

Consensus

Volume 25

Issue 2 *The Arts and the Church*

Article 5

11-1-1999

To Sing the Genuinely Communal Song: One Congregation Considers the Place of Style in Worship

Deborah Buck

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholars.wlu.ca/consensus>

Recommended Citation

Buck, Deborah (1999) "To Sing the Genuinely Communal Song: One Congregation Considers the Place of Style in Worship," *Consensus*: Vol. 25 : Iss. 2 , Article 5.

Available at: <http://scholars.wlu.ca/consensus/vol25/iss2/5>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Scholars Commons @ Laurier. It has been accepted for inclusion in Consensus by an authorized editor of Scholars Commons @ Laurier. For more information, please contact scholarscommons@wlu.ca.

To Sing the Genuinely Communal Song: One Congregation Considers the Place of Style in Worship

Deborah Buck

*Music Director, Augustana Lutheran Church,
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan*

Marvin, Bill, and Susan have radically different tastes in music, especially when it comes to the worship hour on a Sunday morning. They feel strongly about their opinions and share them, often shaking their heads at each other's respective likes and dislikes.

Marv grew up in a small town in Saskatchewan and was playing fiddle, accordion, and a variety of other instruments at an early age. The Lutheran church he attended did not practice a sung liturgy of "church form", as he calls it, so he says he has never understood or cared for "the chant". Many of his family's favourite hymns did not make it into the *Lutheran Book of Worship* (LBW) and he still expresses longing for the close harmonies and "old" tunes of the red *Service Book and Hymnal*. He enjoys visiting evangelical churches where he holidays and comments favourably on the liveliness of their services, yet he is always happy to return to his home congregation where he plays in a small band on Sunday mornings. Marv often states that "worship is supposed to be about joy."

Bill, originally from Ontario, learned to love the hymnody of Luther and chorales of Bach from his immigrant parents. In the large metropolitan congregation of which his family was a part there was always instrumental and choral music of a high calibre, and a fabulous pipe organ which he still talks about. Now he rarely misses an organ recital on radio and often enthuses about the works of Orlando Gibbons and other favourite composers for the instrument. He is an "LBW-only" (*Lu-*

theran *Book of Worship*) worshipper who feels passionately that its liturgies give his life a sense of order. His view of liturgical practice is "the higher the better"; news that the choir plans to sing a "psalm paraphrase" instead of leading the congregation in response chant will generally raise an eyebrow, if not Bill's blood pressure. He usually refers to hymns and orders of service deriving from anything but the LBW as "popular" music.

Susan is a university student who took piano and singing lessons while growing up and was playing the organ in her hometown's Lutheran church at an early age. She still enjoys classical music both in church and concert hall, but her exposure to many different musical genres has led her to love a wide variety of styles including "world" music, jazz, and hymns and anthems by "popular" Christian composers. She loves the variety of liturgies available today and often volunteers to serve as cantor, but she remains fond of the LBW because she grew up with it. The "golden oldie" hymns, as she calls them, hold very little appeal for her, but she was ecstatic when a well-known jazz trumpeter played an improvisation on *Amazing Grace* at her church recently.

One might not find Marvin, Bill, and Susan attending the same concerts very often; but it might come as a surprise to learn that they do, in fact, attend the same church regularly and have done so for many years. Their church does not offer Sunday services catering to the specific musical tastes and preferences of any one of them. Its services are not designated "contemporary", "folk", "traditional", "informal", "formal", "contemporary", "liturgical", "praise", "alternative", or other. Its publicity material and outdoor display board read: "Worship, 9:30 a.m. and 11:00 a.m." It is known among the congregation that, from September through May, an instrumental ensemble leads the early service and organ and choir lead the late service, but apart from this distinction there is little appreciable difference between the two. Of course, churches are not concert halls, and people attend worship services for a wide range of reasons. Yet it is interesting to note that all three of the members introduced above often cite "the music" as the primary reason for choosing their church.

