

DATA: MINISTRY AND EDUCATION PROFESSIONALS

(no slides available)

Twenty-seven church-music professionals in the fields of ministry and education were contacted by e-mail with a request to answer pertinent questions regarding the current reality and future of music in the United Methodist Church. Each consultant was given a list of 3-4 questions most applicable to his or her field, that were to be the minimum number of questions answered, if the consultant was pressed for time. All consultants were given the opportunity, however, to respond to the entire questionnaire, if they were willing and able.

Ten of the 27 consultants contacted responded to the request (1 directly declined to participate and the remaining 16 did not respond within six weeks following the originally requested due date).

A. TRENDS & MEASUREMENT OF CONGREGATIONAL SONG

What do you see as the major trend(s) in UM congregational singing?

Three big trends: one is the more traditional use of hymns, and by this I mean the kind of hymns we associate with the old Cokesbury Hymnal. People still sing those songs. It blows my mind but they still do. Within this trend is the use of very singable, romantic songs from praise music. These songs are typically very singable in the sense that the tune line is easy to pick up and easy to follow. They also have a heartfelt and expressive quality. They are too dramatic for many of those who are more restrained in their musical taste because this restraint is still afflicted by Kant's third critique. These songs do not have those difficult intervals or unusual keys, and they are not stricken with the presumed sophistication and "high culture" criteria of people who graduated from music schools. Quite frankly, some of these songs theologically make my flesh crawl. But some others are just fine. We need to provide those that are theologically sound and stop trying to improve people's "taste in music." You can do new songs with this group. Notice how quickly Lift High the Cross caught on. But it is a highly expressive, dramatic, singable hymn that gets you on your feet and jubilant about what Christ has done. A second trend is that associated with the UM Hymnal. These are typically more literate folk. If you have a great organ and fine musicians this can be wonderful. Quite frankly, however, in some of our churches the hymnal is used in such a boring way that I wonder why people continue to attend, and many don't. The hymnal does have some songs that I find difficult to sing, and I am an old trumpet player who reads music and understands torturous intervals and ungodly keys. Still, the UM Hymnal is a fine work, so much better than the one that preceded it. I am very appreciative of the Songs of Zion and others that bring more of a range of music to the church. A third trend is, of course, the whole praise music scene. Most of that music is simply awful theologically. Yet some of this music is very good. We need to find and support it. There is so much around that a careful eye and ear can certainly discover the good material. Part of the problem is the understanding of contemporary worship as singing six praise songs, doing two Bible verses and a didactic sermon. Add to that a praise band that thinks they are rock stars, and you get liturgical

flatulence. But the trend is real and it is not going away. It can also be very well done. I find GIA Publications, a Catholic outfit, to be the best of the praise music producers. These are the major trends, but they are not the only ones, of course, and you find mixtures in local congregations.

The major trend I see is toward diversity. Hymns, praise choruses, and songs from around the world are sung to the accompaniment of everything from guitar to pipe organ. We mix these in one service, or divide worship services by musical styles. I see this continuing. We are just starting to discover the riches of global song.

At least in our setting, the trend is toward more diverse music within a single service, centered on the Word of the day. There is also a desire for more congregational participation; i.e., service music, sung prayer, etc.

United Methodists, and their precursors, are distinguished by a lyrical-doctrinal aural ethos, a lyrical theology, to use S. T. Kimbrough's term. This ethos was formed and sustained by hearing, learning, remembering, and singing hymns, particularly Wesley hymns, gospel songs, and choruses in class meetings, preaching houses and chapels, camp meetings, urban revivals, Sunday school, prayer meetings and former evening services. The printed repositories for this ethos were the church's authorized hymnals, as well as popular, privately published hymnals and songbooks collections containing Sunday schools, camp meeting songs and choruses, and the gospel songs of the urban revivals, e.g., Moody and Sankey. Beginning in the Reconstruction Era authorized hymnals began to move from a monolithic Wesleyan repertory to a representative ecumenical repertory, and from hymns-only to a worship book. Today, our authorized hymnals are Methodist only in title and format, not in overall content. At the same time, Methodist publishers began a two-track approach to serving the church's needs: selling officially approved hymnals with life spans between twenty and thirty years; and selling their own (the publisher's) and others' song books formed from the high volume, short-term popular gospel song market, e.g., The Cokesbury Hymnal, 1923, and The Cokesbury Worship Hymnal, 1938. The latter served the liturgical-musical needs of a large segment of the church for nearly half a century. Its repertory and complimenting performing practices were formed into a regional evangelical, quasi-Wesleyan lyrical theology. In 1989 the church's two-track approach was merged into a single product, The United Methodist Hymnal, which included a wide range of traditional and new hymns, a generous selection gospel hymns, and a significant number of global, multi-language, multi-ethnic songs. Music supplements to this hymnal were published in 1991 and 1994. I am not aware of any formal study of the church's use of this widely accepted and used hymnal. The two-track approach was resumed in 2001 with the publishing of the UMPH/GBOD collaborative unofficial supplement, The Faith We Sing, 2001, one-half comprised of "neglected" traditional hymns and new hymns with tunes published in the late '80s and the '90s; and the other half comprised of minimal-music songs and choruses. The wide acceptance of this collection is due to its consultative and consensus determined breadth of content meant to serve established as well as emerging worshipping communities, the product's elaboration into flexible unbound resources, e.g.,

Power-Point files for all selections, its wide promotion, and the national training sessions. I am not aware of any study with regard to United Methodist and others' use of this collection.

