Artistic Theologian

ISSN 2324-7282
Published by the School of Church Music and Worship
at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary
P.O. Box 22390
Fort Worth, TX 76122

DESCRIPTION

Artistic Theologian (ISSN 2324-7282) is an evangelical theological journal published annually at www.ArtisticTheologian.com by the School of Church Music and Worship at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary. It focuses on issues of worship, church music, aesthetics, and culture for Christian musicians, pastors, church music students, and worship leaders.

EDITORS

ARTICLE SUBMISSIONS

Articles for the journal should be about 5,000 to 15,000 words and should be submitted to the Managing Editor. Articles follow Kate L. Turabian, *A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses, and Dissertations*, 9th ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2018) for proper stylistic format. They should be submitted electronically as an email attachment using Microsoft Word (.doc or .docx extensions) or Rich Text Format (.rtf extension). Additional style guidelines are available on our website.

BOOK REVIEW SUBMISSIONS

Book reviews for the journal should be between 700 and 900 words and should be submitted to the Managing Editor.

Artistic Theologian is indexed by Christian Periodical Index.

Table of Contents

Artistic Theologian 8 (2020): 1–3

Editorial
As We Worship, So We Believe

Scott Aniol[1]

Imagine a dense forest separating two cities. In order to engage in commerce between these cities, merchants must pass through the forest. For the earliest of these merchants, this was a very difficult task, wrought with many mistakes and casualties. Eventually, though, over time and with experience, the merchants discovered the safest, quickest route through the forest. Once they did, they began to carefully mark the path so that they would remember the best way to go. Even then, each of these early journeys required careful attention to the markers so that they would not stray from the best way. Over time, however, their regular trips along that same route began to form a much more visible path to the degree that years later merchants hardly pay attention; they doze peacefully as their horses casually follow the heavily trod road. Here now is a well-worn path cut through the wood upon which travelers mindlessly pass from one city to the other. This path may seem mundane, but in reality it is embedded with values such as desire for safety, protection from the dangers of the forest, and conviction that this is the quickest way through. The snoozing merchants do not give thought to these values any longer, but the values are there nonetheless, and whether they know it or not, their journey has been shaped by those values. Those values are, as it were, worn into the shape of the path itself.

This fictional story represents the liturgical story of the Christian faith, well illustrating the dynamic, formative nature of the relationship between religion and worship. Christian religion is like a path through the forest that was formed long ago, but along which God's people travel through life every day. Sometimes this formation occurs consciously, but most of the time the journey of

[1] Scott Aniol, PhD, is associate professor and chair of PhD worship studies at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary.

God's people has been shaped by values imbedded in their worship practices in ways Christian pilgrims rarely recognize.

Yet, I think it's safe to say that most evangelical Christians don't realize this about their worship. Worship is what we do when we gather for church on Sunday—we sing some songs and listen to a sermon that hopefully will give us some practical advice for the week. Worship for most evangelicals tends to focus on methodology: How many songs will we sing? What instrumentation will we use? In what order will we organize the service? How we worship is based on cultural conventions, preferences of the people, or tradition. What matters is what we believe and the sincerity of our hearts; how we worship is simply the authentic overflow of our hearts toward God.

However, it is important to recognize that corporate worship does something far more significant than many Christians recognize—worship forms our religion; and the reverse is equally true—religion forms our worship. It's the age-old chicken-and-egg question: which comes first? The answer depends on from which perspective we're looking. From the perspective of leaders among God's people who have given intentional considerations to these matters, religion forms worship. But for most Christians who have not thought much about it—leaders and laity alike—worship has formed their religion without them even knowing it. I am convinced that a central solution to problems we face today in evangelical Christianity is to recover a lost understanding that worship involves more than simply expressing devotion to God through songs we enjoy; rather, worship forms the very core of who we are as Christians.

This interaction between religion and worship characterizes the formation of the Christian faith throughout history, captured in the Latin phrase, *lex orandi, lex credendi*—"the law of prayer, the law of belief." This ancient concept recognized the fundamental relationship between acts of worship and belief. *Lex credendi* is another way to describe religion; *lex orandi* designates worship. The relationship between the two, as I have already mentioned, involves both reflection and formation. In other words, public worship both *reveals* belief and *forms* belief. How a community worships—its content, its liturgy, and its forms of expression—reveals the underlying religious commitments of those who plan and lead the worship.

This may not always be intentional, either. Often church leadership inherits certain ways of worshiping and employs them without ascertaining exactly what kinds of beliefs the worship practices embody, sometimes resulting in worship that does not reflect the church's stated theological convictions.

This is significant exactly because of the second half of the premise—corporate worship *forms* the beliefs of the worshipers. Public worship is not simply about authentic expression of the worshipers; rather, how a church worships week after week progressively shapes their beliefs since those worship practices were cultivated by and embody certain beliefs. This happens whether or not the worshipers consciously recognize it, and therefore if church leadership has not given consideration to how the way they worship is shaping the theology of the congregation, it is quite possible that worshipers are being formed in ways the leadership does not intend.

For these reasons, it is so important for church leaders, and indeed all Christians, to carefully identify what kinds of beliefs have shaped their various worship practices so that they will choose to worship in ways that best form their minds and hearts consistent with their theological convictions.

One of the central purposes of this journal is to explore this formative relationship between worship and religion, and each of the articles in this volume contributes to the conversation significantly. Matthew Sikes demonstrates the impact of a particular interpretation of Psalm 22:3 on contemporary worship theology and practice. Ryan J. Martin discusses how love for Christ will compel Christians to worship that is regulated by Scripture. Holly M. Farrow compares the hymns of British writer Anne Dutton to American theologian Jonathan Edwards with an eye toward the relationship between theology and doxology. David de Bruyn compares that same theologian's theology of beauty to traditional definitions, demonstrating the impact of Edwards's theology on his understanding of beauty. Finally, David J. Calvert details the formative power of one particular aspect of liturgy—the Lord's Supper.

We pray that this volume will help church leaders, educators, and musicians to recognize and evaluate the formational relationship between what they believe and how they worship.

Artistic Theologian 8 (2020): 5–22

Does God Inhabit the Praises of His People? An Examination of Psalm 22:3

Matthew Sikes[1]

"God inhabits the praises of his people." In recent years church leaders across a broad spectrum of Christianity have commonly encouraged their churches with this exhortation. This phrase is often presented as an encouragement for congregants to intensify their participation in the gathering so that they may further experience God's tangible presence. Yet, clarity must be sought in understanding the meaning of this phrase and its context in Scripture.

Further investigation into the use of this expression and its origins reveals Psalm 22:3 as the source. The King James Version renders this verse as: "But thou art holy, O thou that inhabitest the praises of Israel." Others translate it more like the NIV: "Yet you are enthroned as the Holy One; you are the one Israel praises." Just a cursory glance at these two different renderings begins to reveal some of the ambiguity in translating this text. Beyond issues of translation arise matters of exegesis and hermeneutics.

The purpose of this paper is to examine Psalm 22:3 in its canonical and historical context to give an Old Testament framework for understanding God's enthronement and presence in corporate worship and to provide implications for the practice of worship in a new covenant setting. Furthermore, my aim in writing stems from a desire to uncover a biblically faithful interpretation and application of a passage that has frequently been cited to overemphasize the responsibility of the worshiper in corporate gatherings. A survey of the works of many prominent writers of previous decades reveals the evident belief that God is present in a different way because of his people's praises.[2]

---

[1] Matthew Sikes is a Church Music and Worship PhD student at Southwestern Seminary and Pastor of Discipleship and Worship at Pray's Mill Baptist Church in Douglasville, GA.

[2] For example, Darlene Zschech, *Extravagant Worship* (Minneapolis: Bethany House, 2002), 57; Bob Sorge, *Exploring Worship: A Practical Guide to Praise and*

This study opens with a synthesis of contemporary applications of Psalm 22:3 as found mostly within the Pentecostal and Charismatic movements. I will then present an exegesis of this passage, beginning broadly with the Psalms and narrowing to verse three in its context, leading to an examination of the Old Testament concept of God's enthronement as it relates to his presence. Finally, I will provide implications for the use of Psalm 22:3 in the context of contemporary worship under the new covenant. Throughout this paper I argue that although many modern Christians have understood God's enthronement on the praises of his people as an anthropocentric idea of man's responsibility in worship, a more faithful interpretation emphasizes God's sovereign rule and reign over his covenant people as the central theme of Psalm 22:3.

Contemporary Interpretations

In her book *Extravagant Worship,* Darlene Zschech contends:

> The Word says that God *inhabits* the praises of his people (Psalm 22:3). It's amazing to think that God, in all his fullness, inhabits and dwells in *our* praises of him. . . . Our praise is irresistible to God. As soon as he hears us call his name, he is ready to answer us. That is the God we serve. Every time the praise and worship team with our musicians, singers, production teams, dancers, and actors begin to praise God, his presence comes in like a flood. Even though we live in his presence, his love is *lavished* on us in a miraculous way when we praise him.[3]

This quotation appears to reveal the common notion that Psalm 22:3 should be interpreted as a command for man's responsibility to praise *so that* God's presence will be made manifest. However, as I will argue below, this interpretation is unlikely. The pervasiveness

---

Worship (Canandaigua, NY: Self-Published, 1987), 7; David K. Blomgren, Douglas Christofell, and Dean Smith, eds., *An Anthology of Articles on Restoring Praise and Worship to the Church* (Shippensburg, PA: Destiny Image Publishers, 1989), 22; Judson Cornwall, *Let Us Praise* (Plainfield, NJ: Logos International, 1973), 24–25.

[3] Zschech, *Extravagant Worship*, 54–55.

of this viewpoint necessitates an exploration into the history of how this interpretation came into contemporary usage.

In their work *Lovin' on Jesus: A Concise History of Contemporary Worship*, Swee Hong Lim and Lester Ruth find the origins of this interpretation with the Pentecostal emphasis on "a priority for praise as the central activity of an assembled congregation." Lim and Ruth argue that this "priority for praise" emerged in the Canadian Latter Rain Revival of the mid-twentieth century and with Pentecostal preacher Reg Layzell, who pointed specifically to Psalm 22:3 as a proof-text.[4] The idea of praise as a separate, although related, activity from worship developed in the writings of prominent Pentecostal and Charismatic authors in the decades that followed. In the 1970s, author Judson Cornwall wrote about his revelation that "the path into the presence of God was praise."[5] He published a follow-up work in the 1980s in which he cited his discovery that praise and worship were in fact two distinct and progressive activities.[6] In 1987 Bob Sorge wrote in a similar vein as he discussed the priority for praise and the distinction between praise and worship,[7] and in 1994 Terry Law wrote *How to Enter the Presence of God*, which similarly highlighted this distinction.

Moreover, along the way these authors began to associate the ideas of praise and worship exclusively with music and included thanksgiving as a prerequisite to both. Likewise, in the 1980s "praise and worship" became a "technical term outlining a biblical order for a service: first thanksgiving, then praise, and then worship."[8] Reliance upon Psalm 100:4 became a critical component in developing this music-centered order of worship. Lim and Ruth state:

> By the early 1980s this step had been taken and, in an important move, was interpreted in a musical way. Thanksgiving, praise, and worship became a way of envisioning the

[4] Swee Hong Lim and Lester Ruth, *Lovin' on Jesus: A Concise History of Contemporary Worship* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2017), 111–12.

[5] Cornwall, *Let Us Praise*, 26.

[6] Judson Cornwall, *Let Us Worship* (South Plainfield, NJ: Bridge Publications, 1983).

[7] Sorge, *Exploring Worship*.

[8] Lim and Ruth, *Lovin' on Jesus*, 113.

> ordering of songs in the time of congregational singing. The emerging biblical theology had been musicalized.[9]

Praise and worship became a fully developed liturgical phenomenon, and music was the primary tool used to express the liturgical movement.

Referencing Psalm 22:3 and 100:4, Lim and Ruth contend that "together the two passages established a strong sense that God's presence could be experienced in a special way through corporate praising and that sequencing acts of worship in a certain way could facilitate the experiencing of divine presence and power."[10] This statement represents the idea that the emphasis had now been placed on man's responsibility in corporate worship to praise God and its causal relationship to the direct and tangible experience of God's presence. The musical choices made by leaders of the congregation were thought to be the primary tool for the manifestation of God's presence.

The connection that has evolved between music and the praise and worship liturgy is so pervasive that Lim and Ruth see music as becoming a new sacrament in the practice of those within the Pentecostal and Charismatic movements. In fact, the chief musician of the church was no longer referred to as the "song leader," as was prevalent in the early days of Pentecostalism, but the title had shifted to "worship leader" by the 1980s. As Barry Griffing argues, "the goal of the worship leader is to bring the congregational worshipers into a corporate awareness of God's manifest Presence."[11] Praise, worship, and music became so closely intertwined that books like *God's Presence through Music* were written to give direction on how to employ ideal tempo, key, and lyrical content for God's presence to be made manifest.[12] As Lim and Ruth argue, "a worship leader's job was to 'make God present through music.' The sacrament of musical praise had been established."[13]

---

[9] Ibid.

[10] Ibid., 124.

[11] Blomgren, Christofell, and Smith, *An Anthology of Articles on Restoring Praise and Worship to the Church*, 92.

[12] Ruth Ann Ashton, *God's Presence through Music* (Elkhart, IN: Imaginataive Art Ministries, 1993).

[13] Lim and Ruth, *Lovin' on Jesus*, 131.

Eventually, for many reasons, many of these teachings began to invade the broader world of Evangelicalism. In 1991 *Reformed Worship* magazine dedicated an entire issue to the Praise and Worship phenomenon in which influential worship scholar Robert Webber wrote an article explaining the origins of the praise and worship movement and defining some of its qualities. In this article Webber cites many of the same sources that Lim and Ruth provide. One quotation that he submits from John Chissum further elucidates the sacramentality of music that developed:

> John Chisum, Vice President of worship resources at Starsong Communications in Nashville, describes the third phase of the sequence [in the praise and worship liturgy] as an experience of "the manifest presence of God." He says this experience does not differ greatly from the liturgical experience of the presence of Christ at the Lord's table. "In this atmosphere," he claims, "the charisma, or gifts of God are released." And "just as many throughout the history of the church have experienced physical and spiritual healing while partaking of the body and blood in the elements of the table of Christ, so many today are tasting of special manifestations of the Holy Spirit in worship renewal as he inhabits, i.e. settles down, makes his home and abides, in the praises of his people."[14]

The reference to Psalm 22:3 is once again evident in this statement.

Perhaps the composition of this article and others like it by prominent mainline theologians could have contributed to some level of adaptation of the praise and worship model. In his closing lines Webber writes, "what I see in the future is a convergence of worship traditions, a convergence of the liturgical, traditional nonliturgical, and the Praise and Worship tradition. It does not seem to me to be an either/or, but a both/and." This understanding of worship is evident in many churches today.

---

[14] Robert Webber, "Enter His Courts with Praise: A New Style of Worship Is Sweeping the Church," *Reformed Worship* 20 (June 1991), accessed October 5, 2018, https://www.reformedworship.org/article/june-1991/enter-his-courts-praise-new-style-worship-sweeping-church.

Interpreting Psalm 22:3 In Context

In light of this recent interpretation, I will now attempt to uncover the meaning of Psalm 22:3 in its exegetical, historical, and canonical context. I begin by examining some general issues in interpreting the Psalms, providing an overall framework and addressing some of the literary nuances contained within the Psalms, allowing for a more detailed exegesis of Psalm 22, which will provide parameters for a more faithful interpretation of verse three.

General Overview for Interpreting the Psalms

Interpreting the Psalms, especially from a new covenant vantage point, necessitates a theological framework that recognizes the purpose of the psalms in their original context and placement within the canon. Only after establishing this framework is it possible to more fully understand their application within the new covenant. I will briefly present some pertinent concepts that clarify the interpretation of Psalm 22.

First, conservative scholars generally agree that the Psalter reached its final form after the return of the Israelites from exile;[15] yet writing of the Psalms clearly spans many centuries of the Old Testament.[16] Thus, while the historical context of the Psalms is certainly important, their theological context within the history of Israel has greater significance. Mark Futato explains the purposeful use of universal and general language within the psalter, which would have had universal meaning for the people of Israel in the context of their worship. That same use of general and universal language assists worshipers in a new covenant context because this "lack of precision in . . . understanding of the historical context of a given

[15] See, for example, Allen P. Ross, *A Commentary on the Psalms, Volume 1 (1–41)*, Kregel Exegetical Library (Grand Rapids: Kregel Academic & Professional, 2011), 50.

[16] Tremper Longman III, *How to Read the Psalms* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1988), 51–62.

psalm results in increased ease in applying the text to contemporary life."[17]

Identifying the original purpose of the Psalms raises a second issue. Sigmund Mowinckel indicates that "the title of the book of Psalms in Hebrew is *Tĕhillîm,* which means 'cultic songs of praise.' This tallies with the indications we have that songs and music of the levitical singers belonged to the solemn religious festivals as well as to daily sacrifices in the Temple."[18] Praise is a dominant theme of the Psalms; however, readers will have difficulty reading the Psalms and missing the extensive presence of lament. Longman helps to elucidate this fact by stating that "a decided shift takes place" from the beginning of the psalter to the end, generally moving from lament to praise: "In a real sense, the book of Psalms moves us from mourning to joy."[19]

Finally, having a framework for interpreting Hebrew poetry is necessary, for without this the reader will have great difficulty adequately understanding and applying the Psalms. Many of the severest interpretive errors are made because of a lack of basic understanding of Hebrew poetry. The two categories of necessary interpretation are parallelism and imagery.[20]

Interpreting Psalm 22

While initial readings of psalms do not always provide easy categorization, the tone of Psalm 22 is unmistakable, especially within its first 21 verses. In fact, the first two verses establish that this is a psalm of lament, using phrases like, "why have you forsaken me? Why are you so far from saving me? . . . you do not answer," and "I find no rest." Any Christian reading this psalm would most assuredly be reminded of the words of Christ as he is dying on the cross. However, as Ross states, this psalm must "be read first in the

---

[17] Mark David Futato, *Interpreting the Psalms: An Exegetical Handbook*, Handbooks for Old Testament Exegesis (Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 2007), 122–23.

[18] Sigmund Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, Biblical Resource Series (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 2.

[19] Longman, *How to Read the Psalms*, 45.

[20] Ibid., 95–122; Futato, *Interpreting the Psalms*, 24–25.

suffering psalmist's experience as an urgent prayer to be delivered from enemies" before it can be read in its messianic context.[21]

Upon deeper inspection, some objection may be plausible in categorizing this psalm as one of lament. Division in two parts is found at the macro level—verses 1–21 and verses 22–31. Strikingly, these two parts seem to lie in stark contrast. Verse 22 provides a decided shift in the author's tone—from agony and grief to deliverance and thanksgiving. Ross posits that a typical psalm of lament would end with a *vow to* praise; however, "where the vow of praise would normally be [one finds] the main features of a *declarative* praise psalm."[22] This psalm provides a vivid example of the aforementioned concept that the Psalms generally move from lament to praise.

The basic structure of this psalm based on Allen Ross's exegetical outline is as follows:

I. Extended Introductory Cry (vv.1–10)
   A. Cycle One (1–5)
      1. Complaint (1–2)
      2. Confidence (3–5)
   B. Cycle Two (6–10)
      1. Complaint (6–8)
      2. Confidence (9–10)
II. Lament Proper (11–18)
   A. Introductory Petition (11)
   B. Lament (12–18)
      1. Cycle One (12–15)
      2. Cycle Two (16–18)
III. Petition Proper (19–21)
IV. Declarative Praise (22 –31)

Historically, difficulty arises when determining the exact context of this psalm. The indication that this is a psalm of David could either signify a composition by David or in the style of David by a later author. While this appears to be an individual psalm of

[21] Ross, *A Commentary on the Psalms*, 1:526.
[22] Ibid., 1:528.

lament,[23] clearly the psalmist also considers his perspective as a member of the covenant community, switching between the usage of first person singular and plural pronouns. Irrespective of composition date, the text appears to indicate an awareness and intention for use in public worship that would be further confirmed by post-exilic psalter use in temple worship.[24]

More specifically, the above outline elucidates the two cycles of complaint and confidence that occur within the first ten verses. Realization of this cycle provides two greater points for the purposes of this study. First, the move from complaint to confidence is a foreshadowing of the shift that will take place in verse twenty-two. Second, and more significantly, the first section of confidence begins with the verse in question for this paper—verse three.

Putting Verse Three in Context

In many ways, verse three is one of the more difficult to translate and interpret in Psalm 22. Three primary issues arise—translating and interpreting the parallelism, the meaning of the Hebrew word *yashab* ("inhabitest," KJV), and understanding the poetic imagery being employed.

The psalmist is drawing an obvious contrast in verse three as he begins the sentence with "yet you" or "but you." VanGemeren states:

> The pronoun "you" (v 3) is emphatic and, together with the contrastive use of the connective participle, sets up the distance between God and the psalmist: "Yet you" ("But you"). One may venture to say that he feels a tension in his experience with God ("my God," three times) and in God's dealings with Israel.[25]

---

[23] John Goldingay, *Psalms, Volume 1: Psalms 1–41*, Baker Commentary on the Old Testament Wisdom and Psalms (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006), 323.

[24] For instance, verse three speaks directly of the praises of Israel and then the shift in tone that begins in verse twenty-two is almost exclusively focused on praising God in a corporate, congregational setting.

[25] Willem A. VanGemeren, *Psalms*, ed. Tremper Longman III and David E. Garland, revised ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2008), 237.

The psalmist is contrasting what he is experiencing with the reality of what he knows of God and his character. God is holy *and* enthroned on the praises of Israel. The author knows this not only as an abstract theological concept, but he knows it experientially, recalling the trust of God and subsequent deliverance by the psalmist's ancestors.[26] God's holiness and enthronement are past, present, and future realities.

The issue of interpreting the parallelism manifests itself in two remarkably different ways. The NIV translates verse three as "Yet you are enthroned as the Holy One; you are the one Israel praises," while the ESV renders it "Yet you are holy, enthroned on the praises of Israel." The reason for this variation lies with how readers are to interpret the division of the cola.

This line from the psalm is a bicolon that must be divided into two parts. There is historic debate in dividing the cola with the five Hebrew words in the verse, whether they should be broken into 2 + 3 or 3 + 2, and with which colon the Hebrew wor *yashab* belongs. The NIV follows the 3 + 2 division, and the ESV and KJV follow a 2 + 3 division. The most prominent reason for debate originates with the Septuagint translation of the passage, which, when translated into English, renders the verse, "But you, the praise of Israel, dwell in a sanctuary/among saints."[27] Goldingay provides some clarity on this issue:

> I follow the LXX and Jerome in understanding v. 3 as 3–2 rather than 2–3, which would imply, "But you are the holy one, enthroned on/inhabiting the great praise of Israel" (cf. KJV; NRSV; BDB). The idea of Yhwh's sitting enthroned in the heavens or in Zion is a familiar one (2:4; 55:19 [20]; 80:1 [2]; 99:1; 123:1; cf. 99:1–3 for the association with Yhwh's being the holy one; also Isa. 57:15). Likewise, the idea that Yhwh *is* Israel's praise is a familiar one (Deut. 10:21; Jer. 17:14), but the idea of Yhwh's being enthroned on or inhabiting Israel's praise is unparalleled, and if either of these is the psalm's point, one might have expected it to be expressed more clearly. The fact that 3–2 is the more common line divi-

[26] Goldingay, *Psalms*, 1:327.
[27] Ross, *A Commentary on the Psalms*, 1:522.

> sion supports the conclusion that LXX construes the line correctly.[28]

Goldingay believes that the best way to interpret the verse is to use the 3 + 2 division, following the Septuagint. Furthermore, his position that the Israelites and the translators of the Septuagint would have had difficulty with the concept of the LORD's dwelling in the actual praises of Israel is confirmed by Ross.[29] However, in contrast to Goldingay's translation, Ross believes the correct division is 2 + 3 and translates it as "But you are holy, you who are enthroned in the praises of Israel."[30] Yet Ross sees no inconsistency with holding the position that the concept of the LORD as dwelling in the actual praises of Israel would have been foreign to ancient Israelites. His clarification comes with a proper hermeneutic of poetic imagery, a matter addressed below.

The next two issues are related; however, I will address them separately for clarity. The Hebrew word *yashab* and its derivatives are used 1090 times in the Old Testament.[31] The word can, of course, communicate many meanings based on context, including "sit," "dwell," "inhabit," "enthrone," or even "tabernacle," and it is used of both God and men. Both translations already given, "enthroned" and "inhabits," are appropriate in the context of this passage. However, the concern for contextual interpretation remains and will be addressed below.

Finally, if the reader follows the 2 + 3 cola division, then the question of how to interpret the meaning of God's enthronement on the praises of Israel remains. First, the psalmist recognizes and calls attention to God's holiness, and this is important for the context of what follows. Again, recalling the cycle here of complaint and confidence, worshipers should recognize the LORD's holiness in opposition to the psalmist's plight. "Enthroned on the praises of Israel" is a statement that qualifies or elaborates on the reality of God's holiness. Ross sees God's holiness signifying his very essence; God is different, set apart, and completely other than anyone or anything

---

[28] Goldingay, *Psalms*, 1:327–28.

[29] Ross, *A Commentary on the Psalms*, 1:522, n.4.

[30] Ibid.

[31] R. Laird Harris, Gleason Archer, and Bruce Waltke, eds., *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*, vol. I (Chicago: Moody Press, 1980), 922.

else. This is especially true in relation to the pagan gods of the surrounding nations. "To say God is holy in the midst of a lament about unanswered prayer means that God is not indifferent or impotent like the pagan gods—he is different; he has power; and he has a history of answering prayers." Ross continues,

> In the context, then, this attribute of God's holiness is appropriate for building confidence. The rest of the verse builds on this general description for the immediate need: God is so faithful in answering prayer that his people are constantly praising him in the sanctuary. To express this the psalmist describes God as one who sits enthroned in their praises (*a metonymy of adjunct*, "praises" meaning the sanctuary where the praises are given). The praises are so numerous that God is said to sit enthroned on them. God was obviously answering prayers.[32]

Understanding this poetic device—metonymy of adjunct—is key to proper interpretation of the verse. Ross defines the metonymy of adjunct as a figure of substitution where "the writer puts the adjunct or attribute or some circumstance pertaining to the subject *for the subject itself.*"[33] Various metonymic devices are commonly found throughout the Psalms and Old Testament.[34] Similarly, the Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament, in its entry on the Hebrew word *yashab,* cites this very passage as a "metonymy *for the sanctuary where* the Lord was praised."[35]

Implications from the Exegesis of Psalm 22:3

Thus far I have shown the necessity of approaching a psalm with a proper understanding of genre, context, and purpose. I have provided a means for gaining greater clarity on how to interpret Psalm 22 as a psalm of lament, which has a drastic shift toward praise of the LORD in its final verses. Finally, I have provided two

[32] Ross, *A Commentary on the Psalms*, 1:532–33.

[33] Ibid., 1:99. Emphasis added.

[34] Ross cites many examples of OT use of metonymy, see ibid., 1:96–101.

[35] Harris, Archer, and Waltke, *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*, 1:922.

explanations for how to interpret verse three specifically. If Goldingay and translations like the NIV and LXX are correct in the way that the parallelism is divided (3 + 2), then the interpretation is clear, and no further clarification should be needed. Contrastingly, if Ross and others are correct in their position, that the division of the bicolon should be 2 + 3, then the "praises of Israel" is best understood as a representative for the LORD dwelling in the sanctuary or the temple where the praises of Israel took place. Examining the concept of God's presence through his "dwelling" and "enthronement" in the Old Testament will provide greater clarity.

God's Enthronement in the Old Testament

God's enthronement focuses on his sovereign reign and authority over his covenant people and all of creation. The theme of God's kingship is woven throughout Scripture. Nowhere is this more prevalent than in the book of Revelation, which paints a picture of the *telos* of all God's redeemed as well as all the heavenly beings worshiping around the *throne* of God. In some way, every book in the Bible is pointing to this final and ultimate enthronement of God, and the book of Psalms is no exception. Futato states that the dominant theme of the book is the kingship of God.[36]

Not only is God's enthronement a future certainty, it is also a present reality for all who are now in Christ. God's enthronement directly addresses the nature of his presence with his people, but the way that God was present with his people in the first covenant was different than the way that he is present with his people in the new covenant, just as it will be different in the eschaton. This section will explore some key ways that God's presence was made manifest in the Old Testament.

First, I must return to the Hebrew verb *yashab.* As noted earlier, this verb is commonly found in the Old Testament and used both for God and man, with obviously differing connotations depending on subject. In comparison, the Old Testament also uses the word *shākan* for God's dwelling. This word is primarily concerned with God's location, whereas *yashab* "expresses the concept of Yah-

[36] Futato, *Interpreting the Psalms*, 72.

weh's independence."[37] Furthermore, "when God is the subject of the root *yšb,* it is best to understand it as God's *enthronement* rather than his location."[38]

There is a sense of the theological reality of God's sovereign rule and reign that can be gleaned from the differences between these two words. God's enthronement is not bound to time, space, or circumstance; God chose to limit his presence to time and space only *as it was made manifest* to Israel under the old covenant. "He is free, for nothing can bind, restrict, or limit God. He may enter into time and space, but he is not bound to it. His throne is in heaven ([Psalm] 2:4), but his footstool is in Jerusalem."[39] This point further supports the argument that the "praises of Israel" is *representative* of God's presence in the temple and not an enthronement on the actual praises of Israel. God chose to dwell in a special way among his people in the Old Testament as an expression of his covenant towards them; it was not dependent upon anything that they could bring to him in worship.

Concerning the nature of God's presence in the Old Testament, James Hamilton Jr. explains, "the Old Testament teaches that God was *with* his people by dwelling *among* them in the temple rather than *in* them as under the new covenant."[40] God first chose to dwell among his people in the tabernacle of Moses before he then chose to dwell in the temple in Jerusalem. The book of Exodus provides detailed, intricate instructions for the tabernacle and how it should be constructed, all of which were meant to point to God's glory and the need for mediation between sinful man and God's holiness. God did not choose to dwell in the tabernacle and temple in a general sense, but more specifically his presence was represented by the ark of the covenant. VanGemeren argues:

> The "temple" was God's sanctuary, his palace on earth. The OT recognizes gradations of holiness; while the whole land was holy, Jerusalem was more sacred. The outer court was holy, the Holy Place was holier, and the Holy of Holies was

[37] VanGemeren, *Psalms*, 931.

[38] Ibid.

[39] Ibid.

[40] James M. Hamilton Jr., *God's Indwelling Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Old and New Testaments*, ed. E. Ray Clendenen (Nashville, TN: B&H Academic, 2006), 25.

> Yahweh's "dwelling," the *dəbîr* ("the Most Holy Place"). . . . The *dəbîr* was cubic in shape and housed the ark of the covenant, which symbolized the presence of Yahweh.[41]

The relationship between God's presence and his holiness is unambiguous.

Perhaps most significant to the detailed instructions for the construction of the tabernacle/temple and the ark of the covenant is the concept that God's dwelling place was to be an earthly representation of his heavenly one. If the temple was to be an earthly representation of the LORD's heavenly temple, then the ark of the covenant was the earthly representation of his heavenly throne. According to VanGemeren, "the symbol of God's eternal . . . and temporal rule is the ark. The Israelites had no problem conceptualizing his rule; they envisioned Yahweh as being enthroned on earth, in the temple, on the ark, and between the cherubim."[42] Therefore, an understanding of the enthronement of the LORD under the old covenant must take into account that the Israelites would have envisioned his presence as being located in the temple; and the seat upon which he was enthroned was between the cherubim on the ark of the covenant. This concept further elucidates the psalmist's connection of the holiness of God in the first colon of Psalm 22:3 with his enthronement in the second colon.

