen says:

> This is not to say, of course, that artistic value was the foremost concern of Luther and his friends, nor need it have been, because to them this was self-evident. They were keenly aware that imputing to the Holy Spirit the possibility of creating something inferior bordered on blasphemy![23]

Lest we seem superficial, it is well that we do not too glibly pass over the words like "craftsmanship," or "excellence," or "goodness" without asking, "What does that mean?" "Excellent in whose eyes?" What we want to say is that music has intrinsic values; there are certain built-in principles that it must obey to qualify as art. Naumann writes:

> We feel, of course, that the true norms of art do not set laws. Yet, no artist escapes completely the kind of norm his time, his environment and society sets; but every true artist will differentiate conscientiously between norms as historically evident rules and customs and norms that are inherent in art itself.[24]

Soehngen says as much when he comments: "The partnership-theory is valid in the sense that if it is to be a good servant, music must obey the laws of its nature."[25] The musical aesthetes, Langer, Meyer, et al., tell us that when music obeys its own laws it possesses expressive form or artistic meaning. It is understandable, and valid, and possesses continuation and good ending. Suzanne Langer suggests: "In music we work essentially with free forms, following inherent psychological laws of 'rightness.'"[26] Bernstein comments: "He must have the ability to know what the next destination will be—in other words, what the next note has to be to convey a sense of rightness";[27] and a little later on he writes:

> Always probing and rejecting in his dedication to perfection, to the principle of <u>inevitability</u>. This is somehow the key to the mystery of a great artist: that for reasons unknown to him or to anyone else, he will give away his energies and his life just to make sure that one note follows another inevitably. It seems rather an odd way to spend one's life; but it isn't so odd when we think that the composer, by doing this, leaves us at the finish with the feeling that something is right in the world, that something checks throughout, something that follows its own laws consistently, something we can trust, that will never let us down.[28]

Robert Shaw writes: "Great music is great because it calls out to something deep and constant in the human thing, because it carries something so native and true to the human spirit that not even knowledge of how it

is done can kill the magic . . ."[29] After all is said and done, what makes music true and good and right is a mystery that we don't really understand, but we know it is a marvellous gift and when it is there we can tell. It is the sense of rightness that makes for genuine church music. To say more is to say too much! Tangemann, for example, says too much when he writes:

> Providing that the music has dignity, seriousness, sincerity, objective beauty that avoids the egocentric and too personal attitude, any truly good instrumental music may be used in the church . . . Avoidance of operatic music, of theater music, of dance music . . .[30]

In summary, then, let us say that church music is a very special art whereby the church communicates within itself and to the world, set apart by its function, and adding the particular dimension of joy to Christian life and worship. Church music includes all varieties and forms. It is subject only to the restraint of the Word, and its keynote is rightness and excellence.

II. Sacred–Secular Syndrome

In the initial section of this paper we endeavored to show that we can speak of sacred or, if you will, church music. And that the church has complete stylistic freedom, that it is free to borrow from the style of any age or any group within its own age. At this point we wish to assert that once the church has borrowed or incorporated, it automatically creates its own style. For what is style? One of the most lucid definitions is given by Meyer when he states: "Musical styles are more or less complex systems of sound relationships understood and used in common by a group of individuals."[31] The church is people, a singular society with a unique function and a unique message, and when it speaks, it uses a unique voice. Soehngen writes:

> Music shares with theology the "Word" character of the evangelical message: it, too, stems from God's gracious will and is an immediate gift of God; it, too, is mediated through the sense of hearing and thereby possesses the particular capability of association with the Word. In the first place, it is theological—all music is conscious or unconscious praise of the Divine Creator . . .[32]

The music of the church, applied or absolute, as a voice of the Word may seem to share the same system of sound relationships with world-music. But as a matter of fact, when this system becomes a function of the Word and is comprehended by the church, it becomes qualified, and a style evolves, for style is a social phenomenon.

> For the parts of a series must be related to one another in a consistent and orderly manner. They are so related and ordered by the social phenomenon we call style. And if we do not understand a given style, if we lack the proper habit responses, we will either fail to apprehend shape, or if we apprehend it in terms of another style, we will fail to comprehend it. That is, the impression of shape may arise because two style systems have sound stimuli in common, but such an impression will be incorrectly interpreted and, in point of fact, not really comprehended at all.[33]

Thus, it is not very likely that the proponents of jazz will succeed with a jazz mass or jazz liturgical music. We are tempted to say that it is too sophisticated. What we really mean is that jazz is a style that not too many people understand. "Witness the fact that in our own culture the devotees of 'serious' music have great difficulty in understanding the meaning and significance of jazz and vice versa."[34] Should they succeed, should the church understand this idiom and should it serve as a vehicle for the Word, it would not remain the same. A so-called "church jazz" would evolve and so, a new style. This has not only the warrant of sociology but of history as well.

There is a great deal of confusion when we speak of this whole matter of sacred and secular, and I suppose the real problem is a theological one. There are some who assert that there is no difference between sacred and secular, that the church and the world are one, that one of the evils of our society is that the church does not embrace, or if we prefer, integrate with the world. With this concept of church as our basis, it is quite impossible to speak of differing musical styles. But if we are talking about the Christian Church, then there is a difference between sacred and secular (OF. and L.; . . . OF. *seculer*, fr. L. *saecularis*, fr. *saeculum* a race, age, the world.)[35] The church is in the world, but not of the world. It invites and testifies but it does not ignore and embrace. The world is secular and it is sick, and it needs the Word of the church for its redemption. Ross Snyder gives us a good description of the contemporary world:

> We have enough people who have lost their nerve. Enough "forever sucklings" trying to substitute the externalities of an affluent society for food of the soul. Enough mass communication reeking with

> porno-violence, and proud that it is. Enough people all over the world whose lives are burning resentments, vociferous hatreds and fear of other people. We have enough rootless, normless, sanctionless, planless people incapable of family life and history. Enough novelists, poets, writers of movie plots and TV shows whose stock in trade is sick, sick, sick.[36]

Any student of history knows that what is true of our world today has been true of the world through history—there has always been a "secular," and for the Christian there has always been a distinction.

Now it is true, for a person motivated by the Word, that there are no secular activities. His total life is a continual worship. Where the Word of God does not permeate the complete man and his life, the church has broken down. Brand states it well:

> Actually the sacred-secular antithesis is not at home in Christian theology. For the Christian there are no secular activities. To quote Pelikan: "A truly theonomous cultural life would be one in which precisely these secular activities would become part of the service of God . . ."[37]

Naumann makes the same point: "Life in Christ is an everlasting gift. From this understanding of man's destiny we get our proper basis for church music or hymnody or whatever we do to glorify God. Life now is all worship."[38] This, of course, does not deny the world. It does not deny that there is a secular and profane against which the Christian ought to bring his witness to bear. But it does imply that the same force and power that motivates the Christian's life ought to motivate his music. It is the indiscriminate overstatement of the terms "sacred" and "secular" that has caused concern to men like Blanchard, and yet he is quick to realize that a man who writes sacred music will not deny his theology when he writes music not intended for the service.

> I find it very difficult to accept the broad statement and implication that there is no difference between sacred and secular . . . Things pertaining to God and the Church are held and believed to be sacred by most people today . . . Now I certainly do not question the fact that some things cannot be classified as sacred or secular. Take, for example, a composer's craftsmanship and ability . . . he uses the same technique in communicating all his music . . . he does not use sacred technique for sacred music and secular technique for secular music.[39]

The problem is not so much whether church music possesses a style, but whether there is one style, one set of criteria which ought to govern the church in expressing itself. It is not, "What style does the church use?" but "What style ought the church to use?" Here we must be quick to grant the church complete stylistic freedom. That is precisely what Brand means when he writes: ". . . Since the evangelical church knows no sacral style, it has complete stylistic freedom."[40] Soehngen would allow to music of the church the freedom that the gospel itself allows.

> The more independently music in the service of God's Word demonstrates its sovereign artistic character and its compositional freedom from traditional rules, and the greater its art, the more closely it relates to the Gospel. Whoever has no approach to the "evangelical" character of music is under suspicion that something is amiss with his theology.[41]

The evangelical church, the gospel church, then, really has no problem with the sacred-secular syndrome, for it maintains for itself the right to use all music for its purposes, secular, sacred, ancient, modern, as long as it serves the Word. Squire, a church music historian, observes that church music, like all art, has made its way through history in cycles, proceeding from style to style; and the church, which ultimately moves slowly, has absorbed from each style what it felt would serve the Word in its generation.

> The "purest stage" in church art is rarely the maturest stage in the development of the art itself; it is an "adolescent period" in the particular art's development so far as ultimate artistic advancement goes. Nevertheless, one should not be doubtful of the sincerity of religious artists who are endeavoring to move beyond this adolescent stage. For the religious artistic techniques, church artistic styles, and secular artistic attainments do not obliterate each other, but rather are different stages of advancement in a consummate whole. Church art is often the precursor of the secular art to come, and due to the slowness of change in church tradition, the older church art is likely to continue on even after the consequent secular advance has suggested the beginning of a new trend in church art. In church art, then, there is always a tension between the height of its artistic attainment just passing and the adolescence of the new artistic stage just beginning to make itself felt in an oncoming different church art. Church styles and secular styles thus are often the same techniques at different stages of growth.[42]

The earliest church music that we know anything about (i.e., the music of the Old Testament) showed the sacred-secular difference in a very unique way. We see an example of how sacred music became secular music, not by virtue of its style, but because it was no longer evangelical. Squire reports:

> There is no doubt that the music of the temple was at first a sincere effort to worship God effectively and acceptably. However, the emphasis, rather than continuing Godward, defected more and more manward until Amos told that God was displeased with his people "who sing idle songs to the sound of the harp, and like David invent for themselves instruments of music." Amos 6:5.[43]

When the heart of Israel was no longer in its music, its music was no longer sacred, for it was not a function of the Word.