See attached sheet on Streams of Congregational Song. [In this document, respondent gives an overview of what he considers the "Seven Streams of Congregational Song That Have Shaped Hymnals since Vatican II": Catholic liturgical renewal hymnody, Protestant contemporary classical hymnody, African-American spirituals and gospel songs, Revival/Gospel songs, Folk song influences, Pentecostal songs, and Global/Ecumenical song forms.]

Some congregations, depending on the quality and character of musical and pastoral leadership, yet regardless of size, continue a tradition of strong congregational song; others have given up and made all music in worship a performance done for the congregation. Both of these exist side by side within the denomination, and in some cases, side by side in the same congregation.

Considerable diversity: There are many congregations in which much good music is used, including multi-cultural resources (e.g. using the resources of TFWS and UMH); others continue with the "great" hymn tradition sweeping the centuries; some have special services with special music (e.g. Taize and Holden Evening Prayer); others get stuck in a thin "one genre" approach (e.g. Praise and Worship, early 20th century Gospel, commercial gospel).

Lack of part singing which is a result of increasing use of projection screens and decreasing use of printed music. This bodes ill for future generations of musicians to serve the church. Lack of use of hymnal and printed music for congregational singing.

diversity, more world music, more Taize, more "heart music" (music that can be sung sufficiently to be sung "by heart.")

I see some congregations experimenting with more contemporary forms of music, as many have in the last 40 years or so. The congregations in my region don't seem to be moving toward alternate ways of presenting songs (screens over hymnals), but that may just be my limited experience. Some have tried alternate worship experiences, but the larger churches seem to have more success with that than the medium/small churches. I believe that congregational singing remains pretty specific to the region and/or the type of church. The rural churches in my area still use Cokesbury hymnals. Smaller suburban churches in this area use the UMH, and supplement worship and choir music with TFWS or contemporary praise songs.

Given these trends, what theological, liturgical, and missional implications do you see for the future of the church?

We still think theologically way too much in literate terms. For example, in oral congregations we need to be far more able to do theology in story, proverb, and other oral practices. In digital and electronic settings we need to be able to do theology in the integration of image, music, rhythm, lighting, move, dance and word. We are in a missionary situation in this culture. But too many of us are convinced that we don't need to make changes to address our more traditional (not literate) and electronic or digital people.

The General Conference Joint GBOD/UMPH Music Study, 2004-07, should recommend to the General Conference the continuance of TUMPH/GBOD collaborative publications which would be formed from consultations and survey's of the use of existing collections of congregational song and liturgical resources, and the church's general and special liturgical and musical needs. Anticipated results would include the successor to The Faith We Sing, and the publication of collections serving latent unfulfilled needs, e.g., Native American Religious Song, and emerging needs.

It can't put its eggs all in one basket as one size will not fit all. More importantly, one musical style does not represent the breadth of the church and its response to faith and no one musical style embodies a complete theological perspective.

We are long past being able to identify United Methodism as a singing tradition in which our theological core is expressed in song. Other denominations in which I have served as a substitute musician have stronger practices of congregational singing, give more attention to the theological importance of what is being sung, and understand the relationship between liturgy, music, and mission as of more consequence than the numbers in church on Sunday morning (or Saturday evening).

I believe that monolithic "thin" approaches to congregational song reflect poor ecclesiology. The Church is by nature diverse. The gospel is not restricted to "my kind of people" or "my kind of music." Our worship must always embody the affirmation that the Church is more than the local manifestation of a given congregation. "Reaching out without dumbing down" (as Marva Dawn says) is the ongoing challenge. Congregational songs need to have theological integrity, be singable by the community, and have music that is worthy of the message of the text. The tribalization of our worship in terms of musical genre is deeply troubling to me, and is not an adequate approach for the future of the Church.

Fewer musicians will be raised within the church.

more discernment, greater care in choice of music — with consideration for the theology of the text as well as the impact of the melody.

The music in our culture seems to be shaped much more by American Idol than the church. Certainly, some of the praise music I've experienced in some congregations has as much in common with that trend as it does with choral tradition and traditional hymn singing, maybe more. I'm concerned on both sides: on the one hand, a congregation that has a rich choral tradition may discourage congregational participation by insisting on a narrow view of what is appropriate for worship; on the other hand, a congregation accustomed to voting on the most effective performer and accepting ridicule of the less capable ones doesn't encourage congregational participation in song any more than the other. As much as we have moved toward music that is more like the music we hear in culture, we continue to move away from congregation as choir, as leaders in worship, singing the praise of God. Church is presentation instead of participation. Striking a balance between singing what people know and love, and teaching new songs that speak to their hearts, for me, is at the heart of all of this. Also, creating a real sense of community for all of this to happen within.

What connections do you see between congregational singing and Christian identity, practice of ministry, and the impact of culture?

Soul music is very important in the U.S. today. Soul music is the music with which we are encoded and which tells our story. It is crucial to pay attention to this. Music is profoundly tied to the identity of people. More than that, listening to music, making music, dancing to music, dreaming to music, etc., are fundamental formative practices in this culture. A Wesleyan who believes in sanctification must not miss the centrality of these practices in formation. The missional task is to place these musics in God's story. Too much contemporary music is consumerist accommodation. It does not have to be that way. I think of the way one pastor took the rock song My Little Demon and placed it in a multi-media presentation with Romans 6 as the scripture lesson. It was so effectively done that I cannot now hear that song without thinking of Romans 6 and placing it in that passage. We must not forget here the role of rhythm. One musicologist says that when you change the rhythm of a culture, you change the way people experience their bodies. The plain fact is that in some of our churches we are playing exclusively rhythms that simply are out of touch with the way other people, typically younger, experience their bodies. I remember, too, an African philosopher who said that in traditional Africa sound is the model of reality and the criterion of truth. If something does not sound right, it will not be true and it will not be real. We now have something not altogether unlike that now in the U.S. So far as I can tell it is now increasingly global in the youth culture spreading around the world.

