

The Theological Vision that Shaped *Glory to God*

Edwin Chr. van Driel

A Songbook for Such a Time as This

It was the first meeting of the Presbyterian Committee on Congregational Song (PCOCS), commissioned by the General Assembly to edit a new songbook for the denomination. After some personal introductions the chair invited each of us to speak a bit about our hopes, dreams, and fears for the new hymnal. What should the book look like? What should we avoid? What effect did we hope our work would have? The chair took notes on the blackboard. While we went around the table, to our surprise and delight, a common mind developed among us as we spoke. While we did not yet have a clear vision of what the book should look like, nor an idea of what songs should go in it, nor even a

What we needed was something coherent, something carried by a vision. And that vision needed to speak to where our church finds itself today.

process of decision making, one person after the other recognized this: that the church needed more than just another collection of hymns. Of course, we could simply take what was popular from the 1990 blue book, add some attractive material published in the years thereafter, and offer this as the church's new resource. But if we were to do that, we would produce nothing more than a random grouping of songs. What we needed was something coherent, something carried by a vision. And that vision needed to speak to where our church finds itself today.

The more we talked, the more our enthusiasm grew. But so did our realization that the reality of

our church today is a painful one. We are a divided church. We are divided liturgically, and we are divided musically. More distressing, we are also divided theologically. We are a body suffering from divisions and strife, hurting because of schisms that have ripped apart presbyteries, congregations, and families. And, most troubling, the conflicts are so real, and the theological divisions are so deep, that it is unclear if and how we will overcome them.

We are not only a divided church; we are also an anxious church. Our numbers are dropping, our resources dwindling, our membership aging, and with all of these things come serious questions about the future of the denomination. I believe this anxiety might even be a more serious problem than our divisions, because it is more widespread. Congregations that have not suffered from theological conflicts within their own community may nonetheless have a sense of impending doom. Pastors of seemingly flourishing congregations tell me they do not dare to think ten years ahead, when their oldest generation of members, who are also the most significant givers, may have fallen away.

And finally, the world in which our church community lives is itself fraught with insecurity. Earlier generations' trust in human progress has been undermined; two wars and a worldwide economic crisis have depleted our reserves. America is no longer the dominating empire it was only a decade ago. There is a quiet but growing sense that new generations may not enjoy the prosperity that characterized their parents' lives.

It was for such a time as this that PCOCS had to develop a hymnal. In response to where we found ourselves as a church and as a world, the committee decided to focus on the theme of

Edwin Chr. van Driel is associate professor of theology at Pittsburgh Theological Seminary and a member of the Presbyterian Committee on Congregational Song.

salvation history and to have our work shaped by the overarching theme of God's powerful acts of creation, redemption, and final transformation.¹ We believe strongly that what we need in this time of insecurity and anxiety is for our attention to be redirected from ourselves to God. In this time of deep uncertainty about the future of the church, of our nation, and of the world, we need to be reminded that in reality the focus of history is not the rise or fall of empires or institutions but the certain future of God's inaugurated kingdom. In this time of conflict and schism we need to be reminded that we do not belong together because of our own choosing, but because God has drawn all of us together in the covenant of baptism. "You did not choose me but I chose you" (John 15:16). In short: we need to focus less on ourselves and more on God.

The choice of salvation history as the overarching theme of the new resource not only influenced its content but also shaped its organization. The framework of the book is determined by two major parts: hymns that sing of "God's Mighty Acts" and songs that express "Our Response to God." These two parts embrace a third section: "The Church at Worship." The section about God's mighty acts leads us through the history of salvation beginning with God's work of creation and providence, followed

The choice of salvation history as the overarching theme of the new resource not only influenced its content but also shaped its organization.

by God's covenant with Israel, the advent and life of Christ, his death, resurrection, ascension and rule, ending with Christ's return and judgment, and a new heaven and a new earth. The section that bespeaks our response to God is organized in an arguably similar salvation-historical manner, divided among praising the triune God, joining in the Spirit's work, and hoping for Christ's return. The very structure of the hymnal reminds us that all our acts of faith are always embedded in and responding to the preceding acts of God. And it invites pastors and musicians who make song choices for worship to ask: From what part of the hymnal have I been choosing my songs? How do these choices shape the flow of the worship services, and what does this flow say about the relationship between God and us? Is