In the early Christian church the Christians made a joyful noise to the Lord with psalms and hymns and spiritual songs and they also used instruments in their worship as had been done in Old Testament times. It is even likely that they adopted useful secular music. "It is not unlikely that the Christians adopted for their own use the music of their times, including, no doubt, much that was suitable from the pagan literature. Especially would this be so among groups composed of many converted pagans."[44] While the music the pagan brought with him into the church was the music of the people, the church ultimately had to eliminate this process of importation because of the unsavory connotations.

> But by the 3rd century, the increase of conversions among the pagans led the Christians to organize and authorize certain forms for the music to prevent undesirable pagan and worldly associations among the established Christians.[45]
>
> Clement of Alexandria, Reese says, was not likely to be prejudiced against instruments for the sake of some abstract principle . . . He tolerated the lyre and the kithara, only because King David had allegedly used them, and he disapproved of other instruments. This was doubtless due to his fear of associating pagan festal excesses and stage vulgarities with Christianity.[46]

From the third century to the thirteenth very little is known of music at all. Because of the efforts of the churches and monasteries, sacred music was preserved. About all we know of secular music is the minnesingers, meistersingers, and troubadours. Routley tells us there were two styles. "In the Middle Ages there was a clearly distinguished 'church style.' Plainsong was 'church music'; rhythmic, dance-like music was 'secular.'"[47] But Brand reminds us:

> . . . even plainsong cannot be described as sacred music. Fredrich Bochholz points out that when the Roman *schola cantorum* undertook the editing of the plainsong melodies, it was guided not by some canon of churchliness (a typical modern concept), but rather by musical worth, stylistic intention, and artistic vigor.[48]

In the fourteenth century, however, the interchange between secular and sacred becomes very observable.

> . . . in the 14th century secular song began to take on new stature. Its text was not in Latin but in the vernacular. Its tune was now in the highest voice, and none of its parts was derived from the sacred chants . . . However, the new secularization had its inevitable effect upon sacred music; Machaut himself composed a complete polyphonic setting of the Ordinary of the Mass . . . The new rhythmic freedom gave new flexibility to the contemporary handling of chant motifs in the new sacred composition. Duple, triple, and syncopated rhythm were all utilized in the new sacred melody.[49]

Not only was the secular style absorbed into the church style, but even melodies from secular sources were used in the sacred music. Comment on this practice, particularly in regard to Okeghem's sacred and secular music, is that both were of the same style, which is what we would expect, and that the church was using its freedom to make the Word more expressive.

> As Lang has pointed out, they would be recognizable in their secular reference only by the most erudite of musical scholars, and such recognition would lead some observers to feel that the melodies had been ennobled by their being judged worthy of a place in which to exalt the spiritual ideal.[50]

This is true not only of Okeghem, but also of Machaut and Monteverdi, as Tangemann points out:

> Innovations in the art of music—the renewal of musical speech, grammar, syntax, rhetoric—have come first from the secular branches of the art and only later have become established in sacred music. The past shows us countless examples of composers who worked with the greatest success in both secular and sacred music with an enrichment to their total production. Guillaume de Machaut, leader of poetry and music in the French *Ars Nova* of the 14th century, ending his life as canon of Rheims, produced both his single great Mass (the first complete setting in polyphony by one composer) and his even better

known ballades, virelais, and rondeaux. We tend to forget that Claudio Monteverdi, the first genius of opera, was all his life a chapel master in the service of the church, at first in Mantua and later at St. Marks in Venice.[51]

In the sixteenth century the matter of what is sacred and what is secular receives considerable attention, and the principal forces are the Catholic church, Martin Luther and John Calvin. The Catholic church had been carefully watching the interchange between sacred and secular in church music and now felt itself constrained to declare what constituted sacred or church music. It was of the opinion that Gregorian chant, with its austere and monodic line, was the only fit vehicle for the music of the liturgy; and it hoped to perpetuate for its choirs the pure *a cappella* singing style. The error of its action is at once apparent; the church was seeking to limit church music to one style and one practice, and thereby was depriving its constituency of the evangelical freedom to use any music that furthers the Word. Tangemann writes: "In the middle of the 16th century, the Council of Trent's music committee contained certain members who all but urged the banishment of the art from public worship.[52] Squire is even more blunt: "There have always been, in all periods, groups who oppose any kind of sacred music which seems to carry within its style an artistic element. At the Council of Trent (1545-1563) no doubt such persons had a voice."[53]

Luther, as we have noted earlier, looked at music as a gift of God and felt free to use whatever would edify. Schalk gives us this contrast:

> . . . In contrast to the post-Tridentine restrictions which Rome placed on church music in an effort to retain the Palestrinian ideal of pure *a cappella* choral music (which was the most recent attempt by Roman Catholicism to define music as either "sacred" or "secular" in contrast to Lutheranism's usual reference simply to "church music"), the Church of the Reformation turned instead to the development of liturgical music in which instruments and concerted groups of many kinds were common.[54]

Not only did Luther encourage the free use of instruments in worship, but he also made use of secular music. Routley writes: "Luther, like his Protestant predecessors, made much use of secular styles in the music he encouraged; the hymn tunes were very much like the style of non-church music current in the later Middle Ages."[55] Luther, himself, explains how he happened to use the melodies of worldly songs.

> Among our melodies are some to which worldly songs are sung. Foreigners are easily offended by this. But our singers have used them only after careful deliberation. Because of their familiar sound they make it easier to draw the people to a grasp of the truth, and we do not wish to find fault with such good intentions. (Letter of the Elders of the Bohemian Brethren to Friedrich III, 1574.)[56]

Actually Luther oversimplified his case; he did not really use the song of the street but very carefully adapted it in almost every case, and in some cases the adaptation was very extensive. Add to this the fact that the styles of secular and sacred were virtually identical, and it is easier to understand how Luther could find the street song a fitting vehicle for the message of the Word.

> Martin Luther and those who followed his tradition took music from many sources, including the street, the aristocratic drawing room, the operatic stage—wherever there was something they could use. In their times the styles of secular art music were essentially identical to the styles of church music, so there was no great problem here. Even folk music was written in much the same musical language, though simpler. But Luther and the Lutheran musicians were always careful to adapt the music to fit the meanings of the text and the needs of the church and at times the adaption was extensive.[57]

Secular songs in the hands of less capable church musicians did not produce such good results; and even here it is well that we note that the criticisms were directed against their inartistry, because the songs in their hands did not serve as a <u>meaningful</u> bearer of the Word.

> The abuses felt in the choral music of the day stemmed from the custom of borrowing the themes and words from secular tunes for use as *cantus firmus*. Consequently, on many occasions the songs of the church when composed by less responsible musicians may have betrayed an unseemly artificiality. The chief complaint, even so, was not against the secularizing tone of borrowed *cantus firmus*, since such borrowing, though often in poor taste, was done with good intention and therefore not considered sacrilegious; the chief complaint was against the rhythmic interferences of the intricately interwoven parts or voices leading to such garbling of the word text that its meaning could not be grasped by the hearers.[58]

It would not seem extravagant to grant Martin Luther the credit for having placed church music in its proper relationship. For Luther it was not a matter of music; it was a matter of theology. It was a matter of

viewing music as he was wont to view all things, from the standpoint of the gospel, with the evangelical spirit. To Luther the kind or style of music did not matter, as long as it served the Word. And Luther was a gifted enough musician to recognize that music had to be meaningful to serve this function.

> But it is interesting that Luther, himself no mean musician, recognized the superb qualities in Josquin. He saw that Josquin des Pres evidenced keen musical and artistic insights. To Josquin, the subtleties of contrapuntal composition were contrived, not for their own sake, but to serve as a means of significant expression. Because so many church musicians of the day did not see with such perception, this age of music has been frequently disparaged, but not always deservedly.[59]

Calvin, unlike Luther, "was not well disposed toward music. Thus, in all the strongholds of Calvinism where it was not quickly modified by opposing forces, the development of the art of music was stifled; the famine of artistic expression in these places (Scotland, parts of England and Wales, Germany, and Switzerland) still exists."[60] Calvin's attitude toward music was not something that he arbitrarily decided but, like Luther, was a product of his theology. Where Luther was evangelical and scripture-oriented, Calvin was legalistic and rationalistic. Calvin did not speak for the freedom of the Christian man but chose to regulate and discipline the life of the Christian. He spoke of self-denial and would eliminate or not allow whatever was enticing or artistic in religious worship. "To espouse only the simple and the unadorned became a devout religious cause."[61] Nonetheless, Calvin did recognize the fact that music of some kind was important to worship.

> Calvin, despite his innate mistrust of the "dissolute, lascivious character of music," recognized that . . . unison congregational singing should have a significant role in the worship service . . . It is no accident that Calvin speaks of *chants ecclesiastiques* (church songs) . . . and is able to establish distinguishing attributes for sacred music.[62]

The result of Calvin's influence was a new style, restricted to the singing of the Old Testament psalms, unisonally, in metrical versions, and to the singing of short religious songs and approved hymns. Anything pleasing, joyful, or entertaining was denounced along with most recreational activity. Consequently the joy that so characterized the music of Luther, and was its very cause for being, was notably absent from the song of John Calvin.

