

July/August 1986

Integrity

INTEGRITY, a journal published by an independent nonprofit corporation, is intended to be a ministry of reconciliation which utilizes the varied talents of a large community of believers who seek accurately to reveal God to both the church and the world so that all may become one as He is one.

(continued from page 50)

us who are a part of the Stone-Campbell movement will come to appreciate even more the rich heritage of which we are a part. Amidst the struggles within and without the church we look to Christ who has not only made us one, but who has also set us free!

Bruce and Diane Kilmer
Co-Chairpersons, Editorial Board

Note from the *Integrity* Board members:

With this issue, Diane and Bruce Kilmer assume the role of co-chairpersons of the editorial board. Dr. Joseph F. Jones, who has been the editorial voice of *Integrity* for the last

few years, felt it necessary to relinquish the job of pulling each issue together. We owe Joe, who remains as president of the board of *Integrity*, Elton and Laquita Higgs, Dean Thoroman, and Natalie Randall a deep debt of thanks for their past work as the editorial board and for their willingness to continue to advise and serve. Since in the last couple of years the entire board has progressively participated more and more in the planning of themes, articles, and authors, we chose this time to recognize this fact and simply change our board description to the *Integrity* magazine working editorial board with Bruce and Diane functioning as co-chairpersons of the editorial work. As always, we appreciate your participation in this printed ministry through your ideas, responses, and prayers. Thank you!

Editorial: What Do We Have To Offer?

One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic
Leroy Garrett

What We Have To Offer
Hoy Ledbetter

Renewal Through Recovery
W. Carl Ketcherside

**Our Heritage of Music in Worship:
The Blessings of Participation**
Foy Palmer

Readers' Response

July-August 1986
Vol. 16, No. 4

Editorial Advisor
Hoy Ledbetter

Board of Directors

Elton D. Higgs
Laquita M. Higgs
Joseph F. Jones
Diane G. H. Kilmer
J. Bruce Kilmer
Curtis Lloyd
Gary F. Mitchell
Foy Palmer
Henrietta C. Palmer
William Palmer
Amos Ponder
Karl W. Randall
Natalie Randall
Kenneth Slater
Dean Thoroman
Jan Van Horn
John Van Horn

Subscriptions
are by written request. Although there is no subscription charge, contributions are necessary for our survival. Since we are approved by IRS, they are deductible.

Manuscripts
written exclusively for INTEGRITY are welcomed.

Please notify us
when you change your address, so you will not be dropped from our mailing list.

Available back issues
will be sent upon request, but a contribution to cover mailing expenses would be appreciated.

Business Address
10367 Carmer Rd.
Fenton, Michigan 48430

What Do We Have To Offer?

As the heirs of the Stone-Campbell movement approach the end of the 20th century and the 200th anniversary of the Declaration and Address of Thomas Campbell, it is appropriate for us to ask: what do the present day spiritual children of these great leaders have to offer the Christian and secular world at large? Are we nothing more than a narrow sect, far from the great ideals from which we sprang? Or do we still have the marks of a rich heritage which holds valuable beliefs and practices for Christians and non-Christians alike?

This issue of *Integrity* draws on the faith, knowledge and experience of four present-day heirs of Campbell and Stone. Leroy Garrett and Carl Ketcherside are two of the leading fathers of the Restoration Movement in the 20th century. Both of them are known and read by those in the Churches of Christ and Christian Churches of today. Both of them draw on their deep knowledge of the history of the movement and their experience among the churches of the movement over much of this century.

Leroy Garrett teaches us that the leaders of the Restoration Movement held much in common with the church leaders throughout the centuries. He draws for us a historical picture of a church that down through the centuries has had to continually reassess and be renewed by God's Spirit into a body that is one, holy, catholic, and apostolic.

Hoy Ledbetter, the pioneer editor of this journal, encourages us to continue the great work of unity for which we in the Restoration movement have such a historical calling. Hoy offers us a practical vision for how we may apply these principals to today's world.

Then, Carl Ketcherside refines the topic even further by discussing with us that specific beliefs our movement retains and practices can further encourage and mature others in 20th century Christendom.

Finally, Foy Palmer defines for us the importance of one specific practice: participatory worship. Drawing us through history, Foy teaches that a corporate worship that encourages all to participate is vital for a dynamic, growing community.

We are indeed blessed to have collected the insights of these great men of faith in one issue. It is our prayer that those of

(continued on page 64)

One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic

LEROY GARRETT

Denton, Texas

By the time of the council of Nicea in the fourth century, the church had begun to look at itself introspectively, and while it had for some time endeavored to state in creedal terms what it believed about Jesus Christ and his relationship to God, it was now ready to speak categorically about the nature of the church. In the councils that grew out of Nicea, particularly the Constantinopolitan in about 380, the fathers came up with an imposing sentence, pregnant with meaning, about the church. It reflected what believers for almost four centuries since apostolic times had come to believe about the community of God on earth.

We believe in one, holy, catholic, and apostolic church.

The so-called Arian controversy had already disturbed the unity of the church, as had numerous other issues and personalities. Gnosticism had taken its toll, as had Marcionism, and Montanism, influences that suggest that church problems have a way of repeating themselves. Marcion anticipated modern problems growing out of form and textual criticism in that he came up with his own selection of Scripture, rejecting the rest, as well as his own doctrine of Christ and God. Excommunicated by the church, he formed his own communion which survived for several centuries.