Christians are formed by practicing the gestures and rituals, by singing and speaking the texts of our faith. So, singing is formative and affirmative.

IMPOSSIBLE QUESTION.

Historically, the church has survived without strong congregational singing, but it has done so by sacrificing significant practices that form the belief and identity of its members. In the 20th century, as the "popular" church music was being driven by radio programs, revivals, and large independent publishing houses (I think now of Hope Publishing, and its predecessors), so now "popular" church music is being driven by radio and television and the recording industry, bringing expectations of a style of music and quality of musical production that neither serves the church as a community at worship (even if it serves the individual piety of church members) nor which is possible to replicate outside of the recording studio. The interaction of church music with its surrounding culture is not a new problem - it is the problem through the entire history of the church. The question is whether or not the church is willing to make a determination about what serves its liturgical life and its mission in the world.

What we sing speaks both to us and for us. We become the song we sing; indeed, I believe that we sing it until it sings us. Thus, what we sing expresses and forms who we are, the ministries to which we are called, and our being "in but not of the world." We cannot escape the impact of culture, nor, given an incarnational theology, should we. That does not mean that we should be "conformed by the world" but that we should be a transformed and transforming community of God's people in it. Note: anyone who has worked with persons with dementia knows that the "heart music" of hymns and scripture embedded in the experience of their early life remains when almost every other avenue of communication is gone.

Music is a potent component of Christian formation and the connection is vital.

For me, the connection is vital. What I sing is what I believe, how I understand my call, how I practice that call. For the average worshipper, I'm not sure the singing itself has that much connection, except as it calls to mind memories of other spiritual experiences. I also believe the continued and growing impact of parts of the culture that encourage individual expression over corporate expression (American Idol being only one example) has greatly diminished group singing in our culture. I was at a high school basketball game the other night, and they played a recording of a choir singing the National Anthem. I was the only one anywhere near me singing. We are spectators rather than participants. Does that also mean that we will be spectators when it comes to living a Christ-like life? It may. I'm just not sure it's unique to our time.

B. PSALTER, SERVICES, RITUAL, SERVICE MUSIC

What is the significance of the congregation singing vs. speaking the Psalms, responses at Baptism and Holy Communion, and the texts of canticles and service music?

The biggest issue here is one of indigeneity. How do such things work with congregations that are more oral or more digital or electronic?

It is important to use and practice our sacramental rituals in their entirety. That means participating in the prayers, thru song. Singing the psalms is a fundamental part of worship; they are the songs of Scripture.

See Tom Long's Beyond the Worship Wars. "Vital and Faithful Congregations" sing more and talk less.

First, as Jim White so clearly said years ago, reading the psalms (especially "responsive readings") is deadly for faith and piety as well as just plain boring. If the psalms are the "songbook of the Bible" then we should recover the many and various ways to sing them. For example, the Presbyterians, for whom the Psalms have remained central as musical texts, provide within their hymnal a range of styles of singing the Psalms-metrical/hymn settings, plainsong, Gelineau chant, antiphonal/responsive singing. GIA continues to publish settings of the psalms not only in a variety of singing styles, but also in a variety of musical styles - folk-like (Haugen and Haas, et. al), jazz-influenced, chant-based, unison congregational song, and so on. Our psalm responses in the UMH, while providing an initially friendly way to re-introduce some form of psalm-singing, have mostly not worn well; the pointing of the texts in the UMH (and the absence of pointing for the canticles other than in the supplement) is inconsistent and confused by the alternating light/bold print settings that preserve the "default" responsive reading mode. Also, few clergy or musicians yet understand the place of the Psalm in relationship to the lectionary, so it loses its function as a response to the proclamation of the Scriptures. As to the other service music: I have found in several different congregations, of several different sizes, that all are able and willing to sing the responses if someone is willing to teach them how to do so and willing to support that singing. And, in those congregations where they have learned one set of responses for the Great Thanksgiving it becomes possible to learn additional settings. I think the service music least used is the musical responses for the baptismal liturgy. I don't think the attempt to create a responsive prayer over the water modeled on the shape of the Great Thanksgiving has completely worked (and of course, in some places it simply hasn't been used, but that is a different problem). The thing I find now after almost 20 years of experience with the UMH is that the five settings in the UMH were good introductions, some have worn well (the Carleton Young and William Mathias settings), some need to be replaced (Eslinger, Kriewald) with more interesting settings (again, note that the Presbyterians have published a supplemental resource with over 20 different settings, in a wide variety of musical styles, especially working to draw in African-American gospel styles). Finally, with all of the service music-Psalm responses and settings of the Great Thanksgiving: anything we give the congregation that they can sing over time becomes something they can carry with them - in prayer, in reflection, in personal piety, and becomes a resource for the lives as faithful disciples in the world.