Summary

Consequently, God's presence in the Old Testament must be understood as located in a special way with the tabernacle and later the temple. This is essential in providing support for understanding the theological reality of God's sovereign rule as the emphasis for Psalm 22:3 rather than an expectation based on the worshiper's activities in the temple.

---

[41] VanGemeren, *Psalms*, 932.

[42] Ibid., 934.

Implications for Contemporary Worship Practice

Several implications can be drawn from this interpretation. First, the similarities and differences in God's presence in the old and new covenants should be recognized. Under the old covenant God's presence was made manifest *in the temple*—more specifically within the Holy of Holies and between the cherubim on the ark of the covenant. However, this localized presence changed with the advent of the new covenant and the person and work of Christ. In John 4 Jesus teaches that with his coming worship would no longer take place in Jerusalem at the temple, but rather "in spirit and truth" (John 4:24). Moreover, worship in spirit and truth is made possible through the once for all death and resurrection of Christ (Heb 10:1–18). Furthermore, John's gospel states that Christ himself is the temple of God, and Paul and Peter explain that the church has become the temple of God, both individually and corporately. As Andreas Köstenberger submits, "In Old Testament times, God dwelt among his people, first in the tabernacle (Ex. 25:8; 29:45; Lev. 26:11–12), then in the temple (Acts 7:46–47). In the New Testament era, believers themselves are the temple of the living God (1 Cor. 6:19; 2 Cor 6:16; cf. 1 Peter 2:5)."[43]

God indwells every person who is regenerate in a new covenant context. Additionally, participation in the gathered church, the covenant community, is a necessity for every believer to know the fullness of God's presence. This participation is not conditional upon a specific church's ability to offer certain kinds of praise, but it is rather a theological reality for every true church in Christ by the power of the Spirit and because of God's sovereign grace. God calls his people out of the world and their individual lives to worship him corporately in spirit and truth.

Second, considering the difference in God's manifest presence in the Old and New Testaments, affirmation must be given for the necessity of use of the Psalms in Christian worship. New covenant believers can use the Psalms with an appreciation and recognition that they have a fuller picture of God's historic plan of salvation. About the Psalms John Calvin wrote:

---

[43] Andreas J. Köstenberger, "John, " in *Zondervan Illustrated Bible Backgrounds Commentary*, vol. 2 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2007), 141.

> Here the prophets themselves, seeing they are exhibited to us as speaking to God, and laying open all their inmost thoughts and affections, call, or rather draw, each of us to the examination of himself in particular, in order that none of the many infirmities to which we are subject, and of the many vices with which we abound, may remain concealed.[44]

The Psalms form the prayers of Christians and teach them how to express the range of emotions that are appropriate for the Christian life.

Finally, the question of appropriateness and necessity for using Psalm 22:3 as a proof-text to support the statement that God inhabits the praises of his people remains. As presented above, Psalm 22 is a psalm of lament, which turns to a declaration of praise to God in its final verses. In context verse three provides an expression of confidence in the LORD's holiness and the reality that his presence is near. This statement appears to be one of theological reality. However, in the context of a contemporary worship service, "God inhabits the praises of his people" is often used as an exhortation to encourage greater levels of participation and a hermeneutic for connecting worship to individual expression. Christians must reevaluate their use of this expression and its perception and reception in the minds of congregants.

Moreover, the central purpose of the entirety of Psalm 22 must be strongly considered. Goldingay proposes one compelling possibility:

> [Psalm 22] offers a most suggestive concrete expression of a mature spirituality that is able under pressure to hold on to two contradictory sets of facts. The Psalter presents it as a model for the prayer of ordinary Israelites or Christians when they experience affliction.[45]

The first set of facts involve the believer's feelings of being overwhelmed, that these feelings may be due to persecution, and a feeling that God has abandoned them. The second set of facts, which is

---

[44] John Calvin, *Commentary on the Book of Psalms*, trans. James Anderson (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963), xxxvii.

[45] Goldingay, *Psalms*, 1:340.

to first "remind God and ourselves of God's past acts of deliverance toward the people of God," to remember God's faithfulness to his people individually, to "explicitly urge God to change" and bring deliverance, and the belief and realization that God will respond. This prayer provides a model for true confidence and trust of God in the midst of the most adverse circumstances of persecution.[46]

Furthermore, it is paramount to recognize the unforgettable connection of Psalm 22 with our Lord. The words of this psalm were spoken by the suffering Christ as he hung on the cross for the sins of his enemies. This point further impresses the reality that it is Christ alone who makes it possible for the indwelling presence of God with man.

Conclusion

Throughout this paper I have argued that God's enthronement on the praises of his people is a theological reality that emphasizes God's sovereign rule and reign over his covenant people rather than an anthropocentric concept of man's responsibility in worship. My purpose was to emphasize the theological reality that God is present with his covenant people in both the Old and New Testament by the nature of his own faithfulness to his covenant and not dependent on the work of his people.

Does God inhabit the praises of his people? The answer is yes, when understood as a metonymy of adjunct representative of the temple—the individual Christian as well as the gathered church—where he makes his dwelling. God's presence with his people is not because of the efforts that the redeemed bring or the particular songs they use to bring praises to him; and it does not correlate with the amount of physical effort that is exerted. God inhabits the praises, Scripture reading, prayers, preaching, singing and any other Scripturally ordained means of worship that they bring to him by faith as his covenant people, because he is sovereign over all and he has chosen to make his dwelling on earth with his people as a guarantee for the inheritance that awaits all who are in Christ (Eph 1:13–14).

---

[46] Goldingay, *Psalms*, 1:341.

Artistic Theologian 8 (2020): 23–46

Love for Christ and Scripture-Regulated Worship

Ryan J. Martin[1]

Two streams concerning worship diverged from the headwaters of the Protestant Reformation. For Luther, a church may worship with any element not forbidden in Scripture. This is typically called the "Normative Principle of Worship." Besides Lutherans, Anglicans and many evangelical congregations hold to the Normative Principle. Such churches would permit for extra-biblical acts such as incense, drama, or dance as part of their liturgies.

Calvin and Zwingli advocated for a second approach to the elements of sacred worship. They and their heirs have argued that Scripture alone must regulate our worship. The expression was *Quod non jubet, vetat*—what he (God) does not command, he forbids.[2] That is, it is not enough to avoid those parts of worship that the Scriptures forbid, but believers may only include in their worship those parts of worship that Scriptures command. This understanding of the relationship of Scripture and worship is often called the "Regulative Principle of Worship."

The so-called Regulative Principle can be found articulated in several Reformation confessions, including the *Westminster Confession of Faith* (1646) and *Second London Baptist Confession* (1689). Consider the latter's articulation of this belief at chapter 22.1:

> The light of nature shews that there is a God, who hath lordship and sovereignty over all; is just, good and doth good unto all; and is therefore to be feared, loved, praised, called upon, trusted in, and served, with all the heart and all the soul, and with all the might. But the acceptable way of worshipping the true God, is instituted by himself, and so limited by his own revealed will, that he may not be wor-

[1] Ryan J. Martin, PhD, is pastor of First Baptist Church in Granite Falls, MN.

[2] Horton Davies, *The Worship of the American Puritans, 1629–1730* (Morgan, PA.: Soli Deo Gloria, 1990), 17.

> shipped according to the imagination and devices of men, nor the suggestions of Satan, under any visible representations, or any other way not prescribed in the Holy Scriptures.[3]

Many authors have argued for Scripture-regulated worship.[4] In this paper, I will summarize some key reasons why Scripture-regulated worship is both right and wise. My primary contribution, however, is to show and develop the relationship between Scripture-regulated worship and the believer's love for Christ. That Scripture-regulated worship is necessitated from love for Christ is too often lacking in contemporary defenses for the Regulative Principle. This paper will both advance and explore the necessary relation between love for Christ and Scripture-regulated worship.

---

[3] William L. Lumpkin, *Baptist Confessions of Faith* (Valley Forge, PA: Judson Press, 1969), 280. The Scriptures the *Second London Confession* cited in defense of this article are Jer 10:7; Mark 12:33; Deut 12:32; and Exod 20:4–6. The Baptist statement is almost identical to the one found in the *Westminster Confession of Faith*. The differences are small. The Westminster divines had "with" before "all the soul" and "imaginations" rather than "imagination." Compare *WCF* 21.1. For a closer comparison and contrast of Baptist and Presbyterian understandings of the Regulative Principle, see Scott Aniol, "Form and Substance: Baptist Ecclesiology and the Regulative Principle," *Journal for Baptist Theology and Ministry* 15 (2018): 23–32.

[4] See, for example, Davies, *Worship of American Puritans*, 16–19; D. G. Hart and John R. Muether, *With Reverence and Awe: Returning to the Basics of Reformed Worship* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R Publishing, 2002); J. Ligon Duncan III, "Does God Care How We Worship?" and "Foundations for Biblically Directed Worship," in *Give Praise to God: A Vision for Reforming Worship: Celebrating the Legacy of James Montgomery Boice,* ed. Philip Graham Ryken, Derek W. H. Thomas, and J. Ligon Duncan III (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R Publishing, 2003), 17–73; Derek W. H. Thomas, "The Regulative Principle: Responding to Recent Criticism," in *Give Praise to God,* 74–93; Kevin T. Bauder, *Baptist Distinctives and New Testament Church Order* (Schaumburg, IL: Regular Baptist Books, 2012), 24–35; and Kevin T. Bauder, Scott Aniol, et al., *A Conservative Christian Declaration* (Religious Affections Ministries, 2014), 44–49.

Arguments for Scripture-Regulated Worship

Christians have advanced many reasons to regulate Christian worship according to Scripture. What follows is a brief sketch of these arguments.

In a Festschrift honoring James Montgomery Boice, J. Ligon Duncan III suggests several arguments for the Regulative Principle.[5] He argues from God's own nature; as God, he controls worship. Further, the Creator-creature distinction is too great a gap for men to approach God other than how God himself commands.[6] Duncan argues that God's revelation guides worship because biblical worship is a response to God's revelation. He also cites the Second Commandment, which is, properly understood, not a prohibition of false gods (see the First Commandment), but forbidding any image of the invisible covenant God who revealed himself to Israel with his covenant name Yahweh.[7]

Duncan continues. He argues that faith, which is necessary for true worship, can only respond to revelation, and "where God has not revealed himself, there can be no faithful response to his revelation."[8] Moreover, given God's utter holiness, we should be

---

[5] See "Foundations," in *Give Praise to God,* 51–73.

[6] Horton Davies states, "Thus the all-sufficiency of Scripture and the radical inadequacy of man through original sin clarified the necessity for dependence upon the creative, providing, and directing omnipotent adequacy of God the Father and Creator, Christ the Savior and Exemplar, and the Holy Spirit the Inspirer and Enabler, all revealed in Holy Writ" (*Worship of American Puritans*, 19). Hart and Muether are characteristically blunt on this point: "Calvinists believe that depravity extends beyond the reprobate, and includes even the regenerate who still bear the corruption of sin. For this reason, those who are in Christ are incompetent to devise by their imaginations, even devout ones, any sort of worship that is appropriate or pleasing to God" (*With Reverence*, 83).

[7] Hart and Muether observe, "[T]he authority of Scripture in worship is a logical consequence of the Ten Commandments. This is, in fact, the place where the Reformed confessions and catechisms derive the doctrine of the regulative principle of worship" (*With Reverence*, 78). I agree that the Second Word was at the very least the "Regulative Principle" for the nation of Israel under the Sinai Covenant. The moral principle of the Second Commandment should surely inform the church's understanding of the Regulative Principle. Yet below I show that there is a *better* foundation for arguing for the scriptural regulation of *church* worship than the Second Commandment.

[8] Duncan, "Foundations," in *Give Praise to God*, 56.

careful and conservative rather than taking liberties in our worship.[9]

Furthermore, Duncan suggests that Scripture-regulated worship protects believers' freedom to worship Christ according to their conscience and not by the whims of church leaders who impose on them invented ways of worshipping God.[10] Churches should also use God's Word to regulate worship because God often states his delight with those who keep his Word. Scripture-regulated worship can best protect saints from their own heart's perpetual race toward idolatry. Duncan raises the problem of church history; church history teaches that Christianity has been at its best when she worshipped simply, according to the Bible. Church history also teaches that worship invented by men not only violates this very command, but it is often patently blasphemous. Positively, Duncan adds that Scripture-regulated worship is "simple, biblical, transferable, flexible, and reverent."[11]

Duncan's article helpfully illustrates many of the arguments for limiting the elements of church worship services to those pre-

---

[9] Jeremiah Burroughs remarked, "In the matters of worship, God stands upon little things" (*Gospel Worship, or the Right Manner of Sanctifying the Name of God in General,* ed. Don Kistler [Morgan, PA: Soli Deo Gloria Publications, 1996], 17).

[10] Restating an argument by T. David Gordon, Hart and Muether make this point as well: "When the elders of the church call the people of God to worship, they are necessarily and unavoidably binding the conscience of worshipers (because Christians are forbidden to forsake the worship of God). This is not a problem if the church is worshiping biblically because the elders of the church are binding consciences according to the Word of God, as they are called to do" (*With Reverence,* 84).

[11] Duncan, "Foundations," in *Give Praise to God*, 69. Hart and Muether also highlight the simplicity of biblical worship: "Because of the regulative principle, simplicity has characterized Reformed worship" (*With Reverence*, 79). William Kiffin (1616–1701) wrote, "Mans Nature is very prone to be medling [*sic*] with things beyond his Commission, which has prov'd the very pest and bane of Christianity; for notwithstanding that dreadful prohibition, *Rev.* 22.18, 19. Of *adding to,* or *taking from* his word, is not *Europe* full of pernicious Additions and Subtractions in the Worship of God, which are imposed as Magisterially as if enstampt with a Divine Character, though in themselves no other than (as Christ himself calls them) the *Traditions of men: Matth.* 15. 3. It is a superlative and desperate piece of audacity for men to presume to mend any thing in the Worship of God; for it supposes the All-wise Law giver capable of Error, and the attempter wiser than his Maker" (cited in Matthew Ward, *Pure Worship: The Early English Baptist Distinctive,* Monographs in Baptist History 3 [Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2014], 121).

scribed in the New Testament. I want to focus and develop another important argument, the argument from Christ's authority. While recent discussions of Scripture-regulated worship have included Christ's authority, it has been less emphasized. Christ's authority in the church is a necessary foundation for the later discussion of love for Christ.

The Argument from Christ's Authority

The Regulative Principle cannot be understood as a mere novel approach to worship, or even as the preferred method of worship among Reformed theologians. Scripture-regulated worship is best understood as the right and consistent application to worship of a biblical understanding of the relationship of the church to Christ and the apostles.

Christ's Authority through the Apostles

The case for NT authority begins with the authority of Christ. Christ alone has authority over the Church. The "Great Commission" of Matthew 28:18–20 is one classic passage teaching Christ's authority. Jesus begins that passage, "All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me." Jesus is speaking to his followers, the soon to be church, before his ascension, and God the Father has given to Christ authority over all creation. Christ's body, the church, ought to recognize that authority.[12] As Paul says in Ephesians 2:20, Jesus Christ is the Church's *cornerstone.* In Luke 9:35, the Father says of his son, "This is my Son, my Chosen one; listen to him." Jesus Christ is Lord of the Church, and thus churches are to

[12] J. Ligon Duncan III similarly argues for Scripture-regulated worship from the "Church's Derivative Authority": "The Bible's teaching on the derivative nature of the church's authority limits its discretionary powers in worship and enjoins its observance of the regulative principle" ("Foundations," in *Give Praise to God*, 57). Likewise, Hart and Muether argue, "There is no other authority for the church—including her worship—beside the teaching of Christ, who in his office as prophet reveals God's will for our salvation by his Word and his Spirit" (*With Reverence*, 82). Also see Bauder, *Baptist Distinctives,* 28–32.

obey Christ when he tells them how to live, what to believe, what a church is, and what a church is to do.

Yet relatively few individuals in history ever saw Jesus or heard him speak. So how does Christ exercise his authority in his church? The Great Commission answers this question. Christ gave his authority to the apostles, represented by *the eleven disciples* (Matt 28:16). After claiming authority for himself, Christ said to his disciples, "Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you." Jesus commands his disciples to take his authority to all nations, and they do this by proclamation of the gospel and bringing men to confess Christ is Lord—they *make disciples* and *baptize*. Then they teach Christ's commands to his followers. Christ's commands certainly apply to daily conduct, but they also inform the practice of Christ's gatherings (cf. Matt 16 & 18). Christ wants his disciples to obey *all* his commands. While every believer must obey the Great Commission, the original context is significant. Christ gives to *the eleven* this sober responsibility of handing down his commands that they received directly from him. They are the "*Quelle*" (source) of Christ's authority.

This leads to an important conclusion: Jesus Christ sent delegates (apostles) to teach his churches his will for them as churches. This is not only taught in the Great Commission, but in Ephesians 2:18–22 as well:

> 18 For through him we both have access in one Spirit to the Father. 19 So then you are no longer strangers and aliens, but you are fellow citizens with the saints and members of the household of God, 20 built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the cornerstone, 21 in whom the whole structure, being joined together, grows into a holy temple in the Lord. 22 In him you also are being built together into a dwelling place for God by the Spirit. (ESV)

God has brought Jews and Gentiles (*both* in v 18) into one new body, the *household of God*. Those who believe in Christ are adopted in Christ as sons and have been given full standing in God's family

as his children. The church is God's household.

Of greatest interest is vv 20–21: "built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the cornerstone." Paul says the church is built upon two things: a foundation and a chief cornerstone. A foundation is the base or ground of a building; foundations give buildings form and stability. The foundation for the church is *the apostles and prophets*. The prophets are clearly New Testament prophets (see Eph 3:5; 4:11; 1 Cor 14:5, 6, 24–25, 29–31), and Paul means *apostle* in the technical sense here.[13] Apostles are of a higher rank and more significant than prophets, something we can deduce simply in the order they are named (cf. Eph 4:11ff).

In what sense is the church *built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets*? First, consider the nature of the ministry of these offices. In both cases, apostles and prophets were given a *revelatory* ministry. They speak God's Word.[14] In Galatians 1:11, Paul says, "the gospel that was preached by me is not man's gospel" (cf. 1 Thess 2:13–14). Both apostles and prophets had the extraordinary

---

[13] Apostles (in the technical sense) are those who (1) were witnesses to the risen Lord Jesus (Acts 1:21–26; 9:40–41; 1 Cor 9:1); (2) were called by God and Christ (1 Cor 1:1); (3) proclaimed God's revealed Word (1 Cor 2:7; Gal 1:11; 1 Cor 11:23; 15:3); and (4) performed great signs and wonders (Acts 4:29–30; 2 Cor 12:12). They included the twelve less Judas, Matthias his replacement, Paul, and possibly Barnabas (Acts 14:4, 14). Compare I. Howard Marshall: "Apostleship is associated with founding churches and conveys authority over them in terms of imposing discipline and also in terms of receiving and transmitting authoritative revelation, so that apostles, along with prophets, form the foundation of the church (Eph. 2:20; cf. 1 Cor. 12:28–29; 2 Pet. 3:2)" (S.v. "Apostle," *New Dictionary of Theology,* ed. Sinclair B. Ferguson and J.I. Packer [Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2000], 40).

[14] As Calvin explained it: "*Foundation* unquestionably here refers to doctrine; for he does not mention patriarchs or godly kings, but only those who held the teaching office, and whom God had appointed to build his church" (*The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians and Colossians,* trans. T. H. L. Parker, ed. David W. Torrance and Thomas F. Torrance [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965], 154). Jonathan Edwards observed, "The apostles had something above what belonged to their ordinary character as ministers: they had extraordinary power of teaching and ruling that extended to all the churches, and not only all churches that then were but all that should be to the end of the world, by their ministry. And so the apostles were, as it were, in subordination to Christ, made foundations of the Christian church" (*A History of the Work of Redemption,* vol. 9 of *The Works of Jonathan Edwards,* ed. John F. Wilson [New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989], 364).

spiritual gift of receiving and proclaiming God's revelation. This stewardship of receiving special revelation was essential to these two offices. So apostles and prophets serve as a foundation for churches in Ephesians 2:20 through their God-given role to speak Christ's revealed word to his churches.

We see a testimony to this important role in the apostles' own statements, in passages like 1 Corinthians 11:23 and 15:3. Consider the first of these: "for I received from the Lord what I also delivered to you." Paul's ministry in Corinth included a transmission of authoritative teaching. Before the canon was complete, those whom Christ called to fill these two offices authoritatively spoke God's revealed Word to churches. Christ later preserved that foundation through the inspiration of the Spirit in the New Testament canon (more on that below).

How is this revelatory ministry foundational? The apostles and prophets spoke authoritatively on Christ's behalf what Christ wanted churches to believe (doctrine) and to do (practice). The Lord wanted to leave his churches a specific testimony as to faith and conduct. Jesus did not want his followers to dream up their own understanding of God and Christ and salvation and church life. So he taught the apostles during his earthly ministry and, after his ascension, revealed to them and the prophets his Word. This foundation is the divine form and gracious stability for all Christ's churches.

This is related to how Christ is the chief cornerstone in Ephesians 2:20. The cornerstone was the greatest stone set for buildings, providing support and a reference point for all other stones. Cornerstones came to symbolize stability and prominence. So any stability given to churches through the foundation of the apostles and prophets itself rests upon the cornerstone, Jesus Christ.[15] For Paul, the point that Christ is the cornerstone means that his doctrines are the message proclaimed by the apostles and prophets, that through that message Christ gives his church stability, and that Christ receives the glory in his church.

To summarize, Paul teaches that the foundation of the church in what it believes and practices comes from the authorita-

[15] To call Christ the cornerstone was not a mere analogy, but one that testified to the prophetic significance of our Lord as the Christ in Isaiah 28:16 and Psalm 118:22.

tive revelatory ministry of the apostles and prophets, Christ himself being the substance and stability of that foundation.[16] This foundation (like all foundations) was laid once and only once; it does not keep growing or building. Thus the foundational ministry of these men does not continue through some kind of apostolic succession or revelatory magisterium of the Church.[17]

In fact, Jesus told the apostles that they would have such a revelatory ministry. In the hours before he died, Christ told his disciples that the coming Holy Spirit would bring his words "to your

---

[16] Gregg Allison states, "Positively, evangelical theology understands apostolicity to refer to the church's focus on preaching, hearing, believing, and obeying the teaching of the apostles, written down in the canonical New Testament writings. Promised the guidance of the Holy Spirit for this very task, the apostles' memory were aided by the Spirit as they wrote, rendering them and their writings bona fide witnesses of Jesus Christ (John 14:26). Importantly, the apostle Peter himself underscores the manner in which he sought to ensure that the teachings that he had received from Christ would be transmitted to the church after his death ('departure'). . . . (2 Peter 1:12–15). . . . If he, the chief apostle, considered Scripture to be the sure, divine instruction for the church in the post-apostolic era, it is hard to see how apostolic succession could add to this already-certain foundation. Accordingly, evangelical theology embraces apostolicity as the logocentricity, or Word-centeredness, of the church that is focused on the writings of the apostles" (*Roman Catholic Theology & Practice: An Evangelical Assessment* [Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2014], 183–84).

[17] It also means that, since the extraordinary gifts (like tongues and healings; 1 Cor 12:27–31) of the early church are explicitly associated with the revelatory ministry of the apostles and prophets (2 Cor 12:12; Heb 2:1–4), those extraordinary gifts themselves ceased when the apostles passed off the scene. B. B. Warfield observed that the only non-apostolic miracles recorded in Acts were performed by those upon whom the apostles had laid hands (*Counterfeit Miracles* [Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth Trust, 1995], 21–25). He adds, "It is of equal importance to us, to teach us the source of the gifts of power, in the Apostles, apart from whom they were not conferred: as also their function, to authenticate the Apostles as the authoritative founders of the church." He cites a Bishop Kaye who held that only those who had hands laid on them by apostles ever enjoyed miraculous gifts. Another cessationist Richard Gaffin, Jr. does not believe that only those who had received the apostolic lying on of hands performed miracles in the early church, but he does note that "On balance, the overall picture seems to be that the apostolate is the immediate nucleus or source in the church of the gifts given by the exalted Christ in this period" (*Perspectives on Pentecost: New Testament Teaching on the Gifts of the Holy Spirit* [Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 1979], 101). Gaffin's insights were crucial to the forming of my own position on extraordinary gifts, and I owe him much thanks. Also see O. Palmer Robertson, *The Final Word: A Biblical Response to the Case for Tongues & Prophecy Today* (Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth Trust, 1993).

remembrance" (John 14:26). The Spirit, he later added, would lead them into his truth. John 16:13–15: "When the Spirit of truth comes, he will guide you into all the truth, for he will not speak on his own authority, but whatever he hears he will speak, and he will declare to you the things that are to come. He will glorify me, for he will take what is mine and declare it to you. All that the Father has is mine; therefore I said that he will take what is mine and declare it to you." Christ's words are exclusively for the apostles. He indicates that they will have a preeminent gift through the Holy Spirit to remember and receive the doctrines of Christ as special revelation from God the Father. As people receive and believe their doctrine, they in turn are led into Christ's truth, but to receive *all the truth* in this manner is only for New Testament apostles.

As Christ's official delegates, apostles and prophets serve as the foundation of the church in this revelatory ministry. They guide the church's faith and practice. This is especially true of the apostles, who were regarded as the *primary* office for transmitting Christ's teachings. The New Testament's record of primitive church history, especially in the book of Acts, shows the apostles preaching the gospel and setting up leaders in the churches, but any establishment of a line of apostolic authority from one generation to another is altogether absent.[18] In fact, by the late stages of the apostolic era, the apostolic foundation is recognized as a solidified body of teaching (Col 1:6–7, 25–26; 2:7). Paul calls this teaching "the good deposit" in 1 Tim 6:20 and tells Timothy to guard it. Jude calls it "the faith once for all delivered for the saints" (Jude 3).[19]

---

[18] Allison, *Roman Catholic Theology*, 181. John Wesley put the matter simply: "the *uninterrupted succession* I know to be a fable, which no man ever did or can prove" (cited in I. Howard Marshall, "Apostle," *New Dictionary of Theology,* 40).

[19] We find other allusions to the doctrine that apostles are the foundation of the church elsewhere. The foundation of the New Jerusalem in Revelation 21:15 are "the twelve apostles of the Lamb." In 1 Corinthians 12:28, Paul lists the different spiritual gifts the Spirit has given the church. Interestingly, he ranks them. What two spiritual gifts are first and second? "And God has appointed in the church first apostles, second prophets, third teachers, then miracles." The same pattern is in v 29. F. F. Bruce also ties 1 Corinthians 12 to Ephesians 2:20 (*The Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians,* NICNT [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984], 304).

Christ's Authority through the New Testament writings

This leads to further implication. The inspired writings of these men serve today as the foundation of Christ's churches. This fairly straight-forward implication of the above is worth stating explicitly. Paul himself draws a direct parallel between the ministry of the Old Testament Scriptures and New Testament apostles and prophets in Ephesians 3:4–5: "When you read this, you can perceive my insight into the mystery of Christ, which was not made known to the sons of men in other generations as it has now been revealed to his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit." In context, the mystery that Paul refers to is that Gentiles who believe the gospel are members of Christ's church in full standing with Jewish believers. Yet he references the Ephesians *reading* his letter (cf. v 3), as he alludes to the *revealed* message in the holy writings of the *sons of men in other generations.* Consider another example: shortly before his death, the Apostle Peter himself *wrote* to the churches. He tells them why: it is so that, when he has departed his *tent*, or died, they would *recall* the *truth* (2 Pet 1:12, 15). His writings were the way his apostolic message was to be passed down.[20]

The apostles expected churches to submit with universal obedience to their teachings, whether oral or written, as the Word of God and commandments of Christ (2 Thess 2:15). Paul says in 1 Thessalonians 2:13, "And we also thank God constantly for this, that when you received the word of God, which you heard from us, you accepted it not as the word of men but as what it really is, the word of God, which is at work in you believers. "Paul regarded his teaching to be God's Word. In 1 Corinthians 14:37–38, Paul is much more severe with the Corinthian leaders who were allowing the women to teach in the churches: "If anyone thinks that he is a prophet, or spiritual, he should acknowledge that the things I am writing to you are a command of the Lord. If anyone does not recognize this, he is

[20] See Allison, *Roman Catholic Theology*, 183–84. Paul indicates the importance of apostolic writings in his letter to the Colossians, a church that had never seen him face to face. He wrote that letter to exercise Christ's authority over the church (see Col 1:1), one fruit of his *sufferings for* their *sake* (Col 1:24; cf. 2:1, 5). Paul regarded the fact of his personal face-to-face ministry inconsequential to the question of his apostolic authority over churches.

not recognized." A Christian church's legitimacy is in part in its submission to the authority of Christ handed down to us in the teachings of his apostles.

New Testament Authority for Christian Churches

These truths lead to an important conclusion: The church must submit to the whole inspired Word of God, but it is the New Testament that governs the church's faith and practice.[21] Given the foundational role that Christ gave the apostles for the church in their teaching ministry and, given the New Testament is the inspired record of that teaching, it is the New Testament in particular that governs the church.

In Ephesians 2:19–22, Paul says that the apostles and prophets are the foundation of the *church*. He is explicitly speaking of Christ's church (not that there is any other).[22] The church as a unique new entity, and not the nation of Israel, is clearly in view. The church is a New Testament institution (see Eph 2:15). Even those who see more continuity between Israel and the church should concede that, even if the church began before Pentecost, the ministry of Jesus Christ has dramatically altered the organization and operation of the church (see, for example, Col 2:17). The church's nature, mission, and order are divinely revealed in the New Testament. Consider the distinction laid out in the opening verses of Hebrews 1: "Long ago . . . God spoke to our fathers by the

[21] This is an admittedly distinctively Baptist teaching. In his influential *New Directory for Baptist Churches*, the American Baptist Edward Hiscox wrote, "The New Testament is the constitution of Christianity, the charter of the Christian Church, the only authoritative code of ecclesiastical law, and the warrant and justification of all Christian institutions" (Edward T. Hiscox, *New Directory for Baptist Churches* [Philadelphia: Judson Press, 1894]; repr. *Principles and Practices for Baptist Churches* [Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1980], 11). Also see Ward, *Pure Worship*, 110–18.

[22] Paul refers to the church with those two metaphors in Ephesians 2:19: "fellow citizens with the saints and members of the household of God." In v 16, Paul speaks of what Christ has done for Gentiles and Jews: that Christ "might reconcile us both to God in one body through the cross, thereby killing the hostility." This *one body* also refers to the church.

prophets, but in these last days he has spoken to us by his Son."[23] Put another way, the church is built upon the apostles and prophets, with Christ Jesus being the chief cornerstone.[24]

A note of caution: the principle of universal obedience does not apply to everything we read in the New Testament. Some matters addressed there clearly pertain only to the given congregation or individuals addressed for that time period. Several generations ago, the American Baptist preacher William Williams put it helpfully:

> Whatever can be clearly shown from Scripture, either by precept or example, to have been instituted by the apostles, *and which cannot be shown to have had its origin in the temporary and peculiar circumstance of their time,* is binding on us and for all time. Whatever can be shown to have had its origin in the peculiarities of that time, is not binding, the same peculiarities no longer existing. Upon this principle, deaconesses, a plurality of elders, and the 'holy kiss,' are omitted now.[25]

Do not be distracted by the particulars of Williams's list; his princi-

---

[23] As Kevin Bauder has observed, "Only the New Testament tells us what the church is. Only the New Testament tells us what the church is supposed to be" (*Baptist Distinctives,* 20–21).

