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It is inherently impossible to design a form of worship which will at one and the same time ‘attract’ the average modern man and provide a framework in which the authentic Christian Gospel can be preached. The one gives the lie to the other.

(Gordon Ireson, Church Worship and the Non-Churchgoer (1944)1

The last few years have seen a tremendous change in the form of worship in most churches, especially in the realm of praise. Our music has developed so that we can sing about Jesus and what God has done for us in the kind of music we enjoy most.

(Advert in Buzz Magazine, February 1975).2
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Written just 31 years apart, the contrasting aesthetic and pastoral assumptions of these two perspectives reflect a revolution in Christian worship taking place since the Second World War. In 1944, Gordon Ireson (at the time missioner for the Anglican Diocese of Exeter) looked to the coming of peace as both an opportunity and a challenge for the Church as it sought to reconnect the British people with their Christian roots. This, for Ireson, was more likely to result from a restoration of tried and tested patterns than from a radical revolution in church life and liturgy. This was not least because ‘an age so incredibly vulgar that it can turn majestic themes of Mozart and Beethoven into Jazz tunes, and the air of the “Hallelujah Chorus” into “Yes, we have no bananas” is not likely to produce language adequate for the worship of God’.3 Within fifteen to twenty years, however, the musical and liturgical landscape of hymn and Prayer Book, choir and organ familiar to Ireson and his
contemporaries would be challenged by new sounds in both ‘art’ and ‘popular’ music, and by radically different ideas about the content and conduct of worship. Within 30 years, new orders of service heralded the arrival of a more vernacular, participative style, whilst a greater informal atmosphere of worship spread even amongst many otherwise traditional congregations. In music, guitar-led groups were formed and contemporary pop and folk took its place alongside established hymnody. For the contemporary-minded evangelical writers and readers of Buzz magazine\(^4\), these were exciting times: the dead hand of tradition had been thrown off and a younger generation of Christians immersed in the newest pop cultures enabled to worship in language more meaningful to them. However, for those of a more traditionalist disposition, the new styles could sometimes seem an abandonment of taste, decency and a rich heritage.

The divergent views of the two opening quotations reflect something of this heated debate over the style and performance of music for worship taking place within British Christianity since the mid-twentieth century. At root, this debate concerned the locus of authenticity in worship. How was God best to be worshipped through music? Was ‘authentic’ worship that which engaged the heart of the worshipper, or that which employed the appropriate style of music? If the latter, did authentic worship presuppose particular musical styles, or could a variety of styles be contemplated? Was ‘appropriateness’ a function of its organic growth out of a longer tradition, or its fidelity to contemporary ‘secular’ music? Would the Christian message be compromised by adopting contemporary styles or could greater attention to popular culture actually help engage new groups in worship? These were important questions: competing conceptions of worship and preferences in church music generated passion like few other spheres of congregational life in the post-war years.\(^5\)

These were not new questions, of course: concern for authenticity in worship is inherent in the Judaeo-Christian tradition and the Bible.\(^6\) Nevertheless, the later twentieth-century saw a new chapter in this debate. The challenging of long-held conventions in the arts and music, a growing emphasis on personal freedom and the erosion of Christian influence in culture and society not only created a new context for thinking about the ‘authentic’ in worship, but also prompted a reconsideration of what ‘authenticity’ itself might actually mean. All post-war discussions about what made ‘good’ music for worship were underpinned by questions about the integrity, propriety or ‘fitness’ of particular musical styles and their performance. Regardless of theological or ideological differences, these values lie at the heart of what ‘authenticity’ connotes.\(^7\) This essay therefore explores the different ways in which a concern for the ‘authentic’ in worship was worked out in discussions of
church music in post-war Britain, predominantly within an Anglican context. Centrally, the chapter charts a subtle, contested, but crucial, shift away from regarding ‘authenticity’ as inherent in the music itself, and towards a renewed emphasis on the attitude of the worshipper.