> Calvin, through his severe discipline, developed a new "church style." Although Bourgeois, his musician used secular subject matter in his psalm tunes, the manner in which they were to be sung and the fact that they were so few in number and all in one style which was partly a way of performing music, partly a way of composing it—a congregational and strictly unison style . . . The English and Scottish psalm tunes reflected this "church style" and "church manner" in a simpler and more popular, but certainly not secular form.[63]

The sixteenth century, then, was a notable age in regard to what constituted sacred music, and it seems to be a time in which much of our thinking regarding sacred-secular had its origin. We see, perhaps, the largest church group in the Western world, the Catholic church, decree that sacred music shall conform to only one particular style; and we observe at the same time that the reformer, Calvin, carefully defined and perpetuated what he felt is the only sacred musical style. Luther alone avoided the sacred-secular distinction, and it is in the Lutheran church that some very excellent church music had its origin. Schuetz, Scheidt, Schein—to mention only a few—wrote music for organ, for voice, for choirs, single, double and triple, and for instruments of all kinds, being restricted really only by what resources were available to them. "It would take an advanced musicologist," says Routley, "to detect a change of style between the church music and the secular music of Weelkes, Lassus, Byrd, Gibbons, Bach or Handel. What differences there are are surely of the foreground rather than otherwise."[64]

Bach, perhaps the greatest composer of the early eighteenth century, simply carried on in the Lutheran tradition. Herz writes: "A parallel to this is Bach's and his contemporaries' habit of adapting movements from secular works for sacred compositions by the same process of text substitution."[65] But Bach would not be bound; he actually converted some of his own secular music for sacred purposes.

> . . . Bach transformed an aria of Pallas praising Zephyr in a comic birthday cantata into a New Year's greeting to Jesus in the *Christmas Oratorio*. In a similar way the superb concluding chorus of the *St. Matthew Passion* is but an expansion of a harpsichord Sarabande with words added.[66]

Bach, in his endeavor to use music to glorify God did not hesitate to use harmonies previously unheard in church to make the hymns more expressive. Tangemann reports: "The youthful Bach was censured by his church board for using strange, harsh harmonies in playing the hymns for congregational singing."[67] For in

all that Bach wrote, his guiding principle was: *Soli Deo Gloria*. He did not simply grind out musical copy because it was his job or because he had to have something ready for the next Sunday. Herz, who has made detailed study of the cantatas of Bach, cannot help remarking: "Bach refused to shake cantatas out of his sleeve the way Telemann and Graupner did. The profundity with which he revealed biblical scenes and characters rather recalls Rembrandt and his religious art."[68] Sacred-secular was no problem for Bach; his problems were bigger! Questions he had to answer were: Does the music serve as a fitting vehicle for God's Word, i.e., can the word be understood clearly and does the music intensify its meaning? Is the music familiar to the congregation (cf. the frequent use of chorales)? Does the music express the joy which is characteristic of the Christian faith? Understanding, familiarity, joy—these were the big words for Bach. Buszin says it well:

> It mattered not whether the text was sacred or secular, serious or humorous, the musical setting always allowed it to be comprehensible . . . Music itself was neither sacred nor profane. Texts determined such differences, and since church music was to be sacred in character, everything possible was done to enunciate and present the texts so that their message would be understood clearly. When choral music was contrafacted, its texts were normally converted from secular to sacred. The reverse procedure was usually applied only by scoffers who attempted thus to ridicule, to confuse, and to debase. Familiar music was thus used with sacred texts to be sung not only with familiarity and joy, but also with understanding. It was devoid of inhibitions . . .[69]

Squire describes the secular influence on the 17th century by summarizing:

> Thus, in the 17th century . . . solo singing . . . was given priority over choral singing. The tonality of major and minor transposing scales displaced Gregorian modality. Homophonic composition . . . displaced . . . polyphonic music. Accompanied music became more and more elaborate. Instrumental music arose as an art in itself, and divorced from word texts altogether, it was able to satisfy the needs of aesthetic abstraction . . .[70]

In this period, as in the previous one, the integration of secular factors into the music of the church by those who had neither the spirituality nor the artistry to handle the means, seriously impeded church music and is responsible, at least to a degree, for the attempt of the church to militate a church style. It at the same time underscores the truth that those who have not the gift of musicianship had best leave church music alone.

> However, as was inevitable, among the musically artistic clergymen who were not religiously sensitive, there arose (and still exists) an intermixing of church, religious, artistic and secular factors that brought about, in too many instances, the formation of a conglomerate which, because of its lack of character, has hindered the fruition of the church's musical enterprise into authentic religious service.[71]

In the nineteenth century church music had very little to commend it. The really gifted composers did not write for the church: "Tragically, too, musicians refused to use their talents in the service of the Church and, like Handel in his Messiah and Beethoven in his Missa Solemnis, used Sacred texts to produce works for the concert stage."[72] And those who did write for the church were victims of their own age, the age of reason and, at the same time, the romantic period. Routley gives an extravagant description of this period, though in any music history text you can find much of what he says verified.

> Thus men gave themselves up to creaturely lusts and vile appetites, i.e., to sentimentality . . . I define "sentimentality" as the evocation or the seeking of emotional satisfaction divorced from reason and responsibility. The new rhetoric of music gave abundant opportunity for artificial creation of emotional tension and its speedy and satisfactory release (via the diminished seventh as often as not.) . . . From the continent they overheard the lush melodies of Michael Haydn, Bortniansky, and all those who exploited the possibilities of parallel diatonic thirds and sixths. But to this the English added the chromatic splash, the monotone with moving underparts in imitation of the 7th Symphony of Beethoven or the C Minor Polonaise of Chopin; the dramatic expression and changes of key, usually minor to major; the spurious heartiness of the phony march; the cradle-seeking, bosom-cuddling lullaby of a part song. As if this was not enough, along came those "ambulance-men" Sankey and Moody who sang their carols of rescue and refuge to dispossessed industrial peasants, and the prosperous people who imitated these carols—which began that long association between zealous piety and aesthetic vulgarity which still persists among us. In these ways the temptation toward cheap effect and easy impressiveness presented itself to a church that was vulnerable to all such assaults.[73]

Some very unique things happened in the nineteenth century. As in prior ages, church musicians did not hesitate to use the new harmonies and expressive devices of the age, and these were not wrong; for in the

hands of a discreet church musician, whose one goal was to express the Word, this music, too, had a contribution to make. It is not only wrong to attempt to throw out what the nineteenth century had to offer as unfit for church use, it is impossible. For we are all products of the age that has gone before us and either knowingly or unknowingly assimilate what it had to offer. The problem did not lie with the advances made in the nineteenth century but with the abuse of these advances in the music of the church. For at the hands of the church musicians a new church style developed that was highly rhetorical—it was more concerned about how the message was expressed than about what it had to say. "The direction which popular church music took within the period of the first stages of the evangelical revival was toward abundant rhetoric and away from musical integrity."[74] Or as Routley goes on to explain:

> Too often it hardly mattered what the content was, so long as the outward form was highly colored, emotionally restless, and full of emphatic ornament. The "church style" proved to be the secular romantic style minus reason and responsibility.[75]

Routley correctly points to the problem—the church musicians simply were not able to cope with the resources before them.

> The great bulk of eighteenth-century architecture, urbane, reserved, and ceremonious, not exploring the depths of human experience . . . From Beethoven onward there is an enormous amount that music is permitted to do and say that occurred only to the highest geniuses of the eighteenth century; . . . the rise of part singing and choral societies, together with the romantic movement in music, gave an opportunity for new secular styles to be incorporated in church music, which again . . . was largely missed through the ineptitude of church musicians . . . Fewer really able musicians were found wholly within the church. So "secularization" becomes increasingly a matter of misusing the secular, and the distinction of the church style, instead of being, as it was in Palestrina's time, an excellence, became a degeneracy. Church music became bad secular music, bad simply because the musicians within the church could not handle the resources they took over.[76]

Routley rather astutely observes that the church style was lacking, not because of the use of the secular, but because of its abuse. While we have been able to observe that the music of every age has suffered at the hands of the inept musician, Routley is ready to lay the blame for all the evils of this period on the artistic inability of the church musician but neglects to see that the real problem is not artistic ability, but theology. Secularism began to take over, and by that we do not mean that the music had absorbed the secular idiom; we mean that the theology was becoming worldly, and the message of the church to the world was being lost. Buszin states this very well:

> After about 1700 a marked decline set in, which did great harm to Lutheran theology and church music. Lutheran theology became rationalistic and Lutheran music lost its power and vitality. Liturgical standard continued to decline, with rationalism contributing to this decline. Continued attachment to superb church music might have helped to stem the tide; instead, however, all three—theology, liturgy, and church music—degenerated to the tragically low standards and criteria of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries . . .Secularism took over and joined hands with high academics; dull pedantry resulted. The arts, particularly music, lost their Christian heart and spirit. Tragically, too, musicians refused to use their talents in the service of the church . . .[77]

The keywords of church music, joy, familiarity, excellence, understanding, were being lost. Rhetoric, mood, solemnity, exoticism—these became the new words. Choirs sang anthems and solos in the church which were not in the least related to the message of the gospel or the function of the service. Herz observes:

> The learned style of the fugue as well as the operatic *da capo* aria came under attack from the Age of Reason and gave way to the "noble simplicity" of the popular church style . . . Bach's "well-regulated" church music in which each cantata commented in word and tone on the specific meaning of a Sunday or holiday, yielded to compositions of a general religious mood that fitted any holiday.[78]

The romantic church style was so self-conscious, so mood-oriented, that church musicians even reserved for themselves the right to upgrade the music of Bach.

> In his book on Bach . . . Philip Wolfrum stated . . . of the suggestion that the *Well-Tempered Clavier* be played on clavichord or harpsichord . . . "it is nonsense to return Bach's masterwork to the children's room of instrumental construction!" After all, "we cannot unscrew (our ears) and replace them with others . . . Whoever does not know how to bring Bach's music in line with, say, the *Meistersinger* score,

> whoever does not realize that the light of a younger genius always illuminated the ancestor, cannot be helped."[79]

Brand very wisely evaluates the whole romantic era with its excesses and evils in the light of the evangelical spirit of the gospel by showing that, where the interest of the music was not the word, no true church music could evolve.