God introduced only as an agent from the past, one whose work inspires us for what we do in the here and now? Are hymns about God's mighty acts only the opening chorus for what is otherwise a service focused on our responses? Or is God in our praying and singing the living and active one, the one who is both behind and before us, the one who "is going ahead of you to Galilee" (Mark 16:7)? Is this God present at the beginning and ending of our worship? Because it is only in this, a God who is resurrected and goes ahead of us, that there is a future.

Salvation History and the Shape of *Glory to God*

Organizing the book along the arc of salvation history paid off richly in many ways. First, the narration of salvation history encompasses the feasts and themes celebrated in the liturgical year—after all, the liturgical cycle follows basically the life of Jesus and the aftermath of Pentecost—but at the same time it has a wider span, reaching back over Advent to Israel and the beginning of creation, and reaching beyond Pentecost to Christ's return and creation's final transformation. A salvation-historical framework thus allows the hymnal to reflect more fully the scope of the biblical witness than an ordering shaped by the rhythm of the liturgical year, as most mainline hymnals are.² Moreover, adherence to the liturgical year varies within our denomination. Sure, everybody celebrates Christmas and Easter, but not every congregation is concerned with Trinity Sunday or Christ the King. A songbook shaped by a salvation-historical narrative is therefore more inclusive of the diverse liturgical practices within our church.

Second, because of the wider span of the theme of salvation history, the hymnal has a special and explicit place for God's relationship with Israel. Such attention was largely absent in previous hymnals. Yes, it is a Reformed tradition to include the Psalter in our hymnals, but the psalms are usually used more as songs of the church than as expressions of Israel. Moreover, research shows that the psalms are among the least used songs from the 1990 *Presbyterian Hymnal*.³ The theme and outline of *Glory to God* allowed us to do something different. First, the hymnal has a specific section for "God's Covenant with Israel" which contains psalms as well as songs based on the Old Testament narrative. It is, admittedly, a small collection of hymns. The difficulty we had in identifying hymns devoted to

the Old Testament stories itself underscores the need for more explicit attention to those texts.⁴ Partly because of this section devoted to Israel we were free to decide, next, not to include the psalms in a separate section, as was done in many previous Presbyterian hymnals, but to distribute them thematically over the full range of the outline. While this makes the Psalter less visible as its own collection, we are hoping that this will enhance the use of the psalms in our worship services. If previously one were looking for a song for a Christmas celebration, one might not immediately have thought of James Montgomery's version of Psalm 72: "All Hail to God's Anointed" (GTG 149). Now it is there, right after "Mary and Joseph Came to the Temple" (GTG 148) and before "As with Gladness Men of Old" (GTG 150).

Third, the theme of salvation history gives us a theological rationale for why our singing needs to include hymns and songs from other cultures. It is fair to say that, for many congregations, this is a difficult hurdle to take. The same research that shows the low use of the Psalter in our worship brings out the fact that the non-Western songs in the 1990 *Presbyterian Hymnal* are used even less. Frequently, congregations find it difficult to engage in hymns set in a different musical style. I am sure there is also in some congregations an instinctive resistance against the introduction of music produced on non-American soil because it is perceived to be driven by "liberal" political correctness. But in salvation history we are confronted by a God who in Jesus Christ "gathers up all things in himself" (Eph. 1:10), and who brings together people from different cultures and different nationalities to form "a new humanity" (Eph. 2:15), a new "household of God" (Eph. 2:19). Singing hymns from other parts of the world teaches us that we may form only a small congregation in Brookfield, Connecticut, or Fairfax, Missouri, but that we are united with thousands of other churches all around the globe. They tell us as large congregations in, let's say, Atlanta or New York City, that there are many communities all over the world with which we are called to share our resources. As *Glory to God's Theological Vision Statement* says:

The framework of the history of salvation offers a theological rationale for asking us to learn songs that come from cultures different than our own: Pentecost

teaches us to speak and hear the gospel in many tongues and languages and only thus, "with all the saints," to comprehend the breadth and length and height and depth of the love of Christ (Eph. 3:18). We do not sing hymns and songs because they were birthed in our culture; we sing them because they teach us something about the richness that is in God.