We have heard about "worship wars" at conferences and in the media, read about them in journals, and been sobered by accounts of specific battles of such a nature in our own communities. These wars have many "fronts",¹ but the author of a new survey of church music involving

over 800 parishes in New England, Linda J. Clark, confirms that in her experience the bitterest conflicts in churches today are waged over style, particularly the issue of “traditional” versus “popular” music.² Although Augustana Lutheran Church in Saskatoon, where I am employed as Music Director, has experienced more or less tension over this very issue over the years, it is certainly and thankfully not “at war”. Our members Susan, Bill, and Marvin are clearly at odds on aesthetic and liturgical grounds. They are surely aware of the existence of churches in our city whose services are tailored to their respective tastes and opinions. Nevertheless they choose to remain members of this one congregation, often electing to attend the very same service. If style of music is as important to them as they regularly claim, what keeps them coming to a church that does not deliver consistently the kind of music any of them ideally would wish?

This is a conundrum worth probing in the face of the above debate and we — worship committee, pastor, our members, and myself — have been doing just that over the past few years, as we attempt to balance extreme positions on the one hand and the desire to reinvigorate and renew our worship practice on the other. It is not the intention of this article to present our church as a definitive example of “how to” create a healthy worshipping community or to claim solutions to the very difficult issue raised above. We are not particularly remarkable as a church, but like every church we are unique. This is not a success story as such but the continuing story of our own personal worship journey and our struggles and discoveries along the way, some of which might, it is to be hoped, prove valuable to other congregations similarly engaged in the process of finding their voice.

What we have discovered is that style — specifically the manner or form of hymns, liturgy, and other service music — is both incidental and integral to worship, important but necessarily remaining in balance with many other considerations; that we at Augustana must reject completely the movement current in many congregations in the country to create separate worshipping communities around the matter of style, and that when we dare to put style in its proper context, we in time enable the creation of what the theologian and writer Gordon Lathrop calls a “genuinely communal song”³ which expresses our faith as a community while broadening our faith as individuals.

The History and Progress of the Debate in our Congregation

One could argue that Augustana has been involved in the “traditional” vs. “contemporary” debate since our church was first established, although at that time these musical styles were inseparable from two competing cultures — that of the “old” country and that of the “new”. Although it originally celebrated one Swedish and one English service on Sundays, the church moved to a single English service soon after its 1929 groundbreaking, maintaining this one-service practice for decades. There is no readily available documentation on this evolution to all-English worship, but it cannot have occurred without considerable debate, if not pain. Worship was thereafter based on the official Lutheran hymnals and Augustana was using the LBW almost exclusively from the 1970s until 1983. With the change of pastoral leadership came the introduction of a so-called “contemporary” service at an earlier hour. The sole source of liturgy and hymns at that service became the Augsburg publication *Songs for a New Creation* (SNC, Holy Communion Setting B by John Ylvisaker), and an instrumental ensemble of piano, guitars, bass, and percussion was formed to lead the worship service. The 11:00 service remained strictly LBW or so-called “traditional” worship.

A new pastor arrived in 1993, and it was around this time that questions about the church’s worship practice began to arise in discussions among worship leaders and parishioners. We had all heard about congregations in our city (if I may be bold enough to make so specific a reference) who were experiencing a kind of “divorce” over the very worship practice we had adopted years earlier — a “contemporary” service in addition to a “traditional” LBW service. We had heard that the two worshipping groups in those churches rarely, if ever, saw each other; that there was great acrimony between the opposing camps; and that members were even leaving these congregations over the issue of style. Suddenly we were sensitized to the potential for such division in our own congregation. Were we too becoming polarized? Were we setting the scene for our own tragic split over the issue of style?