[24] This does not in any way mean that we reject the teaching of the Old Testament inspired by the Holy Spirit. I cannot stress this enough. On the contrary, we affirm the testimony of Paul: "All Scripture is breathed out by God and profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for training in righteousness, that the man of God may be complete, equipped for every good work" (2 Tim 3:16–17). The Old Testament teaches us who God is, who we are, who Christ is, the centrality of God's glory, the exactness of God's wrath, the richness of God's grace, the character of a life of faith, the future glory of Christ and his people, and even the shape of right and wrong. Its teaching is absolutely authoritative as God's Word. But when we want to know who we are and what we are to do, Baptists have gone to the New Testament. For examples from history to show that Baptists have held this, see Bauder, *Baptist Distinctives,* 20–24. Bauder cites not only the non-Baptist Ulrich Zwingli, but J. M. Carroll, Francis Wayland, W. H. H. Marsh, and B. H. Carroll.

[25] *Apostolic Church Polity* (1874), in *Polity: Biblical Arguments on How to Conduct Church Life: A Collection of Historic Baptist Documents,* ed. Mark E. Dever (Sheridan Books, 2001), 537. Also see John Owen, *A Brief Instruction in the Worship of God and Discipline of the Churches of the New Testament,* in *The Works of John Owen,* ed. William H. Goold (East Peoria, IL: Banner of Truth, 2009), 15:465–67.

ple still stands. Today's deacons probably do not focus on delivering food to Greek-speaking Jewish widows, as in Acts 6. When believers read a permanent mandate from the apostles, they must obey. Churches should look for two things: evidence of the practice and a clear command from the apostles. Yet when we find first-century circumstances, the underlying principles often apply indirectly to contemporary ecclesial communities. Saints may not greet with a holy kiss today, but Christian assemblies must have warm affection. The bottom line is that churches must obey the apostles. Today, this means obeying the commands of the New Testament.

New Testament Authority and Scripture-Regulated Worship

What does the New Testament govern in a local church? The apostles' teaching governs local churches' doctrine and practice. The church's practice includes its moral conduct and spiritual obedience to Christ in believers' daily lives. A church's practice also includes her worship. In other words, if churches are to be built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets with Christ himself as our chief cornerstone, they must also conform their worship to the apostles' teachings in the New Testament. As John Owen observed, "The worship of God is of that nature that whatsoever is performed in it is an act of religious obedience."[26]

Most Christians (especially those in Protestant denominations) already acknowledge this, at least to some degree.[27] They agree that churches must conform to what the Scriptures teach concerning aspects of worship like baptism and the Lord's Table. Yet I would suggest that if an assembly would be a New Testament church, it must submit to the New Testament in *all* matters of its worship, not simply in the baptistery and at the Table. If one be-

[26] John Owen, *A Discourse Concerning Liturgies,* in *The Works of John Owen,* 15:43.

[27] The number of Baptists abandoning Scripture-regulated worship is especially lamentable. Baptists believe that the NT alone governs the mode and recipients of baptism. Likewise, New Testament governs how Baptists practice the Supper. Yet, more recently, many Baptists have denied the conviction that they must conform *all* their worship to the New Testament.

lieves that the Scriptures are *sufficient,* this is a necessary consequence. The Bible in God's providence was given to address everything that a church needs for faith and practice and worship.[28]

Paul warns churches not to depart from Christ in their worship. In Colossians 2:16 he insists, "Therefore let no one pass judgment on you in questions of food and drink, or with regard to a festival or a new moon or a Sabbath. These are a shadow of the things to come, but the substance belongs to Christ." The "Colossian Heresy" was clearly influenced by Judaism, probably mixed with some kind of proto-gnosticism.[29] Importantly, Paul regards all human inventions in worship to be contrary to Christ. Those who add *asceticism* or *the worship of angels* likewise undermine the authority of Jesus Christ, "the Head, from whom the whole body, nourished and knit together through its joints and ligaments, grows with a growth that is from God" (v 19). Paul recoils against the heretics who were trying to bind Christians with slogans like, "Do not taste, Do not handle, Do not touch." His response is most telling: he calls such "human precepts and teachings." Then he adds in v 23: "These have indeed an appearance of wisdom in promoting self-made religion and asceticism and severity to the body, but they are of no value in stopping the indulgence of the flesh." The first thing these things *promote* is *will worship* or *self-made religion,* which Paul clearly rejects. The indictment is stunning. When people introduce their own ideas into the Christian faith, they invent their own religion, which is tan-

[28] Commenting on Hebrews 8:5, John Gill puts it this way: "[W]hatever is done in a way of religious worship, should be according to a divine rule; a church of Christ ought to be formed according to the primitive pattern, and should consist, not of all that are born in a nation, province, or parish; nor should all that are born of believing parents be admitted into it; no unholy, unbelieving, and unconverted persons, only such as are true believers in Christ, and who are baptized according as the word of God directs; the officers of a church should be only of two sorts, bishops, elders, pastors or overseers, and deacons; the ordinances are baptism, which should only be administered to believers, and by immersion, and the Lord's supper, of which none should partake, but those who have tasted that the Lord is gracious; and this should be performed as Christ performed it, and as the Apostle Paul received it from him; the discipline of Christ's house should be regarded, and all the laws of it carefully and punctually in execution; and a conversation becoming the Gospel should be attended to" (*Exposition of the Whole Bible.* Compare Kevin Bauder, *Baptist Distinctives,* 24–28).

[29] See F. F. Bruce, *Epistles,* 17–26.

tamount to idolatry.[30] This teaching of Paul is the basis for the Regulative Principle of Worship.[31]

Saints are not left to their own ideas about worship. They have a clear idea from the New Testament what elements of worship are to be present in their worship services, for Christ and his apostles command believers to include several worship practices in their gatherings.[32] Both precept and example mandate that the proc-

---

[30] See G. K. Beale, *Colossians and Philemon,* BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2019), 249–50. John Calvin says of this term, "ἐθελοθρησκίᾳ literally denotes a voluntary worship which men choose of their own will, without a command from God. Human traditions, therefore, please us because they accord with our own mind, for anyone will find in his own brain the first outlines (*idea*) of them" (*Epistles,* 343). Also see his remarks on Ephesians 2:20 (*Epistles*, 154). Also Bauder: "This passage contains two enduring lessons. The first is that Christians do not have the freedom to make up moral rules for other Christians. If a requirement is not revealed in or cannot be soundly inferred from the Word of God, then it cannot be a matter of binding authority. The second is that Christians do not have freedom to make up their own doctrines, order, or worship. If a doctrine or practice is not revealed in or cannot be soundly inferred from the Word of God, it must not be introduced as an aspect of the Christian faith" (*Baptist Distinctives*, 31).

[31] Baptists have historically embraced the Regulative Principle. The *Second London Baptist Confession* affirmed, "The light of nature shews that there is a God, who hath Lordship, and Sovereignty over all; is just, good, and doth good unto all; and is therefore to be feared, loved, praised, called upon, trusted in, and served with all the Heart, and all the Soul, and with all the Might. But the acceptable way of Worshipping the the [*sic*] true God, is instituted by himself; and so limited by his own revealed will, that he may not be worshipped according to the imaginations and devices of Men, or the suggestions of Satan, under any visible representations, or any other way, not prescribed in Holy Scriptures" (22.1). Likewise, the General Baptist *Orthodox Creed* confessed, "The light of nature sheweth there is a God, who hath sovereignty over all, but the Holy Scripture hath fully revealed it; as also that all men should worship him according to God's own institution and appointment. And hath limited us, by his own revealed will, that he may not be worshipped according to the imaginations and devices of men, or the suggestions of Satan, under any visible representations whatsoever, or any other way not prescribed in the holy scriptures" (40). In recent years, many have forgotten this doctrine, but it is historically Baptist. In fact, the logic of Baptist churches is really built upon a consistent adherence to the Regulative Principle. For more, see Ward, *Pure Worship.* Ward argues "that everything we find distinctive about [early English Baptists], including their hermeneutic, their ecclesiology, and their soteriology, was driven by their fundamental desire to worship God purely" (xii). According to Ward, Scripture-regulated worship is *the* distinctive of early English Baptists.

[32] See Bauder, Aniol, et. al., *A Conservative Christian Declaration*, 44–49.

lamation of God's Word is to be present as Christians gather.[33] Paul tells Timothy to "preach the Word" (2 Tim 4:2). The church is to read the Scriptures publicly in their assembly.[34] Likewise, Christian churches are commanded to pray and sing. Paul tells the Ephesian church that they ought to be "addressing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody to the Lord with your heart." Then again he tells them to be "praying at all times in the Spirit, with all prayer and supplication. To that end, keep alert with all perseverance, making supplication for all the saints."[35] Apostolic churches also regularly practiced giving, as is plain in Philippians 4:18 and 1 Corinthians 16:1–4. Paul tells saints in 1 Corinthians 11 to observe the Lord's Supper, and Jesus commands his followers in Matthew 28:19 to baptize. To these elements, Christian churches have no authority to add ways of worshipping God. To do so would be to depart from the foundation of the apostles and prophets. Worship that is not regulated by Scripture is tantamount to teaching as doctrines the commandments of men, something Christ denounced in Matthew 15:7–9. In that passage Christ calls invented worship vain or pointless. Inventing some new way of worshipping is not so different from requiring Christians to believe some new doctrine that humans have invented.

In sum, the Christian religion is subservient to Christ's authority. Christ gave that authority to his apostles and prophets, and he sealed that authority in the New Testament, which the apostles regarded to be both authoritative and inspired. This body of teaching is sufficient for the faith and practice of Christians today. If persons claim to follow Christ, they must not only conform their beliefs to Scripture and their personal lives to God's Word, but the practice and worship of their churches must also conform to the New Testament.

---

[33] The New Testament commands churches to preach and teach in passages such as Matt 28:20; 1 Pet 4:11; Acts 6:2; 14:7, 21–22; 15:35; 18:24; 1 Cor 1:17; etc.

[34] 1 Tim 4:13; Col 4:16.

[35] The New Testament commands churches to pray and sing in passages such as Eph 6:18; cf. Acts 2:42; Col 3:16; also see Acts 1:14, 24; 3:1; 4:31; 6:4; 12:5; 13:3; 16:25; 20:36; etc.; 1 Cor 11:4–5; 14:15–16; Phil 4:6; Col 4:2; 1 Thess 5:17; James 5:13; Eph 5:17–20; James 5:13; cf. 1 Cor 14:26.

Love for Christ, Christ's Authority, and New Testament Authority

The idea of Christ's authority can be developed in other ways. More than being about the so-called "worship wars," Scripture-regulated worship is really about the believer's love for Christ. All people are obligated to submit to Christ's authority (Phil 2:9–10; Col 1:18; Rev 5:12–13). To disobey the New Testament is to disobey Christ himself (1 Cor 11:1). If one confesses that Jesus Christ is Lord (Acts 2:36; Rom 10:9; 1 Cor 1:2; Phil 2:10), that person is obligated to obey him. When people believe the gospel, they receive Christ Jesus *the Lord* (Col 2:6).[36]

The force of this must rest upon the consciences of church pastors and workers and even theologians. Christ is Lord of all. He is the head of the body (Col 1:18), and the church's faith, polity, and worship are all received from Christ himself. Every Christian's obedience is not merely a matter of submission to a supreme authority; the believer's obedience is a matter of authority mixed with love. Jesus said in John 14:15, "If you love me, you will keep my commandments" (cf. Exod 20:6). A believer's submission springs, not as a prisoner toward a violent guard, but out of love for the Lamb once slain.

This is why believers want the New Testament to govern their churches. Though they have not seen the Lord Jesus Christ, they *love him*. They "believe in him and rejoice with joy that is unspeakable and filled with glory" (1 Pet 1:8–9). The saints' desire to obey the Scriptures flows out of love for the Savior.

True religion is very much a religion of love or affection for Christ. Jonathan Edwards observed, "That religion which God requires, and will accept, does not consist in weak, dull and lifeless wouldings, raising us but a little above a state of indifference: God, in his Word, greatly insists upon it, that we be in good earnest, fer-

[36] As John Davenant remarked on Colossian 2:6, "The Colossians, and so all true Christians, received *Christ the Lord*, both of their faith and their life: nor will they suffer rules of faith and Christian life to be imposed upon them by any one else. . . . He is a Christian in vain, nay, to his great loss, who resolves not to direct both his faith and his life by the rule of Christ" (*An Exposition of the Epistle of St. Paul to the Colossians,* trans. Josiah Allport [London: Hamilton, Adams, and Co., 1831], 1:379–80).

vent in spirit, and our hearts vigorously engaged in religion."[37] Believers, according to Paul, are those *who love our Lord Jesus Christ with love incorruptible* (Eph 6:24).

The reasons to love Christ are innumerable. The Son of God himself is the reason why the Son of God is to be loved.[38] John taught us, "We love him because he first loved us" (1 Jn 4:19). Looking at Revelation 5 alone, Christ is due our love, for he is the "Lion of the tribe of Judah" (v 5), the "Root of Jesse" (v 5), the "Lamb who was slain" (v 12), the one who opens the seals of divine judgment (v 5), the object of angelic worship (v 8, 11), the one who has "ransomed people" from the entire globe "for God by his blood" (v 9), and the one who has made those who believe in him "a kingdom, priests to our God," giving them a right to "reign on the earth" (v 10).[39]

American Baptist John Leadley Dagg wrote a book on church practice called the *Manual of Theology*, in which he connects a church's obedience to God's Word and their love for Christ*:* "To love God with all the heart is the sum of all duty. . . . Love to God produces obedience; for it impossible to love God supremely without a supreme desire to please him in all things. Hence this one principle contains, involved in it, perfect obedience to every divine requirement."[40] Again: "The true spirit of obedience is willing to

---

[37] Jonathan Edwards, *Religious Affections*, vol. 2 of *The Works of Jonathan Edwards,* ed. John E. Smith (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1959), 99. For more on Edwards and the affections, see Ryan J. Martin, *Understanding Affections in the Theology of Jonathan Edwards* (New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2018).

[38] As Bernard of Clairvaux beautifully expressed it: "You wish me to tell you why and how God should be loved. My answer is that God himself is the reason why he is to be loved. As for how he is to be loved, there is to be no limit to that love" ("On Loving God," trans. Robert Walton in *Treatises II,* vol. 5 of *The Works of Bernard of Clairvaux,* Cistercian Fathers Series 13 [Washington, DC: Cistercian Publications, 1974], 93).

[39] For an exceptional, brief treatment of Christ's glory, see Edwards's sermon, *The Excellency of Christ* (Boston: Thomas Dicey, 1780). In his preface to a 1780 edition of Edwards's sermon, John Ryland observed that "The Excellence of Christ . . . is the first grand truth of divine revelation in point of dignity, beauty, and usefulness; and therefore it demands and deserves the utmost regard and affection from every true Christian on earth" (Ibid., 3).

[40] John Leadley Dagg, *Manual of Theology, Second Part: A Treatise on Church Order* (Harrisonburg, VA: Gano Books, 1990), 9.

receive the slightest intimations of the divine will."[41] Love for Jesus Christ, our dying Savior and risen Head, is the fertile ground out of which the fruits of good church doctrine, practice, and worship springs.

We insist on Scripture-regulated worship because we dearly love our Lord Jesus Christ. Worship is not only the vehicle whereby we express our love for Christ (more on that below), but that love also controls our worship.

The Regulative Principle of Worship is not, consequently, a matter of turning the Bible into a lawbook. The *reasons* for New Testament authority show its significance. To disobey the New Testament is to disobey Christ himself. To add to or alter the New Testament is to modify Christ's instruction, for there is no gap between Christ's teaching and the apostles' teaching for the churches.

Love for Christ and Loving What He Loves

Love for Christ leads to Scripture-regulated worship another way. To review: if Christ's authority regulates church practice, and if that authority is mediated through the apostles and prophets, now finished in the canon of the New Testament, then believers should only worship with those elements Christ has given them.

Moreover, if believers love Christ, they not only willingly submit to his authority, but in that submission they learn to love what he has prescribed for them. As John tells us in 1 John 5:3, Christ's "commandments are not burdensome." Unglorified humanity, however, *does* find God's commandments burdensome. Natural human beings have evaluated New Testament worship and found it wanting, either technologically, visually, or in relevancy. Our love for Christ, however, should teach us to love what he loves. If Christ loves (or wills) a certain kind of worship, his authority should draw believers' love away from their own preferences and interests.

What folks love is very often taught to them by others. This principle is powerfully at work in popular culture. A social dynamic influences what people love. People are easily swayed by trends.

[41] Ibid., 11.

One respected art critic can spoil one's love for this or that composer or painter. When Christ gave his church the elements of worship, he as it were said to her, "These are the ways of worshipping that I delight in, that I find beautiful." In fact, Holy Scripture compares prayer to the sweet aroma of *incense* (Rev 8:3–4); it describes the Word of God as "better . . . than thousands of gold and silver pieces" (Psa 119:72); and says that those singing to the Lord are *radiant* (Jer 31:12). If Christ, the Lord of glory (1 Cor 2:8) declares that such worship is beautiful, his body ought to find it beautiful as well. Believers have the mind of Christ, so they should agree with his aesthetic judgment, and love what he loves. As Petrus van Mastricht argued, Christ alone is the one "who understands perfectly the method of worshiping God (John 1:18)."[42] Too often people are drawn away from what is good and holy and beautiful, and toward that which God has never willed that people use to worship him (Col 2:23; cf. Jer 32:35).

Love for Christ through Scripture-Regulated Worship

Believers ought to submit willingly to the worship principles given to them in Scripture because they love Christ and because they love what Christ loves. In at least one other way is a soul's love for Christ connected to Scripture-regulated worship. The New Testament way of worship is the surest means by which believers *grow* their love for Christ. The primary reason Christ through his apostles gave churches the elements he did was he in his wisdom ordained that those elements would be blessed by the Holy Spirit to nurture and grow true spiritual love for Christ.

The believer's love for the Incarnate Christ is a very unusual thing. She loves this Lord and Savior sight unseen. As Peter says in 1 Peter 1:8–9, "Though you have not seen him [Christ], you love him. Though you do not now see him, you believe in him and rejoice with joy that is inexpressible and filled with glory, obtaining the outcome of your faith, the salvation of your souls." We love

[42] Petrus van Mastricht, *Prolegomena,* vol. 1 of *Theoretical-Practical Theology,* trans. Todd M. Rester, ed. Joel R. Beeke (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2018), 73 (§ 1.1.1.XI).

Christ *though we have not seen him.* The believers addressed in 1 Peter not only loved Christ, but they loved him in a most splendid and joyful way. Clearly, love for Christ is very different from most other earthly loves. The great majority of Christians throughout history love a Savior they have never touched or seen or heard first hand. Moreover, the Son of God is holy, so a saint's natural, depraved love struggles to love him as she ought. Thus believers' love for Christ is supremely spiritual, both in the sense that they have not seen him, and that the Spirit of God must generate this love for God in their natural hearts (1 John 4:1–6; Col 1:3–5; Rom 5:5).

God ordained and designed saints' love for Christ to grow with the Spirit's grace through the elements of worship he gave in the New Testament. Indeed, preaching, praying, singing, and the ordinances are the only ways of growing Christians' love for God that God has explicitly blessed. Table the question of *how* one uses these elements as forms, which is also an important matter in expressing and cultivating love for God. With the elements of Scripture-regulated worship, the unseen Christ is presented to believers' understanding and moral imaginations in the ordinances and preached Word of God. Perhaps this is why Paul says to the Galatians, "It was before your eyes that Jesus Christ was publicly portrayed as crucified" (Gal 3:1). According to Ephesians 4, the ministry of the Word (given through apostles, prophets, evangelists, shepherds, and teachers) furthers believers' *knowledge of the Son of God* and Christian maturity (v 13), with the ultimate goal that the whole church *builds itself up in love* (v 16). The love mentioned above, that Peter so beautifully described in 1 Peter 1:8–9, was itself born in the believers "through the living and abiding Word of God . . . , the good news that was preached to you" (1 Pet 1:23, 25).

In *Religious Affections,* Jonathan Edwards makes the point that truly gracious affections are cultivated through such means.[43] In prayer, saints declare their own "meanness" and God's perfections, so that "such gestures, and manner of external behavior in the worship of God, which custom has made to be significations of humility and reverence . . . affect our own hearts, or the hearts of oth-

[43] Edwards's original point was to prove that gracious affections are essential to true religion. To do so, he showed how the Scriptures hold up the "ordinances and duties, which God has appointed," which nurture our holy affections, and are "means and expressions of true religion" (*Affections*, 114).

ers." Likewise, Christian singing "seems to be appointed wholly to excite and express religious affections." The "sacraments" too are "sensible representations" of the gospel and Christ's redemption so as "to affect us with them." Finally, "the impressing divine things on the hearts and affections of men, is evidently one great and main end for which God has ordained, that his Word delivered in the Holy Scriptures, should be opened, applied, and set home upon men in preaching."[44] Edwards is arguing that the very nature of these elements are such that they grow Christian affections.

John Owen makes a similar point about preaching in *The Grace and Duty of Spiritually Minded*:

> It must be observed, that the best of men, the most holy and spiritually minded, may have, nay, ought to have, their thoughts of spiritual things excited, multiplied, and confirmed by the preaching of the word. It is one end of its dispensation, one principal use of it in them by whom it is received. And it hath this effect in two ways: (1.) As it is the spiritual food of the soul, whereby its principle of life and grace is maintained and strengthened. The more this is done, the more shall we thrive in being spiritually minded. (2.) As it administereth occasion unto the exercise of grace; for, proposing the proper object of faith, love, fear, trust, reverence, unto the soul, it draws forth all those graces into exercise.[45]

Owen would certainly view the other elements of gospel worship in a similar light.[46] His point concerning the ministry of the Word is that it is particularly appropriate to engender spiritual affections. Later in the book, he insists, "This is the first reason and ground whereon affections spiritually renewed cleave unto ordinances of divine worship with delight and satisfaction,—namely, because

---

[44] Edwards, *Affections*, 115.

[45] John Owen, *The Grace and Duty of Being Spiritually Minded*, in *The Works of John Owen* (Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth Trust, 2009), 7:283.

[46] Elsewhere Owen stated, "The next and principal ends of all instituted worship, in respect of believers, are, in the increase of the grace of God in them, their edification in their most holy faith, and the testification of the good-will of God unto them" (*A Brief Instruction,* 15:460–61).

they are the means appointed and blessed of God for the exercise of faith and love, with an experiences of their efficacy unto that end."[47]

Arguably, there are other ways of growing the saints' love for Christ in the natural world apart from church worship. The love a believer has for the Triune God ought to grow as she goes about her daily life, whether while explicitly worshipping or not. A Shakespeare sonnet or a good meal or marriage can and should increase love for Christ (see 1 Tim 4:1–5, especially v 4). Yet it is hard to imagine this love coming into being and being sustained over time, apart from the means God has given in New Testament worship (see Rom 10:17). Further, it seems that the way of worship prescribed for churches in the New Testament was designed to facilitate the growth of believers' affections for the Triune God. In sum, Christ gave his church the elements of worship he did in order that he might graciously grow its love for him through the Spirit.

Conclusion

This paper is an argument for Scripture-regulated worship. I began looking briefly at some of the traditional arguments for this understanding of worship. I have argued that the so-called Regulative Principle springs foremost from the Scripture doctrine of the relationship of Christ's authority and the New Testament apostles, now preserved in the New Testament canon. Then I showed how this authority is related to the believer's love for Christ. First, believers submit to Christ's authority because they love their Lord Jesus. They should also love the worship Scripture prescribes because it is what Christ loves. Finally, following the Regulative Principle in their worship services is God's primary way to grow their love for Christ.

[47] Ibid., 437.

Artistic Theologian 8 (2020): 47–74

The Union of Theology and Doxology: A Comparative Study of Jonathan Edwards and Anne Dutton

Holly M. Farrow[1]

"*And safely bring them home again, through all these various ways,*
Infinite wisdom did ordain electing love to praise."
–Anne Dutton, Hymn XVII[2]

The simultaneous existence of the Age of Reason and the Age of Piety during the eighteenth century stands as a great historical paradox. Although it was an age marked by distinct inclinations toward science, logic, and human reasoning, the era also witnessed theologians and authors whose works expressed heightened levels of reverence, devotion, and religious experience. This study will provide a doctrinal and literary interaction between two such authors: Reformed pastor and revivalist Jonathan Edwards (1703–1758), who provided one of America's most prolific and impactful theological legacies, and Anne Dutton (1692–1765), a British Particular Baptist and pastor's wife who voiced a lifelong mission to point others to Christ through her extensive theological writings in the form of treatises, poetry, hymns, and personal letters.[3]

A comparative study of the two theologians will offer a new perspective on spiritual writings during the Evangelical Revival and

[1] Holly M. Farrow is a Church Music and Worship PhD student at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary.

[2] Anne Dutton, *Hymns Composed on Several Subjects,* in *Selected Works of Anne Dutton, Volume 2: Discourses, Poetry, Hymns, Memoir*, ed. JoAnn Ford Watson (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 2004), 192–93.

[3] In a tirelessly devoted manner (much like that of Edwards), Dutton spent the greatest majority of her time writing, often upwards of sixteen hours per day. Dutton was so dedicated to her ministry of writing that she even expressed regret over the time spent eating and sleeping. See Joann Ford Watson, ed., *Selected Spiritual Writings of Anne Dutton: Eighteenth-Century, British-Baptist, Woman Theologian*, vol. 1, *Letters* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 2003), xxxvi.

a new way to contemplate Edwards, especially since Dutton is under-researched.[4] Like Edwards, Dutton faithfully proclaimed a staunch defense of Calvinism against various Arminian doctrines that she deemed objectionable and "nurtured the distant American awakening" through her vocation of religious writing.[5] As will be seen, for an eighteenth-century Baptist female author to have published works with a theological depth and acumen that could withstand a comparison to Edwards was remarkable and extraordinarily rare. Accordingly, the establishment of specific connections and correlations between Edwards and Dutton would be a useful and compelling addition to eighteenth-century evangelical research.

In this paper, I will argue that Jonathan Edwards and Anne Dutton display a notable similarity of content, depth, and intensity, both in their doctrinal writings of theology and in their devotional language of doxology.[6] To sustain this argument, I will first establish the historical context for the study by briefly noting the impact of Edwards upon Particular Baptists in England as well as Dutton's position and influence during the eighteenth century. Next, after a brief discussion of the Puritan notion of the joining of theology and doxology, I will compare specific theological works of Edwards and Dutton to elucidate striking resemblances in depth and content as demonstrated in their writings on such topics as *resignatio ad infernum*, union with Christ, justification by faith alone, and the Lord's Supper. As will be shown, both Edwards and Dutton shared the conviction that the Holy Spirit should receive equal consideration and emphasis along with the Father and the Son in theological discourse.

---

[4] See Michael Sciretti, "'Feed My Lambs': The Spiritual Direction Ministry of Calvinistic British Baptist Anne Dutton during the Early Years of the Evangelical Revival" (PhD diss., Baylor University, 2009), 8. Sciretti reports that even with the vast abundance of her extant theological discourses, "no critical evaluation of Dutton exists."

[5] Barbara J. MacHaffie, *Her Story: Women in Christian Tradition* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), 84.

[6] Throughout this project, the term "doxology" will refer to "vertical" language and expressions that either praise God or address him directly. For additional background on this definition, see Stuart Sheehan, "The Changing Theological Functions of Corporate Worship among Southern Baptists: What They Were and What They Became (1638–2008)" (PhD diss., University of Aberdeen, 2017).

In the next section of the paper, I will identify several metaphors and figures of speech common to the writings of Edwards and Dutton (such as light, sweetness, and love), and will indicate similarity of usage. This section will also indicate the authors' mutual love for the Song of Solomon, whose rich imagery and symbolism made it a favorite book of both writers.

Finally, I will examine the intense doxological expression shared by Edwards and Dutton—a devotional use of language describing religious experiences that some scholars interpret as "mystical." Fredrick Youngs identifies several attributes of mystical religious experiences: impassioned feelings of bliss and peace, a strong awareness of the sacred, and an overwhelming sense of the presence and ineffability of God—perceptions that are indescribable and extend beyond the capacity of words.[7] Their shared use of rhapsodic language to express their experiences of the divine, along with the parallels of thought found within their theological treatises, will clearly indicate a remarkable, compelling likeness and connection between Edwards and Dutton.

The Impact of Edwards and Dutton on Particular Baptists in England

During the eighteenth century, religious works by American authors were commonly and regularly read by British readers—particularly so among non-Anglican evangelicals. The works of Edwards were first received in England as a welcomed harbinger of revival. Additionally, David Bebbington asserts that Edwards held other points of interest for British believers: he was "a profound explorer of Christian doctrine" who captivated his readers' imaginations with his descriptions of revival and heightened Christian experiences.[8] Furthermore, he championed Calvinism in a manner that was "intellectually acceptable" and compatible with contempo-

[7] In this paper, the term "mystical" will refer only to these specifically named characteristics. See Fredrick Youngs, "Jonathan Edwards, a Mystic?" *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 38, no. 1 (Spring 2011): 52.

[8] David Bebbington, "The Legacy of Jonathan Edwards in Britain," in *The Global Edwards: Papers from the Jonathan Edwards Congress Held in Melbourne, August 2015*, ed. R S Bezzant (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2015), 2–4.

rary Enlightenment principles such as "light, liberty, and progress."[9] Most impactful of all (and of great significance to the present comparison to Dutton) was Edwards's "authority [in] *shaping theological discourse*."[10]

Among British Particular Baptists, the writings of Jonathan Edwards were celebrated and his influence was profound and "decisive."[11] The *Faithful Narrative of Surprising Conversions* (first printed in London in 1737) was the first work of Edwards to impact England—it was widely read and received as "an exemplary narrative" that brought with it a "spirit of optimism and possibility."[12] Although originally a piece of personal communication between pastors, the *Narrative* was enthusiastically presented before entire congregations and appeared in various evangelical periodicals. In Hindmarsh's estimation, it was a "runaway best-seller" that invigorated the spiritual landscape of Britain and spurred on her believers to embrace the active work of evangelism. Succinctly put, the works of Edwards "gave them hope—hope that they might see revival, too."[13]

Although they were greatly encouraged by Edwards's dramatic accounts of revival in New England, the Particular Baptists still wrestled through various theological debates and controversies. Their emphasis on election and predestination caused some to espouse antinomianism,[14] which maintained that because salvation comes "by grace and through faith alone" and not by means of human effort, man's behavior was predestined and unbound by the

---

[9] Ibid., 4.

[10] Ibid., 3. Emphasis added.

[11] D. Bruce Hindmarsh, "The Reception of Jonathan Edwards by Early Evangelicals in England," in *Jonathan Edwards at Home and Abroad: Historical Memories, Cultural Movements, Global Horizons*, ed. David W. Kling (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2003), 207.

[12] Ibid., 203.

[13] Ibid., 202–3.