Montanus anticipated problems growing out of the modern charismatic movement in that he emphasized the working of the Holy Spirit to such an extent that he saw himself not only as a prophet but as the forerunner of the Paraclete, and he insisted that true Christians must have certain recognizable spiritual gifts. He, too, left the church and formed his own organization.

With all these problems, and more, the Nicene fathers proclaimed that the church is one.

However troubled, however "divided" in a sense, the church is nonetheless united as the one Body of Christ upon earth.

The same is true in regard to its holiness, its catholicity, its apostolicity. Even from the beginning the church has never in its humanness been holy in any exemplary way. Nor has it because of its sectarian and parochial tendencies, even from the outset, been true to its call to catholicity. And its struggle with questions of authority and the place of Scripture reflect a less than perfect loyalty to apostolic tradition.

But still, the fourth-century church, wracked by schism and decadence, insisted that the Church of Christ upon earth is one, holy, catholic and apostolic.

Basis for Reform

While expressed in different ways, their four-fold interpretation of the nature of the church has served as a principle of reformation. From Luther to our own Stone-Campbell movement the integrity of the nature of the church has served as a basis for reform.

In 1517, when Luther posted his Ninety-Five Theses on the door of the Castle Church in Wittenberg, his primary concern was the place of indulgences, but in his 37th thesis he referred to the church as the gift of God rather than as a creation of man. The church's oneness and holiness are evident in that it is the creation of God's grace, and by implication catholic in that the gift knows no bounds of race, color, tongue or tribe. And, even by implication, apostolic in that the apostles, as chosen envoys, were made stewards of the gift. This is why in the 62nd thesis Luther wrote, "The true treasure of the Church is the sacrosanct Gospel of the glory of the grace of God."

“The true treasure of the Church is the sacrosanct Gospel of the glory of the grace of God.”

To Luther, the church was apostolic because its true treasure (rather than indulgences issued by the pope!) was the gospel of the grace of God preached first by the apostles. This is why Luther felt justified in challenging the hierarchy's presumption in excommunicating him from the church with his plaint, “But I have been baptized!” Baptism, Luther believed, brought him into the Body of Christ, God's own gift, a relationship no hierarchy of man could sever. “I have been baptized” placed him within God's special grace and beyond the judgment of any pope.

But the reformation really began for Luther two years later, in 1519, in the Leipzig Disputation, when he questioned not only the infallibility of the pope's General Council but of the pope himself. In denying that the church was founded upon Peter and in questioning the authority of the holy fathers, he insisted that Christ is the only foundation of the church, for other foundation can no man lay. A year later, in an address to the German nobility, Luther wrote like the reformer he now was and as if he were a product of the Stone-Campbell movement: “We have one baptism, one Gospel, one faith, and all are Christians alike; for baptism, Gospel, and faith, these alone make spiritual and Christian people.”

It was Luther's way of expressing the great truth that goes back to Nicea and back to the Scriptures themselves; **the church is one, holy, catholic and apostolic.**

The Unbounded Church

The spirit of Luther burned in the soul of Barton W. Stone, the founder, if we name but one person, of what he chose to call “The Reformation of the 19th Century,” which eventually led to the formation of Christian Churches and Churches of Christ. When he finally wrote the history of his movement, Stone referred to

the influence of Luther, especially in relation to the inviolability of the church. Defending Luther from the charge of having “left the church,” Stone insisted that he only left the church of Rome and not “the church considered in the more extensive sense.”

The church in the more extensive sense. That description speaks volumes on what the pioneers of the Stone-Campbell movement believed about the church. The church “in the more extensive sense” is the church the Nicean fathers had in mind, the true Body of Christ upon earth, which by its very nature is one, holy, catholic and apostolic.

Stone spoke more descriptively of this “more extensive” church in the *Last Will and Testament of the Springfield Presbytery*, which is one of the founding documents of Christian Churches/Churches of Christ. “We will that this body die,” he and other former Presbyterian ministers wrote in an effort to lay aside the last vestige of partyism, “and sink into union with th Body of Christ at large; for there is but one Body, and one Spirit, even as we are called in one hope of our calling.”

It read like Luther and the Nicean fathers. It was an appeal to the integrity of the church, which in its essence is one and cannot be divided, just as it is holy and cannot be profane. Since it is God's gift, it is united, and since it is filled with the Holy Spirit, it is holy. Stone and his men pointed to the essential holiness of the church in that little document: “We will that preachers and people cultivate a spirit of mutual forbearance; pray more and dispute less,” and even to its catholicity and apostolicity: “We will that the church of Christ look up to the Lord of the harvest to send forth laborers into his harvest; and that she resume her primitive right of trying those who say they are apostles and are not.”

It should be noted that while Stone did not yet have a single congregation known as the Christian Church or Church of Christ, he spoke of “the church of Christ” and “the Body of Christ at large” as a living reality upon the earth. He obviously did not have the “restorationist” notion that the true church had ceased to exist and that he had been called of God to

“restore” it. Like his hero Luther, Stone may have left the Presbyterian church but not “the more extensive church.” And he wanted his ecclesiastical creation to sink into union with that church, “the Body of Christ at large.”

This view of the church is seen in another of the founding documents, the *Declaration and Address* of Thomas Campbell, written in 1809, five years after Stone's document. Its most famous line is, “The Church of Christ upon earth is essentially, intentionally, and constitutionally one,” which stresses the unity of the church amidst a divided Christendom, as did the Nicean fathers. The rest of Campbell's sentence stresses the catholicity of the church: “. . . consisting of all those in every place that profess their faith in Christ and obedience to him in all things according to the Scriptures.” And even its holiness when he adds: “. . . and that manifest the same by their tempers and conduct, and of none else; as none else can be truly and properly called Christians.”