Coupled with this fear was the concern that our hymnal at the early service did not really stand up to the requirements of weekly worship. The Worship Committee had already found it necessary to supplement the SNC service with one hymn from the LBW since discovering that SNC contained many hymns of a general nature but too few relating to the texts and themes for the day. Furthermore, worship at 9:30 was

becoming monotonous; we were curious about experimenting with additional worship resources and practices in an effort to refresh and reinvigorate our service — *one* of the reasons why we had introduced a contemporary service to begin with! Unfortunately the 9:30 congregation was now so in the habit of using this service order that introducing liturgies or hymns from other books would surely create some resistance. We decided it was a chance worth taking.

Gradually, our planning began to incorporate music from a variety of resources besides SNC and the distinction between the two services began to blur. For example, we occasionally sang settings of the psalms at both services despite the fact that chanting had all but disappeared from the early worship since the introduction of SNC. The choir, which had formerly sung only at the late service, began to alternate its participation at both worship times. A Festive Liturgy with organ and brass became traditional at both the 9:30 and 11:00 services on high feast days. “Intergenerational Services” from the Sunday School curriculum, informal in character and using hymns from a wide variety of sources, were occasionally offered in both time slots. Our worship services were not only becoming less distinguishable one from the other, they were growing decidedly more eclectic.

Then in 1995 the Worship Committee accepted the gift of the *Hymnal Supplement 1991* (HS, published by G.I.A.) from a member family and moved to introduce the HS liturgy at both services. “Now the Feast and Celebration” seemed to lend itself both to the organ and piano-with-band configurations. The hope was that learning this single service might prove a unifying experience for our “two” congregations while expanding our range of worship options. Meanwhile, both SNC and LBW would remain in rotation at both worship times.

All of these changes, introduced over a long period, prompted a remarkable range of feedback. While many young people and families responded enthusiastically to HS, there was strong negative reaction from some long-standing older members who frequented the first service. They were dissatisfied not only with the style of the new liturgy, with its chanting and foreign sounding melodies and harmonies, but with the perceived pattern of interference with 9:30 worship in general. Worship committee and church council were told to “stop tinkering with *OUR* service” by a few worshippers from both services who claimed that most people were choosing which service to attend based on its particular

worship style. HS and LBW hymns and liturgies were dismissed as “too formal” for the 9:30 crowd, yet to our bewilderment HS was thought “too informal” or “popular” in style for some of the 11:00 crowd. Some of us were shocked to find that we were able to refer to a “9:30 crowd” and an “11:00 crowd” at all! Was this not exactly the polarization we had been so committed to undermining?

In April of 1996 the Worship Committee decided to survey the congregation. From the results we learned that “the congregation [was] generally content with the various forms of worship” that were being used, but some passionate points of view remained on both sides of the style question. Second, we learned that more than 50% of respondents were choosing to attend either the early or the late service due to the *time* at which it was offered, not the *style* of the service. It was there in black and white: style did not determine the attendance pattern of the majority of our parishioners.⁴

Our Current Practice of Worship

Our current practice of worship is unprecedented in our history. We are now alternating as many as nine different Lutheran liturgies in a church year — five from the LBW, “Now the Feast and Celebration” from HS, SNC, and an original jazz setting of the Eucharist composed by our pastor. In addition there are special services such as Festive Liturgies, services for healing, the annual Evangelical Lutheran Women (ELW) Praise Service, and carol services at Advent and Christmas, to name a few.

The hymns are selected from three sources (LBW, SNC, HS) but we use no more than two books within a service in an effort to avoid awkwardness. A band continues to lead the 9:30 worship, though not exclusively; organ and choir, the 11:00 service, though not exclusively; and on some occasions the two services are identical in content. In the summertime we move to one service and a rotating schedule of LBW (Setting II and Service of the Word), SNC, and HS. I would say the majority of our membership can participate in any of the above liturgies with confidence.

If forced to declare what “style” of worship we offered at Augustana, we would most likely have to answer “eclectic” or “blended”, but in our worship planning we hardly use the word “style” at all. Considerations other than that of style guide us.