<p>The more the congregation sings its responses the better. This is especially the case with those parts of the service that are by nature song, e.g. psalms and canticles, and responses in the great prayers of the sacraments.</p>
<p>Singing the Psalms is crucial to our identity. Whether sung in traditional chanting or praise choruses, they must be sung.</p>
<p>I am unsure of this regarding the Psalms and Baptism — I think that some different settings would improve the desire to sing the responses — but singing the Eucharist is really important; new Communion settings will be absolutely welcome.</p>
<p>In my congregation, we sing the Communion setting in TFWS. We also sing the Strathdee Lord Bless You and Keep You as a congregational blessing. Both of these musical settings have become beloved in our congregation. Singing them makes each ritual much more meaningful, and the congregation sings them with more enthusiasm than they sing most hymns. For us, they work because they are both easy and interesting to sing as well as beautiful. We will sing some responses for responsive Psalms, but only if they are familiar hymns or refrains. We rarely use the Psalm responses in the hymnal, and we don't sing the responses at baptisms. I personally think that singing responses and using music within a service in interesting ways (framing scripture or prayer) with a hymn or response greatly enhances a worship act, but only if they are carefully selected and easy to sing. If they are unfamiliar or difficult, doing so diminishes the act, and it would be more effective read than sung.</p>
<p>What trends do you see in congregational singing of speaking the Psalms, responses at Baptism and Holy Communion, canticles, and service music?</p>
<p>In some places this is greatly increasing (and certainly it is a part of our training and practice). It is also being neglected in a major portion of our congregations... we need more, not less, emphasis on this...</p>
<p>Need to be able to sing psalms and responses in a variety of styles. See the new Evangelical Lutheran Worship and all of the Eucharist settings, e.g.</p>
<p>As with A.1., the trends are varied across the denomination. Some places have done a good job of developing and supporting these practices; others have simply ignored them. In some cases, the "trends" are only a question of what the next pastor decides to do rather than the particular practices and traditions of congregations (or even of Methodism).</p>
<p>The antiphons (sung responses) are frequently used when the psalms are used in United Methodist worship (note: The inclusion of varieties of approaches to singing the psalms found in the new Upper Room Worshipbook is good. Metrical expressions of the psalms</p>

and canticles are valuable resources but should not replace the psalm text itself in the resources (although it may in the service itself). The sung responses in the Great Thanksgiving are often used, although not as widely as I wish they were. I do not understand why the musical responses in the Prayer Over the Water are so seldom used — both of them are very singable and they add greatly to the impact of the prayer. We need to encourage and model them as much as possible. Brief congregational sung responses provide good opportunities for what I call "bridge music," that is, the use of a "praise" chorus, Taizé piece, hymn refrain, gospel song, or cross-cultural piece that is not the predominant genre of that service to broaden the experience of congregational song in that service and to embody the wider nature of the Church.

After a rise in the use of service music following the 1989 Hymnal, it is declining in use, primarily because of the lack of new settings, and a perceived time problem (it takes too much time in the service).

We're trying to sing Psalms a bit and Baptismal responses more, but again, different settings would improve probably our motivation. We sing Holy Communion responses consistently.

I'm not sure I can answer this.

C. TEXTS AND TUNES (INCLUDING GLOBAL & ETHNIC)

What is the importance of singing songs in a language other than the congregation's primary language?

This can be very important especially if the church and or community has people who speak that different language. We use Spanish language in some of the songs we sing in our church because we have Spanish-speaking people in our congregation and many more in the culture around us. The danger here is using it as a kind of status politics, that is, to demonstrate how "cosmopolitan" we are.

To sing another person's language and song is to unite ourselves in solidarity with the whole church. When we stretch ourselves and our 'preferences' we move beyond the parochial to a broader understanding of the Church.

This is a witness to the diversity of God's creation and a sign of hospitality to those who are different than we (near and far). It draws us out of our cultural captivity. No one culture has a corner on God. See my One Bread, One Body: Exploring Cultural Diversity in Worship.

Michael Hawn, in *Gather into One* helps makes the case for this practice as a way of helping us more clearly identify with the "other" even when the "other" isn't visibly present in our midst. But this hasn't been well interpreted to congregations. Nor has simply learning to sing "ethnic" songs in English translation been well supported. Yet, some of this material is the most interesting musically and textually (I think of some of I-to Loh's settings in the UMH).

If by "language" you mean "musical language," see the above for my answer. The use of the spoken language of another culture would also reinforce the nature of the Church as global as well as local. However, introducing such song demands sensitivity and a "gift" for doing it well (cf. Michael Hawn!!)

absolutely critical — and even more important if you don't have people in your congregation who represent the ethnicity of the music you're singing. We are no longer a country in isolation, but part of a global economy and political entity — and music in our worship needs to reflect this, and with the array of resources currently available, "I Don't Know How To Do It" is no longer a valid excuse!

I think it is important as a tool to help people understand the vastness of God and God's love for all people.

What is the importance of singing songs in multiple styles (traditional, contemporary, gospel, Taizé, world/global)?

The biggest problem here is when it is externally imposed and when the soul music of a congregation is unheeded or violated. See my comments about soul music in question A-3. We sometimes have "with it" pastors who see their role as one of "raising the musical tastes of their congregations" and what they sometimes do is rape the musical tastes of their congregations.

See *Gather Into One: Praying and Singing Globally*

To a large extent, while the question suggests that this is new, it isn't. Every one of our hymnals for the past century has represented some kind of blend of musical styles—chant, Victorian part song, Lutheran chorale, Genevan psalm tune. What is new is the multiplication of styles. For me the question isn't the importance of singing in multiple styles, but how any particular style facilitates the worship by a congregation and how it serves the liturgy in a particular time and place.