The Church's Essential Unity

There were founding documents before Stone and Campbell and they too emphasize the integrity of the church's essential unity. Rice Haggard, one of those Methodists who rode with Francis Asbury as a circuit-rider and helped found the first Christian Church in 1794, put the essence of the Stone-Campbell plea in one pungent sentence in his *An Address* (1804): “One thing I know, that wherever nonessentials are made terms of communion, it will never fail to have a tendency to disunite and scatter the church of Christ.”

Again we see that these pioneers believed “the church of Christ” was a reality when they did not yet have a “Church of Christ” of their own. In another place in the document Haggard wrote, “The Church of Christ is **one body**, and one name is enough for the same body.”

And when Haggard and his Methodists at last formed their church and, with the help of James O'Kelly, wrote out “The Cardinal Principles of the Christian Church,” that same Lutheran-Nicean view of the church is evident. The first principle reads, “Jesus Christ is the only head of the church.” Another principle made Chris-

tian character the only test of the fellowship, while another named the unity of all believers as their mission.

A Scriptural Outlook

This heritage we first have in Scripture, for the Bible holds no more a possibility for a divided church than it does for a divided Christ. And while the early church with its Jewish beginnings faced a great task in reaching out to other nations, it did in time become universal in its mission and outlook. It is significant that the last book of the Christian Scriptures speaks of a great multitude of redeemed ones, too many to number, “from every nation, and all tribes and peoples and tongues.” If the church began as a narrow Jewish sect, at least in the eyes of the world, it was soon universal in that its outreach and proclamation was for all mankind.

That the church was called to be holy is evident from the mandate of Scripture that “Without holiness it is impossible to please God.” Even the erring church at Corinth was described as a temple of God and the dwelling-place of the Holy Spirit. The church's apostolicity is evidenced by its having been built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, and from that day to this those who dream up new revelations and write new Bibles are seen as sects and cults.

We of the Stone-Campbell heritage can say with our Nicean forebears that we too believe in one, holy, catholic and apostolic church. If this four-fold vision of the nature of the church is real but not realized, then we have identified our mission. We must be intolerant of the idea of a divided church and name ugly division for what it is, a sin against God and a blight to mankind. If our people were born and bred for a passion for the unity of all believers, we must nurture that passion.

Dr. Leroy Garrett, Ph.D. from Harvard University, has taught in several colleges and universities, been the founder and sole editor of *Restoration Review* for the 34 years of its existence; his most definitive work, *The Stone-Campbell Movement*, a 739 page anecdotal history of three churches, was published in 1981. Brother Leroy always welcomes those who wish to correspond with him. His address is: 1201 Windsor Dr., Denton, Tx. 76201.

What We Have to Offer

HOY LEDBETTER

Atlanta, Georgia

During the past few years I have had numerous occasions to discuss Christian unity with ecumenical leaders of various kinds, including officials of the World Council of Churches. Again and again such discussions have reminded me of a document which, although it was first published in 1809, still seems as fresh as the latest unity meeting. I refer to Thomas Campbell's *Declaration and Address*, which has not only been a powerful force within our own communion, but anticipated to a great extent the modern ecumenical movement almost a century and a half later. If Campbell were living today, he would be thrilled to see his concerns so widely shared, and I have no doubt that he would be at the forefront of efforts to unite professing Christians. Which is exactly where his spiritual descendants **should** be.

Because I frequently see people either moving toward or having arrived at the ideas expressed in the *Declaration and Address*, and since that document remains a potent stimulus within my own communion, notwithstanding the fact that we sometimes seem to have forgotten it, I believe our people have more to contribute to contemporary discussion than we may realize.

This is particularly true now that serious attention is being given to the problem of resolving dogmatic differences between the churches and there is widespread recognition that real progress is impossible without determining what can be done with honest but divisive disagreement on Bible requirements. Since this has always been a big issue with us, and we understand how vehemently people of strong convictions defend their doctrinal positions, we should be ready to share whatever wisdom we have in this matter with the rest of the religious world.

Another positive development for us is the growing conviction, at least among some leaders, that the autonomous churches (such as we are) need to be drawn into the ecumenical discussions. I believe this would be a constructive move, not only because of the statistical significance of the independent churches, but because they can bring with them no small amount of experience in dealing with problems of unity, especially on the local level.

I realized that citing the *Declaration and Address* hardly inspires some of our own folks to stand up and sing "Onward, Christian Soldiers"; they are too far-removed from their roots. They could never take up Barton Stone's call, "Let Christian unity be our polar star"; it would stick in their throats. And their defense mechanisms engage at the very mention of the word "ecumenical." But they do not speak for all of us, or even most of us. Let them preach and practice exclusionism if they must, but let us get on with what the Lord has ordered us to do and carry out a ministry of reconciliation.

Only One Body

To begin at the beginning, the first of Thomas Campbell's propositions in the *Declaration and Address* asserts "that the Church of Christ upon earth is essentially, intentionally, and constitutionally one." This forceful statement means that unity is related to the fundamental nature of the body of Christ, being an indispensable aspect of what the church is. It means that the church is united by God's design and plan, and in no other way can it be what God intended for it to be. It means that unity is built into the basic structure of the church, as a vital ingredient in its make-up.