Creating Worship with Integrity: Our Three Criteria

The above account of our recent worship history might suggest that our worship life is built on a negative, that is, that we are motivated in our planning by a fear of division over the issue of style which dictates that we create a kind of worship satisfactory to the majority of our members. It may appear that, for all our efforts not to allow style issues to rule our worship and limit our expression, we are still enslaved by these same issues as we create acceptable, wishy-washy “worship for all” that in fact expresses nothing more than a shallow, general level of satisfaction. Yet it is my view that the statistic of generally happy worshipping parishioners is merely an ancillary result of good worship planning, not the goal. Simply stated, the goal is worship that binds us together as proclaimers of the gospel. Perhaps it is this point of worship — the desire to be proclaimers together — which invites Marvin, Susan, and Bill in the act of worship at Augustana and sustains them week after week, whether or not they are entirely “satisfied” with the style of worship offered.

Members and visitors have observed that our worship services have “integrity”, and I have often found myself reflecting on what that means. Integrity by definition is that which is whole, complete, and undivided though being composed of many parts (*The Oxford English Dictionary*). All parts contribute to the realization of the whole. We seek integrity in worship in three respects. First, all the parts of the service must originate from the Word and work together to achieve the proclamation of the Word. Second, our worship has integrity only when it *integrates* (a distant relation of the word “integrity”) — that is to say, includes and occupies the whole membership, uniting them in the proclamation of that Word. Finally, worship must possess integrity of structure, following the “ordo” or rubrics of Christian worship. In effect our worship is bound together by the Word and by tradition, and we are bound together by the worship itself, which is the expression of what the Word means to us and has meant to us through the ages.

These criteria are indeed key to planning every worship service at Augustana. Any music selected must derive directly from the texts for the day. This is a goal well articulated by Daniel Zager in a recent statement about the place of style in worship.⁵ He charges worship leaders to forget the question of style in favour of the more fundamental question: “How can music best complement theology within the worship service?” He urges them diligently to “[seek] that music — congregational song,

instrumental music and choral music — that undergirds, supports, reinforces, repeats, declares the theological focus of each Sunday and feast day.” The texts come first; the musical form which these texts take on is an important but secondary consideration. Zager further argues that, “...to privilege style above all else is ultimately to fail as church musicians and pastors, for we then deny — or at very least dramatically underutilize — music as a powerful means of participating in the proclamation of the Gospel message.”

Zager’s emphasis on *participation* points us to the second criterion which emerged over time as a key to successful worship at our church: our worship practice must integrate our members as proclaimers of the Word. Planners of worship have the responsibility to enable the genuinely communal song of which Lathrop writes. The song which proclaims the reality of the gospel in the lives of all who worship cannot be delegated to a few singers, but must incorporate as many voices as possible.

We try to program music which inspires our members to service, encouraging them to contribute their diverse voices to the communal song as cantors, assistants, readers, instrumentalists, choir and committee members, and, of course, as members of the worshipping assembly without whom no worship would be possible. This inclusive practice of worship necessarily considers not only the varying abilities of our parishioners, but the varying musical traditions which they find meaningful and accessible. Practically, if we are to include “Bill” in the proclamation of the gospel through music, we must seek the kind of material which he either already considers “good music”, or which he might discover *is* “good music”, if given the opportunity. Naturally, achieving such connections between music, musicians, and worshippers requires familiarity with their musical orientation, much planning, and a high degree of creativity.

Finally, we look for integrity of structure in worship, which is critical for achieving a sense of flow. Even when music and lectionary are closely linked, worship can *dis-integrate* without careful attention to the structure, particularly if our services attempt to incorporate much participation from the membership. We either use an existing liturgy within which we substitute musical responses which we have selected or composed ourselves, or fashion a “new” service following the *ordo* of worship. Far from limiting us, structure frees us to innovate within the traditional forms

that both lend order to our lives and connect us with our ancient worshipping tradition.