**The Meanings of ‘Authenticity’**

Understanding what ‘authenticity’ might mean in the context of music for worship requires consideration of three particular strands of writing. The first
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is Christianity’s biblical and theological inheritance and the various understandings of ‘true worship’ within it. For example, the Pauline exhortation to sing ‘in Psalms, hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your hearts to the Lord’ has had a varied exegesis in Christian history, sometimes used to justify the most elaborate choral service, and at other times (such as in Zwingli’s Zurich) even to disallow singing entirely. In theological terms, music had the potential to be both an incredibly powerful means of praise and a dangerous source of distraction or corruption.

Second, discussions of ‘authenticity’ also have a musicological inheritance derived from aesthetics and cultural theory. In some contexts, ‘authenticity’ may mean faithfulness to the performance styles of a composer’s lifetime, or to their original intentions. However, ‘authenticity’ may also be a tool of critical analysis: music has often been labelled ‘authentic’ if it conforms to particular stylistic expectations, or embodies something meaningful for (or about) its audience or performer. Ideas of ‘authenticity’ have also changed over time: influenced by Kant, Hegel and others, mid-twentieth-century musicologists frequently assumed that beauty was an ‘intrinsic, objective quality’, implying ‘authenticity’ could be measured with relative ease according to particular conventions. By the 1990s however, musicologists were far more likely to regard ‘authenticity’ as subjective, highlighting the power relations implicit in labelling a piece or performance as ‘authentic’ or ‘inauthentic’.

A parallel subjectivization of ‘authenticity’ has (thirdly) taken place in the realm of ethics and values. Charles Taylor suggests that over the post-war period in particular, a fundamental shift has taken place towards the personal, the interior and the individual as the final source of meaning and self-definition, with a corresponding critique of the ideal of a consensual (therefore externally imposed) public good. Historians concerned with the cultural and religious life of Britain since 1945 have noted a similar trend, variously highlighting a decline in ‘living according to the rule’, a shift from ‘doing the done thing’ to ‘doing your own thing’, or a ‘turn inwards’ in the
locus of moral authority. Nevertheless, as Taylor notes, this ‘ethic of authenticity’ has by no means achieved universal acceptance – evidenced by the quotations which head this chapter, and by recent media and political debate on the legacy of the 1960s. That this new conception of ‘authenticity’ has (in Taylor’s words) both its ‘boosters’ and its ‘knockers’ will become evident in the rest of the essay.

Choosing Music for Worship: Cultural and Religious Conventions

The early- to mid-twentieth-century saw the emergence of a loose consensus between influential writers and musicians on the style, performing standards, and quality of music for church. In hymnody, a wealth of cherished

[eighteenth- and nineteenth-century material was further enhanced by the addition of new work – notably the English Hymnal of 1906. Its musical editor, Ralph Vaughan Williams, was one of a growing number of respected composers who (since Stanford) had begun to devote serious attention to church music. Although topics of contention still existed, many church music professionals and interested amateurs nevertheless perceived themselves to be part of a stable, slowly evolving and progressively more refined tradition: as Erik Routley later reflected, ‘On Christmas Day 1955, some of us thought we had Church music pretty well where we wanted it.’ ‘Church Music’ was widely understood as a recognisable genre with its own canon of greats and loose criteria for selection.