[14] From the Greek terms *anti* meaning "against" and *nomos* meaning "law." See "Antinomianism," in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Bible and Ethics*, edited by James D. G. Dunn. *Oxford Biblical Studies Online*, http://www.oxfordbiblicalstudies.com/article/opr/t430/e10 (accessed 17-Nov-2019).

obligations of moral law.[15] Because of a strongly emerging "hyper" Calvinism (a position held by a good number of influential theologians and pastors), many Calvinistic Baptists arrived at the conclusion that if certain people were not predestined for salvation, the matter was settled and no evangelical effort would change the outcome. With this outlook, offering the Gospel to the lost was "at best a waste of time, and at worst an insult to God and divine providence" and therefore to be avoided.[16]

The dilemma for the Particular Baptists was how to preach faith and repentance to all while remaining true to their Calvinist principles. In his *Freedom of the Will* (1754), Edwards provided Baptist preachers with the perfect answer: Mankind was endowed with the "natural ability" or potential to accept the Gospel. Even so, some individuals experience a "moral inability" to embrace salvation because of a steadfastness of sin springing from their own hearts.[17] Accordingly, it was clearly the "duty" or responsibility of each person to repent and come to faith. This realization—that a belief in the doctrine of election need not impede preaching repentance—enabled pastors to make an open invitation to all in good conscience. This newly found freedom and shift in doctrinal thinking greatly stimulated evangelism and missions among Particular Baptists.[18] Michael Watts observes that "the writings of the Congregational pastor of Northampton, Massachusetts [led] to religious revival among the Particular Baptists of Northamptonshire, England and set in train the dispersion of the principles of English Dissent to the four corners of the world."[19]

Within Anne Dutton's sphere of influence, her own extensive ministry of writing was securely set within this Particular Baptist theological context. Anne's husband, evangelical minister Benjamin Dutton (1691–1747), assumed the pastorship of the Particular Baptist church of Great Gransden in Huntingdonshire in 1732.

---

[15] Michael D. Thompson, "Edwards's Contribution to the Missionary Movement of Early Baptists," in *The Contribution of Jonathan Edwards to American Culture and Society: Essays on America's Spiritual Founding Father (The Northampton Tercentenary Celebration, 1703–2003)* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2008), 320.

[16] Ibid.

[17] Ibid., 322.

[18] Bebbington, "The Legacy of Jonathan Edwards," 6.

[19] In Leonard George Champion, "Evangelical Calvinism and the Structures of Baptist Church Life," *The Baptist Quarterly* 28, no. 5 (January 1980): 197.

Anne's distinguished ministry of writing began soon thereafter, appropriately coinciding with the early dawning of the Evangelical Revival.[20] By the year 1737, when Edwards's *Faithful Narrative of Surprising Conversions* first appeared in London, Anne had published seven discourses on various theological topics, including her acclaimed poetic work *Narrative on the Wonders of Grace* (1734) and *A Discourse upon Walking with God* (1735). By 1740, the full flames of revival were sweeping over England, and by August of 1741, Dutton's treatises were being published and circulated in *The Weekly History*. Scholars have recently acknowledged the full weight of Dutton's evangelical impact during this time, noting that she was "perhaps the most theologically capable and influential woman of her era, an uncommon interpreter of Scripture, and an obedient servant of Christ."[21]

In addition to her extensive theological publications, Dutton penned an immense number of personal letters of spiritual encouragement to evangelical leaders and lay people who sought her wisdom in both doctrinal and personal matters of faith. Among her many correspondents were George Whitefield (1714–1770), John Wesley (1703–1791), Phillip Doddridge (1702–1751), Selina Hastings, Countess of Huntingdon (1707–1791), William Seward (1702–1740), and Howell Harris (1714–1773).[22] Dutton befriended Whitefield and fully supported his evangelical efforts at a time when most Calvinistic Baptists were distinctly "opposed to the new Evangelical movement."[23] William Seward, who accompanied Whitefield in his travels, expressed that Dutton's letters were "full of such comforts and direct answers to what I had been writing that it filled my eyes with

[20] Sciretti, "Feed My Lambs," 2. In this passage, Sciretti also notes the intriguing fact that Dutton's theological treatises and poetry were first published "two years before the conversion of George Whitefield and five years before the conversions of Charles and John Wesley."

[21] Karen O'Dell Bullock, "Anne Dutton," in *Handbook of Women Biblical Interpreters: A Historical and Biographical Guide*, ed. Marion Ann Taylor (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012), 172–73.

[22] Sciretti, "Feed My Lambs," 5. Additionally, through her published discourses, Dutton sparred theologically with John Wesley regarding his belief in the ability to attain a state of sinless perfection while on earth.

[23] Ibid.

tears of joy."[24] Welsh revivalist Howell Harris affirmed Dutton's ministry of writing when he confirmed to her that "our Lord has entrusted you with a Talent of writing for him."[25] In addition to these noteworthy friendships and associations, Dutton had a special concern for the newly converted who found themselves troubled in their personal circumstances or doubtful about whether they would be counted among God's elect. Dutton's influence eventually stretched across the Atlantic into the American colonies, where she gained a solid reputation particularly among converts in Georgia and South Carolina through her publications and personal correspondence.[26]

Whether Edwards and Dutton ever corresponded directly is unknown. Nevertheless, evidence that Dutton knew of Edwards and his writings does exist. In her Letter XX, Dutton mentions Edwards by name and comments at some length upon his "late account of the work of God in the conversion of souls to Christ in New England."[27] Moreover, because she was a published author and was particularly well read (having frequently corresponded with several key evangelical ministers and having served as editor of the evangelical periodical *The Spiritual Magazine*), Dutton was engaged with contemporary evangelical writings and events throughout her life. In all probability, a figure of Edwards's magnitude would have impressed upon the shape and tone of Dutton's theological writings.

The Theology of Edwards and Dutton: Expressions of Resolute Faith

To demonstrate the notable parallels of thought in the theological convictions of Edwards and Dutton, it is first important to note that the two theologians shared a common body of divinity handed down from their Puritan forefathers. "Communion with

[24] Stephen J. Stein, "A Note on Anne Dutton, Eighteenth-Century Evangelical," *Church History* 44, no. 4 (December 1975): 488.

[25] Ibid.

[26] Ibid., 489.

[27] See Watson, *Selected Spiritual Writings*, 1:138–44.

God," states J. I. Packer, is the nucleus of Puritan theology.[28] The firmly held beliefs of the Puritans led them to establish a faith system that was "first and foremost about the worship of God . . . theology and the life informed by such convictions were to be one harmonious act" of worship and praise.[29] Put simply, worship is the "external manifestation" of theological "internal convictions."[30] Theology inspires doxology—and the two are intricately woven together and inseparable.

The theological legacy of the Puritans, inherited and expressed by Edwards and Dutton, was an unwavering commitment "to search the Scriptures, organize their findings, and then apply those to all areas of life."[31] Additionally, while the Puritans were exceptional interpreters of Scripture, "their intellectual rigor was matched or even surpassed by their piety."[32] Only through strict obedience and adherence to the Word, reflection upon God's character and his work among mankind, and the indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit could a believer properly live unto God, in harmony with his will and to his glory.[33] The Puritans also trusted that the influence of God would be visibly manifested within their practical, day-to-day life experiences. Succinctly put, their arduous intention was "to live *coram Deo*"—in the presence of God and "before the face of God."[34]

One of the "giants" among Puritan thinkers who undoubtedly influenced the theologies of Edwards and Dutton was John Owen (1616–1683). Timothy Edwards, Jonathan's father, owned a good number of Puritan classics in his library, including works by Owen—writings that are considered to also have been spiritually formative for his son.[35] In the case of Dutton's works, the names of

---

[28] In Peter Beck, "Worshiping God with Our Minds: Theology as Doxology among the Puritans," *Puritan Reformed Journal* 5, no. 2 (2013): 194.

[29] Ibid.

[30] Ibid., 196.

[31] Joel R. Beeke, "Reading the Puritans," *Puritan Reformed Journal* 3, no. 2 (2011): 197.

[32] Ibid., 198.

[33] Beck, "Worshipping God with Our Minds," 196.

[34] Beeke, "Reading the Puritans," 199.

[35] Michael J. McClymond and Gerald R. McDermott, *The Theology of Jonathan Edwards* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 61.

Puritan authors who influenced her writing are often cited, and John Owen is among the men most frequently mentioned.[36]

The pathway to communion with God, in Owen's view, was a "proper biblical theology," achieved through careful exegesis that was precise and free of error.[37] As theological knowledge increases, communion with God deepens and matures. God's purposes in this communion are grounded in love and always to his greater glory: "God would have it so," writes Owen, "for the manifestation of his own glory. This is the first great end of all the works of God. That it is so is a fundamental principle of our religion. And how his works do glorify him is our duty to inquire."[38]

This notion is also found and clearly demonstrated in the writings of Edwards and Dutton. In his *Dissertation on the End for Which God Created the World* (1755), Edwards states that "the great and last end of God's works which is so variously expressed in Scripture, is indeed but *one*; and this *one* end is most properly and comprehensively called, THE GLORY OF GOD."[39] Similarly, in her treatise *A Discourse Upon Walking with God* (1735), Dutton writes that "God's end in walking with his People in Christ, and in all the Ways of Divine Appointment, is *ultimately his own Glory*; and subordinately their Good and Salvation."[40] As will be shown, the theological harmony and agreement shared by Edwards and Dutton extend to several additional religious topics that were points of discussion during the eighteenth century.

Resignatio ad infernum

The topic of *resignatio ad infernum* (resignation to hell) is a concept with a long history, having been discussed by theologians dating back to the medieval period. A person would voice a "will-

[36] Sciretti, "Feed My Lambs," 119.

[37] Beck, "Worshiping God with Our Minds," 196.

[38] John Owen, *Christologia*, in Ryan L. Rippee, "John Owen on the Work of God the Father," *Puritan Reformed Journal* 8, no. 2 (2016): 90.

[39] Edwards, *The Works of President Edwards, in Four Volumes: A Reprint of the Worcester Edition* (New York: Leavitt, Trow & Co., 1844), 254.

[40] Dutton, *A Discourse Upon Walking with God,* in *Selected Works of Anne Dutton,* 2:53. Emphasis added.

ingness to be damned" if s/he had achieved such a selfless state of piety that if condemnation was ordained as part of the divine will, and if their damnation would somehow glorify God more than their salvation, it would gladly be accepted "out of absolute love and absolute obedience to God."[41] Edwards, however, considered this to be the mindset of a person who "seems" to have a love for God and Christ, but has "no grace." In a footnote written by Edwards in *Religious Affections*, he paraphrases a passage from his grandfather Stoddard's *Guide to Christ*, stating that "sometimes natural men may have such violent pangs of false affection to God, that they may think themselves willing to be damned."[42] The concept appeared in Edwards's writing years earlier in the *Narrative of Surprising Conversions*; Edwards describes believers who have such a strong "sense of the excellency of God's justice" and an "exceeding loathing" of their own sinful unworthiness that they experience

> a kind of indignation against themselves, that they have sometimes almost called it a willingness to be damned; though it must be owned they had not clear and distinct ideas of damnation, nor does any word in the Bible require such self-denial as this. But the truth is, as some have more clearly expressed it, that salvation has appeared too good for them, that they were worthy of nothing but condemnation, and they could not tell how to think of salvation's being bestowed upon them, fearing it was inconsistent with the glory of God's majesty.[43]

Dutton addresses this matter in a personal letter to a man who was troubled that his love for God had not achieved "such a height" as to be content with damnation if it would "advance the Kingdom and the glory of Christ."[44] Dutton counsels that it had never once entered her mind that "God would be more glorified in

---

[41] Clark R. West, "The Deconstruction of Hell: A History of the Resignatio Ad Infernum Tradition" (PhD diss., Syracuse University, 2013), 4.

[42] Edwards, *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*, vol. 2, *Religious Affections* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 147.

[43] Edwards, *Narrative of Surprising Conversions*, in *The Works of President Edwards, in Four Volumes* (New York: Robert Carter and Brothers, 1879), 3:247.

[44] Dutton, Letter XX, in *Selected Spiritual Writings*, ed. Watson, 1:138.

my damnation than in my salvation."[45] In the next paragraphs of her letter, she expresses a view on the subject that is in complete agreement with that of Edwards:

> I think Mr. Edwards, in his late account of the work of God in the conversion of souls to Christ in New England, gives a hint concerning some persons who had such a sense of the justice of God in their damnation, if he were to send them to hell, that they were ready to express themselves after such a manner as if they were "content to be damned;" and then adds, "that he knows no Scripture that requires it." An absolute contentment with damnation is doubtless unlawful; it is incompatible with that principle of self-preservation which God hath put into all his creatures.[46]

Dutton encourages the recipient of her letter to focus instead upon the eternal, "unsearchable" love of Christ, assuring him that the Father, to save his people from their sins, had placed "the cup of damnation, of curse and wrath, into Christ's hand, and through his drinking it up for us he puts the cup of salvation into ours."[47]

The Believer's Union with Christ through the Holy Spirit

Parallels of thought between Edwards and Dutton are also displayed through their corresponding points of view regarding union with Christ, a topic that both theologians wrote about extensively. Edwards states that "all divine communion, or communion of the creatures with God or with one another in God, seems to be by the Holy Ghost."[48] As Robert Caldwell aptly explains, "In the theology of Jonathan Edwards, the Holy Spirit's activity as the bond of the trinitarian union between the Father and the Son is paradig-

[45] Ibid.

[46] Ibid., 139.

[47] Ibid., 143.

[48] Edwards, "Miscellanies" No. 487, discussed in Robert W. Caldwell III, *Communion in the Spirit: The Holy Spirit as the Bond of Union in the Theology of Jonathan Edwards* (Milton Keynes, UK: Paternoster, 2007), 86.

matic for all other holy unions in his theology."[49] Edwards affirmed that the Spirit also creates the union between Christ's human and divine natures, the union that believers have with Christ, and the union that Christians have with each other.

In the view of Edwards, for a saint to have union with Christ requires an act of the indwelling Holy Spirit, who brings holy authority and influence into his life. Edwards clearly states that the Spirit

> unites himself with the mind of a saint, takes him for his temple, actuates and *influences* him as a new, supernatural principle of life and action . . . the Holy Spirit operates in the minds of the godly, by uniting himself to them, and living in them, and *exerting his own nature* in the exercise of their faculties.[50]

Dutton expresses the reality of divine influence upon the Christian believer in different words, yet the underlying message is essentially the same; the saint experiences union with Christ, whose influence enables him to live a new life:

> But that if any man be in Christ by *influential union*, if he be vitally *united to him as his root and head of influence*, he partakes of Christ's life, has a sameness of nature with him, a new life of grace from Christ the new Adam communicated to him; or, that by virtue of his thus being in Christ, he (the man) is a new creature; old things are become new in him.[51]

The topic of union with Christ through the work of the Holy Spirit also appears in several of Dutton's hymns, such as the following example taken from Hymn *L*, "Faith, the Gift of God, the Effect of Christ's Death, and the Work of the Spirit," stanzas five and six. The biblical references provided for each line of poetry are Dutton's,

---

[49] Caldwell, Communion in the Spirit, 8.

[50] Edwards, "A Divine and Supernatural Light," in *The Works of President Edwards* (New York: Robert Carter and Brothers, 1879), 4:440. Emphasis added. See also Caldwell, *Communion in the Spirit*, 102–4.

[51] Dutton, in *Selected Spiritual Writings of Anne Dutton*, 6:178–79. Emphasis added.

and incidentally demonstrate a meticulous devotion to Scripture that is reminiscent of Edwards:

The Spirit works this grace,	1 Cor. xii. 9.
By his almighty power,	Eph. i. 19.
In every of the chosen race,	Acts xiii. 48.
At the appointed hour.	John v. 25.
Faith lives in Christ its root,	Gal. ii. 20.
And 'cause its union lasts,	John xiv. 19.
It brings forth all its precious fruit,	Col. i. 6.
Though nipp'd with stormy blasts.[52]	1 Pet. i. 6,7.

In sum, Edwards understood the Holy Spirit to be the "meeting place" of the communion shared by the Father and the Son—and consequently, the work of the Spirit forms the basis of all manifestations of Christian communion.[53] As such, Edwards firmly believed that the Holy Spirit should receive equal honor along with the Father and the Son; he perceived a notable "deficiency" in the church's discourse regarding pneumatology and sought to rectify it.[54] Dutton shared Edwards's desire to give equal honor and consideration to the Holy Spirit. In the Preface to *A Narration of the Wonders of Grace*, she writes:

> I would not have any from thence think, that I esteem that part of the Spirit's work as a wonder of grace *inferior* to the rest. No; I believe that all the acts and works of the three Persons in God, as they have a joint hand in the salvation of the elect, shine forth with as equal splendour.[55]

---

[52] Dutton, in *Selected Spiritual Writings of Anne Dutton*, 2:228.

[53] Caldwell, *Communion in the Spirit*, 45.

[54] Ibid., 9.

[55] Dutton, Preface to *A Narration of the Wonders of Grace*, in *Selected Spiritual Writings of Anne Dutton*, 2:114.

Justification

Another area of theological similarity between Edwards and Dutton comes to light when exploring their respective treatises regarding justification. Edwards's *Justification by Faith Alone* was published in 1738; Dutton's *A Treatise on Justification* was published anonymously two years later and went through three editions (1740, 1743, and 1778).

In his treatise, Edwards refutes the theological views of John Tillotson (1630–1694), a former Archbishop of Canterbury who believed that justification referred to the "pardon or remission of sins" and nothing more.[56] Edwards agreed that guilt and sin are indeed removed, but he also believed that an additional act takes place—the believer *gains* right standing before God through the imputation of the righteousness of Christ. Edwards wrote that "a person is said to be justified, when he is approved of God as free from the guilt of sin and its deserved punishment; and as having that righteousness belonging to him that entitles to the reward of life."[57] Edwards based his discourse on the following passage from Romans 4:5: "But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness," thereby confirming the traditional Reformed position that justification is by faith alone.

Edwards maintained that justification released believers from the bondage of sin and its rightful penalty and provides the gift of Christ's righteousness through imputation. The dual nature of justification correlates with the dual nature of Christ's sacrifice: his suffering erases the sinner's guilt, and his obedience provides "the reward of heaven."[58] Justification is based only on God's grace and not any "moral qualifications" of man. Here once again appears the concept of union with Christ, which occurs when the sinner accepts Christ's invitation to redemption. Edwards believed that spir-

---

[56] In Michael McClenahan, "Justification by Faith Alone," in *A Readers Guide to the Major Writings of Jonathan Edwards*, ed. Nathan A. Finn and Jeremy M. Kimble (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2017), 84.

[57] Edwards, "Justification by Faith Alone," in *The Works of President Edwards*, 4:66.

[58] Sang Hyun Lee, "Grace and Justification by Faith Alone," in *The Princeton Companion to Jonathan Edwards*, ed. Sang Hyun Lee (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005), 137.

itual union should be a reciprocal "mutual act of both," in which each one receives and joins with the other.[59] Once a believer gains admission into communion with Christ, God sees the worthiness of Christ when looking upon the regenerate soul. Edwards teaches that the state of justification happens only by faith, the "instrument by which we receive Christ."[60]

Dutton's treatise on justification approaches the topic with a theological depth and sophistication that can withstand a comparison to Edwards; her acumen is lauded by the publisher of the 1778 edition, who stated that the treatise "needs no recommendation" because its content would "sufficiently recommend itself."[61] The treatise was thoroughly endorsed based on its skillful hermeneutic, described as "Scripture interpreting Scripture."[62] Dutton's heavy reliance upon the Bible is clearly seen in the detailed outline she provides for her discourse:

> Section I. Of the Matter of Justification. Jeremiah 23:6. *This is the name whereby he shall be called,* THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS.
>
> Section II. Of the Manner of Justification. Romans 4:6, 1:17, 10:10. *God imputeth righteousness without works. The righteousness of God is revealed from faith to faith. With the heart of man believeth unto righteousness.*
>
> Section III. Of the Time of Justification. Romans 4:25, 3:26, 1 Timothy 3:16. *He was delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification. God is just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus. God was justified in the Spirit.*
>
> Section IV. Of the Effect of Justification. Romans 5:1, 4:7, 2 Corinthians 5:14. *Being justified, by faith we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ. Blessed are they whose iniqui-*

[59] Ibid., 138.

[60] Edwards, "Justification by Faith Alone," in *The Works of President Edwards*, 4:68.

[61] Dutton, *A Treatise on Justification*, in *Selected Spiritual Writings of Anne Dutton*, 4:xiv.

[62] Ibid., 4:xv.

ties are forgiven. The love of Christ, who died for us, constraineth us to live unto him.

Section V. An Objection, urged against the preceding Scripture-Doctrine of Justification, answered. James 2:21. *Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered his son Isaac upon the altar?*

Section VI. The Insufficiency of legal obedience to the justification of a Sinner. Romans 3:20. *By the deeds of the law, there shall no flesh be justified in his sight.*

Section VII. The Conclusion. Isaiah 45:24. *Surely, shall one say, In the Lord have I righteousness*.[63]

A perusal of this outline shows the great extent and depth of Dutton's treatment of the subject, including the anticipation and explanation of possible objections, a feature also present in Edwards's treatise. Similarities to Edwards are also apparent in the themes and language she employs in explicating the topic: "the manner of justification, as with respect unto God, it is by imputation; and with respect to ourselves, by Faith."[64]

The Lord's Supper

Perhaps one of the strongest points of agreement shared mutually by Edwards and Dutton is their "highly sacramental" interpretation of the Lord's Supper. As Calvinists, both would have inherited the *via media* view of John Calvin. As Michael Haykin explains, the elements of the Table are "signs and guarantees of a present reality. To the one who eats the bread and drinks the wine with faith, there is conveyed what they symbolize, namely Christ. The channel, as it were, through which Christ is conveyed to the believ-

[63] Dutton, *A Treatise on Justification*, in *Selected Spiritual Writings of Anne Dutton*, 4:67–146.

[64] Ibid., 4:95.

er is none other than the Holy Spirit."[65] The Spirit connects or "unites" believers to the risen Christ. In the Supper, Christ is received "not because Christ inheres the elements, but because the Holy Spirit binds believers" to himself. If faith is not present, "only the bare elements are received."[66]

Edwards maintained a strong conviction that one must be a professing Christian to gain admittance to the Table, reflecting his belief that there should be a "clear distinction between the church and the world" and that the Lord's Supper was a privilege reserved only for believers.[67] Defending his case with 1 Corinthians 11:28 ("Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat"), Edwards indicates that "it is necessary, that those who partake of the Lord's Supper, should judge themselves truly and cordially to accept of Christ, as their only Saviour and chief good; for of this the actions which communicants perform at the Lord's Table, are a solemn profession."[68]

Dutton's view of the Supper had a historical foundation in the *Second London Confession of Faith* (1689), which ratified for Baptists that the ordinance serves as "confirmation of the faith of believers . . . their spiritual nourishment, and growth in him."[69] Therefore, and not surprisingly, Dutton concurs with Edwards completely; in her treatise *Thoughts on the Lord's Supper* (1748), she states clearly that the Supper is only for the members of Christ's body, the Church: "For as the Lord's Supper is a Church-Ordinance, those that are the subjects thereof must be Church Members."[70]

---

[65] Michael A. G. Haykin, "Anne Dutton and Her Theological Works," in *Eight Women of Faith* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2016), 63.

[66] Ibid.

[67] Edwards, *A Humble Inquiry into the Rules of the Word of God Concerning the Qualifications Requisite to a Complete Standing and Full Communion in the Visible Christian Church*, discussed in Mark E. Dever, "Believers Only—Jonathan Edwards and Communion," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 172 (July–September 2015): 262.

[68] Ibid.

[69] Michael A. G. Haykin, "His Soul-Refreshing Presence: The Lord's Supper in Baptist Thought and Experience in the 'Long' Eighteenth Century," *Institute for Christian Worship Lectures* (February 2008): 2.

[70] Dutton, *Thoughts on the Lord's Supper: Relating to the Nature, Subjects, and Right Partaking of this Solemn Ordinance; Written at the Request of a Friend, and Addressed by Letter to the Tender Lambs of Christ* (London: J. Hart, 1748), 9.

For both Edwards and Dutton, the ordinance of the Lord's Supper demanded solemnity, reverence, and preparation of heart. Edwards expressed in no uncertain terms the "magnitude of the sacrament," warning that "those who contemptuously treat those symbols of the body of Christ slain and his blood shed, why, they make themselves guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, that is, of murdering him."[71] Dutton's words express the same conviction; she insists that anyone who partakes of the elements without receiving Christ by faith in their hearts is "so far from partaking of the Lord's Supper, that they are guilty of a great Abuse of it: Not discerning the Lord's Body therein, which can only be done by Faith, they become guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord, 1 Cor. 11.27."[72] The weight of these strong words clearly indicate that both Edwards and Dutton believed the observance of the Lord's Supper to be an occasion that demanded the utmost solemnity, reverence, and piety.

Coming together by faith to the Lord's Table was also an endeavor of the soul to gain spiritual sight, to look upon Christ "with spiritual eyes."[73] This spiritual sight was not merely attaining intellectual insight into doctrine; it was an engagement or "betrothal" of the heart in which a "mixture of affections" was to be anticipated. Consequently, a believer could feel sorrow for his sins while simultaneously rejoicing in Christ's willingness to die in his place.[74] Edwards, in a sermon on Luke 22:19 preached in June of 1734, declared: "Another thing meant by 'Do this in remembrance of Me' is that we should do it to revive suitable affection towards Christ, not merely to revive thoughts of Christ in our understanding, but also suitable exercises towards him in our hearts."[75] Dutton similarly references affections within the Lord's Supper, and her message closely resembles that of Edwards: "We ought then, in an especial

---

[71] Matthew Westerholm, "The 'Cream of Creation' and the 'Cream of Faith': The Lord's Supper as a Means of Assurance in Puritan Thought," *Puritan Reformed Journal* 1 (2011): 209.

[72] Dutton, *Thoughts on the Lord's Supper*, 22–23.

[73] Westerholm, "The Cream of Creation," 210.

[74] Ibid., 212.

[75] Edwards, "The Lord's Supper Ought to Be Kept Up and Attended in Remembrance of Christ," in *Sermons on the Lord's Supper*, ed. Don Kistler (Orlando, FL: Northampton Press, 2007), 60.

Manner . . . to regard the affections of our souls, that they intensely fix upon Christ crucified, that glorious object presented to our Faith, and act suitably towards him."[76]

In the view of Edwards and Dutton, when the elements of the Supper are received by faith, the Christian receives the body and blood of Christ spiritually, signifying union with him.[77] Around the years of 1750–51, Edwards preached a sermon based on 1 Corinthians 10:17 in which he distinctly states that the Lord's Supper is "a representation of the union of Christ and his people, a union of hearts . . . here is also represented their union one with another, for here they meet together as brethren, as children of one family, as one spouse of Christ."[78] Dutton also employs language that speaks of union with Christ while feasting at his Table: "So by our repeated eating of Christ by Faith, in this Ordinance, our spiritual life is maintain'd and increased, we grow up into Union and Communion with him."[79]

Edwards and Dutton both viewed the ordinance as a "seal" of this union with Christ, presenting the Supper as "a foretaste of the marriage supper of the Lamb," an eschatological reality of the coming Kingdom of God.[80] Edwards, in a sermon based on Luke 14:16, implored his listeners to consider all the glorious provisions that God has made:

> Is it not worth the while to accept any invitation to come to the marriage supper of the Lamb? Blessed and happy are they who enter in with God into the marriage. Yea, is not she blessed who shall be the bride, the Lamb's wife, to whom it shall be granted to be clothed in fine linen, clean and white, which is the righteousness of the saints (Revelation 19:8).[81]

---

[76] Dutton, "Thoughts on the Lord's Supper," 56–57.

[77] Westerholm, "The Cream of Creation," 215.

[78] Edwards, "The Lord's Supper Was Instituted as a Solemn Representation and Seal of the Holy and Spiritual Union Christ's People Have with Christ and One Another," in *Sermons on the Lord's Supper*, 74.

[79] Dutton, "Thoughts on the Lord's Supper," 39.

[80] McClymond and McDermott, *The Theology of Jonathan Edwards*, 491–92.

[81] Edwards, "The Spiritual Blessings of the Gospel are Fitly Represented by a Feast," in *Sermons on the Lord's Supper*, 125.

Dutton offers her readers a similar vision of the resplendent future awaiting those who are in Christ: "The Lamb will bring you as his Bride, into the Bride Chamber, and set you as married to the Lord, to feast with him at his Marriage Supper."[82]

Finally, the similarities between Edwards and Dutton on the Lord's Supper can be traced even more closely to specific wordings and phrasings. Edwards preached that "Christ was not only with his disciples at the first sacrament, but he *sits with his people* in every sacrament."[83] Dutton's view matches that of Edwards both in meaning and expression: "the King is pleas'd to *sit with us*, at his Table."[84] Additionally, Dutton and Edwards share a specific commonality of language in their descriptions of what is imparted to the saint during the Supper. "As our Lord is spiritually present in his own ordinance," Dutton writes, "so he therein and thereby doth actually communicate, or give himself, *his body broken, and his blood shed*, with *all the benefits* of his death, to the worthy receivers."[85] Correspondingly, in his *An Humble Inquiry*, Edwards writes that "Christ presents himself" through the sacrifice of his "*body broken and his blood shed*," to "impart to them *all the benefits* of his propitiation and salvation."[86]

As has been shown, the kinship and correlations found in the respective theological expressions of Edwards and Dutton are extensive. After having established the numerous parallels of thought found in their doctrinal writings, I now turn my attention to their doxological language of praise.

The Doxology of Edwards and Dutton: Voices in Harmony

The Puritans saw their Creator as Lord over each aspect of human life—therefore human behavior must be governed by a

---

[82] Dutton, "Thoughts on the Lord's Supper," 36.

[83] Edwards, "The Spiritual Blessings of the Gospel are Fitly Represented by a Feast," in *Sermons on the Lord's Supper*, 123. Emphasis added.

[84] Haykin, "His Soul-Refreshing Presence," 3. Emphasis added.

[85] Ibid. Emphasis added.

[86] Emphasis added. See discussion of this passage in Caldwell, *Communion in the Spirit*, 161–65.

proper understanding of God. A proper theology did not consist of merely a "set of rules" but was an all-consuming, authoritative "life-force."[87] Beck explains: "Biblical theology produces practical results and eternal praise."[88] Seventeenth-century Puritan John Owen said "the vital force of theology is piety, it is worship."[89] Dutton alluded to this truth herself when she penned the words, "Salvation and Glory are put together in the Doxologies of the saved ones."[90] As will be seen in the next sections, a harmonious synthesis and union of theology and doxology are demonstrated in the highly expressive language of Edwards and Dutton.

Metaphoric Language Common to Edwards and Dutton: Types and Tropes

Edwards states that "types are a certain sort of language, as it were, in which God is wont to speak to us."[91] Figures or types in the Old Testament foreshadow subjects and occasions found in the New Testament. In his *Images of Divine Things* notebook of 1728, Edwards speaks of types that depict "the way all things point beyond themselves" to demonstrate a "higher spiritual principle."[92] For example, Edwards states that "the rising and setting of the sun is a type of the death and resurrection of Christ" and that "the juice of the grape is a type of the blood of Christ."[93] Dutton also references the use of types in her writing; in her *Discourse Upon Walking with God*, she states: "As a Type of Christ, Joseph had this Name of

[87] Beck, "Worshiping God with Our Minds," 203.

[88] Ibid., 198.

[89] Ibid., 197.

[90] Dutton, *A Discourse Upon Walking with God,* in *Selected Spiritual Writings*, 2:57.