The fact that unity is not always a high-priority topic in congregational goal-setting is

all the more reason this characteristic of God's church needs to be constantly emphasized. It is an element of the gospel which we tend to forget in the defense and maintenance of our denominational turf, and our active devotion to it does not quite seem to fulfill the Biblical requirement of **diligence** in this matter. So this historic emphasis needs to be echoed among us today.

Campbell recognized, of course, that the one church "must necessarily exist in particular and distinct societies, locally separate from one another," but nevertheless "there ought to be no schisms, no uncharitable divisions among them." Can that noble, and often elusive, objective be attained?

The Bible Can Unify

A practical as well as essential means of maintaining the Spirit's unity is to take the Bible as the only rule of faith and practice. But it should be quickly said that this does not mean what it is sometimes assumed to mean, when it has become the boast of factions which base their rights to exist on biased, or at least questionable, interpretation of chosen passages. Rather it means that nothing should be made a condition of fellowship or a requirement of faith unless it is, as Campbell put it, "expressly taught and enjoined upon" Christians in the word of God. What is "expressly taught and enjoined" is, by definition of the terms, definitely and unmistakably stated and clearly and emphatically bound. Unless an article of faith can be so described, it must not be made a test of fellowship. This rule alone would eliminate the basic reasons many churches exist as separate entities.

It is almost always the case that beliefs which keep Christians apart from each other are not based upon the express teaching of the New Testament, but upon inferences and deductions. We all know how that within a given group inference may become **necessary** inference and therefore justify breach of fellowship over what another group may with equal conviction deem unnecessary. History is littered with sects who have defended their party characteristics in this way.

For a corrective to that inevitably divisive approach one need not look beyond Campbell's proposition "that although inferences and deductions from Scripture premises, when fairly inferred, may be truly called the doctrine of God's holy word, yet are they not formally binding upon the consciences of Christians farther than they perceive the connection, and evidently see that they are so; for their faith must not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power and veracity of God."

Unfortunately not all inferences are "fairly inferred." But when they are, they may be truly regarded as God's doctrine. However, that does not mean that they will be so recognized by everyone, and, even though true, they may exhibit to the minds of some honest seekers the wisdom of men rather than the truth of God. Christian communion cannot stand on such an unreliable basis. Therefore, even accurate inferences and deductions cannot be bound upon Christians "farther than they perceive the connection, and evidently see that they are so." This approach accords perfectly with Paul's rule that "each one must arrive at his own firm conviction" (Rom. 14:5).

In developing the positive and negative items of its creed, in stating the terms of its faith and working out its defense against error, the church will develop arguments which are in a great measure the result of human reasoning and which essentially contain many inferential truths. While these are very valuable for their purpose, they must never become tests of fellowship. To make them conditions of mutual acceptance would be to say that "none have a right to the communion of the church, but such as possess a very clear and decisive judgment, or are come to a very high degree of doctrinal information," which is denied by the Biblical recognition that the church will always contain members who will vary considerably in spiritual maturity.

To Be An Undivided Family

It has been our long-standing position that men and women are entitled to a place in the church without full knowledge of the truth, and that they should never "be required to make

a profession more extensive than their knowledge." Profession of their faith in Christ and obedience which issues from a realization that they are lost and that he is the only way of salvation is all that is absolutely necessary to qualify them for admission into his church.

All those who make that profession and put it into practice should consider each other as the precious saints of God and should love each other as brethren, as children of the same family and Father. And none among them should ever dare to put asunder those whom God has joined together.

It was Thomas Campbell's position "that division among Christians is a horrid evil, fraught with many evils." He declared it to be antichristian, antiscritptural, and antinatural. It destroys the visible unity of the body of Christ; it is a direct violation of his express command; and it stirs up Christians to despise, hate, and oppose one another, when they are bound by the gospel to love each other as brethren, even as Christ loved them.

Finally, Campbell contended that whenever it is absolutely necessary for the church, in order to fulfill its mission, to adopt expedients for which there is no express scriptural statement, these must be clearly marked as human expedients, without any pretense to a more sacred origin, so that any differences regarding them arising later on may produce neither contention nor division within the church. This rule provides an important safeguard against the perpetual tendency to regard long-standing incidental practices as fundamentals of the faith.

While Campbell's propositions are, in a way, an embarrassment to me, because they

demonstrate that we should have known better than to practice division and multiply sects among ourselves, I am nevertheless pleased to be able to set them forth against sectarianism today, outside our fellowship as well as within. In reviewing them, I am also grateful to recall that they have never been entirely lost sight of within our movement, for there has always been a remnant of nonsectarian folks, faithful to their heritage, who have kept restating them.

The propositions, while very comprehensive, may not cover every difficult obstacle to unity which we may face, nor are they intended to be the last word on solving the problems of fellowship. They should be supplemented with the lessons we have learned through generations of study and experience since they were first given to us, and subjected to reexamination among those who are disposed to grow in the truth. But that they will get high marks when tested by either Biblical exegesis or practical experience I firmly believe. Consequently, we may bring them to bear upon ecumenical discussions today with the expectation that they will be welcomed by reasonable people and contribute to the unity of the Spirit in our time. Given their potential for doing good in a world weary of division, they are indeed a gospel which we should not be ashamed to preach.

Hoy Ledbetter needs no introduction to *Integrity* readers since he was the founding editor of the journal, and served as its editor-in-chief for fifteen years until his resignation in March, 1984; since that time he has continued to serve as Editorial Advisor to the Editorial Board. Hoy and wife, Lillian, with daughter Priscilla, now live in Decatur, Georgia and serve with the Brookvalley Church.