Fourth, because of the theme of "salvation history" this hymnal has a strong eschatological orientation. "Salvation history" is going somewhere. Christ's work did not end on Easter morning; his ascension is his royal inauguration, his ascension to the divine throne, from which he is leading creation to the fullness of time, the consummation of God's kingdom. This is why the category after resurrection is not just called "Ascension," but "Ascension and Reign," and this is why the narration of the history of salvation ends with the categories "Christ's Return and Judgment," and "A New Heaven and a New Earth."⁵ These categories in turn have their parallel in the "Our Response to God" categories of "Living and Dying in Christ" and "Trusting in the Promises of God." This eschatological orientation is much stronger than in preceding hymnals, and it is so on purpose.⁶ Not only do we believe that such eschatological orientation reflects more faithfully the eschatological nature of the gospel; it also is part of our effort to redirect our anxious attention from ourselves to the certain hand of God.⁷

Fifth, it is within this salvation historical narration of "God's Mighty Acts" that one finds a category called "The Church." This too is a deliberate decision. In our culture it would not have been strange to place the church under the heading of "Our Response to God." Many understand the church to be a voluntary organization of people who decide to respond faithfully to the offer of the gospel. One joins or leaves the church at will, so one thinks. From a Reformed perspective, this is not right. The church is not a voluntary organization, but a community established by God. And one does not join the church at will, but through baptism. Baptism is not something we do, it happens to us. When we are baptized, we are, as Paul says, united with Christ in his death and resurrection (Rom. 6:3-4). Thinking about the way the first Christian community baptized, by full immersion, the apostle suggests that

when the baptized go under in the water they go into the grave—Jesus’ grave. They die. When they come up again, they are resurrected—with Christ. In our baptism we have already died and have already been resurrected. But “being resurrected” is not something we do by ourselves. It is being done to us. If the church is the community of the baptized, then likewise the church is not a voluntary organization we join or leave at will, but a community gathered by God. It is important to realize this in a time of deep ecclesial division and strife.⁸

Sixth, a framework of salvation history gives a proper place for what usually are called “national songs.” Every hymnal committee wrestles with what to do with these. While it is true that when we gather together for worship one nationality is often in a majority—for instance, Americans, Canadians, or Dutch—we do not come together *as* Americans, Canadians, or Dutch. We come together as people called from every nation and every tongue to form this “new humanity,” this new “household of God.” In being together we offer to the world a foretaste of the new creation in which nationality, gender, and race are no longer the primary shapers of our identity. Because we do not come together *as* Americans, Canadians, or Dutch, it is odd when as a Christian community we are asked to sing songs that puts words in our mouth that appeal to one particular national identity rather than our common identity as the baptized. When a congregation is asked to sing “God Bless America,” how does this make non-American members feel? It implicitly suggests they are, actually, only second rank. On

We come together as people called
from every nation and every tongue
to form this “new humanity,” this
new “household of God.”

the other hand, practically speaking, no publisher would let a hymnal committee get away with axing a selection of “national songs” altogether. While the motivation for this would probably be more commercial than anything else, there is oddly a good theological rationale for it. Although we do not get together as Americans, Canadians, or Dutch, being a Christian does not mean we are stripped of our national identity, just as we are not stripped of our gender or race. These things are part of the diversity in which God created us; and, as the

