

An Introduction to a Theology of Worship - Week 9

by Greg Willson
www.gregwillson.com

History, Creeds/Confession, Outreach/Fellowship

Review of Sanctification:

The broad aspect of worship

Worship involves the intellect, the physical body, the emotions- the whole person: the Hebrew version of "heart." **What does this say about how we use our body in worship?**

Playing the Right Notes Well

right notes in the right way in the right context

A Trinitarian Invitation: to Doing and Not Doing

Dave Brubeck Quartet's *Take Five*

Towards a Sabbath Rhythm of taking time and active participation
contra our culture: time is something to be dominated and we passively are entertained

the importance of silence

History:

2000 years in 2 minutes

Synagogues: psalms (author of Hebrews chooses psalms that were commonly sung)

plainchant: Gregorian chant

cantus firmus + melody on top

harmony (vertical)

counterpoint (horizontal: musical lines that sound very different and move independently from each other but sound harmonious when played simultaneously), polyphony, syllables and words

The decadence: Bach's Mass in B Minor, Mozart's masses were so long only parts could be used for church services.

Eventually common people couldn't really take part in the Mass, it was only reserved for professional musicians. Reflecting other aesthetics: cathedrals, language, etc.

During the Protestant Reformation, both groups responding to Catholicism, wanted more participation

Council of Trent: borrowing secular songs (from the pub!)

Calvin and his peeps: only metrical psalm singing (Louis Bourgeois' music for the Geneva Psalter)

music reflected the whole aesthetic change

even today, there's want to purge "secular" aspects of music from Sunday morning. But what is secular? Syncopation? Instrumentation? Also, Lutheran songs came from pubs, Calvin's songs were "too upbeat and happy" (jeered by Queen Elizabeth: "Geneva jigs"). Does the passing of time turn them into something not secular anymore?

Let's not become gnostic: we are not redeemed from the world, we are redeemed in the world.

The danger of making situational concerns normative: how do *we* respond to *our* culture? We shouldn't look back to a certain period of time (many problems here), but our past traditions should be one factor that informs our interaction with the culture today.

This is not something we're ever going to "just get." It will always be a struggle-
reference *Early Christian Painting*

The Importance of Creeds and Confessions

or, How To Use Your Imagination

many of us are afraid to use our imagination, especially when it comes to theological truth, but some of that fear might come from us not knowing how to properly use our imagination.

Contemporary society tells us that limits inhibit freedom. But the right limits actually give us freedom.

If I was to ask you- say a word out loud, there's typically some sort of initial paralysis. We first put an internal limit (maybe you look around, maybe you revert to a greeting...)

If I was to ask you- name something in this building, that might be a little easier.
If I was to ask- name what you had for breakfast, even easier. The limits give you freedom to respond.

Now, we do need the right limits. If I was to ask you- what does it feel like when you fly through the air. None of us can fly, so we don't know- again, we can't answer.

So restriction comes from no limits or wrong limits. And freedom comes with the right limits. If we say we have no limits, we are saying that we're god. But that will become our captivity, because we're not, and because we can't truly live that out- it will be futile. But if we embrace the limits of what it means to be human instead of see humanity as something to conquer, we can have freedom.

When we are given the right limits, there's freedom for us to move. This is a helpful way to think of the historic creeds. Let's take the Incarnation as an example. There is much more work to be done and imagination to be used when coming to this topic.

BACH PARTITA: ordered, yet feeling of freedom and endless possibilities vs. random plinkings

This historic church, of which we are a part, has put right limits on Christ's incarnation

(from *Jesus in Trinitarian Perspective*)

Four Creeds:

Nicaea (AD 325): condemned Arianism (denies Jesus' divinity), *God alone can save us*

Constantinople I (AD 381): reaffirmed Nicaea, condemned Apollinarianism (Jesus had a human body and soul, but a divine mind), *That which is not assumed is not healed*

Ephesus (AD 431): condemned Nestorianism (Christ is two persons- one divine, one human), specified the one person in Christ

Chalcedon (AD 451): condemned Eutychianism (Christ's humanity was taken over by the divine, or Christ had a human nature but it was unlike the rest of humanity), maintained the two natures without confusion or change, separation or division.

O	Fully God	T
n		w
e		o
P		N
e		a
r		t
s		u
o		r
n	Fully Human	e
		s

This gives us correct boundaries for freedom to interact, now that we have correct boundaries.

Imagination is not bad, by the way...
 science can only take us so far

Now we can use our imagination to try and understand more about Christ, take a particular story- the testing in the wilderness, Christ in the garden, on the boat during the big storm where He made the storm silent: What is He like? What was going on in that scene- the attempt is to put yourself in the text. After this, now apply the text: how does it affect your life, culture, church?

the same exercise with wrong limits (Christ was not human, etc.), the same exercise with no limits (did it really even happen?)

remember the Trinitarian Invitation

Creedal Jazz example:
 32 bars: F x 12, G x 16, F x 4 :||

Outreach/Fellowship

the myth of only one or the other: is your church more about outreach or building up the body?

A lesson from how to look at art:
 Modern (object only)

Postmodern (subject only)

as a church, we shouldn't be postmodern, we shouldn't be modern, as always, we need to thoughtfully engage the culture. It's easy not to, so typically churches don't.

Modern only: we do what we want as we've done it and take it or leave it (often under the guise of "being biblical")

Postmodern only: we seek to engage people where they are (often under the guise of "authenticity")

Can you see the improper view of the Incarnation here?

modern: deity, no humanity- offer hope without affirming suffering

postmodern: humanity, no deity- affirm suffering without offering hope

A Third Way (dialogue between the two)

art is not created in a vacuum, just as we are not living in a vacuum.

the necessity of the object and subject in dialogue

This is all very exciting, but what does this have to do with outreach and fellowship?

A musical example:

playing together, but also taking into account the audience

only playing to each other vs. only playing to the audience vs. A Third Way

why some people think "family" is a bad metaphor for church (though it doesn't have to be): some families aren't very inviting, families don't often add outsiders (except in marriage, and even then they leave the family unit)

the *missio Dei*

the Trinitarian chord:

music is played **to** and **with** other musicians and also rings forth- to the world, to the onlookers

When looking at art:

modern only: only for the object

post-modern: only for the subject

A Third Way: for artists *and* spectators

Piper: Missions exists because worship doesn't
Chords work together and resound outward

Using genre: outreach: accessibility: Rock/Pop
community: fellowship/intimacy: folk

Folk music and the perception of impossible cultural divides
Bobby McFerrin's pentatonic demonstration (TED talk)