> It is not that they wrote in a secular style, but rather that they wrote to express themselves and not to serve the Word. The great romantic artist was not interested in selfless production of liturgical music; he wished to produce art for posterity. It is true that the romantic style(s) is not suitable for liturgical music. The spirit of the times was essentially pagan, and one would not therefore expect music to reflect the spirit of the gospel. But the solution is not to brand such a style secular and then advocate a hothouse sacred style. Any artificial style is bound to be esthetically inferior, and thus unsuited for the worship of God.[80]

III. The Future of Church Music Today

In discussing the course of church music in our own age and what our attitude toward the "sacred-secular" problems ought to be, it is well that we take into account the thinking that we have inherited from the Romantic Era, a thinking that has not only influenced the early part of this century, but even the last decade. When thinking church-musicians of the last century realized how sadly the "church style" had degenerated and that the sacred had become secularized, they looked back to the music of previous ages. They discovered that the sacred music of the Renaissance and of the Baroque was of excellent quality and that the church musicians of that time possessed a marvellous balance between secular and sacred. They admired how marvelously that music fit the words and the rich gospel content of the texts. The thrilling sounds of *a cappella* singing and the inspiring triadic harmonies of Palestrina—harmonies given tension and release by a masterful use of suspensions—these factors led them to glorify the *a cappella* sound. When they compared this beauty with the richly chromatic harmonies of their age and when they saw in this music the life principle of all music,[81] tension and release, contrasted with the motionless and tensionless "Gospel Song," they began to coin words like "abstract," "objective," "pure"; and the romantic notion of serene, contemplative, mood, and atmosphere began to invade our vocabulary. Early in the twentieth century, when church musicians looked even further back than Bach, the Gregorian chant was idealized, and unisonal, arhythmic singing was judged to be the best sound for liturgical worship because of its esthetic, objective, and pure sound. Modal harmonies and moving in parallel motion, a type of magadizing, were judged as the most expressive way to convey the church's thoughts. And so, almost as a reaction, a new style of sacred music evolved. It was a mold into which all sacred music would have to be poured, and it was advocated on every hand.

> . . . he will find that each prescription of the church is met by one or another of the technical subdivisions of music thereafter described: a rhythm that avoids strong pulses; a melody whose physiognomy is neither so characteristic nor so engaging as to make an appeal in its own behalf; counterpoint, which cultivates long-breathed eloquence rather than instant and dramatic effect; a chromaticism which is at all times restricted in amount and lacking in emotionalism; dissonance, used only when it is technically necessary or in the interest of text emphasis; and modality which creates an atmosphere unmistakably ecclesiastical.[82]

These words by A. T. Davison (first published in 1951 and republished in 1960!!!) well reflect the thinking just two decades ago. In defence of Mr. Davison, let it be said that if his thinking were followed, it would effect a change for the better in the services of many of the churches of our country. Consider Etherington's description of a typical service:

> The typical service begins with the organist playing something like the *Melody in F* or *Angel's Serenade*, with the tremulant very much in evidence; or, as a special treat, he may select from his classical repertoire Handel's *Largo*, which is considered appropriate for almost any occasion. There may be one good hymn—a metrical psalm, a German choral tune, or something from the Victorians. Almost certainly there will be a gospel hymn and at least one of a rollicking character more often associated with Saturday night then Sunday morning. Any chanting is likely to consist of frantically hurried recitations alternated with stiff, unnatural sections of the chant in strict time, the sense and beauty of the words being entirely destroyed in the process. The anthem may be one of those that are run off the presses of our lesser publishers in as great volume as our metropolitan newspapers, but with less intellectual content. Perhaps the big moment arrives when the soloist, assuming a conspicuous position and carefully looking around the church to make sure that no one's attention is diverted else

where, sings *Open the Gates of the Temple* or *The Stranger of Galilee*. Having succeeded in destroying the effects of devotional prayers and a good sermon, the organist triumphantly plays the people out with a march that makes the windows rattle.

Unfortunately, this description of service music is not exaggerated. Nor is the type confined to small rural churches. I have examined service lists of large city churches which have included every item that I have mentioned. The reader who remains incredulous will have no difficulty in verifying my statements in almost any community in the United States or Canada.[83]

The problem with A. T. Davison's description of the "church-music-style" is not that he has failed to describe good music but that he is prescribing a kind of archaism coupled with the romantic notion that the service must possess always a kind of quiet, contemplative atmosphere. Tangemann reflects the same sentiments:

Good church music will avoid the cloying sentimentality to which so much religious painting and music fell prey in the past century, and it will equally avoid catchy rhythms, facile melodies and commonplace harmonizations which destroy the mood and atmosphere essential to worship.[84]

The concept of a "solemn service" was also reflected in the organ building. The lip of the pipe was "nicked" in order to provide a smoother, romantic sound; only in the last few decades has any number of organs appeared with pipes as they once sounded. This was not done in the name of archaism, but because the original Baroque pipes so well expressed the joy and vitality of our Christian faith. There is a certain percussive precision to their sound that doesn't really fit into the "solemn service." Rembert Weakland has viewed the romantic church style with great perception:

The Romantic period . . . did see in the medieval world an ideal balance between secular and sacred, or a mergence of the two. It sought to find in the medieval the pristine Christian feeling or faith. It saw in medieval art, architecture, and music the height of the Christian aesthetic . . . In his search for this objective transcendental music, the Romantic found the chant and polyphony closest to his ideal . . . Thibaut . . . calls the Palestrinian a-cappella-style the perfection of church music. One only has to read Richard Terry's *The Music of the Roman Rite* to hear . . . I think we may say that modern individualistic music, with its realism and emotionalism, may stir human feeling, but it can never create that atmosphere of serene spiritual ecstasy that the old music generates . . .

(Pius X) reflects the general thinking of the most enlightened musicians of his time. To them, the single line melody of chant or the plastic fluidity of the sixteenth century polyphony contrasted with the emotion-filled chromaticism of the Romantic harmony. It was thus judged objective. Its rhythmic placidity gave it an ethereal quality in contrast to the heavy meter of the nineteenth-century music.[85]

Weakland's suggestion, however, is not that we abandon *a cappella* music, or that we never sing Bach, or that the service cannot be solemn. But what he does suggest is that we use what the past has to offer that is good; but that we do not become oblivious to our own society. He says:

(The Romantic notion is that) with the old, objective music we are on safe ground; if the new is also objective and aims at transcendentalism, it also is safe. Today this feeling is achieved by musicians through the introduction of modal harmonies, parallelisms and the like . . . He (the church musician) sees the holy in the archaic. Many, if not most, of our current problems arise from this assumption . . . (The treasures of the past) can only be preserved for that which they are: beautiful pieces of music.[86]

A sane attitude toward music of our day would seem to be this: that we strive for the Word-function and quality of the older music, but at the same time be open to accept these characteristics as they are applied to the present. Squire says it very well:

While one can hope for a restoration of the quality of the older music, one should not urge that the complete diet of religious music be taken from an older idiom which may, because of its intrinsic genuineness, still prove to be artistically and culturally arresting. A purist or an ascetic who urges adoption of the old and the ignoring of the new, unwittingly urges worship of an anachronism and unwittingly neglects the opportunity to commune intelligently with those who still find living in the present to be provoking and stimulating.[87]

If, however, we are aiming for quality, it is vital that church musicians be musically sensitive and trained personnel. There is a certain amount of education and discipline that would seem to be a prerequisite. John Ciardi writes:

> I think in every art there has to be some disciplined containment of the medium. The most passion a human being can assemble into himself, the most art, or the most quickening of himself, if it sits at the piano, is going to come to nothing unless there are some educated fingers between the passion and the instrument. All of the arts are learned things. They're not necessarily textbook learned, but they always involve disciplines gladly accepted. A good athlete trains. A good violinist practices. A good writer writes. And when one is training or practicing or writing, he is thinking not only humanly but also technically. He has to be aware of his instrument, his entity.[88]

It is very likely, then, that the church could hire professional musicians to write its music, but it takes more than skill. It take a soul—someone dedicated to the cause of the Word with personal faith in Jesus Christ. "It really seems, then, as if the professional is going to become more and more important in church music as music becomes more complex,"[89] says Routley, but he is going to have to be, above all, a Christian. To ignore this lesson from our musical past would only work harm to the cause of the gospel. For if a church musician truly understands the evangelical spirit of the gospel, he will not hesitate to use the secular or the sacred or the old or the new. This background and understanding of church music he must bring to his work.[90] At the same time, he must be one "who can convey his musical thoughts to others by the use of professionally-accepted standards of communication through notation and other symbols . . . The melody, rhythm, harmony and overall sound should be such as to impress more forcefully upon the singers and hearers what the text is saying."[91] A good example from history is Heinrich Schuetz. "Leo Schrade, in writing about the relationship of Heinrich Schuetz to the liturgy, has pointed out that the creative restlessness of the Dresden master lay in the desire always to remain abreast of his time in his creative work and therefore to make fruitful as soon as possible for German church music the new compositional impulses emerging from Italy."[92]

When we speak of excellence as a mark of the church musician, we do not mean excellence as an end in itself, for this again would not be fruitful for the church. "In the religious connection, art has never been considered as existing for its own sake, but rather for the service and glory of God and man. . . . Accordingly, church tradition has hampered art when art showed signs of following after a goal other than the needs of man as he endeavors to strengthen his relationship with God."[93] Religious art without faith is like a tinkling symbol (cymbal). Naumann comments: ". . . it is possible that the technical part—the technical excellency of the work, let us say—becomes the end instead of a means to an end. In this case, also, the formal makes itself independent and destroys the spiritual."[94] Buszin, moreover, intimates that if God wanted absolute perfection He would not have asked men to praise Him, for God judges by the heart of the worshiper, not the criteria.