book of Revelation suggests, this is a diversity that will even enrich the new creation, as “the kings of the earth will bring their glory into it” (Rev. 21:24). God deals not just with individuals; God also deals with societies and the life of the nations. The theme of “salvation history” has a place for that. Rather than awkwardly placing hymns that speak of God’s dealing with the nations in a “national songs” category at the end of the hymnal, these songs have a place in the unfolding of God’s eschatological work. However, God’s dealing with the nations is not focused on only one country, and is not only positive. Songs that suggest that one nation is God’s specially chosen nation have no place in a Christian hymnal. We can ask God’s blessing upon our nation, but not exclusively ours. In addition, there will be times when we have to acknowledge that our nation does not deserve God’s blessing, but God’s judgment. Therefore, the category of God’s dealing in “The Life of the Nations” has hymns such as “God of the Ages, Whose Almighty Hand” (GTG 331) but also “Judge Eternal, Throned in Splendor” (GTG 342), brought back from the 1955 Presbyterian *Hymnbook*. Maybe the best example is a hymn new to Presbyterians: the Caribbean song “The Right Hand of God” (GTG 332), which has these stanzas:

The right hand of God is striking in our land,
striking out at envy, hate, and greed.
Our selfishness and lust, our pride and deeds
unjust,
are destroyed by the right hand of God.

The right hand of God is healing in our land,
healing broken bodies, minds, and souls;
so wondrous is its touch with love that means
so much,
when we’re healed by the right hand of God.

Salvation History and the Language We Use

The theme of salvation history not only helped the committee to decide which songs should become part of the collection, but the PCOCS also drew on this theme to negotiate questions regarding language and text versions of the included songs. One of the issues before every hymnal committee is that of gendered language for God and God’s people. In our church, inclusive language for the people of God is no longer a discussion. The theological rationale for this is, again, salvation history. This

history involves Sarah no less than Abraham, Ruth no less than Boaz, Mary no less than Peter, and a songbook that is shaped by the theme of salvation history should reflect this in the way it speaks about God's people. So we included both "For All the Faithful Women" (GTG 324) and "By All Your Saints Still Striving" (GTG 325) in our collection.

When it comes to the use of language for God, however, the conversation is still ongoing. While many are deeply nurtured and comforted by traditional imagery for God, many others are concerned about associations of patriarchy and other forms of domination and are looking for other and more diverse language. Here too the committee felt that the notion of salvation history offers a way forward. As the language statement of the PCOCS says:

Scripture uses an abundantly rich array of prose and poetry to tell us about God's powerful acts of creation, redemption, and final transformation. Much biblical imagery is indeed masculine, but there is also a wide variety of other metaphors that are either feminine or gender-neutral. Most important, behind *all* biblical narrative lies the deep and prevailing sense that God is the one whose ways and thoughts are as beyond human speech as the heaven is higher than the earth (Isa. 55:9). Our lips need to be cleansed by a burning coal before we speak or sing any word about the holy God (Isa. 6:5).

And so a hymnal that is true to salvation history needs to draw on the full reservoir of biblical imagery for God and God's gracious acts. The committee resolved that the final collection "will include both metaphors that are comfortable in their familiarity and those that are enriching in their newness." Moreover, since the God who meets us so graciously and intimately in salvation history is at the same time one who is wholly other and beyond gender, "texts will reflect a strong preference for avoiding the use of male pronouns for God. . . . The goal is a collection in which traditional hymns and songs are balanced with others that are more gender-neutral or expansive in their reference to God."

At the same time, for the sake of salvation history, the committee resolved that two gendered references should be preserved in the collection. One of these is the practice to call both the God of

Israel and Christ "Lord." In the centuries before our year count (the "second temple period") it became a custom among Jews to avoid pronunciation of the covenantal name of God, YHWH. The name was seen as too holy to be taken upon human lips. Whenever the text of Scripture was read aloud and the text referenced God's covenantal name, the reader would, without further announcement, replace that name by another term. The most frequent Hebrew substitute was *adonay*; among Greek-speaking Jews the favored term was *kyrios*. Both words mean "Lord." Replacing the covenantal name with *kyrios* became so standard that this is how we find YHWH "translated" in the Greek version of the Old Testament that Greek-speaking Jews used, the Septuagint. This practice has since been followed by virtually all Christian Bible translations. For instance, wherever the Hebrew reads "YHWH," the NRSV reads "LORD." Rather than being an expression of domination or masculinity, the use of "Lord" is thus an expression of reverence for the Holy Name by which God discloses Godself in Hebrew Scripture. This in turn is significant for when we come to the world of the New Testament. That "Jesus Christ is Lord (*kyrios*)" is one of the oldest confessions concerning him. It has both a Roman and a Jewish background. On the one hand, "Lord" (*kyrios*) was the title of the Roman emperor.