For many amongst the English church music establishment of the 1940s and 1950s, implicit or explicit ‘authenticity’ meant faithfulness to these standards and expectations. Four underlying assumptions seemed particularly common: first, that church music should elevate the tastes and spirits of worshippers; second, that it would be of sufficient compositional quality; third, that it would be consonant with the longer church music tradition; and fourth, that church music should have no obviously ‘worldly’ connotations, reflecting the prevailing understanding of a sharp dividing line between ‘sacred’ and ‘secular’ spheres. The widespread acceptance of these paradigms is graphically demonstrated in ‘establishment’ reactions to Geoffrey Beaumont’s Folk Mass of 1956 which, in drawing heavily on the dance and light music of the twenties and thirties, arguably presented the first major and popular challenge to the conventions of the day. Critics rounded on the Mass for pandering to a lowest common denominator, and thus failing to lift its hearers to ‘learned’ conceptions of taste. For the Editor of English Church Music, the piece, though well-intentioned, was part of a tendency, ‘to under-rate the capacity of ordinary, humble people to think and feel finely’. (As Robert Hewison has noted, the transformative potential of ‘common culture’ was a powerful ideal in the mid-twentieth-century, but commonly with the assumption that ‘common culture’ meant ‘western European high
Second, critics fixed on what they regarded as the low compositional standards of the piece. One scathing editorial review in *Musical Opinion* of December 1957 found the piece composed, ‘almost entirely of clichés, which does not contain one original idea from start to finish’. By contrast, the review continued, ‘Modern compositions must by their musical merit and gravity be worthy of the liturgical functions’.

Third, critics found the *Folk Mass* wanting in its disregard for the wider Anglican musical tradition. Mid-twentieth-century discussions of church music often display a strong consciousness of drawing upon a distinguished national heritage. This did not demand mere imitation, but did assume a rootedness in the work of great English church composers past. By (wrongly) labelling the work a ‘jazz mass’, its critics found it easier to discount the work on the grounds that it did not arise from the European classical tradition from which church music traditionally drew its repertoire. Finally, many establishment voices were critical of the *Folk Mass* lest it lead people ‘to despise a religion which thinks to ensnare them by decking its services with the trappings of the dance hall and variety stage’. This notion that the forms and styles of Christian worship were necessarily antithetical to popular culture was a prominent feature of the 1940s and 1950s. In his much-reprinted 1948 book *The Anglican Way*, the Revd Verney Johnstone (then Director of Religious Education for the Diocese of Newcastle) reminded readers that, ‘Anglican worship stands in sharp contrast to all that is “popular” and “cheap” in modern life... and we have to wage a constant battle against the infiltration of such “cheapness” into our services’. As John Connell and Chris Gibson have argued, claims of ‘authenticity’ in music have often been related to music’s relationship with its context, or based on ‘attempts to embed music in place’. The capacity to create an atmosphere conducive to (or ‘fitting’ for) worship was therefore a key strand of debate over new musical styles.

General agreement on what constituted ‘good taste’ in music was probably always more an aspiration of ‘respectable’ and ‘expert’ opinion than a reality. Nevertheless, the controversy over the Beaumont *Folk Mass* demonstrated that by the mid-1950s, even the ideal of a general public consensus on musical taste was beginning to be questioned. The challenge came from two very different quarters: from the arrival of rock’n’roll (associated with the youth sub-cultures of the 1950s and 60s) and from new directions in the world of ‘art music’ (notably the ‘avant-garde’ of Cage, Boulez and Stockhausen). Both forms, in different ways, challenged the prevailing Romantic conceptions of beauty and taste. However, both also extended the Romantic ideal of artistic freedom as the wellspring of creativity, emphasising expression and experience as the touchstones of ‘authenticity’. In this light, musical canons...
and conventions of all kinds were increasingly viewed with suspicion. The resulting change of tone was graphically illustrated in the difference between the 1951 Archbishops’ Commission report *Music in Church* and its 1992 successor *In Tune with Heaven*. Whilst the former implicitly assumed the pre-eminence of the western classical tradition, the latter concluded that to ask, ‘what is good art... painting... sculpture... poetry... music?’ was ‘the least satisfactory discussion in connection with any art form’ and that ultimately, ‘judgement depends primarily on personal taste.’ Indeed, ‘Who dare presume to describe the aesthetic tastes of the Almighty?’ Even the phrase ‘church music’ – widely considered a recognisable genre forty years previously – was placed in quotation marks by the 1992 report’s authors.\(^{31}\) The notion that ‘authenticity’ might derive from faithfulness to a distinct ‘church’ style was by this time increasingly difficult to assert unchallenged.