From Our Scrapbook: Some Examples of Worship That Works

None of the following examples of integrated worship is necessarily new and many churches are doubtless doing similar work, yet these may help to illustrate what it is we at Augustana strive for as we plan.

We follow Luther's Chorale Service of Holy Communion (a wonderful example of how parts of the liturgy can be replaced with metrical paraphrases found in the LBW) and perform a substitution or two of our own, replacing Luther's suggested *Isaiah in a Vision Did of Old* with a lovely Sanctus for choir by a living composer in a popular idiom. Our fledgling children's choir, still limited to mainly unison singing, learns by rote, and then leads the Psalmody from LBW Morning Prayer, communicating the text with its descriptions of the works and wonders of the Lord in a delightfully fresh way. An aspiring timpanist learns from a visiting professional to simulate the sound of the earthquake suggested in the Passion narrative at the close of the Good Friday tenebrae service. An expectant mother is asked to sing the Magnificat, communicating the joy of Mary's song in a breathtaking way. Members of a quilting circle lead the congregation in a service dedicating their handiwork to the glory of God. Children are invited to encircle the font during a baptism. A foreign exchange student leads a hymn from her country and accompanies on a native percussion instrument. A longstanding member is invited to choose and direct an anthem based on the lectionary and locates a version of Psalm 23 sung by our choir some fifty years ago. As she rehearses it the older singers reminisce and impart the history of the work and of the church choir to younger singers.

In summary, then, we work to plan liturgical worship that facilitates ways in which our membership may proclaim the gospel anew each Sunday and feast day. Lathrop's description of the goal of worship leadership resonates with our own stated aim:

We look for a participating assembly, gathered around the word and sacraments of Jesus Christ every Lord's Day, led by ministers who honor and serve this assembly and a choir and musicians who help it to find its voice...Our assembly, regardless of its ethnic origin or economic make-up, simply needs to be drawn, again and again, into [the] sources

of its own meaning, and into a continually renewed practice which manifests that meaning.⁶

Not Quite One Voice: The Unsettling Sense That We Are Kidding Ourselves

Yet admittedly there are members of our assembly who resist being drawn into a “renewed practice” of worship, those still convinced that there is only one “right” style for our congregation. Augustana continues to live in a tension. Though we have received many indications that we are pointed in the right direction in our worship planning there remain those among us who say they are only interested in singing “their” hymns and liturgies. Their voices are heard from time to time at worship committee and council meetings and via the church grapevine. Yes, we often say, conflict can be a sign of health and growth, and yes, it is to be expected and even desired that the art of music provoke a passionate response. Still, we wonder what will happen to that group of people committed to one style of worship or another as we continue to homogenize our two services and make it less and less possible for anyone to attend a “contemporary” or “traditional” service at our church.

One might say, “Well, those people are wrong. Worship is not about style.” It is not about finding “a place for me, for my work and art, for my opinions and tastes, for people like me.”⁷ We can argue that these people are just destined to miss the point of worship altogether because they are blinded by their own agendas. We can argue that our aesthetic differences are symptoms of theological differences too deep to be resolved within our walls. Maybe it is time for Marvin or Bill or Susan to go church shopping! After all, we worship leaders have a clear mandate (75% or so of the congregation) to plan worship in the way we do.

Of course, nobody really wants members to leave. Yet losing members is only one consequence of such thinking. There is also the possibility that these members ultimately may become increasingly disruptive, if not destructive. Or perhaps there is a consequence we have not yet begun to consider. For all our self-assurances that *our* worship way is the “right” way, deep down exists the unsettling sense that we may be kidding ourselves when we say that we attempt to foster the genuinely communal song. How participatory can our worship really be if fully a quarter of us are longing for a kind of expression which our church does

not offer, or at least does not offer exclusively? Are we to settle for partial praise as certain voices stay silent? “Not Quite One Voice” is no title for a hymnal! How can we claim to practice *corporate* integrated worship when there are members who do not identify with the eclectic form of expression that is evolving at Augustana? Perhaps the gravest consequence of dismissing the style extremists in our congregation is that we in effect close the door to a much more profound experience of worship than we have yet known.