Rather than being an expression of domination or masculinity, the use of "Lord" is thus an expression of reverence for the Holy Name by which God discloses Godself in Hebrew Scripture.

When the writers of the New Testament confess Jesus to be Lord, they thereby proclaim that not Caesar but Christ rules this world. On the other hand, in using the word *kyrios* for Jesus, the Jewish writers of the New Testament hearken back to the way they are accustomed to referring to Israel's God and make a startling identity statement: that in Jesus this very God has become present among us.⁹ Of course, these two claims go hand in hand. It is because the first Christians recognize in Jesus YHWH, the very God of Israel, that they can do no other than to say that he, and not Caesar, is the *kyrios* of heaven and earth. It is for this reason that it is so important to preserve "Lord" in our songs

and liturgies. Were we no longer to use “Lord” for Israel’s God, we would no longer understand what we claim about Jesus’ identity when we confess him Lord. Were we no longer to use “Lord” for Jesus, we would lose the strongest defense we have against empire: that Christ is Lord, and not Caesar.

Taking the theme of gendered language out of the heat of the political debate and situating it in the overarching theme of salvation history reveals a certain irony in the way the debate often plays out. Many who champion gender-neutral or female images for God identify themselves as “liberal”; many who resist it call themselves “traditional” or “conservative.” The irony is that a term like “Mother Jesus” is not a feminist invention, but one coined by the medieval theologian Anselm of Canterbury (1033–1109), the same person who developed the satisfaction theory of atonement:

And you, Jesus, are you not also a mother?
Are you not the mother who, like a hen,
gathers her chicken under her wings?
Truly, Lord, you are a mother;
for both they who are in labour
and they who are brought forth
are accepted by you. . . .
So you, Lord God, are the great mother.¹⁰

I imagine it is exactly *because* of Anselm’s orthodoxy that he so freely plays with language for God. If male and female were created in the image of God (Gen. 1:27), but Godself is beyond gender, a multitude of images can be used for the divine. Likewise, if God is not gendered, then Jesus’ gender, while without doubt male, is accidental to divine revelation and salvation. We find the same female language for God in a number of writers from this time, including Bernard of Clairvaux, John Calvin’s favorite medieval theologian.¹¹ Therefore we sing Jean Janzen’s “Mothering God, You Gave Me Birth” (GTG 7): the hymn may have been composed in 1991, but the images go straight back to the medieval theologian Julian of Norwich (1342–ca. 1416). Not everything that is new to us is new to the Christian tradition. It seems, all in all, that salvation history refuses to be stretched on the Procrustean bed of our theological partisanships.

In addition to the term *Lord*, the committee resolved to preserve the Trinitarian formulation of Father, Son, and Spirit. This is the formula by which we are baptized; this is the name that unites us

with each other and with all Christian communities beyond our denomination (Matt. 28:19). At the same time, other images and metaphors for the Trinity will be welcomed, as long as they adhere to the core principles of Trinitarian theology. God exists in three persons, but there is nonetheless only one God who knows and loves and acts. Alternative metaphors for the Trinity cannot suggest there are three distinct actors in the Godhead. Therefore, next, in salvation history, no person of the Trinity acts alone; every act is an act of all three persons in the one God. Images that distribute divine acts among the three Trinitarian persons are therefore not properly identifying the Triune God.¹² Finally, alternative metaphors for the three Trinitarian persons cannot suggest that these persons are “parts” of God—because if they were, each person would not be fully God, and thereby, not God at all.