I anticipated this in the above. As is evident, I think this is very important.

I think diversity is critical in terms of genre as well as ethnicity. Different styles of music affect people in different ways at different moments — a Howard Gardiner principal

extrapolated, but also something that those of us who plan and lead worship take into consideration for every service.

I think it is important as a tool to help people experience the living Christ in ways that speak to their own preferences and experiences and at the same time expand the ways they can experience God

What is the importance of using inclusive and expansive language for humanity and God?

This is very important, but don't make it like a speed bump as if we are trying to make sure people "get it." Just do it artfully so that it aesthetically integrates into the hymn, and does not come off like Custer's Last Stand.

Very. Not to eliminate some names in favor of others, but to expand our understanding of who God is.

Each generation needs to reframe God in its own terms. There will be no consensus as our generation's voice is very diverse. However, the art must not be lost. No one wants to sing bad P.C. renditions with easy words substitutions. Important, though obviously a thorny issue.

Given the "battles" over inclusive language 20+ years ago, it amazes me how little attention this receives today, especially in the production of "contemporary" music. The CCM industry seems to still think that the KJV of Scripture is the only thing that can be sung, that everything must be about "men", "Kings", etc. Given the work we (as a denomination) did on inclusive language in the years leading up to the 1989 hymnal, I am surprised how quickly even our publishing house and agencies have stepped back from this. It is disappointing. And, that we continue to allow material that is explicitly anti-Jewish (I realize this is a different question) that sets of Jews against Christians as them and us (see Twila Paris' Lamb of God TFWS 2113 as an example) when we have such strong texts (and very old at that) that work against such division (Ah, holy Jesus...I crucified thee.)

Very important — especially when the songs are new or not in the memory bank. Rewording what is in the memory bank demands poetic gifts as well as theological integrity. The New Century Hymnal's approach is not the way to do it. The Chalice Hymnal is a much wiser model to follow.

Again, critical.

I believe it is formative in how people understand God and great care should be given to the words we use about God especially, as well as people. I also think it should be used to call attention to God and not to the language language–self.

What is the importance of using texts and tunes from non-Judeo-Christian faith traditions?

The biggest problem here is when churches do so like tourists. Or when there is some assumption that all the religions are equally true [how in the world would anyone know that?] or that all religions are on just different paths to the same God [how would one know this either?]. Such approaches are insensitive to difference and violate other religious traditions. I suspect that there are not more than 100 people in the entire UMC who really know the major world religions well enough to use them sensitively — and I am not one of those people. The point is we need help in such use of other traditions. I have even seen some of our UM agencies use other faith traditions this way when it was obvious, even to me, that they did not know what they were doing. We are especially bad in our Anglo–European use of Native American religions. Native Americans must just fall out of their chairs laughing at us.

To use texts and tunes from outside one's own faith tradition requires great sensitivity and respect for the other... I'd be careful with this...

Christianity exists in a very religiously pluralistic society in the United States. To the degree that we can agree theologically in the broadest sense, yes.

I'll answer with a different question: Why would we use texts that do not express our faith in and worship of the Triune God whom we profess? There is a kind of universalism present that conflicts with what I see in the universalism articulated by the Wesleys. As to the tunes: the first question to ask is whether or not the tune adequately sets the text (both theologically and musically) and whether it enables the congregation to sing the text or not. If the tune prevents us from singing, what is the point?

Some texts will work, some won't. We need to be Christian people committed to interfaith dialogue, but expressing our own faith perspective. Any tune that can be a good vehicle for singing the text can be "baptized" — in time, it becomes a part of the treasury of congregational song (e.g. Celtic tunes, the appropriation of Vaughn–Williams). Texts must be examined carefully for integrity of meaning in the Christian context. They should not be in conflict with the faith affirmations of the Christian community.

Moderately important, but not as critical.

If it helps people experience the living Christ in worship and have an appreciation for all of God's children, then it is good to do.
What is the importance of using non-sacred texts and tunes in congregational song?
See my response to A-3 above. The big issue here is whether these texts and tunes are placed in God's story or whether they are seen as the presumed "larger story." I think the latter is a major theological mistake.
Non-sacred tunes have been used since Martin Luther. He gave them Christian words and the people sang what they had learned in the taverns. A non-sacred text can have a positive message that supports the gospel and relates to people who grew up outside the church. I use these very sparingly, but I did have a soloist sing Nature Boy by Eden Ahbez, to assist in expressing the truth that to love is the greatest commandment.

In what ways would these songs gather the community in the praise of God?

Texts: NO. Tunes need to be taken on a case-by-case basis. A little hard to draw the line on this issue of tunes as they morph over time.
Again, I'll ask a question: What makes a tune "sacred" other than it's pairing with a text and its use in the context of worship? I'm not sure what you are asking about "non-sacred texts" — should we sing Love Me Tender in worship? I don't think so, because it says nothing about the human-divine relationship, is not directed to God (the literal definition of a hymn), and does nothing to offer ourselves in worship. Should we sing John Lennon's Give Peace a Chance — perhaps, it doesn't seem all that far from Let There Be Peace on Earth (UMH 431). So, does the text (sacred or otherwise) speak Christian truth/gospel? Does the tune provide the means by which a community (not a performing/professional ensemble) can sing the text?
Much of what I said above can answer this question as well. In terms of contemporary secular music, the value is connectivity with contemporary culture. The danger is also connectivity with the contemporary culture!
I don't think this merits much attention — there's so much important, beautiful, memorable and faith-forming music within the faith tradition that there's not time to sing it all. I do not believe we need to sing non-sacred texts/tunes in order to "connect" with the congregation.
As long as it helps people experience God through Christ and is not merely a fun/cool thing to do, I think it's fine.