*Performing Music for Worship: Popular Culture and Self-Expression*

Defining artistic ‘authenticity’ as individual expression rather than imitation was not a new idea in the late twentieth-century. Nevertheless, technological change, increased social freedom, acceptance of cultural pluralism and a renewed suspicion of ‘authorities’ created strikingly propitious conditions for a shift towards viewing self-expression as the primary locus of ‘authenticity’ in the post-war period. What did this mean for church music? A helpful case study is found in the rise of a new style of charismatic and evangelical worship. Revivalist Christianity has a long history of adapting contemporary tunes for worship, and charismatic and evangelical Christians in the 1960s also began to see the potential of the new rock and pop styles in worship and mission.\(^{32}\) Whilst many existing churchgoers were happy with the existing style and content of public worship, others found it old-fashioned, dull and distant from everyday life.\(^{33}\) Whereas the growing and cautiously confident churches of the post-war period were largely able to insist that this distance was the fault of contemporary culture rather than the Church, and thus leave change in worship to a longer process of evolution, the crisis experienced by many congregations from the late fifties to the early seventies appeared to demand more radical solutions. ‘The church must move with the times’, as the popular dictum of the day put it. One element of the charismatic and evangelical response to this situation was to seek words and music for worship which reflected popular styles.

While criticized as driven by fashion or ‘gimmicks’,\(^{34}\) much of the new wave of experimentation was driven by a search for a musical language that was sensitive to the experience of the person in the street and the musical worlds they inhabited. This was important if the growing gap between church and contemporary culture was to be closed, but it also reflected a wider shift in the meaning of ‘authenticity’ itself, as a quality residing less in the music *per se* and more in the sincerity of the individual worshipper. Besides changing
the music itself, early charismatic leaders also sought a more participatory approach to church music not solely reliant upon office-holders or salaried professionals. Alongside or in place of the organ, instrumental groups were frequently formed (by 1988 an estimated fifth of all Anglican congregations had one). Whilst many of these were technically proficient, the sincerity of the musicianship was frequently prized above technical ability. A greater sense of personal freedom was also evident in encouragements to bodily movement, a loosening or abandonment of set liturgy and a simpler, vernacular (though biblically grounded) style. As Jeremy Begbie, James Steven and others have noted, the 1970s and 1980s saw an increasing volume of songs conceiving praise and worship of God as a highly personalised, intimate experience. Where Youth Praise contained a strong missiological dimension, Sound of Living Waters gave increased prominence to the gathering of believers for worship. This idea became even more prominent in

the Songs of Fellowship collections, in which a number of songs set worship within a place of safety and refuge away from the danger and corruption of ‘the world’. Arguably the emphasis on the personally meaningful in worship has been further extended in the more interior, open-ended approach of ‘alternative worship’ services growing in popularity from the early 1990s, many of which (significantly) eschew congregational singing altogether in favour of individual reflection.

This foregrounding of ‘authenticity as personal sincerity’ in charismatic and post-charismatic worship may reflect two much wider shifts in the religious and cultural life over the post-war period: first, a renegotiation of the boundaries between private opinion and public consensus. To sing the more objective doctrinal or credal statements of much traditional hymnody arguably represented a public consent to official religion. On the other hand, the more subjective and experiential nature of many contemporary praise and worship songs allowed more scope for the ‘private’ to inform the ‘public’. Second, the concern for sincerity in worship arguably reflected the fact that Sunday church was increasingly the domain of a smaller band of individually-committed believers rather than a wider cross-section of the devout, the half-believer and the outwardly-conformist sceptic.