> God does not distinguish between the criteria of the seventeenth or eighteenth, nineteenth or twentieth, third or fourth centuries; God's standards are constant and do not vacillate or change. They always measure the heart. God requires no more of us than that each of us be found faithful and that we apply as much skill and ability as God has given us, regardless of what era or century we live in.[95]

It would seem from our discussion that there is no limit for the 20th century musician; he may use whatever resources he chooses to express the Word. And yet there are limitations. There is the limitation of art itself, something that supersedes both secular and sacred. "We rightly fear," says Weakland, "the introduction of an emotional revivalism into our worship; for, without the restraining control of art in music, the sentimental and the banal soon result."[96] Another limitation is the matter of relevance. Even expressive art, if it is not relevant to man, does very little to foster God's glory.

> Only where music or another form of art succeeds to be to the ear and eye of man (Man in the sense of the essentially human) a visible or audible representation of the thoughts and spirit of man, and where man the audience is enabled by the very presentation to translate back into the spiritual the sounds and the sights, only there is art relevant to man, only there is the essence of art.[97]

For music to communicate it must be relevant, it must be understood. If music is written in a style that people do not understand, sacred or secular, it has no place in liturgical worship, for it cannot communicate or edify. "Music which does not serve is not appropriate for liturgical use, and music which is not understood (which stands outside the common sphere of discourse) does not edify."[98] Many times the church musician has an understanding that the lay person does not; or he fails to realize the connotations and implications that the layman associates with music that he himself finds objectionable. In these cases evangelical freedom would require a good deal of understanding and education and charity. "But the Biblical polarity between freedom and restraint must not be forgotten. Stylistic freedom must be tempered by consideration for the brother (in this case the musical layman)."[99]

How have composers today combined the secular idiom to form a sacred style? Actually things are being written so fast that it is virtually impossible to begin to give an honest appraisal. As a typical example we might cite the *Folk Mass* by Geoffrey Beaumont. Most church musicians familiar with it find it trite and musically barren. Routley says:

> Beaumont's music, and that of his imitators even more, is musically so thin, so tedious, so dreary in its substitution of decoration for invention that it sounds more like patronage than forgiveness. If everything is initially made so easy and undemanding, if these cut-rate values are at the beginning offered as Gospel values, either the evangelized will see through it and find it insulting or he will receive a shock . . . One way or another he is going to get a big surprise and a big disappointment.[100]

It is Carl Halter's opinion that the *Folk Mass* will fail for extramusical reasons. He says: "A careful hearing of this particular attempt at freshening the idiom of church music will, I think, reveal that the other connotations associated with jazz are entirely too strong to be overcome by sacred words and purposes."[101]

In commenting on a *Rock 'n Roll Mass*, most church musicians feel that styles are too divergent and the connotations too strong. Robert Wunderlich, commenting on the statement of the editors that their *Rock 'n Roll Mass* followed the traditions of Luther in "combining secular music with texts for worship," says:

> This is a very misleading statement . . . In their (Luther's) times the styles of secular art music were essentially identical to the styles of church music, so there was no great problem here . . . But Luther and the Lutheran musicians were always careful to adapt the music to fit the meanings of the text and the needs of the church and at times the adaptation was extensive. They did not merely "combine secular music with texts for worship," which is what is going on with little thought or sensitivity in too many instances today.[102]

Carl Halter comments:

> It is to be doubted that Germans at the time of the Reformation felt the incongruity in the use of secular idioms in church which we would feel were a "rock-and-roll" tune used in one of our services.[103]

Another attempt at using the secular for sacred purposes is the use of so-called "pop-hymns." We read in the introduction of one such hymnal entitled, *Hymns for Now*:

> We have called this collection of songs, "hymns." Maybe you won't agree that all of them are hymns. But the definition we are using says that the meaning a Christian brings to a song makes it "sacred." A song becomes a hymn when we interpret and use the words and melody to glorify God. And we believe it is possible to glorify God with these songs. So we call them hymns.[104]

Actually, it is very difficult to bring Christian meaning to the hymns mentioned in *Hymns for Now*. The words for many of these hymns are very superficial, and it seems to me that it would be very difficult for many to bring Christian meaning into the music. One seriously questions whether the music is "capable of accepting into itself the truth, meanings, and emotional values inherent in the contemplation of God and godly things."[105] Brand says: "Today a greater gap exists between sophisticated or 'serious' music and pop music. We do not have a musical culture; we have musical cultures. But a pop tune does sound different (it is recognizable whether the words are known or not) from symphonic theme or a 20th century hymn tune done in the traditional manner."[106] One wonders why the effort is being made to translate the church hymn into the pop style. For most serious young people both styles exist side by side, and they would many times prefer not to worship with the pop melodies. This does not infer that their religion is not integrated with their daily life; nor does it prevent them from singing pop tunes, words and all, to the glory of God, simply as a matter of recreation. Eric Routley gives us something to think about when he writes:

> It is easy to say that a new generation demands new music and it is good to insist on the church's making large efforts to be friendly to the puzzling youngsters who are so extraordinarily sulky about the church. We should not forget that the church is more than a dragnet collecting all the fishes from here and there, that it also has in it the quality of the man who gave everything for the achievement of one pearl (those parables are side by side in St. Matthew's Gospel), lest in welcoming the youngsters we also welcome the cheap values that have alienated them from the Gospel and made them sulky.[107]

There seems to be some indication among contemporary musicologists that the hymns of the 20th century will be patterned after the folk idiom. True folk music, however, is so regional that one hymn is not likely to be the expression of the whole country. And if the hymn is composed merely in the folk style, you have a sort of contrived art, an artificial style which "is bound to be esthetically inferior, and thus

unsuited for the worship of God."[108] One of the authors of a folk mass, Fitzpatrick, argues for folk music in this way:

> To deny folk music a place in the liturgy is to deny part of the important musical religious history of our own country . . . Folk hymns . . .led to the development of America's unique contribution to Christian song, gospel hymnody. The popularity of this music, termed "true folk music of the people," is still attested to in its use by evangelical Christians today . . . It is no wonder we are referred to by some as having rhythmless worship, as being a white man's church, or a snobbish church, when we deny religious folk music a place in our worship.[109]

While Fitzpatrick might have made a case for folk music, his allusion to the gospel song is not very convincing. Of our large body of hymns, perhaps this music was the tritest and most irresponsible. Any music without the leadership of a capable musician and theologian does not seem likely to last. Squire says:

> The feeling that music should be an expression of the people who use it is in keeping with the democratic spirit of Protestantism; but often this spirit is allowed to deteriorate into something less than one of responsibility. Protestantism should train itself away from irresponsibility—and of course, all should recognize that music is not mere self-expression; music is a transcending force for helping in the influence of the human spirit.[110]

Countless examples of the avant-garde in church music today could be cited, but perhaps the one that has attracted the greatest acclaim is *The Passion and Death of our Lord Jesus Christ According to St. Luke*. It represents not only a combination of the sacred and secular in music but also contains "affect-music," or "organized sound." Since I have never heard a complete performance, a judgment cannot be made. Robert Miller reviews the work in this way:

> The composer, whom *Time* justly called "Europe's most impressive new voice in modern music," is 34 year old Krzystof Penderecki . . . a citizen of Communist Poland. No new music of the last 20 years, not even Benjamin Britten's impressive *War Requiem*, has met with such widespread, rapid and enthusiastic response from audiences and critics throughout Europe and America. The Polish newspaper *Zycic Warszawy* hailed it quite justly as "one of the greatest religious works of the age." Among the features that warrant such an accolade, it is an uncompromisingly modern work employing ad lib tone clusters, quarter tones, and unusual sounds such as those produced by rubbing the backs of violin bows on chairs. Yet it incorporates traditional elements such as Gregorian chant and the Passion form established by Schuetz, Telemann, and Bach, and it integrates these seemingly diverse features with unerring and forceful originality.[111]

What is the music of the future? In the final analysis, time alone will decide, and the judgment will be made "on the basis of how well, how truly, and how meaningfully the music of this or any other idiom has served to symbolize and transmit the Christian message and ideal."[112]

APPENDIX

ARE WE FOSTERING A CONTRIVED ART?

If twenty centuries of church history have taught us anything, they have taught us that change in the tradition of church usually occurs very slowly. The world might react quickly, but ordinarily it takes a long time for art in the church to respond. This is understandable, for people in the church tend to cling to their traditions. They will not innovate for the sake of innovations, but proceed more thoughtfully. The question is asked, "Why change?" "What purpose will it serve?" Thus, by the time a new secular idiom is absorbed, this idiom has already proved its merits, namely, that it is worthy to promote the cause of the Word.

> Church art is often the precursor of the secular art to come, and due to the slowness of change in church tradition, the older church art is likely to continue on even after the consequent secular advance has suggested the beginning of a new trend in church art.[113]

Obviously this is more of a merit than a liability, but at the same time it is not an excuse. It is not an excuse to neglect contemporary resources or to neglect the past.

It is to be admitted that the romantic notion of archaism and the worship of past styles and practices may have made the 20th century guilty of just the abuses we have spoken of above. But I wonder

also whether we are not experiencing the same lag that church music has experienced throughout history! It takes time for contemporary styles to be absorbed; and where they are absorbed quickly, so quickly that the past heritage is forgotten and not built upon, a true art does not evolve, but an experimental and contrived art results. This is precisely what happened in the early 19th century, when the church musicians took over a medium they did not understand, could not control, and did not really serve the purposes of the church. A few quotations from Routley will substantiate this assertion.