D. IMPLICATIONS OF DIGITAL AND EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES

Assuming the continued and increasing use of: CD accompaniment tracks for congregational singing; projected lyrics; MIDI; live Internet resources used in worship; remote worship sites with simulcast or recorded sermons; downloadables for worship use; posting services to the Internet, including Podcasting and video/audio streaming: what are the implications for the future of the church?

The basic issue here is immersion. That is, the central practice of powerfully persuasive and formative gatherings today is a multi-sensory, multi-media event where image, music, rhythm, lighting, move, dance, and word are integrated and where people are immersed in these events as performers — not as passive viewers or listeners. In worship these immersive events must be an ecology of God's story, an environment that places us in a living and critical appropriation of the Scripture and tradition of the church. As performers of this more embodied, multi-sensory practice the congregation takes a far more active role. We simply must stop doing these worship services that are so dominated by talking heads. This also means that contemporary worship services that keep the congregation sitting on its butt and watching what goes on up front must cease. We also need more prophetic multi-media practices in contemporary worship. Most contemporary worship is dreadfully accommodative to this culture. Hence we need the critical use of the technological resources mentioned in the question. I believe we are moving toward a time where we will see less of the critical distance of print and much more of the critical immersion of media in worship, hence requiring more and more of the resources the question mentions. We need to learn to use the technological resources to develop multi-media settings where we can do the juxtapositions and other practices necessary for critical immersions. (See recent book, *Powerful Persuasion: Multi-Media Witness in Christian Worship*, Chapters 10 and 11.) Obviously, then, the full range of technological resources mentioned in the question become extraordinarily important in the preparation of such worship services. Moreover, we need far greater participation of the congregation in the production of such worship. A lone wolf pastor cannot do it. Again, this suggests the importance of the technological resources mentioned in the question and the necessity of their being made available to a great range of people in the pews.

Church musicians need to be better trained across a wide continuum of technical, theological, practical methods. Pastors the same... There is every possibility for artistic, theologically sound use of technology — and also the reverse. It does mean that in many instances, 'new' denominational hymnals are not on the horizon.

The wide acceptance of *The Faith We Sing* is due to its consultative and consensus determined breadth of content meant to serve established as well as emerging

worshipping communities, the product's elaboration into flexible unbound resources, e.g., Power-Point files for all selections, its wide promotion, and the national training sessions. I am not aware of any study with regard to United Methodist and others' use of this collection

Too broad for me. Bottom line, with all due regard to Sam Young, we still need a hymnal as this medium does something that none of the other media do. The Faith We Sing proves that a hymnal will still make money. All the above plus a hymnal.

I realize the practical "need" for CD accompaniment, but as I remind my liturgy and music students, no one has yet provided a mechanism by which a CD player can respond to the particular rhythms, breathing patterns, environmental conditions, of every different congregation-things which every "live" musician learns to do again and again in each place in which he or she provides musical leadership. The questions about the use of media for distribution of resources seems to respond simply to the changing character of the means for distribution — I wouldn't argue for a return to the quill pen (although the St. John's Bible is lovely, prayerful, and a act of devotion in its own right). But, I'm not sure that the ease of distribution via internet has always served us well — there seems to be missing in this process the means for critical analysis of the materials. That is, there is a lot of stuff that is offered that I'd rather not see used because of what it says/does theologically. As to services on the internet, podcasting, etc — if these are intended to be used the way printed or recorded copies of sermons, etc., have been used—a aids to study and devotion, as means of reaching the "unwillingly homebound", then I support them. If we assume we can be church without a physically gathered community, we quickly become a new form of Gnostic, separating body and spirit, denying our faith in an incarnational God, and contribute to the ongoing individualism/voluntarism that drives us a part across our North American culture.

Some of this will be helpful to individual congregations. Some of it will enrich Christian worship. Some of it will enhance individuality over Christian community in ways that are not true to the nature of the Church. Emerging technologies should not be either embraced or dismissed as a whole. Theological and liturgical implications must not be ignored. There will be those with special gifts AND theological and liturgical sensitivity who will point the way.

I believe that after a rise in the use of technology, it will decrease in its significance, especially the use of recorded accompaniment. There will be a time of reliance on these because of the dearth of musicians. But this vacuum will be filled. Recorded music, sermons, etc. will have a place, but they will not eventually be the norm.

This is a huge question. I think the remoteness of technology in so many aspects of our society today is not necessarily something that we, the body of Christ and a community want to hold as an ideal. People are seeking more connection with others, not less.

Having said that, there are aspects that will be helpful to faith formation, but I don't think we've lived with these aspects of technology long enough to assess their importance for the future.

With all of these possibilities, the challenge will remain creating real and authentic communities where people can come as they are, be welcomed and loved, and at the same time challenged not to remain the same but to go out as Christ's servants in the world to love and serve others. These technologies can serve this mission, but they must not distract from this mission, and I'm afraid they often do. Instead they allow for and even encourage the creation of false communities, or individuals pretending to be in community without ever being in physical contact with another human. The church must use these as tools to reach people and serve people, and they must never replace the not-so-polished authenticity of a heart-felt song presented with humility and grace, or the sermon shared by the pastor who was there when a member's husband died.