Whilst the popularity of the praise and worship song reflected a genuine tendency towards interiority and expressivity in late-twentieth-century charismatic and evangelical worship, it was not the only trend. Evangelical song-writers also championed the renewed use of ‘scripture in song’, delved into an older hymn tradition and wrote prolifically of transcendence, social justice, prophecy and eschatology. In so doing, they were to produce music quite different from the intimate, highly-personalised worship song. Leading exponents of the genre, such as Graham Kendrick, even warned explicitly of
the dangers of ‘spiritual self-gratification’. Nor may ‘authenticity’ necessarily imply *individualized* expressivity in evangelical worship: Pete Ward notes how recordings of worship songs have established certain performance styles as definitive, whilst the ‘alternative worship’/‘emerging church’ movement moderates individualizing tendencies with a strong emphasis on community.

Nor has the emphasis on personal authenticity in worship been confined to evangelicalism: active participation in worship and accessible language have become more common across almost the whole spectrum of Christian worship. In Roman Catholicism, for example, the flowering of the liturgical movement in the early-twentieth-century and the subsequent encouragement of the Second Vatican Council from the early 1960s helped to ensure that congregational singing and formal liturgical participation became a regular feature of worship in most parishes. The speed of the transition was all the more remarkable given the lack of a strong tradition of congregational singing in English Catholicism – although some remained to be convinced. Across denominational and stylistic boundaries, the late-twentieth-century emphasis on participation and accessibility in worship arguably reflected a much wider partial de-regulation of the worship space (e.g., a widespread rejection of the early-twentieth-century tendency to see hushed concentration in church as the epitome of ‘reverence’; the decline of ‘Sunday best’ clothes, and a greater informality of behaviour in church).

Locating Music for Worship: Folk, Pop and World Music

While the adoption of ‘pop’-influenced music has perhaps been the dominant trend, a highly significant counter-trend has been the supplementing of the established hymn, organ and choral corpus with a variety of other sources with the intention of creating worship more authentically ‘of the people’. Far from foregrounding the interior in worship, this movement has, in sharp contrast, placed the locus of authenticity just as firmly in the music itself as did the church musicians of the 1940s and 1950s. The rift between ‘pop’ and ‘the popular’ has been amongst the most prominent fault-lines for the discussion of ‘authenticity’ in music in the twentieth century. Influentially, the Frankfurt School cultural theorist Theodor Adorno insisted that, far from being genuinely ‘of the people’, ‘pop music’ was merely the product of a mass-produced, standardized ‘culture industry’ cynically manipulating the tastes and desires of the people. This strong distaste for ‘pop’ culture as inauthentic was shared (albeit on different grounds) by a range of 20th Century British cultural commentators from F. R. Leavis to Richard Hoggart. The accusation that pop’s commercial origins and ‘lowest-common-denominator’ approach made it an inauthentic vehicle for worship attracted some support from ‘establishment’ commentators on church music in the
However, this did not prevent church musicians and liturgists of more traditional preferences searching for an authentically ‘popular’ church music style. For A.G. Hebert, modern art had effected a ‘divorce between art and the people’ but ‘as Christian worship is the worship of the Body, its forms of music and ceremonial must be such that the people can make them their own’. Here, Hebert’s convictions reflected a wider awareness by the mid-twentieth-century that the church’s music was failing to engage with the mass of the population. In 1958 Charles Cleall, respected church musician and writer of the ‘Master of the Choir’ column in the journal Musical Opinion voiced his concerns about church music ‘indistinguishable from that of “Saturday Night on the Light [Programme]”…’ but also criticised ‘scholarly’ ‘hymn books of good music, fine poetry and splendid engraving; aesthetically unexceptionable, but so free from red blood that nobody wants to use them’.