Unity Meeting

As announced in our May/June 1986 *Integrity* issue, we are continuing plans for a Unity Meeting to be held in Michigan, October 16-18, 1986. Leroy Garrett, author of the *Stone-Campbell Movement* and elder of the Denton, Texas Church of Christ, J. Harold Thomas,

minister of the University Church of Christ in Conway, Arkansas and Walter Zorn, professor of Bible and Bible Languages at Great Lakes Bible College, Lansing, Michigan will be featured speakers. We encourage you to reserve these dates and attend. More information later.

Renewal Through Recovery

W. CARL KETCHERSIDE

St. Louis, Missouri

The God whom I serve and love — and the God who loves me — is a God of history. He made it! And he is still making it! He did not retire on "social insecurity" just because he ended "the work which he had made." The congregation of the saints, the gathering together of the believers in Jesus, is part of that history. I am sure my readers will forgive me if I regard it as a major part. It was a decisive breakthrough in the battle against Satan and his angels. They have never recovered from it. They never will!

It was the apostles and prophets to whom he made known the mystery by revelation. That mystery had not been declared to the sons of men in previous generations. Revelation is the uncovering for man of what he could not discover for himself. The mystery was the fellowship. And the declaration of its being made known is given in the letter of togetherness — that to the Ephesians. The word **together** occurs seven times, the word **grace** twelve times in the six small chapters into which it has been divided, sometimes unwisely.

God did not launch the Ship of Zion on the stormy waters of human thought and behavior and abandon it. He was as interested in the revolutions as he was in the revelation. He was concerned about Huss and Luther, Wycliffe and Tyndale, Wesley and Calvin. He was moved by the Waldensians and Albigensians. He was concerned with the invention of printing by Gutenberg. He knew about Barton W. Stone, Walter Scott, Thomas Campbell and Alexander Campbell. He also knew about George Campbell of Aberdeen, James Macknight, and Phillip Doddridge, from whom they were constantly borrowing and frequently quoting. He was as familiar with Campbell's Living Oracles, as he was with his own oracles committed to the Jews

which gave them such an advantage over the uncircumcised.

He was aware of the development and growth of some 25 "restoration movements" in the fifty years starting with the American Revolution. They were in the hollow of his hand. Some of these resulted from the aftermath of that war. Others had their roots in the old world. The climate of the Second Great Awakening which began to sweep America after the French Revolution was conducive to such reform. It was a protest against the ignorance, the decadence, the violence and the vileness of the frontier. It was also a living testimony against the lack of spirituality and looseness in morality which characterized the life of the pioneers.

Heirs of a Movement

I am happy to be the heir of one of those movements started by good Presbyterians. It was just that, and nothing more. I am not so foolish as to think of it as the church. Once I did and that was the fountain of the sectarian spirit which I imbibed. Now I can see that the gravest error ever committed against that noble experiment was when it was allowed to become a church. It was driven to that because of the opposition, persecution and mockery directed toward it. It has lost almost two centuries milling around in the sectarian thicket since then. We must honestly face the fact that it may never find its way out. But there will be other movements under God's amazing grace.

The Declaration and Address, which has been called the Magna Carta of the reformation movement as the Campbell's thought of it, specifically declares that "this Society by no means considers itself a Church." It desired to adopt and recommend such measures as would

give rest to the brethren throughout all the churches. Repeatedly it referred to "our dear brethren of all denominations." It pointed out: "We have our educational prejudices and peculiar customs to struggle against as well as they." At first glance it seems that those who subscribed to it would hold themselves aloof from any denominational alliance and by association be able to advise and counsel all of the Christians in every one of them. That hope went glimmering and a denomination was formed which, in many communities, refused to have anything to do with others.

A Purpose in History

What was accomplished by this reform? Fortunately, there were several things which it did that brought credit to it. For one thing, in its inception, it demonstrated that one could be a Christian, and a Christian only. In a day of rigid alliance to men and their narrow creedalism, it proved that one of the most effective ways to fight sectarianism was to love all who professed faith in Jesus but to be a member of no party. "Disentangled from the accruing embarrassments of intervening ages" they submitted as follows: "That the Church of Christ on earth is essentially, intentionally and constitutionally one." It is regrettable to admit that it was not too many years until the movement ceased to move. Not only did it come to a standstill but actually began to regress.

Another great stride forward was the death of creeds. These synopses of belief were reckoned as the basis for faith by virtually all of the groups which had gathered themselves around a man and his teaching. Those who were illiterate could memorize the creed and parrot it and thus feel justified in the divine presence. Many were hard put to explain it but they could recite it by rote. The Campbellian reformation, with its penchant for slogans said: "A creed either contains what the Bible says or it does not. If it contains more than the Bible it contains too much, if less than the Bible it contains too little, if exactly what the Bible contains we do not need it." With the reformers it was not so much a question of what one believed but in whom. Jesus became the only creed. This

was a great contribution to faith.

Being able to see the result of binding deductions from the scriptures upon others, who could not concur, they carefully enunciated a policy which would eliminate much of the divisiveness resulting from such a course. The paragraph dealing with this is so trenchant and powerful as to bear repeating. "That although inferences and deductions from Scripture premises, when fairly inferred, may be truly called the doctrine of God's holy word, yet are they not formally binding upon the consciences of Christians further than they perceive the connection, and evidently see that they are so, for their faith must not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God."