A Music Minister Returns To The Pew

I believe that one of our challenges as worship leaders is to regard our bitterest disagreements over the matter of musical style not only as conflicts which we strategize to avoid, but as opportunities for us to transform ourselves and our congregations, ultimately enriching the worship experience and the very faith we endeavour to express through worship. In her study entitled *Music in Churches: Nourishing Your Congregation's Musical Life*, I think Linda J. Clark hands us a key to unlocking the conflict over worship style issues when she writes about the problem that is created when music ministers make judgments on behalf of others. She reminds us that because our judgments about music are always inadequate — clouded as they are by our own values and background — music ministers “...have to *learn* [my emphasis] how to make these judgments for groups of people whose life of faith is as wide-ranging as their musical tastes. Our task is to find, or write, good music that is expressive of the life of faith of the congregation. To do so means learning about the musical and faith lives of the people in the pews.”⁸

This sounds like work. At Augustana we think we already engage a wide range of expression to accommodate the many traditions and gifts of our parishioners; we are careful to ground all our worship practice in the lectionary; we expend great effort in creating elegant, flowing structure; we have even composed, administered, and processed a survey to gauge congregational response. Yet here Clark is advocating a kind of knowing that simply does not come about as the result of opinion surveys. “Learning about the musical and faith lives of the people” sounds as though it goes far beyond mere “service planning”, even the theological, inclusive, intelligent planning we think we do. Precisely how do we church musicians learn about the faith lives of those in the pew, and who

really has time to do it? Tucked away in our choirlofts, or running from service to service, from rehearsal to meeting — the demands of our job already seem great. She assures us however that “the two [musical life and faith life] go together: Learning the music of people *is* learning their faith. Musician and congregation join in a mutual education project, in which a variety of musical expressions are shared among people of different ages, cultures, and traditions.”⁹

Although I have illustrated ways in which we at Augustana do already try to accommodate a variety of musical expressions I find this idea of learning the faith of people through their music compelling because it really says nothing about “accommodating” anyone. To be truly “in the pew” with people, as it were, implies not being content with *gestures* of inclusion, tipping our hats to one taste or opinion or tradition here and there. Being in the pew with someone implies a long-term process of getting to know her or him on a new and much deeper level. We are being challenged to discover what a person’s music means to him or her, take an interest in what has shaped him/her as a person of faith, take note of those practices and hymns which are meaningful to her/him and find out *why* they are meaningful. This is the intensive “mutual education project” of which Clark speaks. As we enable this mutual education project we may discover that a glorious consequence is the broadening and enriching of everyone’s faith.

When I first met Marvin I never imagined the day would come when he would teach me anything. Fresh out of school and newly arrived in the position of Music Director, I prided myself on my extensive musical training and knowledge, and I certainly felt I had the “right” idea about what worship should be. Marvin, on the other hand, was not a schooled musician but a self-taught violinist, and I found most of his opinions and tastes directly opposed to mine. It bothered me when Marv told me he thought the purpose of worship was “joy”. I assumed he meant that he preferred hymns that were lively, in major keys, and expressed a “bed of roses” attitude to the Christian life. I tried to include such music in our instrumental prelude whenever I could, though I was not fond of it. I would protest that worship should express a complexity of things: fear of God, grief, longing, repentance — in a variety of keys and even modes! However, I was determined that Marvin and I would find a way to co-exist, even though I concluded it would probably mean compromising my aesthetic.