[91] Quoted in Tibor Fabiny, "Edwards and Biblical Typology," in *Understanding Jonathan Edwards: An Introduction to America's Theologian*, ed. Gerald R. McDermott (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 99.

[92] Jennifer L. Leader, "In Love with the Image: Transitive Being and Typological Desire in Jonathan Edwards," *Early American Literature* 41, no. 2 (2006): 157.

[93] Edwards, *Images or Shadows of Divine Things*, ed. Perry Miller (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1948), 58, 68.

the Shepherd of Israel given him, Gen. 49.24."[94] The concept of types even appears in Dutton's hymnody:

> The law had figures, types and shades, Heb. ix. Verse 9.
> Of glorious things to come; Chap. x. 1.
> Which in the gospel are display'd Col. ii. 17.
> And follow in their room.[95]

This sophisticated use of typological language by Edwards and Dutton points their readers to "an iconic window" through which they may "catch a glimpse of the desired eternal."[96]

Tropes: Light

The way to come to know Edwards best, in the estimation of Ronald Story, is "chiefly through his language."[97] Story concurs with Marsden, who stated that the central core of Edwards's life was "his devotion to God expressed with pen and ink."[98] Story identifies several frequently recurring "tropes" or metaphorical figures of speech found in the works of Edwards; after identifying them, I will then demonstrate their usage in the works of Dutton.

First and foremost, "light was Edwards's favorite image and metaphor," observes Story, because Scripture hallows the concept of light from the very dawning of Creation through the coming of Christ, the Light of the World.[99] God is the "Father of Lights" and the saints walk together in the light of Christ, as "children of light."[100] The most significant symbolism associated with Edwards's treatment of light is that it represents "the beams of God's glory,"

---

[94] Dutton, *A Discourse Upon Walking with God*, in *Selected Spiritual Writings*, 2:68.

[95] Dutton, Hymn III, "The Glory of the Gospel Above the Law," in *Selected Spiritual Writings*, 2:178.

[96] Leader, "In Love with the Image," 167.

[97] Ronald Story, *Jonathan Edwards and the Gospel of Love* (Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 2012), 28.

[98] Ibid.

[99] Ibid.

[100] Ibid., 29.

his holiness, and the "manifestation of the excellency" of God, who is the Light to all creation in the same way the "fullness of the sun" touches, illumines, and brings warmth to all in the natural world. In his *Covenant of Redemption*, Edwards writes, "That beauteous light with which the world is filled in a clear day, is a lively shadow of his spotless holiness."[101] Dutton speaks of light in much the same manner as Edwards; in her treatise, *A Discourse Upon Walking with God* (1735), she writes: "God is Light; Light here, as I conceive, is put for Holiness. And we may read it thus, God is *Holiness*, and in him is no darkness, no sin. . . . And if we thus walk in the Light, as he is in the Light, we have Fellowship one with another. God with us, and we with God."[102] The metaphor of light as the brightness of Christ also occurs in Dutton's hymnody:

> No wonder that the moon and stars — Heb. viii. 13.
> Are vanish'd out of sight;
> Since Christ, the glory-sun appears — Chap. ix. 11.
> With his out-shining light.[103]

Sweetness

Another figure of speech used by both Edwards and Dutton is the word "sweet," described by Story as one of the most prevalent descriptive words "in the Edwardsian lexicon."[104] Edwards uses the figure of sweetness to make declarative assertions about "God, grace, and the community of Christians."[105] Edwards describes the beauty of Christ as "most sweet" and rejoices in "sweetly conversing" with him. The Song of Solomon "sweetly sings" about the eternal marriage feast of Christ and the Church. The Persons of the Trinity share among themselves an "infinitely sweet energy which

---

[101] Quoted in Paul R. Baumgartner, "Jonathan Edwards: The Theory Behind His Use of Figurative Language," *PLMA* 78, no. 4 (September 1963): 322.

[102] Dutton, *A Discourse Upon Walking with God*, in *Selected Spiritual Writings*, 2:21.

[103] Dutton, Hymn III, "The Glory of the Gospel Above the Law," in *Selected Spiritual Writings,* 2:178.

[104] Story, *Jonathan Edwards and the Gospel of Love*, 45.

[105] Ibid.

we call delight."[106] When writing about conversion, Edwards declared that it is a sweetness understood only by those who have tasted it. Those who embrace true religion experience the beauty of Christ, which exceeds the vain pleasures of this world "as much as gold and pearls" exceed "dirt and dung."[107] In the works of Dutton, the concept of sweetness regularly finds expression when speaking of the communion between God and his people: "In the Way of Faith, or divine Revelation, they sweetly walk and talk together as Friends . . . in the Way of instituted Worship, God and his People sweetly commune together."[108] In her hymnody, Dutton expresses the sweetness of salvation:

SALVATION, O how sweet,	Ps. lxxxix. 15.
How joyful is the sound!	
Free reigning grace, through Jesus Christ,	Rom. v. 21.
O how it doth abound.[109]	Verse 20.

Edwards's and Dutton's "Mystical" Language and Experience: Divine Love

The intense spiritual experiences recorded by Edwards and Dutton are often described as "mystical" because they express an overwhelming desire "to be united in rapturous love with [their] Creator."[110] Edwards stated that "true religion is summarily comprehended in love" and ultimately, all things unite and "resolve into love."[111] Frequently in his writings on divine love, Edwards uses wordings and metaphoric language that possess a "lyrical, near-mystical" quality because he writes of a holy love that infinitely extends into all eternity. Succinctly put, love—in all its forms—points

[106] Ibid., 45–46.

[107] Ibid., 47; in his discussion of these passages, Story cites *The Works of Jonathan Edwards* 19:82–85.

[108] Dutton, *A Discourse Upon Walking with God*, in *Selected Spiritual Writings*, 2:44–45.

[109] Dutton, Hymn XXXVI, "Salvation in Election, and Covenant Settlements," in *Selected Spiritual Writings*, 2:212.

[110] Youngs, "Jonathan Edwards, A Mystic?," 49.

[111] Story, *Jonathan Edwards and the Gospel of Love*," 99, 102.

the elect to the future eschatological reality of Heaven. Edwards employs "soaring, ecstatic language" to depict the heavenly kingdom as a place where love is perfectly united and realized between God and all its citizens: "The very light which shines in and fills that world is the light of love. It is beams of love; for it is the shining of the glory of the Lamb of God, that most wonderful influence of lamblike meekness and love which fill the Heavenly Jerusalem with light."[112]

Passages from Edwards's *Personal Narrative* clearly display a heightened or "mystical" sense of language and expression:

> And as I was walking there, and looked up on the sky and clouds; there came into my mind, a sweet sense of the glorious majesty and grace of God, that I know not how to express. I seemed to see them both in a sweet conjunction: majesty and meekness joined together . . . there seemed to be, as it were, a calm, sweet cast, or appearance of divine glory, in almost everything. God's excellency, his wisdom, his purity, and love seemed to appear in everything; in the sun, moon, and stars; in the clouds, and blue sky; in the grass, flowers, trees; in the water and all nature.[113]

Elsewhere in his conversion narrative, Edwards reported that he felt an overwhelming "sense of the glory of the divine being" and pondered how happy he would be if he "might enjoy that God, and be wrapt up to God in heaven."[114] He also described feeling "an inward sweetness" that would "carry me away in my contemplations," kindling "a sweet burning in my heart."[115]

The conversion narrative of Dutton displays a passion and energy quite similar to that of Edwards. She used intense language and imagery in her description of coming to Christ, declaring that she laid "prostrate before the throne of God's grace 'with a Rope about my Neck.'" Her expression was both plaintive and theological all at once: "Out of the Depths of Misery, I cry'd unto the Depths of

---

[112] Quoted in Story, *Jonathan Edwards and the Gospel of Love*, 121.

[113] See this discussion in Youngs, "Jonathan Edwards, a Mystic?," 50.

[114] Ibid., 53.

[115] Ibid.

Mercy."[116] After this experience, Dutton sought God "in the means of grace" through hearing sermons in corporate worship and reading the Bible. She describes her attainment of spiritual sight, in which she gained a vision of "such a ravishing Beauty, and transcendent Excellency in Christ that my Soul was ready to faint away with Desires after him."[117] Hindmarsh notes the "strikingly Edwardsian vision of the incandescent beauty" offered in Dutton's account.[118]

Like Edwards, Dutton often used language and imagery of love as found in the Song of Solomon, exclaiming that she was "pained with Love-Desires" and languished in "Love-sickness."[119] Additionally, doxological exclamations often appear within Dutton's theological treatises; for example, in *Thoughts on the Lord's Supper*, as she counsels the faithful regarding the proper, introspective manner in which to receive the Supper, Dutton suddenly erupts into rapturous praise:

> O what a Love, to our loving, lovely, dying, rising, reigning, coming Lord, doth his Love of Bounty, call for as Duty from us! Let us, attracted, allured, enkindled by the Power of infinite Love, cast our little Drop, into Love's vast Ocean, our little shining Spark, into Love's vehement Flame, into Love's adorable Brightness![120]

This type of emotive, rhapsodic language prompts Hindmarsh to make the following comparison: "If Catherine of Siena was a Third Order Dominican, then Anne Dutton must be reckoned something of a Third Order Baptist mystic."[121] Michael Sciretti concurs, stating that Dutton's language mirrors that of Christian mys-

---

[116] See this discussion in D. Bruce Hindmarsh, *The Evangelical Conversion Narrative: Spiritual Autobiography in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 296.

[117] Ibid.

[118] Ibid.

[119] Ibid., 299.

[120] Dutton, *Thoughts on the Lord's Supper*, 28.

[121] Ibid.

tics who went before her and that her theology was admirable because it is tempered with "the words and images of Scripture."[122]

Conclusion

This historical comparison of Edwards and Dutton affirms that evangelical communities in England and the American colonies exerted influence over one another and often shared a unity of thought that crossed denominational boundaries. Accordingly, scholars such as Richard Carwardine attest that the impact of revivalism upon the overall "shaping of society and culture" cannot be overstated.[123]

Through a close examination of their writings, I have shown in this study that Jonathan Edwards and Anne Dutton share a remarkable like-mindedness and a distinct resemblance in the content, depth, and intensity of their theological works and their doxological expressions of praise. I have shown the influence of Edwards within the historical context of the Particular Baptists, in which Dutton performed an extraordinary ministry of religious writing during the Evangelical Revival. To elucidate their strikingly similar theology, I have provided an analysis of their works on such topics as union with Christ, justification by faith alone, and the Lord's Supper. To illuminate the kinship of their doxology, I have identified figures of speech shared between the two authors and have demonstrated a mutual use of rapturous, ecstatic language to express their experiences of the divine.

In addition to its historical significance, the implications of this study are also useful in the consideration of current worship practices. Allen P. Ross states that for corporate worship to effectively reach its full potential, the church must have a thorough understanding of the "biblical theology that informs worship."[124] As

---

[122] Michael Sciretti, "Anne Dutton as a Spiritual Director," in *Women and the Church,* Christian Reflection: A Series in Faith and Ethics (Waco: The Center for Christian Ethics at Baylor University, 2009), 31.

[123] Richard Carwardine, *Transatlantic Revivalism: Popular Evangelism in Britain and America 1790–1865* (Carlisle, UK: Paternoster, 2007), xiii.

[124] Allen P. Ross, *Recalling the Hope of Glory: Biblical Worship from the Garden to the New Creation* (Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 2006), 38.

has been established, both Edwards and Dutton faithfully display an unswerving loyalty and commitment to the authority of Scripture—a rich theological legacy for present-day church leaders with like-minded commitments. Moreover, Inagrace Dietterich asserts that the proper "doing of theology—studying and talking about God—is the responsibility of all who participate in the church."[125]

Through their shared Puritan lineage and their similar religious experiences, Jonathan Edwards and Anne Dutton knew that theology must be built upon a proper understanding of God and must encompass all of life. As a person contemplates the mysteries of God and begins to understand his glorious excellency, s/he is inspired to obedience and a visible amendment of life, which ultimately creates a desire to praise, worship, and glorify God. Right belief leads to right practice—theology becomes doxology.[126]

[125] Inagrace T. Dietterich, "Sing to the Lord a New Song: Theology as Doxology," *Currents in Theology and Mission* 41, no. 1 (February 2014): 24.

[126] Peter Beck, "Worshiping God with Our Minds," 201–3.

Artistic Theologian 8 (2020): 75–98

Jonathan Edwards's Synthesis of Definitions of Beauty

David de Bruyn[1]

Beauty is integral to Christian worship. Christian worship, spirituality, and spiritual formation can be said to be in pursuit of beauty. The psalmist states that his "one desire" is the perception of God's beauty (Psalm 27:4). Howard argues,

> Christian formation is not simply the application of principles to our lives, it is rather the ever-increasing embodiment of Beauty. Hence we must learn to see the aims of our growth in Christ not simply as responsibilities or commands but also as experiments in a beautiful life.[2]

If beholding God's beauty is commended by Psalm 27:4 as a central pursuit in a believer's life, then recognizing and perceiving beauty is fundamental to Christianity and to Christian worship.

Indeed, the perceptive powers generally thought necessary to recognize beauty are needed in worship. The fact that artists and art critics describe the procedure of understanding beauty in art in such similar terms to those who speak of worshipping God is striking. These overlaps include the use of the imagination as a form of perception, the pursuit of disinterested pleasure in the object, the practice of immersion into the object to understand it on its own terms, and careful contemplation. If the skills for recognizing beauty overlap with the skills to experience the presence of God, then Christians should be in pursuit of the beauty of God.

---

[1] David de Bruyn, DTh, is pastor of New Covenant Baptist Church in Johannesburg, South Africa, and professor of church history and apologetics at Shepherds' Seminary. This article is an amended and edited version of content from the author's dissertation, "God's Objective Beauty and its Subjective Apprehension in Christian Spirituality" (University of South Africa, 2019).

[2] Evan B. Howard, "Formed into the Beauty of Christ: Reflections on Aesthetics and Christian Spiritual Formation," *Ogbomosho Journal of Theology* 16 (2011): 8.

Further, Christian worship requires art. At the very least, music and poetry are commanded (Eph 5:19; Col 3:16), and the act of corporate worship cannot be performed without art. The arts are fundamental to both private and public worship, and without the ability to perceive the beautiful in art, there will be little sensed beauty in worship. To put it another way, lacking the ability to see beauty in general may hamper the Christian's ability to encounter and experience God.

The neglect of beauty within Christian liturgy and practice in the last century have had visibly negative effects on Christian worship. Concessions to the Enlightenment pursuit of value-free objectivity have produced a less fruitful era for Christian expression in terms of music, poetry, literature, architecture, and the plastic arts.

Perhaps some of the difficulty in restoring beauty as a deliberate aim in worship is the absence of an agreed-upon definition of beauty in the Christian world. True, beauty is far more than an abstract idea; it is a quality to be embodied. Defining beauty conceptually is just the beginning of pursuing beauty. Such a definition is, however, a very important beginning for practical ends. A working definition of beauty and God's beauty can be used by pastors, teachers, and worship leaders as they seek to disciple God's people in corporate and private worship.

A definition of *beauty* or *the beautiful* has eluded the grasp of those who wish a definition with mathematical precision. This more than two-millennia-old discussion remains open, and no definition has satisfied its perennial participants or become the final word.

Few theologians in the Christian tradition have given as much attention to defining beauty as Jonathan Edwards did. Pseudo-Dionysius, Augustine, Boethius, Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventure, Hans Urs von Balthasar, and Von Hildebrand all deserve honorable mention, but Edwards remains peerless for the emphasis he laid upon beauty, and for the explanatory power of his definition.

The sheer volume of writings on beauty, from antiquity to the present day, is enormous. Christians of the last 1900 years have added to this store when referring to beauty while expounding theology, spirituality, or some form of apologetics or philosophy. Synthesizing the competing views of beauty is a herculean challenge.

This paper contends that Edwards attempted such a synthesis and achieved more than moderate success. Understanding and incorporating his definition in Christian worship may lead to a revived pursuit of beauty in Christian worship and spirituality.

Definitions of Beauty

Definitions of beauty and the beautiful can be broadly classified into four types: classical, transcendental, subjective, and theological. Some definitions attempt combinations of these, though for the purposes of this paper, particular definitions will be judged to be primarily allegiant to one category or the other. A brief survey of these four types of definitions and their proponents follows.

Classical Definitions

Classical definitions use some form of what Farley calls "the Great Theory of Beauty,"[3] which originated in Pythagoras and was developed by Plato and later Platonists. Christians influenced by Plato developed similar versions of the same idea.

The Great Theory defines beauty as essentially *proportion*. At the heart of this theory is the idea that beauty is fundamentally the harmony of parts to a whole.[4] Beauty is symmetry between composite parts or elegant relationships between parts that combine to make a unified, whole form. This symmetry is what provokes pleasure in the beholder. Plotinus saw beauty as "that which irradiates symmetry."[5] When the human mind or spirit senses the order and harmony of things, it experiences the pleasure of beauty.[6]

Christians found in this formula a way of linking beauty to God himself. Augustine, drawing on Plato, regarded equality as the

---

[3] Edward Farley, *Faith and Beauty: A Theological Aesthetic* (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2001), 17.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Earle J. Coleman, "The Beautiful, the Ugly, and the Tao," *Journal of Chinese Philosophy* 18 (1991): 213.

[6] Richard Viladesau, *Theological Aesthetics: God in Imagination, Beauty, and Art* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 134.

main principle of beauty, where harmony and unity are reducible to equality.[7] Thomas Aquinas, following Aristotle's expansion of Plato's definition into integrity, harmony, and clarity,[8] coined what became a standard definition of beauty during the High Middle Ages, stating that beauty includes three conditions: perfection or integrity, proportion or harmony, and brightness or clarity.[9] Richard Harries, bishop of Oxford, saw all beauty as characterized by wholeness, harmony, and radiance, though differing in its forms.[10]

Materialist and Darwinian accounts of beauty in symmetry also exist. Goldman suggests that humans find beauty as they spot order within complexity, since the intellect ever seeks patterns of order.[11] Some see beauty as the human recognition of mathematical and geometrical patterns in nature and transposed into art.[12]

Of course, objections are levelled at both the Christian and non-Christian forms of this definition. Guy Sircello criticizes all theories of beauty that are some form of the classical theory as "unitarian" and sees them as destined only to increase the demise of beauty.[13] Calvin Seerveld strongly challenges Christian forms of the classical theory, or the classical idea of metaphysical beauty, saying that Scripture does not bear out this notion, feeling that the core of what is often considered aesthetic is in Scripture "lucidity": "a playfulness, which assumes vital, sensitive formative ability, is at the core of imaginativity."[14]

While classical definitions have never persuaded all, the perennial return to the notions of harmony and symmetry in the

---

[7] Oleg K. Bychkov, "What Does Beauty Have to Do with the Trinity? From Augustine to Duns Scotus," *Franciscan Studies* 66 (2008): 199.

[8] James A. Martin, *Beauty and Holiness* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990), 16.

[9] Kin Yip Louie, *The Beauty of the Triune God*, Kindle, Princeton Theological Monograph (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publishers, 2013), §735.

[10] Richard Harries, *Art and the Beauty of God* (London: Mowbray, 1993), 24–25.

[11] Alan H. Goldman, "Aesthetic Qualities and Aesthetic Value," *The Journal of Philosophy* 87, no. 1 (January 1990): 33.

[12] Eric Newton, *The Meaning of Beauty* (London: Longmans Green and Co., 1950), 25.

[13] Guy Sircello, "Beauty in Shards and Fragments," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 48, no. 1 (1990): 21.

[14] Calvin Seerveld, "Christian Aesthetic Bread for the World," *Philosophia Reformata* 66 (2001): 160.

discussion of beauty is significant enough to warrant giving the classical idea of beauty as harmony some consideration.

Transcendental Definitions

The second group of definitions employs the transcendentals to define beauty. The phrase "truth, goodness, and beauty," coined by Plato, is well known as the triad of transcendentals. Transcendental definitions of beauty define beauty in relation to the unseen and ultimate qualities of truth and goodness, or as some combination of these. In these definitions, beauty is understood as identical to the good,[15] as a form of moral goodness,[16] as the "*radiance* of the true and the good,"[17] or even as the "capacity to proclaim truth and to realize goodness."[18]

Mortimer Adler claims that beauty is a synthesis of truth and goodness: "like the good in that it pleases us, like the true in that it is not acquisitive desire."[19] Savile states that Hegel saw art's role to "reveal truth in pleasing, sensible form."[20]

Again, those in Christendom have found this definition useful. Pope John Paul II defined beauty in this way:

> [I]n a certain sense, beauty is the visible form of the good, just as the good is the metaphysical condition of beauty. This was well understood by the Greeks who, by fusing the two

---

[15] Viladesau, *Theological Aesthetics: God in Imagination, Beauty, and Art*, 134.

[16] Anthony Skillen, "The Place of Beauty," *Philosophy* 77, no. 299 (January 2002): 36.

[17] Stratford Caldecott, *Beauty for Truth's Sake: On the Re-Enchantment of Education* (Grand Rapids: Brazos Press, 2009), 31.

[18] Paul Munson and Joshua Farris Drake, *Art and Music: A Student's Guide*, Kindle, Reclaiming the Christian Intellectual Tradition (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2014), §301.

[19] Mortimer Adler, *The Great Ideas*, ed. Max Weismann (Peru, IL: Open Court Publishing Company, 2000), 156.

[20] Anthony Savile, "Beauty and Truth: The Apotheosis of an Idea," in *Analytic Aesthetics*, ed. Richard Shusterman (Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell, 1989), 127.

> concepts, coined a term which embraces both: *kalokagathía*, or beauty-goodness.[21]

Wainwright conceives of beauty along the lines of divine design: truth reveals the Creator's design, goodness is when creatures act in light of the Creator's purpose, and beauty is the result—when all is shaped according to the divine design.[22]

Bishop Harries distinguished between beauty and glory by saying that "when goodness, truth, and beauty are combined we have glory. When boundless goodness, total truth, and sublime beauty are combined in supreme degree, we have divine glory."[23]

The transcendental theory has had its critics, too. Cory disputes the equivalence of beauty and truth, saying each requires the other, but they are not forms of one another.[24] Von Hildebrand goes beyond truth and goodness, saying that beauty is the radiance of *every* value: qualitative values, moral values, intellectual values, and aesthetical values.[25]

The transcendental theory has the power of explaining why beauty seems to have much to do with fittingness and excellence. The overlap between goodness, which is to say, what ought to be, and beauty, shows that beauty must have a strong relationship to truth and goodness. The repeated declaration that God saw that the creation was "good" (Gen. 1:4, 10, 12, 18, 21, 25, 31) is not primarily a statement about the created order's ethical state, as much as its aesthetics: its excellence, fittingness, and beauty.

---

[21] Pope John Paul II, *Letter of His Holiness the Pope to Artists*, 1999, https://w2.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/letters/1999/documents/hf_jp-ii_let_23041999_artists.html.

[22] Geoffrey Wainwright, "The True, the Good, and the Beautiful: The Other Story," *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa* 107 (July 2000): 24.

[23] Harries, *Art and the Beauty of God*, 54.

[24] Herbert Ellsworth Cory, "The Interactions of Beauty and Truth," *The Journal of Philosophy* 22, no. 15 (July 1925): 395.

[25] Alice von Hildebrand, "Debating Beauty: Jacques Maritain and Dietrich von Hildebrand," *Crisis Magazine*, August 2004, 41.

Subjective Definitions

A third kind of beauty-definitions defines beauty almost entirely as its effects or experience within the perceiving subject. These expound beauty in terms of the peculiar aesthetic pleasure, or its ethical effect upon the subject. Such explanations adopt some form of emotional or psychological theory that locates beauty in the response of the perceiver.[26]

Some, such as McMahon, see the experience of beauty as the human pleasure of awareness of the process of problem-solving in perception.[27] Perhaps partly borrowing from the classical theory, this definition sees the human mind as experiencing beauty when it recognizes relationships of harmony and unity, be these components of a physical object, or concepts within an idea. Kant's idealism saw beauty as the mind's recognizing purposiveness, without having an acquisitive interest in the object. Lorand believes that beauty is a complex concept, best understood by its numerous opposites: ugliness, meaninglessness, boring, kitsch, insignificant, or irrelevant.[28] Though these represent real values, they cannot be united, and therefore beauty is a "high degree of inner order." For others, such as Elaine Scarry, beauty cannot be defined as an unattached ideal, but one can point to beautiful objects and describe their effects, causing one to be deliberative, saving life, and increasing justice.[29]

To be clear, proponents of this definition do not necessarily deny that objects of beauty have outward qualities that might be construed as beautiful. Rather, their claim is that beauty itself must be defined as the subject's response to these qualities, not as something that exists entirely independently of observation or inherently in the unperceived object. Philosopher Roger Scruton defines beauty as that which pleases, while stating that beauty is nevertheless

---

[26] F. Duane Lindsey, "Essays toward a Theology of Beauty Part I: God Is Beautiful," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 131, no. 522 (1974): 121.

[27] Jennifer McMahon, "Towards a Unified Theory of Beauty," *Literature and Aesthetics* 9 (1999): 23.

[28] Ruth Lorand, "Beauty and Its Opposites," *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism,* 52, no. 4 (1994): 402.

[29] Elaine Scarry, *On Beauty and Being Just* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999), 9.

the subject-matter of a judgement of taste. This judgement of taste is "about the beautiful object, not about the subject's state of mind."[30]

Perhaps one might summarize the valid insight of this definition thus: what is experienced as beauty may exist *separately* from a perceiving subject, but it does not truly exist *without* a perceiving subject. That is, while beauty is not merely the inner experience of perceiving subjects, something's beauty is impossible to speak of without perceiving subjects.

Theological Definitions

The fourth kind of definitions employs theological ideas to define beauty. Theological definitions take God himself as the foundation of beauty, or as the ultimate form of it. In these definitions, beauty is either an attribute of God, or a way of speaking of God's being or relations. Importantly, theological definitions insist that one define beauty with God's revelation in Scripture, not primarily with philosophy or aesthetics. De Gruchy warns against attempting to define God's beauty based upon our own definitions of beauty, rather than using the form of beauty revealed in creation and redemption.[31] Revelation, then, must be the key for understanding beauty as it relates to God.

Understanding beauty as being, and God's being as the ground of all being, makes beauty equivalent to God. Spiegel summarizes the idea: "As all being is either God or is derived from God, so all that is beautiful either *is* him or comes *from* him."[32] The idea of beauty as being prevailed in medieval Christendom.

According to Lindsey, Karl Barth saw the beauty of God as the more precise designation of the glory of God, "the sum total of the divine perfection in irresistible self-manifestation."[33] Wooddell ventures that something "is beautiful insofar as it reflects the char-

---

[30] Roger Scruton, *Beauty* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 5.

[31] John W. de Gruchy, *Holy Beauty: A Reformed Perspective on Aesthetics within a World of Unjust Ugliness* (Richmond, VA, 2001), 6.

[32] James S. Spiegel, "Aesthetics and Worship," *Southern Baptist Journal of Theology* 2, no. 4 (1998): 42.

[33] Lindsey, "Essays toward a Theology of Beauty Part I: God Is Beautiful," 127.

acter, nature, or will of God."[34] Munson and Drake similarly regard beauty as the forms through which people recognize the nature and ways of God.[35] Similar to these definitions are those that regard the triune love of God as primordial beauty. Jeremy Begbie insists that God's beauty be defined as dynamic love, not a static structure.[36]

Here, proportion, radiance, perfection, and pleasure can be united in light of the reciprocal love of the Godhead. In *The Beauty of the Infinite*, David Hart argues that "true beauty is not the idea of the beautiful, a static archetype in the mind of God, but is an infinite music, drama, art, completed in but never bounded by the termless dynamism of the Trinity's life."[37] Robert Jenson has insightfully recognized the dilemma of subject and object, of beholder and beheld in the topic of beauty, and finds its ultimate reconciliation in God himself, that the triune God of Christianity is beautiful, and all that he perceives that reflects his own beauty. "In God there is a genuine I and a confrontation with another, and their harmony in loving beauty is reliable."[38]

Some medieval theologians combined the classical idea of symmetry with the Trinity, seeing beauty in the three persons of the Trinity as equal, that is, mutually related through the common relation of equality (their beauty results from the proportion of equality, parallel to earthly beauty). Others saw God's beauty simply in his excellence, while some saw it in the relations of procession between the Persons of the Godhead.[39]

Conversely, some writers have rejected metaphysical notions of beauty. Edgar agrees with Seerveld and Begbie that beauty should be thought of as that which alludes to God and which faith-

---

[34] Joseph D. Wooddell, *The Beauty of the Faith: Using Aesthetics for Christian Apologetics*, Kindle (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2011), §1327.

[35] Munson and Drake, *Art and Music: A Student's Guide*, §245.

[36] Jeremy Begbie, "Created Beauty: The Witness of J. S. Bach," in *The Beauty of God: Theology and the Arts*, ed. Daniel J. Treier, Mark Husbands, and Roger Lundin, Kindle (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2007), §182.

[37] David Bentley Hart, *The Beauty of the Infinite* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2003), 177.

[38] Robert W. Jenson, "Beauty," in *Essays in Theology of Culture* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1995), 152.

[39] Bychkov, "What Does Beauty Have to Do with the Trinity? From Augustine to Duns Scotus," 212.

fully represents his attributes and ways.[40] God's ways are both good and great, and faithful representation of this is a gargantuan task.[41]

Theological definitions, then, insist that beauty is defined derivatively from what God is: his being, attributes, or relations. Beauty cannot be a concept to which God conforms; the very concept must be derived from the perfection within God.

Analysis of the Various Definitions

A Christian conception of beauty cannot be satisfied with a definition of beauty that excludes or neglects God. Beauty must be defined in relation to God and using Scripture. With this qualification in mind, each of the four definitions of beauty will now be examined.

First, is beauty the harmony or proportion so loved by Platonic aestheticians? Its constant refrain in discussions of beauty is certainly indicative of the attractiveness of the idea, and it would be bold to dismiss it out of hand. The classical theory explains much, particularly in visual perception, or in the beauty of intellectually elegant ideas (in mathematics, for example). For all that, beauty-as-harmony fails to deal adequately with the phenomenon of unitary beauty. Some phenomena, such as light, or the beauty of a single

---

[40] William Edgar, "Aesthetics: Beauty Avenged, Apologetics Enriched," *Westminster Theological Journal* 63, no. 2001 (2001): 120.

[41] Since the time of Immanuel Kant, some writers have distinguished the idea of beauty from the idea of the sublime, a modern example being Gilbert-Rolfe (1999). They argue that being awed, humbled and overwhelmed with the dangerous beauty of a storm is qualitatively different from being cheered and delighted by the beauty of a tranquil landscape, calling for distinct words to describe the two: the storm being sublime, and the landscape being beautiful. Such a distinction was inevitable to the Enlightenment, attempting as it did to describe human reason and experience without reference to God. This nuance of the discussion of beauty need not detain the reader, for in the spirituality of Christianity, both will be combined in the experience of God. God's beauty is both "unbounded" in his infinitude, and "bounded" in the creation and the Incarnation, meaning that Kant's or Burke's distinctions are not a problem for the study at hand. See Alejandro García-Rivera, "Aesthetics," in *The Blackwell Companion to Christian Spirituality*, ed. Arthur Holder, The Blackwell Companions to Religion (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2005), 357.

color, are not beautiful by virtue of harmony, but because of their simple, singular beauty. The pleasure obtained by beauty cannot be finally reduced to admiration of symmetry, for some beauty is the beauty of the simple, or the sublime, or even the tragic—in which the disharmonious nevertheless attains a beauty in our eyes. Certainly, the beauty of God's harmony with his own being in the Trinity is unquestionable, which this paper will develop further. To make this harmony the very essence of beauty, however, is to make harmony an ideal to which God himself conforms. God's beauty must almost certainly *contain* the qualities of harmony or symmetry, but it will not do to say that it is equivalent to those qualities. Harmony then becomes the ultimate good, perhaps unwittingly displacing other attributes of God, claiming in an unwarranted fashion to be the supreme good.