Images that distribute divine acts among
the three Trinitarian persons are therefore
not properly identifying the Triune God

Implied in all of this was also the resolve, if needed and appropriate, to change hymn texts. Hymnal committees who do so regularly encounter the objection that this would infringe on the authorship of hymn writers. Existing hymn texts should be respected as they are; if there is a preference for different texts, new hymns should be composed, so the argument goes. Two responses are appropriate. First, we all sing changed hymn texts. For example, we probably all sing “Hark! The herald angels sing, ‘Glory to the newborn king’ ” at Christmas time. But in doing so we sing an altered hymn text, because Charles Wesley actually wrote “Hark how all the welkin rings! Glory to the King of kings.” It was George Whitefield who changed Wesley’s words fourteen years after the song was composed.¹³ Second, and more principally, the argument misunderstands the relationship between hymn writers and the Christian community. Hymn writers do not simply offer individual expressions of personal faith. If that is what they want, they should write poems. Hymns are written in the service of the wider church. In the church, notions of authorship and intellectual property do not function as they do elsewhere. Just as among the first Christians “no one claimed private ownership of any possessions” (Acts 4:32), and Ananias and Sapphira could not

hold back part for themselves except at the price of death (Acts 5:1–11), Christian hymn writers—as well as liturgists, and preachers, and theologians—give up the ownership of their work once they offer it to the community. The thoughts we develop, the words we pray, as well as the hymns we compose for the people of God, become thereby *their* thoughts, their prayers, their songs, and will subsequently be molded into new things as the community grows in knowledge and love of Christ.

These last points are a good illustration of the fact that hymns, and, therefore, hymnals, are not just expressions of religious feelings and musical preferences. They are also confessional in nature, and therefore catechetical. This is why we must resist those voices that suggest that hymnals are expressions of an outdated power structure and elitism, and that song selection should come from the grassroots and be left to local communities.¹⁴ Hymns shape our theological imagination, often more than sermons or confessional texts. Hymn texts are held deeply in our memory and will carry us in times of sadness and joy. In its public worship the church professes what it believes. A church that takes itself seriously takes its songbook seriously, because a hymnal is, in a sense, a confessional document. And confessional documents are more than local expressions; they are declarations of the whole church.¹⁵ Hymnals are only outdated and elitist if confessions are outdated and elitist.

This hymnal is also meant to be a confessional expression. It is a place where we as a church confess to the world and encourage each other that, yes, we may be shrinking in numbers and influence and we do not know quite what to do with that; and yes, we may be theologically conflicted in deeply hurtful ways and we do not know how to overcome our divisions; we may be tired, confused, and anxious; but we know that, in the end, none of this matters. It is not about us; it is about God. It is not about our future, but about God's future. And because it is about God's future, miraculously, our future is secure. We are baptized people, and as such, we are rooted in salvation history, united with Christ in his death and resurrection, and therefore set on the path of salvation.

We know that Christ is raised and dies
no more.

Embraced by death he broke its fearful hold,
and our despair he turned to blazing joy.
Alleluia!

We share by water in his saving death.
Reborn we share with him an Easter life
as living members of a living Christ.
Alleluia!

The Father's splendor clothes the Son with life.
The Spirit's power shakes the church of God.
Baptized we live with God the Three in One.
Alleluia!

A new creation comes to life and grows
as Christ's new body takes on flesh and blood.
The universe, restored and whole, will sing:
Alleluia! (GTG 485)

Notes

1. See the PCOCS Theological Vision Statement. The statement is available among the "Resources" on the website of the project: presbyterianhymnal.org.
2. This is also the case with the first half of the 1990 *Presbyterian Hymnal*, which opens with 157 hymns that lead from "Advent" to "Christ the King/Ascension."
3. As part of the preparation for the new resource, the PC(USA)'s Research Services distributed surveys about congregations' use of the 1990 *Presbyterian Hymnal*. The results are available under "Research" among the "Resources" on the website of the project: presbyterianhymnal.org.
4. Given the hymnal's theme, the committee was keen on including hymns that reflect specific stories of the biblical narrative. We found that few such hymns are available. There may be a lesson in this for future hymnal committees. One of the most successfully coherent twentieth-century hymnals, the Dutch *Liedboek voor de Kerken*, had among its editorial committee members a number of hymn writers who, once the direction of the hymnal was set, were commissioned to write hymns specific to the hymnal and the churches for which it was being produced. Future hymnal committees and publishers may want to follow this example. For the fascinating story of the *Liedboek voor de Kerken* see: *Een Compendium van Achtergrondinformatie bij de 491 Gezangen uit het Liedboek Voor de Kerken* (Amsterdam: Prof. Dr. G. van der Leeuw Stichting, 1977), 1291–1324.