> The next two generations (1780-1850) saw a degeneration of the new secular style into a new church style through the inability of church musicians to handle the new resources as skillfully as their predecessors had handled them.
>
> . . . too often it hardly mattered what the content was, so long as the outward form was highly colored, emotionally restless, and full of emphatic ornament. The "church style" proved to be the romantic style minus reason and responsibility.[114]
>
> In these ways the temptation toward cheap effect and easy impressiveness presented itself to a church that was vulnerable to all such assaults.[115]

When thoughtful church musicians became aware of this new church style, they reacted strongly; they abandoned anything that smacked of "Romantic," and found the ideal in the past—Baroque, Renaissance, and Gothic. After all, contemporary music offered no solution. We can be thankful for this reaction, for we have been led by them to found our art on the sound basis of historical development. As a result, some of the most magnificent music of all time has not only been placed at our disposal, but is still being unearthed.

But what about the 20th century idiom? What about the crisis? There is a crisis in church music, particularly for the Catholic Church. It failed, by legalistic dictum, to absorb the musical resources of history. Now, when compelled by similar dictum to a vernacular liturgy, it finds itself in a quandary; its historic chant was never conceived for the English language, and it has little heritage on which to rely.

But where is the crisis for Lutherans? Gensel quotes Dr. Krister Stendahl of Harvard:

> Dr. Krister Stendahl, Harvard Divinity School, warns that unless the Lutheran Church reforms its liturgical language "the sons and daughters of the Reformation" run the risk of getting "stuck in their 16th century museum of linguistics." He also states that "the language of Jesus and of the early church had a directness and a nonsacred character." We come to worship as though now—for an hour or so—we must fit ourselves into a strictured outline. Emotions, thoughts, "life-out-there" must somehow make the service meaningful for the sake of that which has been made "sacred" through usage and institutionalized blessings. I'm saying that we could almost (we will!) paraphrase the words of our Lord that "the Service was made for man and not man for the Service."[116]

Granted that the "thee's" and "thou's" of our service are a "museum piece" and that the settings of our liturgy leave much to be desired, does the church really face a crisis? Is the problem with the form of the words and how they are intensified, i.e., the music? Or is the problem more basic? Is the problem with the theology, with a gospel that the sons and daughters of the Lutheran church don't really want? The form not only can be changed, but will change; people will not continue long using "thee's and thou's." And I'm certain that the music of the liturgy will change, too. It is very likely that these changes will involve our contemporary idiom. But the contemporary, and secular, if you will, can become involved only as it serves the Word of God.

But let me ask again, is the situation critical? Do we really face a crisis? William Robert Miller seems to think so.

> Our failure is not an occasion for giving up but for getting with it, for redoubling our lame efforts until we can stride forward to where the real action is . . . Today's young generation, he said, is becoming a population majority. Out of no mere perversity or vanity, they are attuned to the sounds of today and they rarely hear them in church. Either get those sounds into the church or follow this generation as it bids the church farewell and finds the music it holds sacred somewhere outside.[117]

Kent Schneider echoes the same sentiments:

> Man as the metaphor of mixed-media has the creative task to bring newness out of all that is. The time is crucial. The risk is present. The possibility is worth celebrating.[118]

Are the young people really going to leave the church because the music doesn't sound like the pop tunes they hear on the radio and which have so little to commend them? Do the young people really "hold sacred" the sounds of today? Or is it the sounds of the avant-garde which actually only a fraction of our

young people ever hear? Or is it the spirit of our time that we are committed to change? The idea of experiment, of the new, of the different, or change for the sake of change has become part of our educational philosophy. Applied to music this means, "Let's get with it!" The very spirit of the times requires that we produce something new and exciting and different.

One cannot fault, but only admire the church musician who has the unique gift to communicate through sound and who brings with him not only a technical knowledge of the accumulated resources of music (past and present), but also a lively Christian faith. What this man writes will be the music of the church.

But the church musician to whom the crisis is a theological one, who would like to eliminate the sacred-secular dichotomy of Scripture, will cease to be a church musician. And the one to whom the crisis is one of arbitrary change, who composes solely for the sake of experiment, will give birth to a contrived art, unsuitable for the worship of God.[119]

NOTES

[1] Eric Routley, *Music Leadership in the Church* (New York: Abingdon, 1967) 45.

[2] Eric Routley, "The Vocabulary of Church Music," *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 18: 2 (1963) 135.

[3] Oskar Soehnger, "Church Music as Art," *Festschrift* (Valparaiso, 1967) 32.

[4] Eugene L. Brand, "Music in the Liturgy, Basic Problems," *Response* 7:3 (St. Paul, 1966) 143.

[5] Soehnger 27.

[6] Eugene L. Brand, "Congregational Song: The Popular Music of the Church," *Church Music* 68:1 (St. Louis: Concordia, 1968) 3.

[7] Walter E. Buszin, "Criteria of Church Music in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," *Festschrift* (Valparaiso, 1967) 17.

[8] Brand, "Music in the Liturgy" 144-145.

[9] Ulrich Leupold, *Journal of Church Music* (October 1967).

[10] Gerhard Herz, "Bach, Cantata No. 4," *Norton Critical Scores* (New York: Norton & Co., 1967).

[11] C. Alexander Peloquin, "In Praise of Joy—the Left Position," *Crisis in Church Music* (Washington DC Liturgical Conference, 1967) 77-78.

[12] Herz 6.

[13] Robert I. Blanchard, "Church Music Today, the Center Position," *Crisis in Church Music* (Washington DC Liturgical Conference, 1967) 66.

[14] Herz 6.

[15] Carl Halter, "What Makes Music Sacred," *Journal of Church Music* 2:7 (1960) 2-5.

[16] Robert Tangemann, "Music and the Church," *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 12:3 (1957) 56. ("The music must, of course avoid associations inimical to an atmosphere of worship. This is a highly personal matter and can easily lead to serious problems. No simple rule can be suggested" 58.)

[17] Halter 3-4.

[18] Soehngen 24-25.

[19] Halter 4-5.

[20] Soehngen 26.

[21] Routley, "The Vocabulary" 140.

[22] Routley, *Music Leadership* 35.

[23] Soehngen 25.

[24] Martin Naumann, "The Divine Pattern for Art," *Festschrift* (Valparaiso, 1967) 9.

[25] Soehngen 141.

[26] Suzanne Langer, *Philosophy in a New Key,* 2nd ed. (New York: Mentor Books, 1951) 240.

[27] Leonard Bernstein, *Joy of Music* (New York: Signet Books, 1967) 81.

[28] Bernstein 97-98.

[29] Robert Shaw, "The Conservative Arts," *Diapason* (Chicago, June 1966) 43.

[30] Tangemann 58.

[31] Leonard B. Meyer, *Emotion and Meaning in Music* (Chicago: Phoenix Books, 1956) 45.

[32] Soehngen 27.

[33] Meyer 160.

[34] Meyer 62.
[35] *Webster's Collegiate Dictionary,* 5th ed. (Springfield: G. & C. Merriam Co., 1947) 899.
[36] Ross Snyder, "The Time of Celebration is at Hand," *Chicago Theological Register* 58:4,5 (1968) 2.
[37] Brand, "Music in the Liturgy" 144.
[38] Naumann, "The Divine Pattern" 9.
[39] Blanchard 66.
[40] Brand, "Music in the Liturgy" 45.
[41] Soehngen 27.
[42] Russel N. Squire, *Church Music* (St. Louis: Bethany Press, 1962) 104.
[43] Squire 19.
[44] Squire 37.
[45] Squire 40.
[46] Squire 46.
[47] Routley, *Music Leadership* 45.
[48] Brand, "Music in the Liturgy" 144.
[49] Squire 84.
[50] Squire 86.
[51] Tangemann 59.
[52] Tangemann 59.
[53] Squire 99.
[54] Carl F. Schalk, "Music in the Lutheran Worship," *Crisis in Church Music* (Washington DC Liturgical Conference, 1967) 49.
[55] Routley, *Music Leadership* 45.
[56] Brand, "Congregational Song" 3.
[57] Robert Wunderlich, Book Review of "Hymns for Now," Workers Quarterly 39:1 (St. Louis: Concordia, 1967) 37.
[58] Squire 99.
[59] Squire 87.
[60] Squire 128.
[61] Squire 168.
[62] Soehngen 27.
[63] Leupold, "But regardless of particulars, his liturgical reforms show such a firm grasp of the essentials and such a bold and sure expression of them that his reforms became a pattern for centuries to come and set forth principles that are as valid today as they were in Luther's time."
[64] Routley, "The Vocabulary" 145-146.
[65] Herz 6.
[66] Tangemann 58.
[67] Tangemann 59.
[68] Herz 11.
[69] Buszin, "Criteria" 15.
[70] Squire 105.
[71] Squire 108.
[72] Buszin, "Criteria" 20.
[73] Routley, *Music Leadership* 142.
[74] Routley, *Music Leadership* 36.
[75] Routley, *Music Leadership* 41-44.
[76] Routley, *Music Leadership* 47.
[77] Buszin, "Criteria" 20.
[78] Herz 15.
[79] Herz 18.
[80] Brand, "Music in the Liturgy" 144.
[81] Langer 227-228: ("The fundamental relationships in music, he says, are <u>tensions</u> and <u>resolutions</u>; . . . wherever sheer contrasts of ideas produce a reaction, wherever experiences of pure form produce mental tension, we have the essence of melody . . . There are certain aspects of the so-called 'inner

life'—physical and mental—which have formal properties similar to those of music—patterns of motion and rest, of tension and release . . .")

[82] Archibald T. Davison, *Church Music*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1960) 38.

[83] Charles L. Etherington, *Protestant Worship Music* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965) 208.

[84] Tangemann 57.

[85] Rembert Weakland O.S.B., "Music and Liturgy in Evolution," *Crisis in Church Music* 2:3 (Washington DC Liturgical Conference, 1967) 10.

[86] Weakland 11.

[87] Squire 108.