Second, is beauty equivalent to truth and goodness? If beauty obtains a correspondence between internal appreciation and external realities, then beauty cannot be entirely separated from truth.[42] Nor can hating what is beautiful to God be considered moral or good, so loving beauty is itself virtuous, or good. Perhaps one might say with Scarry that beauty is allied with truth, but not identical to it.[43] Its nature as some kind of ultimate value must place it into relationship with other ultimate values such as goodness or truth. Nevertheless, defining beauty solely in terms of the abstract transcendentals of truth and goodness (whether one grants them independent existence or not) potentially leaves beauty in the realm of a philosophical construct, rather than an attribute or property to be experienced.

Third, can beauty be defined as pleasure in a subject? Beauty may represent a phenomenon in a perceiving subject, but that phenomenon corresponds to something outside the subject. As Hart points out, the fact that beauty can surprise one shows that beauty is not merely a projection of one's own desires, but an evocation of desire by the object.[44] It may be true that no beauty exists without

---

[42] David Lyle Jeffrey and Gregory Maillet, *Christianity and Literature: Philosophical Foundations and Critical Practice*, Kindle, Christian Worldview Integration Series (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2011), §480,

[43] Scarry, *On Beauty and Being Just*, 52.

[44] Hart, *The Beauty of the Infinite*.

beholders; it is equally true that beholders do not create beauty out of themselves. One must examine the subjective experience of beauty, but Christians must insist that a real phenomenon exists outside the subject, in recognizable properties in the object. A definition of God's beauty must include the concept of pleasure in another (pushing one inexorably to a Trinitarian view of God's being), but more is needed to sustain a robust view of God's beauty. It appears the remaining option for a working definition of God's beauty is to harmonize these three definitions with the fourth category: theological definitions of beauty.

Is beauty another name for God's uncompounded, infinite being? Defining beauty as equivalent to God's being creates its own problems. If beauty is God's being simply considered, and God's being is the ground of all being, how does one then explain ugliness in the order of things? If beauty is to be predicated of God's being, the idea must refer to solely God's being *in himself*, transcendent above immanent reality. For unquestionably, in secondary reality—the created order—God's beauty is not perfectly reflected; indeed, it is often parodied, warped, and distorted.

Moving one step away from God's being simply considered, is God's beauty one of his attributes, or the sum total of his will and ways? Is God's beauty the name for when God's glory is displayed and experienced? This is a generally safe assumption, since Scripture does link God's beauty with his glory (1 Chr. 16:29; Job 40:10; Ps. 29:2). Yet to say that God's beauty is God's glory is merely to substitute a biblical word for a philosophical one, and merely drives one to define both more explicitly.

Is the Trinity's life the essence of God's beauty? Is God's beauty particularly related to the Trinity: the symmetry of relations, the harmony of three who are one, or the relationships of love with one another? If God's beauty represents not merely his essence or being, but the radiance and pleasurable splendor of this essence, then God's delight in God would be one of the strongest contenders for a working definition of God's beauty.

While each of these four definitions captures part of the idea and phenomenon of beauty, they appear insufficient taken on their own. This deficiency could be addressed if a synthesis of the definitions were attempted.

Jonathan Edwards's Definitions

Jonathan Edwards's writings on beauty represent one of the most compelling solutions to defining beauty. The seventeenth-century American theologian's writings on beauty[45] represent a fascinating (though perhaps unintentional) synthesis of these four definitions of beauty, combining harmony, the transcendentals, the subjective, and the varying theological definitions in one.

Edwards's view of beauty was fundamental to much of his theology. Farley goes as far as to say that in Edwards's interpretation of philosophical and religious themes, "beauty is more central and more pervasive than in any other text in the history of Christian theology."[46] Edwards does not just theologize about beauty: beauty (loveliness, sweetness) is the fundamental motif through which he understands the world, God, virtue and "divine things." Similarly, McClymond and McDermott write:

> Beauty is fundamental to Edwards's understanding of being. It is the first principle of being, the inner, structural principle of being-itself. This stress on beauty set Edwards apart from other Protestant authors. . . . One might interpret the whole of Edwards's theology as the gradual, complex outworking of a primal vision of God's beauty that came to him in the wake of his conversion experience.[47]

Edwards regarded God's beauty as his most distinguishing attribute. Writing in *Religious Affections*, Edwards stated, "God is God, and distinguished from all other beings, and exalted above 'em, chiefly by his divine beauty. . . . They therefore that see the

---

[45] Edwards's discussed beauty in many of his writings. His work *The Mind* gives one of the clearest explications of his vocabulary of beauty. Here Edwards presented a classical or neoclassical ideal of beauty. In *A Dissertation Concerning the Nature of True Virtue* (1749), Edwards argued for God's beauty being the ground of all other forms of beauty. Its companion work, *A Dissertation Concerning the End for Which God Created the World,* continues the thesis that the ground of being is God's own happiness, not the creature's.

[46] Farley, *Faith and Beauty: A Theological Aesthetic*, 43.

[47] Michael J. McClymond and Gerald R. McDermott, *The Theology of Jonathan Edwards*, Kindle (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), §1116.

stamp of this glory in divine things . . . see that in them wherein the truest idea of divinity does consist."[48]

Edwards's views on beauty are understood within the context of the subjectivist turn of the mid-eighteenth century, which "experienced a crucial shift in the history of aesthetics from beauty as being to beauty as human self-transcendence," from an external property to a human sensibility.[49] Edwards sought to avoid the objective/subjective dichotomy inherent in some forms of British empiricism and other epistemologies.[50] What set Edwards apart from his contemporaries, and what makes him so relevant to the contemporary discussion, was his ability to combine subjective and objective aspects of beauty in a theory grounded in God's beauty. Moody states that beauty appealed to Edwards because it seemed to be a way to form a concept of objectivity that could be subjectively channeled.[51]

The Classical Definition in Edwards

In *The Mind*, Edwards defended his own form of the Great Theory of Beauty: beauty consists in a relatedness between entities. The relatedness may be an exact correspondence, such as one finds in geometry, or a more sophisticated proportionality, such as one finds in music.[52]

Having said that, Edwards embraced the idea that beauty could include disproportion as well as proportion. "What seems to be disproportionate in a narrow context might appear proportionate in a broader context."[53] An opposite situation occurs when something appears to be beautiful when taken in a narrow context, and

---

[48] Edwards, *Religious Affections* (1754), ed. Paul Ramsey, Works of Jonathan Edwards Online, 2:298 (edwards.yale.edu).

[49] R. Venter, "Trinity and Beauty: The Theological Contribution of Jonathan Edwards," *Nederduitse Gereformeerde Teologiese Tydskrif / Dutch Reformed Theological Journal* 51, no. 3 (2010): 187.

[50] J. A. Martin Jr., "The Empirical, the Esthetic, and the Religious," *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 30, nos. 2–4 (1975): 113.

[51] Josh Moody, *Jonathan Edwards and the Enlightenment* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2005), 105.

[52] McClymond and McDermott, *The Theology of Jonathan Edwards*, §1173.

[53] Ibid., §1173.

yet appears disproportionate, or even ugly, when considered in a larger context.[54] When things disproportionate, unequal, or irregular are harmonized, it intensifies the beauty of the whole. In his sermon "The Excellency of Christ," Edwards demonstrates how apparently opposing attributes in the person of Christ make him as beautiful as he is.[55] Mitchell explains: "Edwards calls the beauty of exact correspondence *simple beauty*. He calls the beauty of proportionality *complex beauty*. These kinds of beauty fit into a larger classification called *secondary beauty*." [56] Secondary beauty applies to physical things as well as abstract concepts or immaterial matters. A well-ordered society can be beautiful. A harmonious community can be beautiful. Well-executed justice can be beautiful.

Thus, for Edwards, *primary beauty* is the relatedness between persons, and Edwards traces beauty back to the first and primary person: God himself. Edwards laid stress in his writings on this kind of beauty. In Edwards's thinking, the usual concepts of beauty, such as abstract proportionality or harmony in created forms of beauty, were really to be understood only as symbolic counterpoints to a higher kind of correspondence, that of wills in persons. Correspondence or symmetry, or harmony between persons—intellectual or volitional beings—was what Edwards called "consent": a term that suggested volition, affection, and love to God and to one another.[57] Consent is Edwards's spiritual and moral equivalent of created or sensible harmony and symmetry. That is, symmetry in the created realm, such as gravity or music or color, has a higher analogue in the consent of spiritual love and union. The ultimate harmony is loving union with God, and the ultimate form of such harmonious symmetry would be God's love for God, meaning his intra-trinitarian love. Directional activity tending toward union was, to Edwards, found in nature—a stone "consents" to the law of gravity, but this is only a type of love in the spiritual world. Reality,

---

[54] Ibid., §1186.

[55] Louis J. Mitchell, "The Theological Aesthetics of Jonathan Edwards," *Theology Today* 64, no. 1 (April 2007): 41.

[56] Ibid., 37.

[57] McClymond and McDermott, *The Theology of Jonathan Edwards*, §1137.

in its most basic form, is relational and dispositional, not static, self-contained substances.[58]

Thus, at the fundamental level, beauty is *being's consent to being*. God's benevolence toward being in general and toward other benevolent beings is the essence of beauty.[59] God's relatedness to himself and to his creatures is primary beauty. Edwards was not claiming that beauty and existence are essentially the same. Existence is fundamental to *agreement*, and agreement is at the heart of beauty. Parting from the ancients and some medievals, Edwards said that being, or existence, is fundamental to beauty, but it is not beauty itself. Beauty is consent, and primary beauty is being's consent to being. The greater the scale of being, the higher the potential for agreement, and therefore for beauty. Beauty is harmonious benevolence. Being is the ground of beauty.

The Transcendental Definition in Edwards

Edwards also assimilates the transcendental definition by combining truth, goodness, and beauty by defining beauty as "true virtue" (or *true goodness*, in modern parlance), which is the beauty of love for that which is most perfect—God himself.[60] In *The Nature of True Virtue*, Edward points out that virtue is considered to be a kind of beauty, but specifically a moral beauty, for no one considers the beauty of nature to be virtuous.[61] He then distinguishes common morality from saving virtue. For Edwards, mere selflessness or morality arising out of selfishness is not true virtue.[62] True virtue is essentially a supreme love for God. This love of God is the beauty of God, the saints, and the angels. When a moral being finds pleasure in God's beauty, that pleasure and desire constitutes his or her spiritual beauty, or moral goodness. God is ultimately beautiful because

[58] Venter, "Trinity and Beauty: The Theological Contribution of Jonathan Edwards," 186.

[59] John Mason Hodges, "Beauty Revisited," *Reformation and Revival* 4, no. 4 (1995): 66.

[60] Louie, *The Beauty of the Triune God*, §3393.

[61] Edwards, "On the Nature of True Virtue," in *Ethical Writings*, ed. Paul Ramsey, Works of Jonathan Edwards Online, 8:539.

[62] Ibid., 8:612.

of what he loves and because of who he is. Holy affections, loving and desiring what God loves, are the subjective analogue to the holy beauty of God.

By using the term "being," Edwards is using the philosophical term for the essence or truth of what is. When the ground of existence finds moral or ethical delight in himself, this is beauty. To put it in transcendental terms: Beauty is the living Truth's goodness to himself, or the Good's truthful response to himself.

The Subjective Definition in Edwards

When Edwards turned to deal with the subjectivity of beauty in the experience of observers, he again formulated a theocentric response to the eighteenth-century discussion of "taste" in his use of the term *sensibility*. Delattre, noted twentieth-century professor of American studies and religious studies, suggests that beauty and sensibility are the "objective and subjective components of the spiritual life" in Edwards's writings.[63] Martin identifies two word groups used interchangeably throughout Edwards's works: an "affections group" (affections, consent, love, will, pleasure, inclination, and disposition) that describe the action of an intelligent being toward other intelligent beings (the actions of the subject); and a "beauty group" (beauty, glory, holiness, proportion, and excellency) that describe both the object of consent and the result of mutual consent.[64]

Balancing objective and subjective sides of beauty so that neither eclipsed the other was what Edwards's intricate theory of sensibility and "sense of the heart" attempted to do.[65] Some of Edwards's work on sensibility was a response to Enlightenment thinkers such as Locke, Shaftesbury, and Hutcheson. In *The Nature of True Virtue*, Edwards referred to Hutcheson by name three times.[66] Mar-

[63] Roland Andre Delattre, *Beauty and Sensibility in the Thought of Jonathan Edwards* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968), 3.

[64] Ryan J. Martin, *Understanding Affections in the Theology of Jonathan Edwards* (New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2018), 113.

[65] McClymond and McDermott, *The Theology of Jonathan Edwards*, §1194.

[66] A. Owen Aldridge, "Edwards and Hutcheson," *Harvard Theological Review* 44, no. 1 (January 1951): 35.

tin believes that Edwards was a "Platonic empiricist."[67] But he was by no means a parrot of popular philosophy.

For Edwards the "sense of the heart" was an appreciation of beauty that is given to a person by God. In his *Treatise on Grace*, Edwards writes that "the first effect of the power of God in the heart in regeneration is to give the heart a divine taste or sense, to cause it to have a relish of the loveliness and sweetness of the supreme excellency of the divine nature."[68] Edwards believed that beauty is definitely something subjectively experienced, in *On the Nature of True Virtue* sounding like one of the earlier *philosophes*:

> It is evident therefore by this, that the way we come by the idea or sensation of beauty, is by immediate sensation of the gratefulness of the idea called "beautiful"; and not by finding out by argumentation any consequences, or other things that it stands connected with; any more than tasting the sweetness of honey, or perceiving the harmony of a tune, is by argumentation on connections and consequences.[69]

Edwards, however, went beyond Locke's view that the mind is merely passive in the process of perception. Edwards believed that the organ that sensed beauty was the "habit of mind," where sense-ideas received through regular physical channels are ordered in their true relational context by the mind, and then delighted in by the mind.[70] Edwards taught the imagination is before the inclination: the imagination reveals the relations between ideas; the inclination takes pleasure in them.[71]

But at the heart of this was the work of regeneration. Edwards sought to explain the ordering activity of the mind and its predisposition toward one thing and not another, in terms of its regenerate or unregenerate state. Regenerate hearts are given a new

---

[67] Martin, *Beauty and Holiness*, 28.

[68] Edwards, "Treatise on Grace," in *Writings on the Trinity, Grace, and Faith*, ed. Sang Hyun Lee, Works of Jonathan Edwards Online, 21:174.

[69] Edwards, "On the Nature of True Virtue," 8:619.

[70] Sang Hyun Lee, "Mental Activity and the Perception of Beauty in Jonathan Edwards," *Harvard Theological Review* 69, nos. 3–4 (October 1976): 390.

[71] Sang Hyun Lee, *The Philosophical Theology of Jonathan Edwards* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988), 156.

inclination, and with it, the ability to see as beautiful what could not be seen before. A human being, once given a new habit of mind, could experience the transcendent beauty that is God. Equally so, an unregenerate person may well perceive other forms of secondary beauty, but lacking the God-given sense of the heart, may yet fail to see the primary beauty that is God. Edwards believed that the scriptural word "spirit" referred to the affections of the mind. If a person obtains new affections, these are part of one's essence, and if one's essence has changed, one also has a new nature. Such a one participates in the divine nature, which explains the consequent love for divine beauty. By partaking of God's love for God, one now has a sensibility for primary beauty.[72]

In this way, by referring to sensibility, habit of mind, or the *affections* as the faculty that perceives or fails to perceive beauty, Edwards placed the blame for failing to see God's beauty at the door of the unbelieving, hard heart, while upholding the truth that God is beautiful to the heart ready to see him. Put simply, just hearts have increasingly just sentiments. Indeed, for Edwards, the essence of true virtue is "benevolence to being in general." When a human being showed the same "consent" towards God, which could be variously understood as faith, belief, hope, obedience, or love, he or she was displaying true virtue, or spiritual beauty.[73] God's love for God manifest in a believer was the believer's relish for God's beauty.

By grounding all beauty in God's loving relatedness to himself and developing that definition to encompass all forms of beauty, Edwards could ground beauty in ultimate reality while acknowledging the diversity in the experience of beauty. Diversity in aesthetic taste is satisfactorily explained by the habit of the mind, be it regenerate or unregenerate. Therefore, for Edwards, the *philosophes* were correct to say that much beauty is known by experience, but wrong to deny that any ontological structure of beauty existed. The perception of beauty lay not merely in some neutral innate sense, but in inclinations of the heart, which could be regenerate or unregenerate. Thus, only believers could sense and enjoy the prima-

[72] Louie, *The Beauty of the Triune God*, §2627.

[73] McClymond and McDermott, *The Theology of Jonathan Edwards*, §6424.

ry beauty of God and, having done so, would be even more capable of sensing and enjoying secondary beauty.

Edwards also managed to undermine and transcend the conventional duality of subject and object. For Edwards, beauty is not a property; it is a disposition. It is objective in the sense that it is an actual state of affairs—the way God relates to himself and his world—but it is subjective in that it is a heartfelt disposition: relation and consent on the part of God. Beauty is simultaneously objective and subjective.[74]

The Theological Definition in Edwards

For Edwards, beauty was not a concept one could divorce from God.[75] Edwards is distinct in this respect. While other writers "claim that aesthetic experience points to the goodness of God, Edwards claims that true aesthetic experience is inseparable from the perception of God."[76] The aesthetic experience is not merely a gift from God; he is the very essence of the aesthetic experience.[77]

Edwards's definition of beauty was "being's cordial consent to being in general."[78] This *consent* is benevolence, union, or love: the benevolence of God toward being in general and specifically toward other benevolent beings.[79] Here Edwards defines beauty as God's response to his own ontological being, agreeing with medievalists that God himself is the ground of beauty, not a concept that could be abstracted from God.[80]

Edwards anticipated the objection to grounding beauty in God himself. Complete simplicity cannot be beautiful, for it has no relations of proportionality. Similarly, in primary beauty, a solitary person cannot display this consent, of loving union with himself or herself. In order for God to be beautiful, God must have propor-

---

[74] Farley, *Faith and Beauty: A Theological Aesthetic*, 47.

[75] Owen Strachan and Douglas Sweeney, *Jonathan Edwards on Beauty,* Kindle (Chicago: Moody, 2010), §679.

[76] Louie, *The Beauty of the Triune God*, §1522.

[77] Ibid., §1520.

[78] Edwards, "On the Nature of True Virtue," 8:620.

[79] Hodges, "Beauty Revisited," 67.

[80] Strachan and Sweeney, *Jonathan Edwards on Beauty*, §679.

tionality and consent in God's being.[81] Edwards solved this problem elegantly by putting forward the relatedness of the three Persons in the Godhead as the essence of primary beauty. God's beauty is not merely his being in some static, abstract sense. The beauty is how God dynamically responds to God's being. God's dynamic benevolence, as inclined and expressed to himself and his works, is beauty. Trinitarian love is at the heart of what God's beauty is. The Trinity is the ground of proportionality and consent to Being. Edwards explained in *The Mind*:

> As to God's excellence, it is evident it consists in the love of himself. . . . But he exerts himself towards himself no other way than in infinitely loving and delighting in himself, in the mutual love of the Father and the Son. This makes the third, the personal Holy Spirit or the holiness of God, which is his infinite beauty, and this is God's infinite consent to being in general.[82]

He goes on to say: "Tis peculiar to God that he has beauty within himself, consisting in being's consenting with his own being, or the love of himself in his own Holy Spirit whereas the excellence of others is in loving others, in loving God, and in the communications of his Spirit."[83] Louie writes that for Edwards, God is beautiful only because God is triune.[84] Unlike many other writers, for Edwards beauty is not one of many attributes of the simple divine essence, but a "moral perfection of God, which is embodied in the triune life of God."[85] God's love for God is God's beauty and his chief glory. Edwards has perhaps the best theological definition of beauty, combining essence with dynamic response.

With this theocentric view of beauty, Edwards explained all other forms of beauty, which he termed *secondary beauty*. Beauty in the universe is essentially an enlargement and overflowing of the

---

[81] Mitchell, "The Theological Aesthetics of Jonathan Edwards," 38.

[82] Edwards, "The Mind," in *Scientific and Philosophical Writings*, ed. Wallace E. Anderson, Works of Jonathan Edwards Online, 6:364.

[83] Ibid., 6:365.

[84] Louie, T*he Beauty of the Triune God*, §3143.

[85] Ibid.

divine life.[86] It is essentially the beauty of harmony or proportion, and in Edwards's mind, can be manifested in several ways.

The believer himself is a special recipient of God's beauty. Beauty is what genuine religion looks like.[87] Virtue within a believer is those qualities of heart that combine to love God or express benevolence to being in general, and even love for his creation.[88] A believer's beauty is simply a reflection of God's beauty. To love God is to love what he loves, which is to becomes as he is, and to reflect his beauty.[89] At the societal level, a perfectly harmonious society wherein active and mutually supportive social consent takes place would be an example of secondary beauty.[90]

Analysis

Edwards defines beauty as "being's cordial consent to being in general."[91] This definition, combining all four theories, is difficult to improve upon. First, he maintained the classical notions of cosmological harmony and symmetry with the idea of being "consenting" to being: the ultimate harmony must be the fullest reality being in harmony with the fullest reality. Second, he nodded to the transcendental triad of truth, goodness, and beauty by explicitly defining true virtue as beauty. Third, he conceded the valid objections of eighteenth-century *philosophes* to the medieval being-as-beauty notion, and agreed that part of the definition of beauty must include the activity of subjects perceiving beauty. This he did with the concept of sensibility: hearts must be regenerated by saving grace to be able to taste and see that the Lord is good. Perception of beauty is dependent upon being in union with the source of beauty: God

---

[86] Roland A. Delattre, "Aesthetics and Ethics: Jonathan Edwards and the Recovery of Aesthetics for Religious Ethics," *Journal of Religious Ethics* 31, no. 2 (2003): 281.

[87] Mitchell, "The Theological Aesthetics of Jonathan Edwards," 42.

[88] Joseph D. Wooddell, "Jonathan Edwards, Beauty, and Apologetics.," *Criswell Theological Review* 5, no. 1 (2007): 86.

[89] Wooddell, *The Beauty of the Faith: Using Aesthetics for Christian Apologetics*, §2018.

[90] Martin, "The Empirical, the Esthetic, and the Religious," 112.

[91] Edwards, "On the Nature of True Virtue," 8:620.

himself. Finally, he agreed with traditional Christian theology that beauty must be grounded in God.

Edwards, however, managed to advance the Christian understanding of beauty. Instead of making beauty equivalent to being, he defined it as the action and disposition of being. Beauty is not simply God: it is God's loving union with himself. This allowed him to ground beauty in God, while finding a way to explain how such a transcendent beauty could be manifest in immanent reality in great variety. The large varieties of beauty are emanations of God's beauty. Secondary beauty is an analogy for primary beauty. All secondary beauty ultimately points back to the ground of beauty: being's consent to being.

Edwards thus achieved a monumental synthesis of philosophy (both classical and contemporary) and theology.

Can his definition be improved? The conceptual ideas that underly Edwards's definition are difficult to improve upon, but perhaps the nomenclature is worn with age. The word "consent" has contemporary connotations of permission that obscures Edwards's original meaning of *loving union*, giving the word "consent" an archaic flavor. Similarly, the term "being" retains a technical philosophical meaning that is largely unclear to those outside philosophical academia. Perhaps an updated definition may be something along the lines of "ultimate reality's willing union with ultimate reality."

What then are Christians pursuing God's beauty in pursuit of? According to Edwards, they are pursuing the gloriously revealed intra-trinitarian love of God's own being: the delightful union of God with himself, a union to which believers are called. Beauty in worship, spirituality, or sanctification is the pursuit of positional and experiential union with the trinitarian God through the gospel. Such union is the believer's beauty and holiness, the basis of the deepest affections, and harmonious with one's created purpose.

Conclusion

This paper has explored four schools of defining beauty. Jonathan Edwards still represents perhaps the best synthesis of these definitions, defining it as being's consent to being: God's lov-

ing union for and with his own being simply considered, and union with all that reflects him. While the nomenclature of this definition may need updating, its explanatory power remains unsurpassed. Christian worship, art, and spirituality should pursue that which communicates believers' loving, joyful union with the triune God, which is their true virtue: the shared beauty of God.

Artistic Theologian 8 (2020): 99–113

Liturgical Speech Acts in the Lord's Supper

David J. Calvert[1]

What is being formed in hearers as we use language in corporate worship? Does it matter how we speak in and of the Lord's Supper? What is happening when the words "This is my body" are spoken in a congregation? Dan Block makes the bold statement, "The Lord's Supper is the defining ritual of the Christian community."[2] One approach to examining language in this defining ritual is by using the tools of speech act theory, especially the tool of the category of *liturgical* speech acts.

Though evangelical theologians have primarily used speech act theory (hereafter SAT) for hermeneutics, SAT has usefulness for examining the performative speech of corporate worship. SAT was originally conceived by J. L. Austin and further articulated by John Searle. Primarily, SAT focuses on the intentions of the speaker, or what one *does* with words. SAT is framed by the concepts of locution, illocutionary acts, and perlocutionary effect. *Liturgical* speech acts are one way of construing SAT for examining the language of congregational worship.[3]

Following Searle's take on the theory, a locution is a phrase or statement. An illocutionary act occurs *in* uttering the locution, and it is given force by the intent of the speaker. A perlocutionary effect is performed *by* uttering, as the hearer responds (or not). Consider this simple illustration: I utter "It's raining outside" and a hearer responds in grabbing their umbrella. In this example, I ut-

[1] David Calvert, PhD, is Pastor for Creative Arts at Grace Community Church in Angier, NC.

[2] Dan Block, *For the Glory of God: Recovering a Biblical Theology of Worship* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2014), 165.

[3] Liturgical speech acts are multiple, simultaneous, irreducible acts that have formative potential over time as specific words are used and specific actions are performed in repetition. This argument is more fully formulated in David Calvert, "Liturgical Speech Acts: What We Do with Words in Worship" (PhD diss., Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2018).

tered the locution with the illocutionary force of asserting a fact, and the hearer responded with the perlocutionary effect of grabbing the umbrella.

Searle's original taxonomy of illocutionary acts consists of five ways of speaking. An Assertive act makes a claim about the world. A Directive act is a command that seeks to match the world with what is said ("Close the door"). A Commissive act is one in which the speaker commits to make the world match the words, such as in making a promise. An Expressive act simply expresses an internal state of affairs. Finally, a Declarative act brings about a new state of affairs to fit the words with the world ("I now pronounce you husband and wife").

The taxonomy of *liturgical* speech acts accounts for the multiple, simultaneous illocutionary forces used in the speech of corporate worship. Corporate worship is a response to God's self-revelation in Jesus Christ, and thus all of the language used is a response of praise that expresses internal realities of the worshiper (Expressive acts). A Celebrative act is simultaneously Expressive and Assertive. A Participative act is simultaneously Expressive and Commissive or Directive, inviting the hearer to participate in worship in some way. A Re-presentative act is simultaneously Expressive, Assertive, and Declarative. Re-presentative acts have the potential to bring about a state of affairs by their utterance or effect change by their utterance, and much of the language at the Table may be Re-presentative.

Using the tools afforded by liturgical speech acts, this paper will examine the language of the Lord's Supper and consider the various illocutionary acts occurring and their perlocutionary potential. This paper will draw on the insightful categories developed by James K. A. Smith and Nicholas Wolterstorff and the work of Mary Patton Baker as a means of understanding the formative power of liturgical speech acts and will conclude with several implications for the formation of worshipers through participation in the Lord's Supper. Using SAT and liturgical speech acts to examine the Lord's Supper provides new and helpful ways of understanding formation in the language of the Supper in corporate worship.

The Lord's Supper, or Table, is the third movement of the historical *ordo*—Gathering, Word, Table, and Sending.[4] The Supper is part of a tapestry of liturgical speech acts and embodied actions in corporate worship. As David Power comments, both baptism and the Lord's Supper "are interwoven with institutions, lives, histories, personages."[5] Power's language aligns with two supplemental categories of speech act theory: "institutional facts" and "constitutive rules." The Table elements are shaped by institutional facts, constitutive rules, and the denominational traditions that manifest these conditions of performance.

The Lord's Supper and the Christian Social Imaginary

In SAT proper, Searle explains the role of institutional facts in the Background of meaning that supports the intended meaning of a statement. Searle also explains the constitutive rules that construct these institutional facts—X counts as Y in context C.[6] For example, an ordained minister (X) counts as one who may preside over the Table (Y) in the context of corporate worship (C). This rule then functions together with other doctrinal rules to establish the institutional facts that shape denominational traditions. The rules, facts, and traditions all constitute the Background assumptions that inform the meaning of language used in corporate worship.

James K. A. Smith offers a rich category for describing the Background of meaning for the language of corporate worship—the Christian social imaginary.[7] The Christian social imaginary is "a dis-

---

[4] The explanation of the four historical movements of Gathering, Word, Table, and Sending are drawn from Clayton Schmit, *Sent and Gathered: A Worship Manual for the Missional Church* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2009); Bryan Chapell, *Christ-Centered Worship: Letting the Gospel Shape Our Practice* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2009); and Robert Webber, *Worship, Old and New: A Biblical, Historical, and Practical Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994).

[5] David Power, *Sacrament: The Language of God's Giving* (New York: Herder & Herder, 1999), 87.

[6] John R. Searle, *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), 33–35.

[7] James K. A. Smith, *Desiring the Kingdom: Worship, Worldview, and Cultural Formation* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2009), 65.

tinctly Christian understanding of the world that is implicit in the practices of Christian worship."[8] This idea is adapted from Charles Taylor's "social imaginary," or the way we implicitly understand the world to be. As a central element of corporate worship, the potential of the Lord's Supper to shape the Christian social imaginary cannot be overstated.

One cannot develop the liturgical speech acts of the Supper without first acknowledging the Background of meaning that operates in the Supper. Block refers to the institution of the Lord's Supper as "a glorious helix blending at least three First Testament liturgical traditions: the Passover meal, the covenant ratification ceremony, and the sin offering."[9] Similarly, Melvin Tinker takes care to explain the Passover meal as background before exploring the use of illocutionary acts in the Supper.[10] These biblical precedents function as points of reference for the liturgies of the Supper that have developed out of the New Testament accounts of institution and practice. When the Lord's Supper is practiced in corporate worship, the liturgical speech acts shape and are shaped by the Christian social imaginary in a kind of "Background spiral." The meaning of what is said is shaped by the Background, and what is said may also have the perlocutionary effect of reshaping or forming the Background or Christian social imaginary of a worshiper.

Words of Institution

The Table presents complex agency in the language of corporate worship. The phrases of the words of institution are recited directly from Scripture in a context of utterance that resembles reading the Scripture, but the words of institution are intended to be directly accompanied with an embodied response of participation. SAT helps us explore this agency in terms of illocutionary force. Mary Patton Baker highlights the distinction of agency with a specific verb, noting, "As deputized speaker, the minister *invokes* the

[8] James K. A. Smith, *Imagining the Kingdom: How Worship Works* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2013), 109.