Eventually it came to pass that the wall of separation between clergy and laity was broken down. God's people (laos) were seen as God's portion or lot (kleros). All of God's people eventually became clergymen. All of God's clergymen were seen as laity. It required no miter, cassock or surplice to immerse or to dispense the Lord's Supper. On the frontier, men who worked in the fields all day became the preachers and proclaimers of the Word at night and on Sunday. No ornate or elaborate cathedral was required. The ill-equipped frontier living-rooms became places of praise. Brush arbors were raised to shade from the sun's rays, schoolhouses dedicated to the task of informing minds became the place where hearts were touched.

The reformatory movement borrowed from any group of believers what was deemed scriptural, adopting it not because it was a denominational practice but because it was obviously authorized by the word of God. Their zeal for missions they received from Count Ludwig Zinzendorf and the Moravians in Bohemia; their weekly observance of the Lord's Supper from the Scotch Baptists. They were eager to examine anything and when they found it in the scriptures they adopted it. Soon the rivers and lakes of the new world were being used as baptiseries as were those of the old.

Now, with two centuries gone by, it is high time for another reformation to come into existence. In this Space Age, communications

have so developed that the truth may be trumpeted to the farthest reaches of the globe. Gone are the Machine Age and the Industrial Revolution. We are now in the Space Age. We have learned to overcome the pull of gravity and to soar into limitless space. The earth is being drawn closer together. The language barrier is disappearing. Indeed, there are already signs that we are approaching another great breakthrough of the Spirit. Renewal is the

watchword of the faith. Renewal through recovery of the apostolic proclamation, purpose and power! Let it come!

W. Carl Ketcherside, through his writings and personal example, has been encouraging us toward the unity and peace of Jesus for many years. Author of several books, Carl also founded and was sole editor of the *Mission Messenger* for many years. Carl and his wife are presently serving at the Cornerstone, a St. Louis inner-city ministry.

Our Heritage of Music in Worship: The Blessings of Participation

FOY PALMER

Warren, Michigan

"Sing unto God ye kingdoms of the earth; oh, sing praises unto the Lord, To Him who rides upon the heavens of heavens, which were of old; lo, He does send out his voice, and that a mighty voice. Ascribe ye strength unto God; His excellency is over Israel, and His strength is in the clouds. O God, Thou art awe-inspiring out of Thy holy places; the God of Israel is He who gives strength and power unto His people. Blessed be God.

Psalm 68:32-35

David gives this call for all to worship the Lord. Worship is the natural response of creature to the creator. "Who were the first people who sang in worship? . . . Of course we have no written records; all we do know, however, is that there is no aboriginal culture that has ever been found on the Earth that did not worship and that did not include song in its worship."¹ When we come into the presence of God with fellow believers, those who have experienced His love and grace, we worship and praise Him because He alone is worthy.

I am not setting forth an exercise in hermeneutics, nor entering a debate of a capella vs. accompanied singing. I am presenting ideas

and concepts gathered from several sources which express the joy of participating in singing praises to our God.

Historical Development

Space will not permit a detailed analysis of the development of the Christian liturgy. The few sources cited would only be the initial step in such an endeavor. However, we must attempt to understand and appreciate the great variety of musical forms which preceded our hymns and gospel songs.

"Christian assemblies have at all times and in all places read the Scriptures, prayed, and sung. The Christian liturgy was born singing, and it has never ceased to sing. . . Singing. . . must be regarded as one of the fundamental constituents of Christian worship. . . the church used music and singing in worship well before it began to ask itself questions about why and wherefore. . ."² We have no clearly defined record of the worship of the early church. Although there are several references in the New Testament of the various elements which have been incorporated into the worship, there is no set liturgy. Several aspects of the synagogue tradition were undoubtedly brought

into the Christian assemblies. Jesus' acceptance of the Shema, "Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God is one Lord; and Thou shalt love the Lord God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might," (Deut. 6:4-5) as the greatest commandment (Matt. 22:34-40) was sufficient for its inclusion into the worship of His church, along with the reading or chanting (singing) of the Psalms. Many New Testament texts were added to the liturgy by the third century, including the Trisagion or Sanctus (Rev. 4:8); Luke's canticles of the Incarnation, the Magnificat (Luke 1:46-55), the Nunc dimittis (Luke 2:29-32); the Benedictus (Matt. 21:9); the baptismal hymn (Eph. 5:14); and the foremost christological hymn (Phil. 2:6-11). These texts, originally sung in Greek, were the basis for various portions of the Latin Liturgy.

St. Ambrose, the fourth century bishop of Milan is known as the father of the liturgical hymn. "These hymns were the true beginning of Western Christian poetry, and their tunes initiated the most widespread and perennially enduring of Christian music forms."³ St. Ambrose is also remembered as the teacher who converted and baptized St. Augustine of Hippo. St. Augustine wrote of these hymns: "What tears did I shed over the hymns and canticles, when the sweet sound of the music of thy church thrilled my soul! As the music flowed into my ears, and the truth trickled into my heart, the tide of devotion swelled high within me, and the tears ran down, and there was gladness in those tears."⁴