[88] John Ciardi, "Saturday Review Columnist Ciardi Comments on Children's Books, Poetry, Christian as Literary Artist," *CPH Commentator* (St. Louis: Concordia, August 1967) 2.

[89] Routley, *Music Leadership* 37.

[90] Halter 4: "No rules are possible to determine or predict in advance which music will or will not have the capacity to be sanctified for sacred use. This is why sensitive musicians always have been, are and always will be necessary to the worship of the church. Their equipment must include a knowledge of the Christian faith, a sensitivity to its holiness, a realization of its worship needs, the judgment to support the good, and the courage to condemn the shoddy."

[91] Blanchard 68.

[92] Soehngen 29.

[93] Squire 104.

[94] Naumann, "The Divine Pattern" 10.

[95] Buszin, "Criteria" 18.

[96] Weakland 13.

[97] Naumann, "The Divine Pattern" 11.

[98] Brand, "Music in the Liturgy" 145.

[99] Brand, "Music in the Liturgy" 145.

[100] Routley, "The Vocabulary" 146.

[101] Halter 4.

[102] Wunderlich 37.

[103] Halter 4.

[104] "Hymns for Now"

[105] Halter 4.

[106] Brand, "Congregational Song" 4.

[107] Routley, *Music Leadership* 146.

[108] Brand, "Music in the Liturgy" 144.

[109] Dennis Fitzpatrick, "A View From the Far Left," *Crisis in Church Music* (Washington DC Liturgical Conference, 1967) 81-90.

[110] Squire 157.

[111] William Robert Miller, "New Sounds in a World of Change," *This Day* (June 1968) 18.

[112] Halter 5.

[113] Squire 104.

[114] Routley, *Music Leadership* 41-46.

[115] Routley, "The Vocabulary" 142.

[116] John G. Gensel, "Worship and Jazz," *A.G.O. Quarterly* 10:1 (1965) 13.

[117] Miller 17-19.

[118] Kent Schneider, "Building Acoustic World," *Chicago Theological Register* 58:4,5 (1968) 13-18.

[119] Brand, "Music in Liturgy" 144.

BOOK REVIEWS

***Pastoral Theology,* by C. F. W. Walther. Trans. John M. Drickamer. New Haven: Lutheran News, 1995. 300 pages, paperback, $7.99.**

C. F. W. Walther's *Amerikanisch-Lutherische Pastoraltheologie*, popularly known as his *Pastorale*, was first published in 1872 as a compilation from articles which had appeared in *Lehre und Wehre* from 1865 to 1871. It had only been available in German until this published English translation by John M. Drickamer. His biographical notes indicate he is a Missouri Synod pastor with an M. Div. degree from Concordia Seminary, Springfield, IL (Fort Wayne, IN) in 1975 and a Th. D. degree from Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, in 1978; presently he is a pastor in Lake County, Oregon. In his preface the translator notes that his translation is "more idiomatic than literal" but "accurate in substance and meaning." He has "considerably"[1] abridged Walther's words (from the fifth German edition of 1906) in two ways: (1) sentences and paragraphs have been omitted as not directly relevant; and (2) many sentences have been shortened by dropping smaller unnecessary German words. The translator has put some footnotes of Walther into the text as paragraphs in brackets, sometimes summarizing Walther. The only blemish in the format of this sturdy, otherwise attractive book is that almost every page has a line or two where thewordsseemtoruntogether, which is bothersome and straining. But ultimately it is worth it for the rich content of Walther's work.

As in his familiar *Law and Gospel* work, Walther's style in this work is to present a main thesis, followed by his personal comments, which include profuse quotations from Luther and the Lutheran fathers. Indeed, as one reviewer has noted, "the German original of this work serves admirably as a textbook for studying the history of Lutheran pastoral theology from the Reformation till the end of the 19th century."[2] But the real value and use for most of us will be for its Scripturally-based guidance for our pastoral theology.

Overview of the Contents

The contents of this work encompass every major phase of the work of the ministry, from beginning to end. Chapters 1-3 deal with the nature of pastoral theology itself, defining its meaning, its acquisition and its sources. Chapters 4-7 deal with the divine Call, defining its importance, legitimacy, validity, and its external arrangements, while chapter 50 counsels on the decision-making process. Chapters 8-10 concentrate on the new pastor, his ordination, first sermon, and first visitations. Chapters 11-18 treat the Means of Grace: requirements for public preaching; Baptism administration, candidates, liturgical customs; Communion announcements, public and private administration of the sacrament, and who is to be communed. Chapters 19-26 address the matters of marriage: various aspects of the wedding, civil laws, prohibited degrees, previous marriages, public announcement, the ceremony, adultery, desertion, divorce. Chapters 27-29 discuss pastoral care of the youth, including confirmation and instruction. Chapters 30 and 34 stress the importance of private pastoral care (*Seelsorge*) and regular home visitation. Chapters 31-33 cover pastoral care of the sick and consider the first visit, the approach, the condition and needs of the patient, the critically ill, and communion. Chapter 35 urges attention to the physical welfare of the congregation's needy. Chapters 36 and 37 deal with pastoral concerns for the dying, the funeral, and Christian burial. Chapter 38 guides in pastoral conduct toward members of another parish, while chapters 39-43 give guidance in administering Christian discipline, including admonition, public repentance, excommunication, and restoring the penitent. Chapters 44-47 discuss a congregation's officers, meetings, new members, and constitution. The final 3 chapters treat of the pastor's personal life, synodical affiliation, the call process.

Of Special Interest

I found the first three chapters valuable in reviewing the very heart of pastoral theology, which he defines as not merely a body of knowledge or book of doctrine, but rather a disposition or condition of the soul to deal with the object. He calls it an "ability," and a "practical" ability which "consists in leading the sinner to salvation through faith . . . and in the work or official functions of a pastor."[3] That this ability is God-given means that it is "attained not by human power and diligence but only through the work of the Holy Spirit. It presupposes justifying faith, and only one who stands in grace, only a regenerate person can have it. . . [It is] an ability acquired through certain auxiliary means . . . not through direct illumination, but . . . indirectly wrought by the Holy Spirit."[4] And then he cites 1 Timothy 4:13-16 to show that the auxiliary means is the Word of God. But the acquisition of the ability (pastoral theology) involves the substance of Luther's well-known axiom: "*Oratio, meditatio, tentatio faciunt theologum.*" Luther: "So, dear Lords and Brethren, Pastors and Preachers, pray, read, study be diligent! Truly, at this wicked, scandalous time, it is not the time to laze around, to snore and sleep. Use your gift, which has been entrusted to you, and reveal the mystery of Christ."[5] The sources for the *meditatio* and the obtaining of the ability he cites in chapter 3

as being, above all, the Holy Scripture itself, but then also Luther's collected works in which "pastoral theological material is scattered everywhere," and complete pastoral theological texts, as well as works of casuistry by our orthodox theologians. In particular Walther recommended *Pastorale Lutheri* by Conrad Porta and books by John Ludwig Hartmann, Solomon Deyling, and others. He also advised the reading of biographies of faithful pastors from the past.

I found particularly humbling Chapter 11, on "The Requirements of Public Preaching." As he described the requirements of this "most important of all official functions," the guilt was not unbearably great as he clicked off the various requirements of preaching: that it contain nothing but God's pure Word and unalloyed, that God's Word be correctly applied, that the whole counsel of God be proclaimed, that it meet the special needs of the listeners; but when he came to the part that it must also be timely, well-organized, and not too long . . . I really felt the pressure, especially in his comments:

> The timely preacher is not content that his sermon contain only the pure Word of God, but continually considers the prejudices, errors, sins, vices, and dangers which prevail in his time, which he knows to be touching, endangering, and infecting his listeners. . . . If we want to be Luther's faithful students, we must again and again consider contemporary dangers and the prevailing spirit of the time in our sermons, writings, and periodicals. We preachers are primarily responsible for the unopposed corruption of our time. Who should speak and work against it? If we do not do so, who can see through it by the light of God's Word and victoriously combat it with the powerful weapon of God's Word? In our time we should lift our voices like a trumpet against the errors and sins of our time. . . . Woe to the preacher who does not touch the sore spots of his time! A double woe on the head of the preacher who otherwise knows God's Word well but has let himself be infected with the spirit and ideas of progress, this dirt soup of all times; . . . It is true that we few, poor preachers will not hold back the flood of the end time. But woe to us if we do not let God's voice of thunder resound into the raging storm "as testimony" against God's enemies and a call to salvation for all who will still be saved! . . .[6]

And I can't bear even to print out loud his quote from Luther's Table Talk about the importance of the brevity of a sermon. Only slightly comforting in this regard was Drickamer's recollection about Luther's criticism of his own pastor, Johannes Bugenhagen. Hearing that his pastor had torn his robe on a nail descending from the pulpit, Luther reportedly said something like, "I always thought he was nailed in."[7]

While Walther is marvelously timely in much of his work, one will recognize that some of his comments are dated and not relevant. John Brug has gleaned some of that dated counsel.

> Not many of our pastors will find it necessary to arrange special meetings and classes for the servants and herdsmen during their every-home visitation (p. 56). We no longer follow the recommended order of distribution in the Lord's Supper: husbands, bachelors, spinsters, wives (p. 143). Other customs which have changed include formal publication of marriage banns in the church, the forms of communion announcement, and the format of instruction for confirmation classes and youth. . . . Not everyone will want to follow Walther's directions for how the pastor must balance the baby on his arm while baptizing it (p. 91). There is no scriptural basis for the claim that excess communion wine must be drunk up, but the wafers may be saved.[8]

Contemporary readers will do well evaluate each case on its own merits and to consider whether the change since Walther's day has been for the better.