[9] Block, *For the Glory of God,* 157.

[10] Melvin Tinker, "Last Supper/Lord's Supper: More Than a Parable in Action?," *Themelios* 26, no. 2 (2001): 20.

Son's illocutionary intent: for an invitation holds a particular kind of illocutionary force."[11] Baker continues, "Each participant hears Christ's invitation in the present moment—to commune with him at his Table—just as he once eagerly and with great love invited his disciples: 'I have eagerly desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer' (Luke 22:15)."[12] The minister does not only re-illocute the Son's illocution; rather the original illocutionary intent is *invoked* or Re-presented, situating the efficacy of the illocutionary point in the communicative act of God. Accordingly, the agency of the liturgical speech acts of the Table is clarified by Wolterstorff's "deputized agency." Wolterstorff articulates his own position on sacramental agency by describing what the minister does and what God does. He claims, "By the appointed minister of the Church uttering the words and performing the actions of sacrament, God presents the promise made in Jesus Christ and assures us that the promise remains in effect." He concludes decisively, "The minister does not do it; God does it. God is the agent."[13] Wolterstorff also implies that the minister re-presents (on God's behalf) the promises made in Christ, which may be described as Re-presentative speech acts.

Understanding God as the primary communicative agent in the Table elements of the *ordo* provides perspective on the efficacy of the communication. Tinker posits that God achieves all of Searle's five illocutionary points (Assertive, Directive, Commissive, Expressive, and Declarative) in the Lord's Supper.[14] God's full linguistic activity is efficacious because of the Trinitarian nature of God's communicative acts, in which the Spirit brings about the perlocutionary effect of what the Father has communicated in the Son, an analogy used by both Kevin Vanhoozer and Michael Horton.[15]

Baker and Tinker each lean on the reflections of Calvin with regard to the language of the Lord's Supper. Calvin claims, "We

---

[11] Mary Patton Baker, *Participation in Christ and Eucharistic Formation: John Calvin and the Theodrama of the Lord's Supper* (Milton Keynes, UK: Paternoster, 2015), 130–31. Emphasis added.

[12] Ibid.

[13] Nicholas Wolterstorff, "Sacrament as Action, not Presence," in *Christ: The Sacramental Word*, ed. David Brown and Ann Loades (London: SPCK, 1996), 114.

[14] Melvin Tinker, "Language, Symbols, and Sacraments: Was Calvin's View of the Lord's Supper Right?," *Churchman* 112 (1998): 146.

[15] This analogy is adapted from Michael Horton, *The Christian Faith: A Systematic Theology for Pilgrims on the Way* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011), 614.

ought carefully to observe that the chief, and almost the whole energy of the sacrament consists in these words, It is broken for you; it is shed for you."[16] Calvin situates the "energy" of the sacrament in the speech act of the words of institution that precede the partaking of the elements. Tinker clarifies, "What is required is not only an understanding of the meaning of the statement and the sacramental act, 'My body which is given for you, take and eat this in remembrance of me' but the force with which the sacrament and statement is to be taken—that it *counts* as promise, persuasion, assurance and unification."[17] The energy or force of the words of institution is an illocutionary force, or rather the simultaneous illocutionary forces of Celebrative and Participative acts that can account for the combination of promise, assertion, and expression together.

"This is My Body"

There is no more potent speech act in corporate worship than "This is my body." A full examination of the weight of this phrase and its impact on the Christian social imaginary is beyond the scope of this work. Provided here is a launching point, by conceiving of the language of the Lord's Supper as liturgical speech acts. Speech act theory assists in determining the speaker's intent, and in the case of the phrase "This is my body," it is clear that Jesus was certainly *doing* something with these words.

This first phrase of the words of institution, which brought about so much difficulty in interpretation during the Reformation, is a powerful *metaphor* regardless of interpretive conclusions. While discussing the language of liturgy as metaphor, Mark Searle claims,

> The [power of] metaphor occurs when it is not simply the context, but the juxtaposition of a second irreconcilable literal meaning, which creates the explosion of insight. When Christ took bread and said "This is my body," two significant units, one an object and the other a verbal phrase, were

[16] John Calvin and Henry Beveridge, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, vol. 3 (Edinburgh: The Calvin Translation Society, 1845), 391.

[17] Tinker, "Language, Symbols, and Sacraments," 146. Emphasis original.

> set in uncomfortable juxtaposition, forcing the disciples to move beyond the literal meanings to a new kind of seeing.[18]

Jesus's use of this particular metaphor leverages the illocutionary forces of an Assertive and a Declarative, otherwise summarized as a Re-presentative liturgical speech act. As Jesus asserts "This is my body" while holding bread, the Assertive act combines with a Declarative act that creates the new state of affairs for the act of partaking of the bread. As presiders over the Table continue to re-illocute this utterance, they also Express their own faith in the promises of God as they speak these Re-presentative acts.

"This is My Blood . . ."

"This is my blood of the covenant" often receives less direct attention than "This is my body," but the phrase is no less powerful. As Jesus holds the cup and makes this statement, the utterance has the force of an Assertive and a Declarative, reframing the state of affairs for both the cup of wine and the covenant context for the disciples who are sharing the meal.[19] When leaders of worship use this phrase as a liturgical speech act, they Express their response, Assert the state of affairs, and Declare the truth. The Re-presentative force of this one phrase has potent influence on the Christian social imaginary for those who hear the words of institution and participate in the Lord's Supper.

"I will not drink again of this fruit of the vine until that day."

Though not regularly included in liturgies of the Table, Jesus's statement following the Declarative act of the cup is a Commissive act, a promise, with an eschatological perspective.[20] Baker

---

[18] Mark Searle, "Liturgy as Metaphor," *Worship* 55, no. 2 (March 1981): 108.

[19] The context of utterance for the Last Supper is described in Matt 26:27–28.

[20] This utterance is recorded in Matt 26:29, "I tell you I will not drink again of this fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom."

summarizes the impact of this utterance saying, "Through speaking these words, Jesus is placing this meal and his actions in the context of Israel's eschatological hopes for a new kingdom."[21] The liturgical speech acts in the Lord's Supper are connected to the eschatological perspective anchored in the Christian social imaginary that informs *how* worshipers remember and frames *why* they participate at the Table.

Words of Delivery

The recorded liturgies of the Presbyterian *Book of Common Worship* and Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (hereafter BCW and BCP) provide instructions for specific words to be spoken by ministers while serving the elements to the congregation. Ronald Byars references the second of the available options in the *BCW*, "The body of Christ, the bread of heaven" and "The blood of Christ, the cup of salvation" and notes their biblical significance.[22] These specific words reference themes from Scripture and the Christian social imaginary, connecting the bread to Christ's body, the manna provided to Israel, and the petition for daily bread from the Lord's Prayer, which is prayed corporately during the liturgy of the Eucharist in the *BCW* and *BCP*. The implied verbs in these phrases shape them as Re-presentative speech acts, bringing about the state of affairs in the awareness of the communicant. The minister uses liturgical speech acts to frame the way the congregant receives the elements.

In the *BCP*, the words of delivery are longer-form paragraphs that include Celebrative and Participative liturgical speech acts in addition to the Re-presentative acts:

> The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life. Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith, with thanksgiving. The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thy

[21] Baker, *Participation in Christ and Eucharistic Formation*, 187.

[22] Ronald P. Byars, *What Language Shall I Borrow? The Bible and Christian Worship* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 158–59.

> body and soul unto everlasting life. Drink this in remembrance that Christ's Blood was shed for thee, and be thankful.[23]

The phrase "which was given for thee," is a Celebrative act, asserting a state of affairs from the gospel. The phrase, "preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life" is a Re-presentative that seeks to bring about what is uttered over the element, with a specifically eschatological perspective. The verb forms for the second sentence for each element are imperative, Directive verbs, "Take and eat . . . Drink this . . .," thus constituting a Participative act that necessitates the participation of the hearer/communicant by partaking of the elements. The response of partaking of the elements is also an illocutionary act by the participant. The participant intends to communicate their belief by partaking. The Lord's Supper is a moment for both verbal and non-verbal illocutionary acts performed by the minister and the communicants.

Non-verbal Illocutionary Acts in the Supper

As Nicholas Wolterstorff has introduced, sometimes one does things with illocutionary force without uttering a word.[24] Wolterstorff illustrates, "One can say something by producing a blaze, or smoke, or a sequence of light-flashes."[25] In the context of the Lord's Supper, the participants "say something" by partaking of the bread and wine. This is especially evident in the verbal and non-verbal illocutionary acts of the Lord's Supper, in which "successful" liturgical speech acts are accompanied by specific embodied actions.

The Table, though shaped by liturgical *speech* acts, is the *embodiment* of what has been uttered in the gospel. Anthony Thiselton expresses the relationship of speech action and embodied action by

---

[23] *Book of Common Prayer* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 338.

[24] Utilizing the "counting as" notion, or the form of a constitutive rule, one may use a gesture to communicate, such as a turn signal on the highway; see Nicholas Wolterstorff, *Divine Discourse: Philosophical Reflections on the Claim that God Speaks* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 83. In *Participation in Christ and Eucharistic Formation*, 122, Baker notes that Austin extended conditions for a successful speech act to "non-verbal acts and symbols, not simply the right words."

[25] Wolterstorff, *Divine Discourse*, 13.

claiming, "Each participant declares, proclaims, or preaches in the breaking of the bread that 'Christ died,' and in eating the bread and drinking from the cup that 'Christ died for me.'"[26] The participant in the Lord's Supper performs non-verbal illocutionary acts that bear considerable weight of meaning in the context of corporate worship.[27]

Just as Baker and Tinker interact with Calvin as an interlocutor for the illocutionary potential of the Lord's Supper, Wolterstorff references Calvin on the signification of the elements of the Supper in the context of the non-verbal illocutionary acts of the minister or presider. Wolterstorff observes,

> Calvin affirms that the bread signifies (represents, stands for) Christ's body and that the wine signifies (represents, stands for) Christ's blood. But the bread and the wine do not possess their signifying functions independently; they possess them within the context of the signifying function of the presider's actions of offering bread and offering wine and the signifying function of the congregants' actions of eating the bread and drinking the wine.[28]

The *function* of the presider's and the congregants' actions may be helpfully clarified in terms of their illocutionary force. The signifying function of the bread and wine is inextricably connected to the non-verbal illocutionary acts of eating and drinking and the ways these acts inform and derive meaning from the Christian social imaginary.

There are communicative, illocutionary forces in the actions performed at the Table. Kevin Vanhoozer describes the *drama* of the

---

[26] Anthony C. Thiselton, *First Corinthians: A Shorter Exegetical and Pastoral Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 185.

[27] Mary Patton Baker has laid groundwork here in her research utilizing speech act theory as a tool for understanding the Christian's participation in Christ and formation in the Eucharist. Baker interacts with Calvin's theology of the sacraments and draws on the work of Vanhoozer and Austin. Baker chooses to use an overly-simplified version of Austin's framework for speech act theory, even claiming that mixing Austin and Searle is "ill-advised"(*Participation in Christ and Eucharistic Formation*, n. 94, 127).

[28] Nicholas Wolterstorff, *The God We Worship: An Exploration of Liturgical Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015), 150.

table, commenting, "The central actions—breaking and taking the bread, pouring and passing the wine—not only recapitulates what Christ has done but, as we do it in remembrance of him, *performs* it."[29] The breaking, taking, pouring, and passing are non-verbal liturgical speech acts that communicate in the context of corporate worship. In other contexts, breaking a piece of bread to consume may not communicate any propositional content with any illocutionary force. However, the constitutive rules and institutional facts of corporate worship create a specific context for the performance of liturgical speech acts and thus, as Wolterstorff observes, "institute a way of acquiring rights and responsibilities."[30] When a baptized believer takes the bread into their hand, they have communicated by that action that they have examined themselves (1 Cor 11:28) and by virtue of their profession of faith and baptism have the right to come by God's invitation to the Table. The actions of leaving one's seat to come forward, passing the elements, partaking of the elements, or abstaining from the elements all function as non-verbal illocutionary acts.

Re-presentative, Re-petition, and Re-enactment

Several of the liturgical speech acts of the Lord's Supper are overtly eschatological. Participation at the Table is observed in space and time, in the context of remembrance and anticipation that is cultivated by the Christian social imaginary.[31] Christ is present because of the covenant he made, through the Spirit, until he participates with believers in the Kingdom. Smith explains that this meal "constitutes us as an eschatological people: while it recalls and recapitulates Christ's death, burial, and resurrection, the Supper also

[29] Kevin J. Vanhoozer, *Pictures at a Theological Exhibition: Scenes of the Church's Worship, Witness, and Wisdom* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2016), 199. Emphasis original.

[30] Wolterstorff, *Divine Discourse*, 84.

[31] According to Baker's understanding of Calvin's theology of the Eucharist, Christ's very presence in the Eucharist is framed "covenantally, pneumatologically, and eschatologically" (*Participation in Christ and Eucharist Formation*, 36).

looks ahead to the feast in the kingdom."[32] Participation in the Lord's Supper, and the liturgical speech acts performed therein, has constitutive potential for the people of God as it both situates them in a moment and connects them beyond that moment.

The eschatological perspective of the Lord's Supper is reinforced by Re-presentative liturgical speech acts repeated and reenacted over time. In rather strong terms, Wolterstorff claims that in the institution of the Lord's Supper, "never has dramatic *representation* been freighted with such awesome import."[33] The language and actions of the Supper re-present elements rich in meaning from multiple connections to the Christian social imaginary, making present again a moment for communion with God and believers at his Table. A Re-presentative *makes present* by bringing about the state of affairs it claims.[34]

The liturgical speech *acts* of the Lord's Supper in corporate worship re-*enact* as they re-illocute the speech acts of Jesus. As Baker frames it, repetition of the Re-presentative acts functionally "re-enacts the Son's word-act at the meal on the night of his betrayal."[35] Baker continues with this terminology, "This sacramental reenactment *presents the Son's execution of the Father's utterances of promises to redeem the world*."[36] The repetition of reenactment contributes to the Christian social imaginary by reinforcing remembrance or *anamnesis*.

---

[32] Smith sets up his conclusion by saying, "So the Lord's supper is a foretaste of the feast in the kingdom which means that its meaning has to be situated within an eschatological horizon" (*Desiring the Kingdom*, 200).

[33] Wolterstorff, "Sacrament as Action, not Presence," 121. Emphasis added.

[34] In a specifically Roman Catholic social imaginary, the significance of the Table can be understood in terms of the Mass being a "representation of the sacrifice of the Cross" and "a sacramental participation in the heavenly liturgy." In these descriptions, Jean Danielou inadvertently illustrates the Re-presentative and Participative liturgical speech acts of the Mass. His theological Background affirms the Re-presentative acts or *making present* of Jesus's sacrifice in the performance of the Mass, and the Participative acts emphasize the eschatological thrust of sacramental participation; see *The Bible and the Liturgy* (Notre Dame, IN: Notre Dame University Press, 2002), 128.

[35] Baker, *Participation in Christ and Eucharistic Formation*, 124.

[36] Ibid. Emphasis original.

Anamnesis

The liturgical speech acts of the Lord's Supper constitute *anamnesis* for worshipers. Jesus's original command focused on the anamnestic character of *doing* the Lord's Supper—"Do this in remembrance." In language that supports the terminology for liturgical speech acts, Bard Thompson defines *anamnesis* as "nothing less than the 're-calling' or 're-presentation' of the passion of Christ so that 'it becomes here and now operative by its effects in the communicants.'"[37] Thompson draws this conclusion in part from the account of Justin Martyr, who conceives of the sacrament as "an anamnesis, a re-calling of Christ's passion."[38] Re-presentative acts, which make present again and bring into being a state of affairs, have anamnestic capacity.

The anamnesis of the Supper re-calls and re-presents while simultaneously anticipating and looking forward. Temporally, the Lord's Supper holds together in tension the past, present, and future experiences of Table fellowship. Regular practice of the Lord's Supper, with intentional reference to the fullness of meaning in the Christian social imaginary, helps worshipers remember rightly and anticipate rightly. As David Power observes, "Oral and ritual performance moreover express the lived connection with the past and with forebears, and with the future that the past promises."[39] The speech acts and embodied acts of the Lord's Supper *do anamnesis* with worshipers, connecting them with those who have participated before, and anticipating participation with Christ in his Kingdom.

Using the categories of speech act theory opens up the language and actions of the Lord's Supper to new vistas of understanding. Baker demonstrates this with a focus on the Holy Spirit's perlocutionary work in the Supper, significant to quote at length:

> Our anamnetic [*sic*] performance consists of seeing, touching, and receiving the body and blood, while the Holy Spirit

[37] Bard Thompson, *Liturgies of the Western Church* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980), 17. Here he cites Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (St. Louis, MO: Westminster, 1947).

[38] Thompson, *Liturgies of the Western Church*, 7. Thompson cites Justin Martyr's *Dialogue* chapters 41 and 70, and *1 Apology*, 66.

[39] Power, *Sacrament*, 67.

> joins the embodied *signum* to the *res* of Christ's body and blood. . . . The Holy Spirit brings the perlocutionary effect of a transforming encounter with Jesus Christ in the heavenlies and we are truly changed through our sacramental participation—whether it be comforted, given hope, a renewed energy to obey, or the profoundly deep knowledge that Christ suffered for us because God loves us and that we are therefore truly adopted children of the Father.[40]

Baker initially lists the senses of sight, touch, and taste in connection with anamnestic performance, but prior to these, congregants have *heard* the speech acts of the minister that provide reference for the meaning of the embodied actions. The "sacramental reenactment" then *does* something, namely "seals" worshipers, which is a biblical description of the work of the Spirit. Because the Trinitarian God is a communicative agent in the speech acts of the Supper, the Holy Spirit is the one who brings about the effects of the illocutionary acts spoken by the Father in and through the Son.

Perlocutionary Formation at the Table

The liturgical speech acts of the Lord's Supper contribute to spiritual formation. This formation may be construed as a perlocutionary effect of the illocutionary acts performed. The Lord's Supper as thanksgiving may form worshipers "as a Eucharistic people, whose lives and whose common life exhibit a quality of gratitude to God."[41] If the Table is set as a place of thanksgiving, worshipers may orient their lives as thankful people.[42] The regular participation in thanksgiving and fellowship with God and with God's people at the Table will shape the way the participant interacts with God's people away from the Table as well.

---

[40] Baker, *Participation in Christ and Eucharistic Formation*, 126.

[41] Byars, *What Language Shall I Borrow*, 161. Byars suggests that this life of gratitude may "enable us, at least in some measure, to serve our neighbor, not with a sense of dreadful duty or oppressive burden, but with delight."

[42] As Baker observes, "We are formed by the habits of our way of acting and reacting to others" (*Participation in Christ and Eucharistic Formation*, 207).

Both individual and corporate formation occurs at the Table. Participation at the Lord's Supper expresses the inward reality of sanctification and formation and expresses the hope of the coming reality of the consummation of God's Kingdom. Baker claims that participation in the Lord's Supper contributes to corporate formation as each experience reminds, "In our ecclesial embodiedness we are the church being the church, making the church visible in communion with the invisible church of those who have gone before us."[43] It is through the liturgical speech acts that shape the Christian social imaginary that the fullness of ecclesial reality is given meaning.

The language of the Lord's Supper consists of rich liturgical speech acts that function differently than speech acts in other contexts. Using SAT and liturgical speech acts in particular provides new ways of understanding language and formation in the Lord's Supper. At the Table, Re-presentatives, Participatives, and Celebratives are all performed in a relatively brief temporal space in conjunction with embodied acts, all contributing to the formation of the Christian social imaginary and the spiritual formation of participants.

[43] Baker, *Participation in Christ and Eucharistic Formation*, 207.

Artistic Theologian 8 (2020): 115–119

Abstracts of Recent SWBTS School of Church Music and Worship Doctoral Dissertations

The Preacher of Spiritual Worship: Benjamin Keach's (1640–1704) Desire for Primitive Purity in Worship

Gray, John Kimmons, PhD

Benjamin Keach, seventeenth century London Particular Baptist pastor, was zealous for biblically regulated worship. The purpose of this dissertation is to provide clarity to late seventeenth-century Baptist worship in general and Particular Baptist worship specifically through an examination of Keach's philosophy of worship. To this end, it argues that that the overarching concern of his worship was his deep desire for primitive purity in corporate worship.

Chapter 1 presents background information and a literature review of previous scholarship in the field of Keachean studies. To understand Keach's reliance upon Scripture for corporate worship, Chapter 2 examines what Keach believed about the Word of God and its applications to life. Chapters 3 through 7 reflect how Keach's guiding principle of primitive purity shaped his practice and theology in multiple elements of corporate worship.

After exploring Keach's bibliology, Chapter 3 examines Keach's philosophy on baptism. Because Keach argued that laying on of hands should follow believer's baptism, a minority position among seventeenth-century Particular Baptists, Chapter 4 explains how Keach's desire for primitive purity in worship shaped his doctrine of laying on of hands. Chapter 5 examines Keach's doctrine of the Lord's Supper as it pertains to person, signification, and benefit, and it argues that his theology of the Lord's Supper is consistent

with his overarching desire for biblical regulation in the corporate worship service.

Keach was also highly instrumental in the implementation of congregational song into Baptist churches, and his influence can still be seen today in the use of what he recognized as the ordinance of singing praises. Chapter 6 considers his theology on congregational song, and it reveals how it was built upon his strict adherence to primitive purity in worship. Chapter 7 delves into two aspects in which Keach showed his aim for biblically regulated worship. First, it examines Keach's doctrine on the first-day sabbath, and then, it explores his doctrine on giving of offering during the Lord's Day service. Lastly, Chapter 8 presents summative remarks on Keach's theology of worship, and it address how his doctrine was shaped by his desire for primitive purity in corporate worship. Further, it provides brief application for the contemporary reader.

A Performer's Study of the Impromptus, Op. 142 of Franz Schubert and the Impromptus, Op. 66 of Nikolai Kapustin

Kim, Dongjae, DMA

The purpose of this document is to provide a helpful resource for the performance of impromptus, Op. 142 by Franz Schubert and impromptus, Op. 66 by Nikolai Kapustin. This study offers a historical overview of the impromptu, an analysis with an emphasis on the formal treatment and harmonic languages of the selected impromptus, and a discussion of several stylistic aspects of both composers.

Chapter 1 is an in introduction to the study and includes a review of literature and summary of the need for study.

Chapter 2 traces the history of the impromptu from the early nineteenth century to the late twentieth century. The background and form of impromptus by several composers are surveyed while identifying features commonly found in these compositions.

Chapter 3 introduces biographical information about both Schubert and Kapustin. This chapter provides a general background on each composer's life and musical influences.

Chapter 4 furnishes a theoretical analysis of Schubert's Op. 142, focusing on Schubert's treatment of formal structure and his distinctive use of harmonic elements.

Chapter 5 provides a detailed analysis of Kapustin's Op. 66. This chapter explores the classical influence on the formal structures and jazz influences on the harmonic language of his compositions. This chapter concludes by offering a brief comparison between Schubert's Op. 142 and Kapustin's Op. 66.

Chapter 6 discusses the pianistic interpretation of Op. 142 and Op. 66 through five areas: pedaling, rhythm, tempo, articulation, and dynamics. For performing Kapustin's music, there are pedagogical suggestions on several aspects of jazz style. Chapter 7 presents a summary of this study along with the final thoughts of the author.

Blessed be God— The Doxology and Orthopraxy Presented in 1 Peter 1 and 2

Motta, Anderson Silveira, DMA

"Blessed Be God—The Doxology and Orthopraxy Presented in 1 Peter 1 and 2" is a musical composition in six parts for SATB Choir, Mezzo-Soprano solo, Tenor solo, Flute, Horn, two Trumpets, two Trombones, Timpani, and Organ. The primary text comes from the first two chapters of the Biblical book of 1 Peter. The American Standard Version, which is in the public domain, is the biblical translation chosen for this piece. The Trinitarian doxology "Gloria Patri" is used as a supplementary text, featured at the end of the composition.

The title of the work comes from the first part of 1 Peter 1:3, a doxology that says: "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." These are the first words to be sung by the choir.

It is practically unanimous among critics and Biblical commentators that the main theme of the epistle of 1 Peter is hope in the time of trial. Christians were facing severe persecution at the time when this letter was written. The author's purpose was to warn his readers against the imminent tribulation and to encourage them to

remain faithful during the difficult times. Throughout the epistle one can see the development of what it means to be saved as well as how to live, once saved. The apostle praises God for his work of salvation through his Son Jesus and continues to write about the way of life given to those who were regenerated as new creatures in Christ.

The messages and the main theme contained in the epistle are as relevant today as they have always been. The eloquence of the Biblical text, combined with a musical setting that enhances the text's Biblical message, is proper and desirable for the church of this present time.

The main purpose of this work is to proclaim, through music, that the praise to God (pictured in the doxology) is not disconnected from Christian works (orthopraxy). These two actions together should always be the intent of the church.

Gaines Stainley Dobbins's Philosophy of Southern Baptist Worship

Stoughton, Da Jeong C., PhD

The goal of this dissertation is to examine the worship philosophy of Gaines Stanley Dobbins (1886–1978), who was one of the most influential figures among Southern Baptists in religious education, church administration, evangelism, pastoral care, psychology of religion, Christian journalism, and worship. His books and articles on worship present biblical, theological, historical, and philosophical views on the meaning, purpose, form, elements, management, and barriers of worship. The dissertation is presented in three parts. The first third of the dissertation (chapters 1–2) provides the secondary sources, Dobbins's biography, and the dominant figures and influential philosophies. The second third of this volume consists of reviews of Dobbins's writings and a summary of his teaching of worship at Baptist seminaries. The last part of this document lays out the synthesis of Dobbins's objective of worship and an evaluation of his theories.

Chapter 1 introduces the thesis of the research and methodology followed by a section of secondary sources.

Chapter 2 investigates Dobbins's life and provides his influential figures and philosophies.

Chapters 3 describes a summary of Dobbins's works on worship.

Chapters 4 provides a description of Dobbins's teaching of worship at Baptist seminaries and the impact of building church teaching and training programs based on his Baptist worship practices.

Chapter 5 sets forth the methodology of how Dobbins integrates worship with evangelism, education, and fellowship and analyzes the strength and weakness of his objectives of worship.

Chapter 6 offers a summary, challenges, further study, and directions of worship.

Book Reviews

***Sabbath and Sunday among the Earliest Christians*, by David W. T. Brattston. 2nd ed. Eugene, OR: Resource Publications, 2017. 82 pp. $13.00.**

"A method that can prove anything proves nothing" (52). David W. T. Brattston, retired lawyer and judge who authored *Sabbath and Sunday among the Earliest Christians,* said this of the Sabbatarian position, which he shows is built upon a faulty method of research. Brattston sets out to evaluate every reference to the day of worship found in the approximately five hundred Christian documents dated prior to the mass apostacy of AD 249–251. To substantiate his case, he shows the unanimity in early Christian literature and the fervency of early Christian for Lord's Day meetings. He concludes his work by addressing the arguments of present-day Sabbatarian. Employing his exemplary approach to research, he concludes that "the earliest Christian literature . . . is unanimous that the main day of the week for early Christians to gather and worship was not the seventh-day Sabbath, but Sunday" (3).

While Lord's Day gatherings described in Scripture may be descriptive in form (Acts 20:7, 1 Cor 16:2, Rev 1:10), the earliest Christians understood them to be prescriptive. After describing a first-century worship service in detail, Justin Martyr (AD 100–165) gives this rationale: "Sunday is the day on which we all hold our common assembly, because it is the first day on which God, having wrought a change in the darkness and matter, made the world; and Jesus Christ our Savior on the same day rose from the dead" (3–4).

Present-day Sabbatarians claim that "the Lord's Day" in Revelation 1:10 is something more like "the Day of the Lord," which is used to speak of a day of judgement, but Brattston swiftly dispels this argument by citing the late second-century work, *The Acts of Peter,* which equates "the Lord's Day" with Sunday: "On the first day of the week, that is, on the Lord's day, a multitude gathered together" (4–5). After examining the approximately 500 documents available to modern scholarship from this time period, the author

concludes that "the chief day of the Christian week, even before the middle of the third century, was Sunday . . . . There is no extant record of it being on Saturday" (6).

Prominent early Christian voices also believed that Jesus abolished the Sabbath. Justin described the Jewish sabbaths as "utterly ridiculous," "unworthy of notice," and "superstition" (9). By the third century, Tertullian taught a form of Sabbath-keeping, but as Brattston points out, Tertullian maintained this practice in addition to keeping the Lord's Day. A major debate during this time, before the start of the Decian Persecution, concerned *how* the Lord's Day should be kept, specifically whether the New Covenant permitted work on the Lord's Day (9–14). The author shows how Justin, Tertullian, and others weighed in on this topic, yet none advocated for a chief gathering on the seventh day.

Using the history laid out in the early chapters as his basis, Brattston addresses the arguments of present-day Sabbatarians. Brattston has this to say about Samuele Bacchiocchi (1938–2008), author of *From Sabbath to Sunday* (Pontifical Gregorian University Press, 1985): "Professor Bacchiocchi quotes or cites a hodgepodge of authors so wide and varied and from so many time periods that any proposition at all can be proved by this method; my comment is that a method that can prove anything proves nothing" (52). The primary point promulgated by modern Sabbatarians is that the earliest believers originally worshipped on the seventh day, but then because of intense persecution against the Jews, these Christians gathered out of necessity on Sunday to differentiate themselves from the persecution. Brattston shows that this theory has no historical support. The main event that Sabbatarians identify is the Hadrianic Persecution of AD 132 to 135. Brattston's most convincing argument is based on the extent of the persecution—for such a persecution to have a far-reaching impact it would need to be widespread, intense, and long-lasting. Brattston concludes that this persecution, although intense, was confined mainly to Judea for just a few years (32–50).

Brattston's commitment to identifying the best sources from history is the greatest strength of this book. In this relatively short volume, the author imparts an approach to historical research that every student of theology should heed: "In Christianity today, too many people allege that an apostolic or other early state of affairs

had existed, without substantiation from original contemporary sources. All teaching and practice must be affirmatively proved from the best evidence available" (27). Brattston's interaction with the Talmud and other Jewish sources is especially helpful for understanding the motivations of Christians during this time by understanding Jewish thought (see chapter 11). This work would be strengthened if it rooted the case for modern-day perpetuation of worship practices in the New Testament text, rather than this case being made from just the practice of the early church. A subject that needs more substantiation and would make for an interesting research topic is the earlier church's view of rest on the Lord's Day (see chapters 4 and 15). Brattston concludes that early Christians "performed secular tasks without conscientious objection" on Sundays (58).

David Brattston presents his case with the precision of a lawyer, the fairmindedness of a judge, and the astuteness of a historian. I recommended this book as the starting place for this topic. This resource—and the author's approach—is an exemplary model for the pastor, layperson, student, and scholar.

Daniel A. Webster

***The Whole Church Sings: Congregational Singing in Luther's Wittenberg*, by Robin Leaver. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2017. 206 pp. $15.00.**

Martin Luther facilitated many changes in the liturgical practices of congregational singing, many of which Protestants still use in worship today. Robin Leaver, professor emeritus at Westminster Choir College and visiting professor at Yale University and Queen's University, Belfast, Northern Ireland, discusses what was happening musically within the church when Luther began instituting his reformation concepts. Lutheran studies often focus on the 1529 Klug Wittenberg hymnal as the first hymnal utilized by Luther and his constituents. However, Leaver's thesis is that Wittenberg churches employed vernacular congregational singing before then, citing hymnals and documents in circulation before this time, namely the 1526 *Enchyridion*.