E. WESLEY HYMNS What is the importance of including Wesley hymns in official worship resources for our theology and denominational identity as United Methodists?

Just a quick comment here: I think the Wesley hymns are wonderful and we need to use them. They do need, however, to be done to radically different beats if they are to address the younger generations. I shall never forget singing "Joyful, Joyful, We Adore Thee" (Beethoven's Ninth, not Wesley) with a group of 500 teenagers and being led by a young pianist who did it with the beat on 2 and 4 rather than 1 and 3. It was simply electric with that crowd.

Wesley hymns and Wesleyan texts are part of our theological identity and articulation.

Wesleyan hymnody is a sine qua non of UM Worship. Need to have more up-to-date musical settings, however. Many great CW and JW texts are lost because of the settings in the UM Hymnal.

I'm not sure we have a clear identity as UMs and I'm not sure very many in our congregation understand the theological centrality of the Wesley hymns for our theology and doctrine. We treat them as quaint historical artifacts, a few of which we continue to sing out of familiarity or fondness. I think there are Wesley texts to be reclaimed that speak to the heart of Methodist, but which require new tunes to carry them (such as the collection that I think St. Kimbrough edited for the last Oxford Institute). We need to retrieve, for example, some of the Wesley hymns on the Lord's Supper. Our seminary has had an Anglican Mission in America congregation borrowing our chapel for the past year with a new congregation of mostly college students. The interesting thing about this community is that they sing the Wesley hymns — far more than most UMs do, and they

are doing so with their own new settings or arrangements (interesting as well — they seem to also be using the covenant disciple model in their catechetical program!).

Except for Orthodox churches with their own distinct musical tradition, every denomination I know uses Wesley hymns, including Roman Catholics. The Wesley hymns are so rich and varied that we can keep mining them for new treasures for generations to come. Some won't fit with our present concerns and sensitivities, but many will. They express United Methodist theology and identity better than anything else, always have, and can continue to do so, if we let them.

Important.

Some of my favorite new choral music includes new settings of Wesley hymns by Mark Miller. I believe fresh musical settings that are easy for a congregation to sing would be very much appreciated in congregations. I'm not so sure denominational identity is that important, except in the ways that it is clarified by our theology and practice. Still, new settings of these hymns would be welcomed.

How are you including Wesley hymns in seminary instruction?

When I was at Saint Paul School of Theology we used Wesley hymns quite often in chapel and other places, but we did not experiment with different rhythms.

Absolutely. . . . often sung to new tunes by composers here and abroad. . . . See the Global Praise books, etc..

Every semester in every basic worship course and in the church music colloquium we have a Wesley sing in chapel every year. Will have a major Wesley exhibit in Bridwell library from Feb. 1 to mid-April 2007.

As often as I can, I bring them into use in the seminary chapel in worship, I use them as teaching texts in courses on worship and prayer, I use them as prayer and devotional texts in the classroom, and I use them as theological documents in teaching about the sacraments.

In teaching the basic hymnody class, we would page through the hymnal, noting all the Wesley hymns and singing some of those less well known. This would be preceded by a mini-lecture on Charles Wesley and the role of congregational song for United Methodists, and accompanied by commentary when certain aspects of Wesleyan theology were at stake (e.g. sanctification in "Love Divine, All Loves Excelling"). In United Methodist Worship (a course meeting the worship requirement), our goal was to have the students so well acquainted with the hymnal, TFWS, and book of worship that they

would be readily available resources in their ministry. An important ingredient in this was attention to the corpus of Wesley hymns included there. Note: Both courses also included attention to Songs of Zion, the Hispanic and Korean hymnals, and the Global Praise resources.

Courses deal with Wesley's theology and the way it's brought to the hymn texts — and we sing Wesley hymns often in chapel.

SUMMARY OF SPECIALIST CONSULTANT RESPONSES GROUPED BY THE FIVE AREAS OF THE MUSIC STUDY

A. TRENDS & MEASUREMENT OF CONGREGATIONAL SONG

What do you see as the major trend(s) in UM congregational singing?

more use of traditional hymns (Cokesbury)
variety of styles in the hymnal
growth of praise music
use of ethnic and global diversity
more congregational participation (service music, sung prayer)
change in hymnal from historical/Wesleyan content supplemented by a variety of songbooks (pre-1989) to a "two-track" hymnal that includes both (1989 and TFWS)
some congregations continue strong singing tradition while others give it up to performers
loss of congregational part singing due to projection and words-only delivery
use of more "heart" music

Given these trends, what theological, liturgical, and missional implications do you see for the future of the church?

we need to move from literate theology to doing theology in story, proverb, orality, and integrating it in image, music, rhythm, lighting, movement, dance, and word
GBOD and UMPH should continue working collaboratively to produce additional supplemental volumes (TFWS2, books for ethnic groups, emerging)
one-volume hymnal can not contain the breadth the church needs; continue supplemental volumes
UMs are no longer unified theologically by our song; we should re-consider the theology of our song and understand the relationship between liturgy, music, and mission
"tribalization of worship through musical genre" is troubling; songs must have theological integrity, be singable, and have music worthy of the text
there will be fewer musicians raised within the church
we must use greater care in choosing music, considering theology of the text and impact of the melody

What connections do you see between congregational singing and Christian identity, practice of ministry, and the impact of culture?