Aurelius Clemens Prudentius (348-c. 410) gave classical literary form to various Christian doctrines. His *Cathermerinon*, 12 lyric poems on various times of the day and on church festivals, contains *Corde natus ex parentis*, "Of the Father's Love Begotten," which was set to the eleventh century plainsong, *Divinum Mysterium*, and appears in several contemporary Protestant hymnals. The monophonic Ambrosian chant (*i.e.*, single line of melody, sung in unison) was clearly the song of the ordinary people. However, musical notation was very primitive and practically nonexistent. The original melodies, which were transmitted orally, have been lost. In contrast, the Gregorian chants of the sixth and later cen-

turies were meticulously preserved, primarily by the Schola Cantorum. This school for training cantors originated in the early fourth century to serve all of the churches in Rome. It continued for approximately 800 years to preserve the music and train singers. Similar schools developed throughout Europe. It took some ten years for the cantors to memorize the Gregorian repertory. There are 645 melodies in the *Antiphonale Missarum*. This was no longer the music of the people. It required a choir of well trained singers, including soloists capable of great artistic flexibility, especially when singing the jubilus on the final "a" of the Alleluia.

"From the 6th to the 9th centuries, the Christian community became two peoples. Graduations of ministry dissolved into a priest-clergy and a passive laity. . . No longer did the laity anoint their sick, take communion in their hands, carry it home to their elderly, feed the poor, sing their worship, . . . Instead of gathering joyfully with Jesus as a community to praise a common Father, the people knelt humbly and worshiped Jesus silently and from afar. They were a new people. Their song was the sound of silence."⁵

The Protestant Reformation brought many changes in the music of the church, and approximately at the same time the polyphonic Latin liturgy reached its zenith in Palestrina's mastery of contrapuntal composition for a capella choir. New styles of music were adapted by various groups formed during the Reformation. The chorale in Lutheran Germany, Calvinism's Genevan Psalter, and the hymns of the Wesleys were songs of the people, in both style and language. This example of new people developing new music is seen in the hymnody of the 18th century American frontier. Even Alexander Campbell published a hymnal for the churches of our heritage.

The Purpose of Music in Worship

Is music a mere decoration for the worship? Is it present in worship to give aesthetic pleasure? Does the presence of music in worship merely justify and affirm the religious

value of art? It is not simply a matter of what is most beautiful or what is aesthetically pleasing. These dimensions are not completely irrelevant, but they are not the essential purpose of music in worship. I perceive this purpose as threefold. 1. The "ecclesia" are the people whom God has called in order to give Him praise. Peter describes Christians as "a chosen people, chosen in order to sing God's praises." (1 Peter 2:9, *The Jerusalem Bible*). Our music cannot rest in itself, however pleasing or beautiful. It always points beyond itself, to the One we worship as we gather together. 2. We are the temple of God, a "living" house of prayer, and as we sing our prayer to Him, we express our emotions and affirm our faith. St. Augustine's well known saying is "they who sing pray twice." Many of our hymns are melodic prayers. 3. Paul's familiar statements in Eph. 5:19 and Col. 3:16 affirm that our singing is to teach. We communicate the depth, the height, and the breadth of God's love in Christ to each other and to the world. God speaks within the church on the lips of living men and women. Our songs must possess the power to embody and realize the communion and communication within the body. They must strengthen and symbolize our unity in the Lord.

Participation

"Participation" expresses first of all the reality of a community of people serving God and each other in love. Singing represents the main form of active congregational participation in worship. But we must ask ourselves: Does our corporate worship involve and encourage participation? Do the people really participate? Or do we only enter into a performance/audience relationship? The Swiss psychologist Jean Piaget describes two categories of relationship: "authority" relations and "mutual" relations. The first produces the situation in which one person interacts with another in a role of subservience: one is the expert and the other is the follower, which promotes superiority. The second produces the interaction of peers, or if not altogether peers, within a realm that allows each to contribute insights, knowledge, investments and commitments for the common good. We

see this principle in Paul's statement, "Let all things be done for edification." (1 Cor. 14:26) Singing expresses the sense of unity and oneness in Christ in a unique way. A sense of belonging and being united to something larger than one's individual world is communicated through the power of the music sung in worship. A diversity of individuals with different backgrounds, histories, and temperaments can become united through song. It has the power of removing barriers between people of diverse interests and talents. It symbolizes the "koinonia," the fellowship of believers in Christ.

We are responding in love to God's initiative. We walk with God and with each other as close friends, and His perfect love casts out our fears. We encourage one another to be at ease with ourselves. It is not simply a matter of more beautiful singing or more sophisticated music. It is a deeper experience, together, of the presence of our God.

Blessings: Celebration and Drama

Singing is a personal activity whereby each and all participants share the event being celebrated, namely the Lordship of Jesus. We do not celebrate ideas or abstractions but people and events. The celebration deals with human experiences because God has dealt with the total human experience in Jesus. Our songs must express and enhance the happiness we have found in Christ, and envision a world of new possibilities under His Lordship. Worship is not a product which we receive. It is an event which we create and celebrate together. Our worship is a symbol of the lifestyle that we are called to follow. Our worship in song should reflect our lives, lives spent in service.

We come together in worship to do a work together in the presence of God. At one time I had serious negative feelings about the common terminology, "the worship service." But now, as I view this work together, this drama, as a response to God's initiating call and action, I see it truly as "service." And each service is a new creation. The praise of hymns, the prayers filled with thanksgiving and need,

the words of encouragement and admonition are indeed a progressive drama.