Leaver delves deeply into the contents of hymnals published within the decade after Martin Luther posted his theses at Wittenberg, referencing numerous developments in hymn printing during the 1520s and 1530s. Leaver states the importance of the omission of the *Enchyridion* from other Lutheran studies and attributes much of the success of hymn preservation and renewal to this publication. As his research shows, there were many developments occurring around Luther's Wittenberg at the time of the Reformation, and hymn singing was a natural development within Luther's reforms. An influential poem that Leaver references early in the book is Hans Sachs's "Die Wittenbergische Nachtigall" ("The Wittenberg Nightingale"), dated July 1523 (45). He challenges the idea of the omission of this poem from other Lutheran studies and states its importance in supporting and expanding Luther's worship reforms.

The focus of Leaver's research lies mostly between 1523 and 1526, through which he compares numerous printings of hymn publications, including those printed both individually and in hymnals. He provides a brief discussion of musical happenings outside of the church in Wittenberg during the early sixteenth century, focusing on the oral folk-song tradition, especially the style used by the Meistersingers. This discussion transitions into Luther's theses, which led to the publication of many liturgical reforms issued by others around Wittenberg from 1517 to 1523. One of the sources utilized in Leaver's research is Luther's publication of "En neues lied" in 1523, the hymn considered to be Luther's martyr song and the inspiration of vernacular hymnody. Due to this publication, Leaver asserts that congregational singing was active in Wittenberg beginning in 1523 (162).

Leaver highlights the Meistersingers' use of bar form in their oral singing tradition, which Luther also used in his hymn writing because he wanted to give his hymns a "receptive hearing" (60), especially in his early hymns. When Luther was purporting the inclusion of vernacular hymnody, he sought competent poets that could clearly articulate accurate theology (69). Leaver points out that Thomas Müntzer fit this category, and a few of Müntzer's hymn translations were printed in either 1523 or 1524, a time when Luther was also actively translating Latin hymns into German (85). Through their combined efforts, vernacular hymnody was established in Wittenberg and slowly started its expansion throughout

the country with the aid of broadside printing. Leaver cites particular hymns, often with tune names, printed in specific hymnals throughout this time. Leaver also discusses Johann Walter's *Chorgesangbuch* of 1524 in detail (97) and uses it as comparison for many following hymnal publications.

With the publication of the *Enchyridion* in Wittenberg in 1526, congregational singing began to be strongly emphasized (104), as opposed to singing solely from the minister or choirs. Leaver details the hymns included in this volume and compares it with the *Chorgesangbuch*, stating the *Enchyridion* was created for the congregation and the *Chorgesangbuch* was created for the choir (106). Through further analysis, Leaver states that the 1526 *Enchyridion* refers to two earlier printings of a similar hymnal, meaning that Wittenberg congregations were most likely participating in congregational singing as early as 1524 (116). This research affirms Leaver's thesis that Wittenberg churches had already been introduced to vernacular congregational singing by the time of the printing of the Klug Wittenberg hymnal in 1529. He offers numerous helpful appendices that show Luther's hymn publications in specific hymnals (Appendix 3), as well as a list of hymn collections printed from 1524 to 1536 (Appendix 5).

Leaver continuously provides historical proof to support his thesis and leads the reader on a journey through his research. He is consistent with his analytical methods and clearly states the need for his research, citing the deficiency in previous Lutheran studies. This book is ideal for researchers wanting to know more about contextualization of Luther's liturgical points of the Reformation as it examines numerous publications that have not been mentioned in other research documents. Leaver's research is thorough, concise, and contributes greatly to the study of congregational singing at the time of the Reformation.

Kim Arnold

***Lovin' on Jesus: A Concise History of Contemporary Worship*, by Swee Hong Lim and Lester Ruth. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2017. 162 pp. $29.99.**

To echo a sentiment from Ira Gershwin: it's very clear contemporary worship is here to stay. Provided this reality, Lim and Ruth's *Lovin' on Jesus* communicates a thorough analysis of this profoundly influential development in liturgical history. Swee Hong Lim is the Deer Park Associate Professor of Sacred Music and Director of the Master of Sacred Music Program at Emmanuel College in Toronto. Lester Ruth is a historian of Christian worship and research professor of Christian worship at Duke Divinity School in Durham, North Carolina.

Lovin' on Jesus offers a clear, concise, and informative history of contemporary worship, presenting an expansive array of aspects of the movement. The writers aim to shed light on the many facets of contemporary worship that work in tandem to create what is now an identifiable liturgical phenomenon. The authors' primary intent is to provide a history of contemporary worship that reaches far beyond just the music associated with this worship style.

The authors' pervading research question is, "what makes contemporary worship, contemporary worship?" They formulate their argument by explaining the ethos and origins of the notable paradigm shifts of this movement. These evolutions are the nature of time, space, music, prayer, presentation of Scripture, and the perceived sacramentality of contemporary worship. Ruth and Lim claim these shifts inform nine key qualities that are the defining features of the movement and can be categorized into four groups: fundamental, musical, behavioral and key dependencies (2−3). These qualities include use of non-archaic English, dedication to adapting worship choices to meet the needs of a target group, extended times of singing, predilection for informality, and reliance on modern technology.

Lim and Ruth label the sources of contemporary worship as the Church Growth movement, Pentecostalism, with traces of the Second Great Awakening (16–17, 21). Much of what drove decisions leading towards contemporary worship was an anxiety to avoid losing youth membership of the church and a desire to seem relevant to the greater culture to prevent congregational boredom. This in-

volved a re-ordering of time with a high priority of maintaining a sense of seamless "flow" to simulate liturgical freedom and promote congregational engagement (32). This shift coincided with an evolution of space, with types of buildings and "liturgical centers" being re-configured with shifted focus to a platform with the musicians as a central focus (41, 52). Furthermore, the placement of technological equipment also becomes a semi-permanent fixture in the worship space (48).

Ruth and Lim detail the key features of contemporary worship music that accentuate its particularity. These features include use of colloquial, intimate, personalized language as a divergence from stately, archaic language (59). Moreover, in efforts to achieve "flow" building in emotional intensity, the "song set" with liberal use of stretching songs becomes prominent (66). Musical language also is both impacted and informed by the language of prayer, with extemporaneity and expressiveness being paramount (89). In this regard spoken prayer and sung prayer become nearly synonymous to the contemporary worshipper (92). As for the exposition of Scripture, intelligibility and relevance drive efforts to become more approachable and relatable to the non-churched individual (108). The authors lastly describe the concept of the "sacramentality of contemporary worship" in which God's presence and power is invoked, encountered, and celebrated through the sequence and flow of praise and worship music, drawing scriptural support from Psalm 22:3 and Psalm 100:4 (124, 130, 137).

The strength of this book lies in the compressed nature of the writing that attains a significant depth of study delivered in a concise manner. In doing so, the authors analyze a phenomenon that few have approached from a historical standpoint. By highlighting key qualities of contemporary worship, the authors illustrate on a grander scale the formative nature of liturgical actions and environments. They helpfully show how the use, misuse, intensification, or degradation of liturgical space, foci, actions, language, and the arts are loaded with a particular theology that is perpetuated by liturgical choices. Similarly, the objective tone of the authors inadvertently calls to question the assumptions of the presumed benefits of contemporary worship. Lim and Ruth unearth many insights imbedded in the ethos of contemporary worship that provide helpful applications. In particular, the authors make the observation

that within the last twenty years, the top contemporary worship songs had very few to no songs that act as a form of intercessory prayer or confession (95).

The objective tone of the writing is on one hand positive and the other negative. At many points it appears as though the authors are hinting at an assessment to avoid saying it outright. For example, the authors explain the anxiety to avoid "dead time" in a service saying, "For many, to have dead time is the kiss of death in worship" (32). These types of statements, humorous as they are, sends the reader into a direction perhaps unintended by the authors by trying to ascertain their implied opinion or conclusion. Secondly, the authors' assessment of musical qualities overlooked the pervasive influence of Electronic Dance Music (EDM) on contemporary worship. As pop-music in general has moved further away from guitar-driven music in favor of beat, loop, and electronically generated music, contemporary worship is beginning to follow the same trajectory. This development should be explored in a later edition of this book.

Finally, this text is immensely helpful for worship pastors, senior pastors, worship historians and worship professors. Contemporary worship is a widespread phenomenon that a large percentage of churches has seemed to willingly adopt for reasons of taste, personality, and comfort with little consideration to biblical instruction as to the content, form, and aesthetic qualities that should be implemented for corporate worship. For consumers and practitioners of contemporary worship, the book presents several convicting insights that serve to edify the church to pursue pure, biblical worship.

Braden J. McKinley

***Redeeming Transcendence in the Arts: Bearing Witness to the Triune God*, by Jeremy Begbie. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2018. 212 pp. $13.42.**

Jeremy Begbie is the Thomas A. Langford Research Professor of Theology at Duke Divinity School. He is a professional musician, a prolific writer, and a frequent speaker on the topic of theolo-

gy and arts. His writings include *Resounding Truth*; *Music, Modernity, and God*; and *Peculiar Orthodoxy*. In this recent publication, Begbie revisits the notion of divine transcendence and the way art (representational and abstract) bears witness to it. Among various approaches of transcendence discussed, the author dismisses the apophatic understanding but endorses connoting transcendence as divine *otherness* and *uncontainability*. By defining divine otherness as Father-Son outward commitment to the created world and divine uncontainability as the inexhaustible grace and goodness of God in the Spirit, the nature of art is capable of responding to language's ineffability by conveying things beyond itself.

In the first chapter of his book, Begbie examines a variety of artistic and theological conceptions of transcendence, many of which lean toward an understanding pointed beyond the creaturely system (radical transcendence). Chapter two explores two common notions of sublime transcendence: Kantian and postmodern sublimities. Both approaches lead us to an apophatic theology—a "negative gesture" (59) connotes ineffable, supra-rational, and disinterested sublimation—best exemplified by Mark Rothko's paintings that express the "what is *not*" of divine transcendence (17). However, in chapter three, Begbie shows from the Scripture (mainly from John's Gospel) that a "distinctive" picture of God's Father-Son self-communication in the Spirit shapes our understanding of transcendence and arts by expressing its own *otherness* and *uncontainability* (78). Far from pursuing "something" unknown and out of this world, the author pens in chapter four, "the arts testify to the transcendence (otherness) of God most potently when they are fully creaturely" (131). Meanwhile, through the agent of metaphor, art is able to bear witness to the divine uncontainability of transcendence (157).

Throughout the entire writing, Begbie urges visual and performing artists to ponder the expression of divine transcendence in art in three directions: (1) Transcendence does not equate "total otherness" as suggested in contemporary use, where God's otherness is not anything or something but the creation. On the contrary and paradoxically, divine transcendence is obligated to tie to God's commitment and faithfulness toward his creation (81). (2) Transcendence is not "out-of-the-box" uncontainability. Instead, it signifies his superabundance (unlimited, inexhaustible, unstoppable,

overflowing) toward his creation—even to humble himself as the Word incarnate (107). (3) Transcendence is not anti-language or anti-meaning, as if language is useless (112–15). Begbie challenges the notion that "art speaks where words give away" (116).

Begbie first notes that artistic (Kantian) sublimity perhaps is a logical link to transcendence. However, this espousal will lead to a wrong kind of unintelligibly and ineffability (53). Besides, he questions if such apophatic treatment in theology will lead us to "a zone of utter emptiness" and open up more uncertainties and unknowns (59). From his expositions of multiple passages in John's Gospel and 1 Corinthians 8, he explains that who God is is fundamentally built upon the oneness, love, and communion between the Father and the Son (84). Therefore, the *otherness* of God does not mean an ontological detachment from the world nor a "disavowal of all things worldly" (81) but "is redolent of God's unswerving commitment to what God has made" (89). Begbie proposes that when the moment that art reflects the full "creatureliness" of this world, God's transcendence is unveiled.

Regarding the second focus of divine transcendence as uncontainability, Begbie states that in speaking of "God's infinite life that the world cannot encompass or possess, we should be thinking of this not as an abstract 'infinity' but as a life of generative outgoingness, rooted in the triunity of God" (102). In other words, artistic means (language, sound, movement, etc.) can never enclose and grasp the inexhaustible goodness of God. He assures that, by using metaphor, art is able to express the uncontainability of God (157). Metaphor possesses both disruptive and disclosed power that is able to bring out inexhaustible and boundless meanings (160). From this, therefore, Begbie declines the notion that divine transcendence is against human language or the immanence of God (120).

In this book, Begbie repeatedly emphasizes that God's transcendence should be understood as his commitment to engage with his created world (otherness) and his superabundant grace (uncontainability). Throughout this writing, Begbie is able to anticipate readers' questions and provide answers in a round-table manner. In spite of Begbie's clear articulation regarding the Father-given outworking love relation with the Son and his agency in the creation of all things, it still seems vague how this outward-imparting nature

applies to divine otherness and his involvement in the creation. Besides, there is an exclusion of the referential-associative perspective when Begbie discusses artistic transcendence, especially regarding artistic sublimity. He does hint at the end of the book concerning the complexity of the understanding of *how* music works, yet it seems lacking for such an important element.

With these being said, I think this is a breathtaking and enlightening writing with a brand new perspective on transcendence and Christian arts. This is not merely a lofty theological and philosophical discourse but also a biblical and exegetical dialogue.

Ian Yeung

***Work that Matters: Bridging the Divide between Work and Worship*, by Kevin Brown and Michael Wiese. 2nd ed. Lexington, KY: Aldersgate Press, 2018. 116 pp. $14.99.**

Why does work matter? How is work life related to spiritual life? Do they clash, blend, or grow separately? Kevin Brown and Michael Wiese, professors in business and marketing with a strong passion for Christian entrepreneurship, propose a theology of work that allows the faithful Christian to "remain undivided" regardless of what his or her work entails and demands (6) and present ways to "live within the present fullness of God" in all life's aspects (20). Brown and Wiese assert as their thesis that work is an act of worship, an act of faith; one can be a person of faith in a working world (viii). Both further conclude that living a holy life, in wholeness for God's glory, "brings worship and work into harmony" (ix).

Brown and Wiese develop their thesis by first identifying misconceptions that create rifts between work and worship. Following that, they offer ways to achieve work that is treated as worship. Chapter 1 sets the stage by defining key terms such as "work," "worship," "holiness," and "wholeness." Moreover, it presents four work-worship misconceptions that thwart the Christian from living a holy and wholly life. Here, the authors play with different prepositions to explain these misconceptions. The first divide is the "work *not* worship," a distorted view that assumes that who we are as workers has nothing to do with our faith, that one's faith is separate

from one's work, creating a dual identity (9). "Work *then* worship" is an understanding that strives to bring the Christian formula of success to the workplace (11). However, the authors argue that even the use of Christian principles at work does not always promise success and profit (13). The inappropriate mixing of work and worship comes in as the third breach: "Work *and* worship" (13). It is the inapt blending of one's faith and work identity that leads to over-spiritualization of work life, leaving little space for the ordinary, and eventually leads the person to exhaustion (15). The last misconception is when one must either "work *or* worship" (16), an understanding that treats ministry as the "Christian route" and the secular work as the "non-Christian route" (16). Further, it is a view that categorizes only ministry professions as "calling"; ministers who decide to leave the ministry are seen as lesser persons who "abandoned true worship" (18).

To address these perversions, Brown and Wiese strongly recommend that a faithful narrative comes as a better alternative in the pursuit for wholeness and holiness: "Work *as* worship" (18). They argue that an appropriate marriage of work and worship is to begin with one's faith identity, and then one must "understand and act in the world based on that identity." To give a clearer picture of how this alternative looks, the authors offer four C's of Work *as* Worship: co-creation, catalyst, community, and contribution (19). A holy life should co-create with God, be a catalyst of good through the use of one's gifts, be willing to build a community by relating, not isolating, and offer a lasting contribution to people for the glory of God. Each of these is singly discussed in the subsequent chapters of the book.

Each work-worship misconception is clearly presented and discussed, supported with appropriate biblical references, examples, and testimonies. Further, the authors did an excellent job in discussing the four C's that helped solidify their argument, that indeed, work is an act of worship. Also, argumentation is well-supported with theological themes, biblical references, and examples that balance both secular and church settings.

Two areas for improvement, however, can be observed from the material. First, without any biblical foundation to support their definition, at the beginning of chapter 1, the authors simply describe worship as "spiritual activities and expressions, enabled by the Ho-

ly Spirit, that we engage in to honor God, express or love to God, and live in God's presence" (3). There is, however, in the conclusion a strongly supported and well-elaborated foundation of the term, which includes Greek words that relate to worship and how it powerfully links with work. Such a section could have been best placed in the introduction. As a major term used in the entire book, the loose definition presented in the beginning could cause misunderstanding on the part of the reader. How does their definition differ from an ordinary person's understanding of a Sunday worship service? If the distinctions are not clear, confusion is certainly bound to happen.

Second, the authors have honestly admitted that this topic is not new, that "other attempts have been made to bring together our worship and work" (19). While they are committed to add their perspective into the discourse, they have failed to show what is unique about their view, specifically their Christian view. For instance, how are they different from *Work as Worship,*[1] which offers a similar Christian standpoint? Identifying the distinct feature/s of their claim could have helped enhance an element of attraction to their contribution to the subject and could have strengthened their place with what sets them apart from those who have already written on a similar topic.

Reflection questions for self and group discussions provided at the end of each chapter are helpful for evaluation. For a claim with a strong paradigm shift such as theirs, the chapter-end questions could serve as stimuli for a life-changing decision. Chapters 2–5 have a "personalize it" section (36, 56, 75, 99), where the authors give concrete examples, tips, and suggestions for practical use; these help the readers actualize the concepts being introduced at the beginning of each chapter. End notes that show sources of more recent works give afresh more relevant situations to the contemporary reader. In the final chapter, a recapitulation of the work-worship divides and a concise discussion of the four C's on what to do about them brings the whole material to a proper closure.

---

[1] Mark L. Russell, Dave Gibbons, Brian Mosley, Matt Chandler, Norm Miller, J. R. Vassar, and Justin Forman, *Work as Worship: God Created Us to Work; God Created Us to Worship; for Us, Work Is Worship* (Richardson, TX: RightNow, 2012).

As it is, Brown and Wiese have successfully presented a unique way of looking at "work" in connection with "worship" and how both could blend appropriately. They offer a fuller understanding on how we could best live our lives in consistency with our faith, to be holy before God, offering our undivided selves for God's glory. However, if topics similar to this have already been examined, they need to explain more clearly to their readers that indeed their perspective stands out among the rest.

Jean C. Nalam

***A 30-Minute Overview of a Practical Guide to Culture: Helping the Next Generation Navigate Today's World*, by John Stonestreet. Colorado Springs, CO: David C. Cook, 2018. Kindle. $2.99.**

This short ebook provides an overview of a longer book that John Stonestreet co-authored with Brett Kunkle. It is part of the Faith Blueprints series designed to give executive summary-type coverage of the main points from what the publisher says are "some of David C. Cook's best books" so that people can "learn from some of the world's best thinkers on the subjects of faith and culture" without having to read the full-length versions. Stonestreet, President of the Colson Center for Christian Worldview, and Kunkle, a former pastor, both speak and write about faith and culture. Although it is authored by Stonestreet, throughout the ebook he speaks on behalf of Kunkle and includes lengthy quotations from the book they wrote together.

The ebook is divided into four parts: "Why Culture Matters," "A Read of the Cultural Waters," "Pounding Cultural Waves," and "Christian Worldview Essentials." The authors' target audience is Christian adults who want to help young people "navigate this cultural moment as champions for Christ" (loc 166). As the title and two of the sections indicate, the authors liken culture to water. However, they float from one water analogy to another, which makes it difficult to catch a definition or consistent description of what they mean when they use the word culture.

The title and cover suggest that culture is analogous to a body of water that needs to be navigated by boat. However, within

the ebook they depict culture as water in which people are trying to survive "cultural currents" that have "shifted and intensified" and "brought a tsunami of change" with "one issue after another after another [that] hits us like a series of waves at high tide" requiring people to "keep their heads above water" (loc 152). Elsewhere, they shift the analogy to that of culture being our natural habitat when they write, "Culture is for humans what water is for fish: the environment we live in and think is normal," and "Like fish immersed in water . . . culture shapes our perceptions of reality" (loc 217).

Their motivation for addressing the topic is that "We make our cultures, and then our cultures shape us" (loc 339) and "culture is shaping the next generation's understanding of faith far more than their faith is shaping their understanding of culture" (loc 740).

Most of the ebook is about teaching young people to not succumb to the pounding cultural waves of unbiblical ideas and practices regarding pornography, sexual orientation, gender identity, consumerism, addiction, and entertainment. Toward the end, the authors admit that they "have been talking mostly about defense" and they then pivot to offense when they write that "We're also called to be faithful ambassadors to the culture" (loc 3635). They suggest accomplishing that by engaging culture in order to influence it for good because "When mature Christians engage the culture fully, deeply, and wisely, the culture won't corrupt us. . . . We'll teach it what is good, true, and beautiful" (loc 759).

The authors point to God's Word as the source for what is true, but they do not elaborate on what constitutes good or beautiful. Other parts of the ebook lack needed explanations as well. For example, they recommend that young people read good books but do not define what qualifies as a good book.

In addition to inconsistent water analogies and the lack of needed explanations for certain terms and statements, another shortcoming is their use of *culture* and *world* synonymously in the title and throughout the ebook. One example of this synonymous use is when they write that they "dream of the day our kids will wade out into the culture and impact the world for Christ" (loc 143). Another example is when they state that unless we examine "the culture around us, it won't occur to us that the world should be any different" (loc 217). Using *culture* and *world* synonymously brings

vagueness and imprecision to terms in need of clarity and distinction.

While this ebook is useful on its own for highlighting the authors' main points, it lacks clear explanations of key terms, such as *good*, *beautiful*, *world*, and *culture*, which are crucial to the topic the authors address. For those trying to decide if the overview or the full-length book could be useful to or for them, the concluding ebook paragraph that suggests Christians should "deal with the ideas, institutions, trends, fashions, and habits of our culture" by celebrating "beautiful art, brilliant ideas, and compelling stories," creating "new policy solutions and clever inventions . . . to solve contemporary problems," confronting "lies, slander, and false religions," co-opting "new technologies . . . for kingdom use," and correcting "false information and misperceptions about others" (loc 3673) provides insight to how the authors perceive and approach the topic of faith and culture.

Brenda Thomas

***Children's Spirituality: Christian Perspectives, Research, and Applications*, ed. by Kevin E. Lawson and Scottie May. 2nd edition. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2019. 424 pp. $49.00.**

In recent years there has been a surge of interest in children's spirituality. A flurry of research, literature, and conferences on children's spiritual formation abound. More than simply a second edition, this book is a reworking of the published presentations from the preliminary conference of the Society of Children's Spirituality: Christian Perspectives (2003), now called the Children's Spirituality Summit. Edited by two founding members of the society—Kevin E. Lawson and Scottie May—this 2019 publication includes new insights on children's spirituality. For example, chapter ten on the brain and child development has been expanded to include the most current research.

The book is divided into five main sections—the first devoted to research, history, and theology. The subsequent sections look at children's spirituality in the contexts of the church, home, and school, concluding with a reflection on the conference as a whole.

While the goal of the conference was to examine research pertaining to the spiritual experiences of children within a Christian worldview, due to the newness of this field of study, the definition of "spirituality" is intentionally "left open-ended" in the book (2). It would not be until a later conference that a working definition would be adopted by the society.[1] However, from the outset their purpose, as described by May, was built on a clear premise that "children are just as much spiritual beings as are the adults in their lives" (1).

While the first chapter gives a good overview of the book, if one is new to the field of children's spirituality, chapter six by Rebecca Nye might be a good place to start. A developmental psychologist from the UK, Nye is well known for her theory of *relational consciousness*.[2] She defines "relational consciousness" as a means in which a child not only becomes aware of their own consciousness but also "exudes a capacity for conscious relationship" (87). Making the switch from studying children's cognitive abilities, she became intrigued with the essence of their spiritual nature. Somehow, even if children did not yet possess the reasoning or language capabilities needed to communicate in the sphere of religious instruction, they seemed to intuit a godly sense. How exactly was this possible? Enter the field of children's spirituality.

Nye points out that research from the previous century had yielded "watered down" religious training since children's cognitive abilities were known to be limited. It was therefore assumed that so were their spiritual insights (86). Children are, after all, quite literal. She writes,

> On one level their conventionally religious reasoning was bootstrapped to their cognitive development, but seeing past this surface layer there was much more going on that suggested profound engagement and motivation, and in an important sense a kind of spiritual maturity which adults often merely feign. (87)

[1] For the definition of "children's spirituality" accepted by the 2006 conference, see Holly C. Allen, ed., *Nurturing Children's Spirituality: Christian Perspectives and Best Practices* (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2008, 11).

[2] David Hay with Rebecca Nye, *The Spirit of the Child* (London: Fount, 1998).

Along with Nye's notion of "relational consciousness" is Jerome Berryman's concept of "silence" in chapter two. Before language takes place, a child relies heavily on non-verbal cues—such as touch, tone, and body language. A problem not only in communication but also in development can occur if these non-verbal cues are out of sync with the language concepts that the child is learning—a child's emotional intelligence can become stunted. Berryman carries this disjunct syllogism into the spiritual realm and posits that as an adult, one may or may not always intuit non-verbally what he or she communicates verbally as a Christian. In other words, does one walk the talk or just talk the talk? For example, "T. S. Eliot observed that the reason so much Christian poetry is of poor quality is that the authors wrote what they thought they ought to write instead of what they actually experienced" (23–24). How can the verbal and non-verbal be bridged? Berryman reports that the poetic nature of Scripture gives an answer: "The Christian language system is a complex repository of such 'poetry.' There are sacred stories, parables, and liturgical gestures combined with words in addition to silence in this linguistic domain" (25).

Klaus Issler offers insight in chapter four of how to "connect some of the theological dots" pertaining to the spiritual condition of children (49). Issler advocates a "before and after" approach to children's ministry, "nurturing the faith of children through corporate practices offered both *before* and *after* children reach an age of discernment" (48, emphasis original). Worshiping corporately is an ideal way for the child to receive both religious educational training and spiritual formation. Other chapters, such as "A Child's Concept of God" offer intriguing insights as well.

For the average children's ministry leader, the field of children's spirituality may sound nebulous and perplexing. While Berryman cautions against using religious language void of spiritual experience, Nye likewise warns against talking about spirituality without using religious language—"at some point psycho-babble could become a replacement for sacred-ese" (94). Berryman points to the power of poetry to communicate "what is silent in human relationships," but acknowledges that "the use of reason, logic, and tradition are needed to guard this language system against misuse" (25). Furthermore, the means of utilizing empirical research to study something "spiritual" is inherently problematic. Nye herself admits

that while qualitative social science has "promise" as a Christian method, "truth and knowledge" may be viewed more as "affected by context and subjectivity" instead of "objective facts" (100). She therefore rightly advises Christians to view the developing research on children's spirituality in tandem with "historical, theological, and educational enquiries" (100).

Zelda Meneses-Reus

***The Gospel-Driven Church: Uniting Church-Growth Dreams with the Metrics of Grace*, by Jared C. Wilson. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2019. 240 pp. $21.99.**

Jared Wilson is director of content strategy at Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, managing editor of *For the Church*, and director of the Pastoral Training Center at Liberty Baptist Church in Kansas City, Missouri. His book presents the idea that the attractional model of church growth pioneered by Willow Creek and Saddleback Churches has become a paradigm for any size church: "While the seeker-driven megachurch is the common picture of the attractional church, plenty of smaller churches use pragmatic and consumeristic methodology in the hope of growing bigger and fulfilling their dream of becoming mega" (25). Traditional churches can also be a part of the "attractional" model as they pursue "whatever it takes to get people in the door" (25). While affording people the opportunity to hear the gospel is admirable and desired, Wilson believes that this model may not be attracting people to Jesus but to a program or event: "What you win people with is what you win them to. The best motives in the world cannot sanctify unbiblical methods" (25).

In *The Gospel-Driven Church,* Wilson argues that the attractional model is based on consumerism and pragmatism catering to the customer and attempting to satisfy their preferences to boost attendance. This is achieved through careful programming designed to appeal to a target audience and tailored to meet their needs. "In some churches," Wilson continues, "you may not hear Jesus mentioned or featured prominently in a message. Worship songs aim at eliciting emotions or inspiring people with positive,

encouraging thoughts rather than rehearsing the gospel or teaching biblical content" (28). Wilson is convinced that the attractional model does not work because it fails to teach biblical principles, wins people to consumerism, and generally is not reaching unchurched people with the gospel (35–36). Because discipleship is not emphasized, the people remain biblically illiterate and are not able to live out their faith in a postmodern world.

Wilson believes that attendance is not the major factor in a healthy, growing church. Instead a church should look for signs of fruitfulness, and he suggests Jonathan Edward's "Distinguishing marks of a work of the Spirit of God" as a guide (54). These metrics are a growing esteem for Jesus Christ, a discernible spirit of repentance, a dogged devotion to the Word of God, an interest in theology and doctrine, and an evident love for God and neighbor (55–66). Although not simple metrics to use, Wilson provides questions throughout the book to aid church leaders as they measure their fruitfulness.

The worship service, according to Wilson, is the setting to establish the gospel-driven model. Acknowledging the "seeker-focused approach to Sunday morning is widespread and influential," Wilson finds this "very unfortunate because it is also unbiblical" (94). He is emphatic that the church is charged with reaching the lost, but "the church's primary worship service should be designed with the saved in mind, not the seeker" (94). The service is constructed "as an encounter, not an experience" with the "four irreducible elements of gospel-driven worship" as the foundation (116). These elements are preaching, praying, singing, and eating. Preaching "is the centerpiece of the worship gathering because it is where we most declaratively and authoritatively hear from God" (116). It must be preaching that "proclaims, exults, and reveals the glory of God in Christ" (97–99). Prayer reflects the Christian's submission to God, and when absent, it "is because we are too busy trying to manipulate God rather than supplicating before him" (117). Singing in the service is based on Colossians 3:16, emphasizing not the individual but the corporate body. Unlike the attractional model that is creating a mood or "vibe," the gospel-driven model pursues songs that give opportunities to "tune our hearts to what Christ has done for us, which transforms our minds, our hearts, and our feelings into authentic worship of God" (119–20). Eating is the celebra-

tion of the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's Supper. Wilson states that the Lord's Supper "places us in a personal and corporate encounter with the sacrifice of Christ and presses us to meet God, confess our sin, and embrace afresh the gospel that saved us and continues to transform us" (121). This transformation leads to a "gospel culture that glorifies God in Christ and overflows out into Spirit-empowered gospel mission" (122).

In *The Gospel-Driven Church,* Wilson advocates for a model that is biblical, disciples believers, strengthens the church community, and reaches out to the lost. As he offers suggestions for transitioning from the attractional model to the gospel-driven model, Wilson acknowledges that it is not an easy path and may cause some people to leave. However, it will lead to a healthier congregation that is committed to Christ and seeks to obey him. To illustrate the concepts, Wilson includes a hypothetical story of a lead pastor and his church leaders as they transition from a successful attractional ministry to a gospel-driven model.

I found this book to be a breath of fresh air in the midst of the myriads of books on church growth solutions. It is a valuable contribution to the subject and a must read for pastors, worship ministers, and layleaders considering this issue.

Lori Danielson

Book Review Index