Of greater concern is the "old Missouri" teaching that crops out here and there, that the pastoral office is the only divinely ordained form of the ministry and the congregation the only divine institution. For example, in chapter 49, talking about the important harmony that needs to exist between pastor and Christian Day School teacher, Walther makes this statement: "The preacher should never forget that the school teacher is also a servant of the church and administers an auxiliary office branched off from his [the pastor's] office . . ."[9] At the same location Drickamer adds this summary note: "[Walther shows with many quotations that every local congregation has full church authority; associations such as synods may be formed in Christian freedom; but they are human, not divine, institutions.]" How much of this latter statement is Walther's and how much Drickamer's can only be determined by a careful reading of Walther in the original.

Conclusion

In his review John F. Brug commends the book as a "welcome addition to the body of literature from our Synodical Conference heritage," and recommends it for purchase especially considering its

modest price. But he feels the severe abridgment and occasional shortcomings of the English text make this edition an inadequate substitute for the German original for those readers who are interested in an in-depth study of Walther's viewpoints and the quotation from the Lutheran fathers.[10]

I agree whole-heartedly with Drickamer's estimation of this great work of Walther. His word of caution not to read the book will be a challenge for our new man, hopefully, rather than an excuse for the flesh.

> The contents of Walther's *Pastorale* will be uncomfortable for those who have compromised with the modern world or with Reformed teachings . . . But Walther's Bible-based principles are still valid and fully applicable today, for they are not from Walther, nor from Luther, but from God's Word, the Bible. Those who want to change the principles of Lutheran pastoral theology must argue—not with Walther, nor with Luther—but with the Triune God, Whose Word establishes those principles for all times and ages.
>
> A note of caution is in order from this translator, who is a pastor, to all the pastors and students who read this book. Do not read the book at all if you want to feel comfortable or take it easy in the ministry! Read it only if you want to be faithful and diligent in the holy preaching office![11]

Whatever shortcomings the translation may have, for many of us in a hurry and not so swift to remember all our German vocables, it is better to have this translation of Walther's *Pastorale* than to have no translation at all. I appreciate the work of the translator to make available this enjoyable work of Walther. Undoubtedly I will continue to find use for it in my ministry, especially the first 3 chapters which remind pastors (and laymen who may read it!) of the serious work of the ministry and of the need for continual rededication. May the Lord evermore give us dedication to and the ability of pastoral theology.

NOTES

[1] John F. Brug, "Reviews," *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* (Winter 1996) 62.
[2] Brug 62.
[3] Walther 8-9.
[4] Walther 10.
[5] Walther 12.
[6] Walther 83.
[7] Walther 84.
[8] Brug 62.
[9] Walther 272.
[10] Brug 63.
[11] Drickamer, Preface.

James E. Sandeen

Motivation for Ministry, by Nathan R. Pope. Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1993.

Nathan Pope is a 1977 graduate of Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary in Mequon, Wisconsin. Since that time he has served in the public ministry of the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod (WELS), at present serving as the pastor of First Evangelical Lutheran Church of Racine, Wisconsin. This book gives a little bit of the flavor of what the pastoral ministry in a confessional Lutheran church body is like at this time in history.

It seems that many pastors are resigning from the ministry in our time. Of the 70 in Pastor Pope's class there are 13 who are no longer serving in the pastoral ministry. Pastor Pope considers the possible causes for this sad phenomenon. He believes that motivation for ministry is the key factor for keeping ministers in the ministry. The right motivation for ministry is the glory of God.

Part One of this 248-page paperback deals with The Theology of Soli Deo Gloria. Part Two considers A Practical Theology for Soli Deo Gloria. There are thirteen chapters altogether. Each chapter contains a brief summary as well as several points of advice for self-examination or self-improvement.

Along the way Pastor Pope refers to past mistakes in his own ministry and how the Lord gradually led him to better ways of thinking about and conducting his ministry. It is my belief that seminary students who have not grown up in a parsonage would especially profit from Pastor Pope's view of the glories of the ministry as well as the pitfalls and temptations. Too often persons on the outside have very little understanding of what the pastor experiences in his calling.

But experienced pastors also should profit from a thoughtful reading of this book. It is easy for us older pastors to handle the holy Word of God in a careless manner and to think of our members as cases or problems rather than as persons for whom our Savior died.

I found chapter 12 particularly worthy of consideration of us all. This chapter deals with the importance of prayer and meditation. How easy it is for us to neglect prayer with the excuse that we have so many other things to do! We need to take the time not only to read God's Word for the growth of our personal faith but also to talk to our heavenly Father in prayer. Here, of course, Jesus is our model, and, to a lesser extent, Martin Luther, who spent at least three hours a day in prayer during the Diet of Augsburg in 1530. I appreciated in particular the suggestion that the membership list of the congregation be used as a guide for the regular intercessory prayers of the pastor for his people. As one piece of advice he suggests: "Set aside thirty minutes every Saturday evening, and pray through a portion of your membership alphabetically, noting intercessory concerns" (p. 222).

I plan to assign this book to our first-year seminary students as part of their necessary reading. I will have to warn them, however, that a small number of typographical and spelling blunders were missed by the proofreader. "Lose," for example, very often occurs as "loose."

David Lau

***Man and Woman in Christian Perspective*, by Werner Neuer. Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 1991.**

This book was originally published in German in 1981 with the title *Mann und Frau in christlicher Sicht*. The English translation was done by Gordon Wenham.

The greater part of the book is a careful study of the Bible references in both Old and New Testaments that discuss the relationship of male and female. It is refreshing to know that there is at least one scholar in Germany that takes God's Word on the subject seriously. His conclusion is on page 134: "Despite the great variety of biblical texts examined, an astonishing consistency has emerged. Everywhere the relationship of the sexes established at creation (Gen. 1-3) is the basis. This is reinterpreted and deepened by passages in the New Testament in the light of Christ's revelation."

This consistency, of course, should not really be so astonishing since one author, the Holy Spirit, is the real author of all the Scriptures. This author, the Holy Spirit, teaches us that there is a God-intended difference between male and female. This difference does not have to do with the way of salvation. Neuer says: "All the books of the New Testament presuppose that women are 'joint heirs of the grace of life' (1 Pet. 3:7) who enjoy the same access to God, redemption in Jesus Christ, and life under the guidance of the Spirit as men do. One will search in vain in the New Testament for any disparagement or disdain of women" (p. 130), even though contemporary Judaism puts down women as inferior in every way.

Nevertheless, on the basis of God's creation, the same principle is upheld in all the Scriptures, spelled out in particular by the Apostle Paul: "The man is head of the woman and is therefore called in church life and in marriage to the task of leadership" (p. 128). "There is no evidence in the New Testament for women exercising teaching or leadership functions" (p. 132).

Neuer contends that it is very important for Christians today to honor what God says about male and female. "Whoever rejects the biblical ordering of the sexes must ultimately reject the God revealed in Holy Scripture" (p. 159). He claims: "A Christian feminist theology is impossible" (p. 160). "Whoever regards the New Testament ordering of male and female as outdated is not just breaking with the New Testament at this point, but with the tradition of the church of nearly two thousand years" (p. 143). Neuer shows that even such "liberal" theologians as Karl Barth, Emil Brunner, and Dietrich Bonhoeffer accepted the Scriptural teaching on men and women.

We should mention that the first part of the book presents "what the human and social sciences know about gender differences" (p. 11). Neuer sees no conflict between what the Bible teaches and what scientific investigation has uncovered. He says: "As our study proceeds we shall see how well the biblical

and scientific views of the sexes complement and confirm each other" (pp. 56-57). By presenting this scientific material Neuer is not putting the Bible and science on an equal level as authorities. Rather, he says very plainly: "The final authority for Christian conviction and behaviour can never be scientific study, which is always open to revision. The final authority is rather Holy Scripture, which as God's revelation discloses deeper truths than the most solidly based science ever can" (p. 56).

Although we can agree with the major thrust of Neuer's presentation, a few question marks remain. Since the first three chapters of Genesis are so basic to the study of the topic and since Neuer says that these chapters "report something that happened in the past" (p. 60), we find it difficult to understand why he says that these chapters "are composed in poetic language" (p. 59) and that they "must not be misunderstood as an exact historical report" (p. 60).

On page 65 Neuer says that "mankind after the fall still has the image of God." His definition of "image of God" does not make use of God's explanation in Paul's letters to the Ephesians and Colossians.

Neuer spends some time discussing the apparent tensions between First Corinthians 11 and 14. In chapter 11 the women are spoken of as praying and prophesying, whereas in chapter 14 it seems they are forbidden from doing so. He presents two solutions to the problem on page 117. The one solution he presents and then rejects is the one I presented at the 1993 CLC Pastoral Conference. It goes like this: "One solves the apparent tension between 1 Corinthians 11 and 14 by regarding 1 Corinthians 14: 34-35 not as an absolute prohibition on speaking but only as a prohibition on teaching, that is participating in a teaching ministry. . . . The parallel passage in 1 Timothy 2:12 speaks explicitly of 'teaching' and not at all about speaking" (p. 117). Why does Neuer reject this explanation? In his view it does not do justice to the Greek term (σιγάω) which, he says, must be taken "in an absolute sense, as a prohibition against any verbal utterance" (p. 117). I believe his view puts too much emphasis on the usual meaning of the word and not enough on the context.

I also disagree with Neuer's statement on page 173: "Because Jesus was a <u>man</u>, only male apostles and church leaders can represent him." Our Lord gave the keys of the kingdom to all His believers: men, women, and children. A wife can present the Lord's Word of rebuke and absolution to her husband in the name of Christ and thus represent Him, just as the husband can represent Christ to her. Surely a mother represents Christ to her children; she is the Lord' representative to them, and the gospel on her lips is just as powerful and effective as the gospel on any man's lips. Our basic reason for denying the pastorate to women is not that women cannot represent Christ, but that Christ through His apostle forbids it in First Timothy 2:11-14 on the basis of creation and the fall. No other argument is needed.

David Lau