Looking back on those days I am appalled at my dismissive attitude towards “Marvin’s music”. Ten years of working elbow to elbow with him have altered my point of view. The more I come to know of him as a person, the more I hear of his faith, the more stories I learn of his life, the more I understand what he is trying to articulate when he says that, for him, the purpose of worship is “joy”. On a day when many people were speechless with grief, Marvin was to lead the congregation in what I had long considered to be a dour old gospel hymn. Yet when he played it it was in a way that expressed not only deep sadness, but the contagiously joyful certainty that his departed friend was at last home. Suddenly I understood that Marvin did not necessarily mean that all hymns should *sound* joyful; but as a person joyfully certain of the power of the resurrection Marvin cannot help but bring this quality of his faith to *all* the music he plays and sings. This revelation had a transformational effect on the way I thought of Marvin, the way I thought of worship, and what I believe.

Of course I still regard myself and all church musicians as leaders who have a responsibility to teach the people entrusted to their care about the broader musical tradition. After all, Clark argues, musicians are “people who have spent their lives developing their responsiveness to musical symbols” and acquiring the disciplines involved in making decisions that are not only musical but theological in content.¹⁰ But as Gordon Lathrop reminds us, we have a responsibility not merely to lead, but to “*love and lead*” [my emphasis] people into a deeper understanding of the liturgy than they already have.¹¹ Loving means listening even to those who possess a view of worship that seems narrower than our own. It means willing to be led.

There can be no pat solutions to the conflict over style that continues to simmer in our congregation. We realize that finding our voice is a process that will take time. As we proceed, the song may not always be harmonious, but continuing to educate ourselves about the faith lives of those in the pew may well be the key factor in keeping our worshipping community united in the singing. I have observed that even those who argue the most strenuously for their own style position seem to crave the worship experience of their Augustana family. I submit that what keeps Susan, Marvin, and Bill worshipping in our congregation is a combination of things: they feel their voices are desired and required in the singing of our song; they are indeed being led into a deeper understanding of the liturgy and hymnody by leaders who love them; and the act of

worship itself binds them together in the common act of proclaiming the gospel. We seek to sing with one voice that is uniquely ours — formed as it is from all our voices — the song that tells the glorious story of God's grace in our lives. Such a song communicates our story more honestly and powerfully than any worship that results when well-intentioned committees or individuals call for the creation of style-focused services whose goal is to "attract youth", "bring in new people", or "liven up the worship service".

Notes

- ¹ Ted Peters, "Worship Wars," *Dialog* 33, (Summer 1994), has used the word "fronts" to describe the many areas of conflict within the larger conflict of worship in churches.
- ² There is much confusion inherent in the terminology being used to describe musical style these days. Although Linda Clark (see Linda J. Clark, *Music in Churches: Nourishing Your Congregation's Musical Life*, New York, NY: Alban Institute, 1994) speaks of "traditional" and "popular" music I will use instead the word "contemporary" for music of an informal nature which is often led by guitar, piano, and other instruments, and the word "traditional" for music from LBW which is often led by organ and choir. These are terms our own church has used in the past and I wish to be consistent in my discussion.
- ³ Gordon Lathrop, "North American Lutheran Worship at the Close of the Century: Reflections," *Cross Accent: Journal of the Association of Lutheran Church Musicians* 6A (January 1998) 5.
- ⁴ The 1996 Augustana Worship Survey had two goals: 1) to gauge more accurately the congregation's response to the *Hymnal Supplement* (HS); and 2) to obtain information that would help us to chart a long-term course for worship. Roughly 10% of the responses were strongly negative; 42% indicated that the time of the service was the deciding factor for attending; another 23% specified that they chose the early service because of its coincidence with Sunday School; 25% cited style of worship; while the remainder said their decision was influenced by a combination of factors.
- ⁵ Daniel Zager, "It's Not about Style," *Grace Notes* (Newsletter of the Association of Lutheran Church Musicians) 14/1 (February 1998) 4.
- ⁶ Lathrop, 4.
- ⁷ Lathrop, 3.
- ⁸ Clark, 71.

⁹ Clark, 71.

¹⁰ Clark, 71.

¹¹ Lathrop, 3.