“. . . The church's business at worship is to show the whole man to himself, and to call forth the gifts and the responses of the whole man. . . This will be possible only if the church's worship is seen to be essentially not merely experience, not merely instruction, not merely an appeal to the will, but a drama which includes all these things and fuses them into a living whole. My contention is that drama does include all these things, . . . that worship is the authentic kind of drama. . .”⁶

Communication

God has revealed his character to us in His Son. Our songs must tell stories and relive the memories of scripture in our own setting and culture. They must be told with vitality and creativity so that they are alive with His power. As we communicate, we challenge one another to justice and love, and we celebrate with thanksgiving the God who has touched our lives. We are led by the Holy Spirit in our singing to communicate His will for our lives, collectively and individually. We are challenged to examine our singing and then be willing to invest time, talents and resources to ensure that He is being praised. God will work in the praises of His people and bestow generous blessings which communicate the meaning, depth, power, intensity, and warmth of our corporate experience of His presence.

Silence and Gifts

These are two inherent blessings of participation which we have either grossly ignored or completely rejected. We can sit “silently” and listen to sermons ranging in length from 30 minutes to more than an hour. We do this gladly, and accept the exhortation and insights which the Holy Spirit reveals to us. However, we become quite nervous if asked to sit or stand for a few moments in silent prayer. Many refuse to accept the opportunity to sit quietly and contemplate the message of a soloist or ensemble, because it has somehow been equated with entertainment. Has this view of sharing gifts

resulted from our artificially imposed dichotomy between “worship” and “Gospel of Hymn Singing?” Can the euphoria of singing obscure God's presence in our midst? We should not participate in worship of display gifts. Talents and abilities should emerge from our participation in worship. Gifts of literature, art, voice, and composition will manifest themselves in ministry to the body. False pride can be a danger, but so can false humility. The Holy Spirit gives gifts of grace and talents to equip the body and enhance its ministry. We need to be open to his leading and not bound by our preconceptions and fears.

These gifts also include new music. Beautiful songs of praise and devotion are being written, truthful music, depicting the God of scripture within our culture, yet capturing the abiding essence of His message. God is blessing us with music from differing sources and cultures. The Holy Spirit is giving us an eclectic repertoire to glorify Jesus: simple music; challenging music; strong, beautiful melodies; and rich harmonies, with texts which express an ever expanding experience of His glory.

Conclusion

As we participate in worship “. . . It is not enough that the piece (of music) be practical, or that it works, or that everyone is singing, or that the music be beautiful. It is necessary that, by the song and music, Jesus Christ be present and acting in the assembly, that his Word be proclaimed and lived, that communion in his Spirit be realized.”⁷ And as we worship “in spirit and in truth,” our singing will express the newness of the Kingdom and communicate the joy found in Jesus. It will lead us as worshipers to a greater maturity in Christ, and spur us to a greater responsibility for the building of God's Kingdom in His World.

1. Parker, Alice. “Hymns In History.” *Pastoral Music*, III, No. 5, 1979. p. 25.
2. Gelineau, Joseph. “Music and Singing in the Liturgy,” in *The Study of Liturgy*, ed.

by Cheslyn Jones, Geoffrey Wainwright, and Edward Yarnold, S.J. New York: Oxford University Press, 1978. p. 440.

3. Douglas, Charles Winfred. *Church Music in History and Practice: Studies in the Praise of God*. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1937. p. 135.
4. Augustine. *Confessions*, IX:6.
5. Bauman, William. “Musical, Liturgical, Pastoral Judgments: New Song, New Judgments?” *Pastoral Music*, II, No. 2, 1978. p. 23.
6. Routley, Erik K. *Words, Music and the Church*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1968. p. 181.

7. Gelineau, Joseph. “Les Assemblies Liturgique et Leur Espression Musicale,” *Eglise qui chante* 118-119, mai-juin 1972, p. 38. Translated in *A More Profound Alleluia! Gelineau and Routley on Music in Christian Worship*, by Charles S. Pottie, S.J. Washington: The Pastoral Press, 1984. p. 27.

Foy Palmer attended Freed-Hardeman College and completed his B.A. at Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan. Presently, Foy is a deacon at Troy, Michigan Church of Christ and is also active in his ministry as Director of the Celebration Singers, an a cappella singing group comprised of members from the Troy congregation. Foy was recently welcomed as a new member of the *Integrity* Board and we are thankful that he has agreed to join in this ministry.

Readers' Response

“Although I receive *Integrity* and usually read most of it, I doubt if I would pay \$7.00 a year for a subscription. Instead of beating around the bush as you have been doing, why don't you come up front with us and dun us for a subscription cost each year? That would help separate the readers from non-readers. Copies might be less, but costs would be reduced also.”

Neil F. Walter
Oglesby, TX

Ed. Note: Thanks for your candid letter. The board has obviously considered in much depth the various possibilities for supporting the publication and distribution of *Integrity*, and feel at the present that voluntary contributions is the most effective approach. You might be interested to know that many readers are on very fixed and limited income, unable to spare a given subscription fee, yet have been devoted readers of the paper for years. We would not want to cut such readers from our mailing list.

To the *Integrity* Staff:

The articles in *Integrity*, especially about the Holy Spirit, have meant much to me. Arthritis has affected my right hand, as well as the rest of my body; so it is very difficult to write. I am sending a check for seven (\$7.00) because I need to be very careful about how I use what money I have. It means much more than that in spiritual value to me.

Sincerely,
Edith Huey
Worthington, Ohio

“I agree that *Integrity* is meeting some definite needs. In the latest issue I found with pleasure the information on each writer. . . May God continue to bless and guide your ministry.”

Fred M. Engle
Roswell, NM