5. This is also one reason why the controversy that Timothy George started with a column in *First Things* about PCOCS's decision not to include the song "In Christ Alone" was so silly (see: www.bit.ly/nosquishylove). George suggested that the wrath of God is "taboo" in the PC(USA). If he had taken a minute to look at the Table of Contents of the new hymnal (which was available online) he would have known the hymnal has a whole section devoted to divine judgment (see PCOCS' response: www.bit.ly/pcoocsresponse).
6. For a further analysis of the eschatological nature of *Glory to God*, particularly in the way hymns are placed along the salvation-historical outline, see in this issue the article by Kendra Buckwalter Smith.
7. For the eschatological nature of the gospel, see: Edwin Chr. van Driel, "The World Is About to Turn: Retelling the Story of Jesus Eschatologically," *Call to Worship* 47.4 (2013), 23–27.
8. For what the notion of the church as a community established by God's covenantal actions means for our ecclesial conflicts and strife, see: Edwin Chr. van Driel, "Church and Covenant: Theological Resources for Divided Denominations," *Theology Today* 65 (2009), 449–461.
9. Cf., for instance, Larry W. Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 108–118; N. T. Wright, Paul in Fresh Perspective (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 69–79, 91–96; C. Kavin Rowe, *Early Narrative Christology: The Lord in the Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academics, 2006).
10. *The Prayers and Meditations of Saint Anselm*, translated and with an introduction by Sister Benedicta Ward (London: Penguin Group, 1973), 153–154. See for other references from Anselm's work: Caroline Walker Bynum, *Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1984), 113–115.
11. For instance, in a pastoral letter: "Do not let the roughness of our life frighten your tender hearts. If you feel the stings of temptation . . . suck not so much the wounds as the breasts of the Crucified. He will be your mother, and you will be his son" (Letter 322, in *Migne Patrologia Latina* 182: col. 527; quoted in Bynum, *ibid.*, 117).
12. Thus, for example, the often used threefold address of God as "Creator, Redeemer, Sustainer" does correctly mention three functions of God, but it is not a Trinitarian address. After all, it is not the case that only the Father creates, and only the Son redeems, and only the Spirit sustains. If we were to say that, we would say that one Trinitarian person can act without the other two, and then we have three independent actors within the Godhead, which undermines the notion that there is only one God. All three Trinitarian persons create; all three redeem; all three sustain.
13. See: Brian Wren, *Praying Twice: The Music and Words of Congregational Song* (Louisville: Westminster, 2000), 301–306. The whole of chapter nine ("To Me, to All, Thy Bowels Move': Why Do They Keep Changing the Good Old Hymns?" 297–348) is instructive.
14. The latest expression of this view is C. Randall Bradley, *From Memory to Imagination: Reforming the Church's Music* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012), 42–46.
15. There would therefore be much to say for a practice that does not just *recommend* musical resources, as our church does, but *regulates* them. Such is the practice in, for example, the Netherlands Reformed Church, where all musical resources used in worship are to be authorized by the national synod of the church, and the Church of Scotland, where musical material is authorized by presbytery. Such practice is not authoritative, but confessional: an acknowledgement that our songs and hymns are public expressions of our common faith. There is a certain irony here too. In my observation, within the PC(USA) it is the more conservative churches that have a stronger tendency to use alternative musical resources instead of the denominational one. But in doing so they engage in what is more a congregational, or free-church practice, than a Presbyterian or confessional one.