Making, listening to, dancing, dreaming to music are formative in this culture. Music in the church, to be formative, must place God's story within this formative music. Pay attention to the role of rhythm in music and how it keeps people in touch with the music, and hence, God's story.
Singing is formative and affirmative. Singing forms us through gesture and ritual.
"Popular" church music, driven by popular culture, results in quality and style of church music that does not serve the worshipping community and that is not singable by the people. The church must determine for itself what serves its liturgical life and its mission in the world.
What we sing speaks both TO us and FOR us — what we sing expresses and forms us.
Music is a potent component of formation and the connection is vital.

B. PSALTER, SERVICES, RITUAL, SERVICE MUSIC

What is the significance of the congregation singing vs. speaking the Psalms, responses at Baptism and Holy Communion, and the texts of canticles and service music?

The big issue: how does this work with congregations that are more oral, or more digital, or electronic?
It is important to sing our prayers, Psalms, and Scripture.
Sing more — talk less.
Reading what was intended to be sung is deadly for faith and piety. People are willing to sing if taught. What they sing they will retain and carry with them.
We must sing the Psalms.
New musical settings are needed.

What trends do you see in congregational singing of speaking the Psalms, responses at Baptism and Holy Communion, canticles, and service music?

At the same time, there are trends of increasing and of decreasing frequency of singing
Need variety of musical style and settings for this singing
Use of service music rose with the 1989 hymnal, but is now declining

C. TEXTS AND TUNES (INCLUDING GLOBAL & ETHNIC)

What is the importance of singing songs in a language other than the congregation's primary language?

Use of non-English is important especially when those persons are present in the church or community
--

It unites us in solidarity with the whole church; reinforces the nature of the global church
It is a witness to the diversity of God's creation and a sign of hospitality. It draws us out of our cultural captivity.

What is the importance of singing songs in multiple styles (traditional, contemporary, gospel, Taizé, world/global)?

We must do so while being sensitive to a congregation's "soul music"
Every hymnal has done this to some extent. What is important is today's multiplication of styles and how they can be used to facilitate worship and serve the liturgy.
All responses claim this as important.

What is the importance of using inclusive and expansive language for humanity and God?

Important, but do it artfully and aesthetically, not like "Custer's Last Stand."
Yes — as an expansion of our understanding of who God is.
Important, but thorny. Each generation must reframe God in its own terms. There will be no consensus for our generation's diversity. Must be artistic and not PC.
CCM has set us back, even in denominational publishing. Related issue is anti-Jewish lyrics (Twila Paris' "Lamb of God," TFWS 2113).
Important especially for new songs not in the memory bank. Take care in rewording heart songs.

What is the importance of using texts and tunes from non-Judeo-Christian faith traditions?

Such use makes assumptions not true: religions are equally true, on different paths to the same God. This practice is insensitive to differences, and violate other traditions. Be careful especially with Native American songs and practices.
Requires sensitivity and respect for the other.
Where broad theological agreement is possible, yes.
For texts: no. They do not express our Trinitarian faith and worship. For tunes: only if it serves the text well.
We first need to be Christian people expressing our own faith perspective, committed to interfaith dialogue. Moderately important but not critical.
What is the importance of using non-sacred texts and tunes in congregational song?
The issue is whether they are placed in God's story or in a cultural larger story. The latter is a major theological mistake.
Non-sacred tunes used since Luther (including tavern tunes). OK to give them Christian words. A non-sacred text may have a positive message that supports the Gospel.
Texts: NO. Tunes: case by case consideration.
Questions to consider: does the text speak Christian truth/Gospel? Does the tune allow for the text to be sung?
The resulting connectivity with contemporary culture can be both a value and a danger.
There is so much already sacred available; don't worry about the secular.

D. IMPLICATIONS OF DIGITAL AND EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES

Assuming the continued and increasing use of: CD accompaniment tracks for congregational singing; projected lyrics; MIDI; live Internet resources used in worship; remote worship sites with simulcast or recorded sermons; downloadables for worship use; posting services to the Internet, including Podcasting and video/audio streaming: what are the implications for the future of the church?
--

"Print" and "talking head" worship leads to "critical distance" of the people, while immersion of the people in all of the mentioned media in a multi-sensory worship experience leads to "critical immersion" in the Gospel. This is of extreme importance.
Take care with artistic, theologically sound use of technology.
The wide acceptance of TFWS is partly due to its use of technology.
We still need a hymnal as this medium does something that none of the other media do.
Technology is limited when compared to live musicians' abilities to adapt instantly. I am not in favor of technology that replaces the gathered community.
Do not embrace OR dismiss technology as a whole. Do not ignore theological and liturgical implications.
There will be a rise in technology's use, but it will then decrease, again replaced by live people.
Technology may make us more "remote" as the body of Christ and as a community. We probably have not lived with technology long enough to assess the importance.

E. WESLEY HYMNS

What is the importance of including Wesley hymns in official worship resources for our theology and denominational identity as United Methodists?

They are important, but must be adapted to more contemporary styles and rhythms.
They have become quaint historical artifacts that we sing out of familiarity or fondness. We no longer have a clear UM identity.
They are so rich and varied, we can keep mining them for generations.

How are you including Wesley hymns in seminary instruction?

We use them in their traditional settings in chapel

often to new tunes by composers here and abroad
in weekly worship, chapel, course instruction, and library exhibits
teaching texts in courses on worship and prayer; personal prayer and devotion; as theological documents in teaching the sacraments
incorporation in classes on hymnody and worship