Cleall’s own answer to this conundrum was to dig deeper into the plainsong tradition and combine this with the best-loved ‘poignant airs’ from a variety of sources from Bach to Sankey. For others, such as the hymn-writer Sydney Carter, some of the early charismatic song-writers, and the Iona Community’s Wild Goose Worship Group, the future lay rather with folk music as an apparently more ‘authentic’ source of inspiration than pop. For Erik Routley, generally an enthusiastic supporter of the development, ‘what folk songs can do – as jazz and pop at present cannot – is reflect faithfully and precisely the prevailing mood of a culture’. In Roman Catholicism, the use of vernacular music was given a particular spur by the Second Vatican Council, in particular in Sacrosanctum Concilium (1963) and the post-conciliar Musicam Sacram (1967). Although little of what was produced arose directly from an English folk heritage, influential early collections such as Malcolm Stewart’s Gospel Songbook (1967) introduced Catholic congregations to a variety of new music from Sydney Carter to American folk and Negro Spirituals. Moreover, though there were some misgivings (in 1969, Catholic lay group Unitas publicly denounced the practice of ‘mini-skirted girls… in front of microphones singing pop tunes whilst the mass is going on’), the uptake of folk music for the Mass appears to have been strong: one 1976 survey of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Portsmouth found a third of parishes already using a folk mass setting. A similar pattern appears to have continued to the beginning of the twenty-first-century, with folk and contemporary music remaining widely used despite criticism of the post-Vatican liturgical agenda in some quarters.

With the increased ease of global exchange in the late-twentieth-century, a final important development was the growth of interest in the music of African, Asian and Latin American Christianity alongside that of folk-style music from the British Isles. Amongst the most prodigious collectors of such
songs have been the Iona Community’s Wild Goose Worship Group, though this represented just part of a wider assimilation of some ‘world church’ songs into denominationally-produced hymnals. Although these largely resisted the temptation to fetishise ‘world music’ as somehow more ‘authentic’ than western pop, it is nevertheless interesting that western church musicians have tended to champion either folk style or pop style music from the Global South. Enabling a general exposure to non-western worship traditions has not therefore been the sole criterion by which new music from overseas has been selected. Nor has the use of folk or world church songs always simply been a matter of musical preference: use of an Iona songbook may be just as much an indicator of congregational style and outlook as using the Spring Harvest songbook or Hymns Old and New. Rather than growing ‘naturally’ out of the communities which sing it, folk music is now a style of hymn-writing; one commodity within an increasingly globalised field of musical options. This is not to deny it either musical merit or devotional value, but simply to recognise that in the pluralised, fragmentary musical sphere of the early-twenty-first-century, the ‘authenticity’ of any church music style cannot be ascribed unproblematically.
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**Conclusion**

Though in fact a very old question, the post-war period saw a new chapter in the debate over what constituted the ‘authentic’ in church music. A significant re-negotiation of values in religion, culture, society and musicology saw the balance of opinion shift away from locating musical authenticity within the music itself or in external conventions on its selection, and towards a greater sense of ‘authenticity’ as deriving from the individual or subjective. However, if this was the dominant trend, we should not only acknowledge the developments which did not fit this pattern, but also the extent to which the meaning of ‘authenticity’ in church music was also viewed in radically different ways. As we have seen, the pursuit of the ‘authentic’ could sometimes lead church musicians to reject the personal, the expressive and the contemporary, in favour of a variety of other, older sources.

Our understanding of the worship of the twentieth-century may be helped by a careful disentangling of the variety of concerns enwrapped in the concept of ‘authenticity’: how should different elements of the Christian theological heritage be weighted in the choosing of music for worship? Is mass consumer culture unacceptable for worship, or should the churches seek to connect with contemporary musical culture and, by so doing, redeem it? Does the power and value of music lie in its inherent compositional qualities (however defined) or in the ear of the beholder? How important is faithfulness to national or denominational tradition? What functions should music play in worship – to attract, uplift or both? And how does a re-drawing of the boundaries between ‘sacred’ and ‘secular’ spheres affect the
ways in which certain styles of music are considered? If a concern for the ‘authentic’ is indeed central to the story of religion in post-war Britain, tracing the different responses to these questions since the mid-twentieth-century is surely an important element in understanding its significance for the life and worship of the Christian churches.
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