

Sound Theology: The Risk of Audition

Ed Foley

It was after I had settled on a title for this presentation that the irony of it all hit me. Thinking about being on this campus and holding forth on the topic on “sound theology” and the “risk of audition,” I was suddenly reminded of an autumn day in 1968, when I first came to this University, played an organ audition with then reigning chapel organist, Dr. Philip Gehring. As I reflect back, however, I am not sure whether that experience should be appropriately categorized as a risk or musicological embarrassment.

At the time I was a student at my religious community's college a few miles down Highway 30 in Crown Point—an institution which no longer exists, and is now the site of Hyles Anderson Baptist College (who knew in those days we would become so ecumenical?). As a candidate for ordination, I was required to pursue the mandatory degree in philosophy. As part of the liberalization of our formation system after the Second Vatican Council, however, some of us were allowed to pursue other studies outside of philosophy, as long as they did not interfere with the mandatory work in logic and cosmology, epistemology, and metaphysics. My escape from all things neo-scholastic was music, and so—after almost a year of acquiring special permissions, securing an extraordinary allocation of funds, and (most difficult of all) receiving permission to use one of the house cars (for the collegiate brothers did not ordinarily have the use of an automobile for themselves)—after all of that, I finally enrolled as a special student at Valparaiso University or, what my superior use to call “that Lutheran School.”

Part of the ritual for commencing study in a performance medium, as many of you well know, is playing an audition. My audition with Dr. Gehring was supposed to take place in some other space—a building that I doubt I could even find today—where there were a series of practice organs. All of those seemed to be occupied at the time of the scheduled audition, however, and I dutifully followed the good Professor over to the chapel, where we headed for the tracker in the crypt. As we traversed the nave, Dr. Gehring assured me that there would be an instrument available here for the audition—for if the crypt organ was occupied, we could always use the mighty Schlicker in the gallery. Needless to say that, although I am sure Dr. Gehring's remarks were meant to be reassuring, they helped convert what had begun as simple, collegiate anxiety to an exceedingly high quality terror. It was bad enough that I was going to have to play for a stranger, a doctor, a professor, a university organist, and a Lutheran—but to do so in such an exposed place where all the world could hear was just too much. Luckily the crypt organ was available;

unluckily, however, there were no doors at the entrance to the crypt for sealing in the sound, so my pedestrian performance echoed through this sacred space, assaulting anyone who happened by.

I remember playing two pieces. The name of the first I do not remember, although I think it was by Dupré. The second was a selection from Bach's *Orgelbüchlein*. It was entitled "Alle Menschen müssen sterben" (all people must die)—and, if memory serves me correctly, I did. Dr. Gehring, always the gentleman, laid me to rest gently and eventually directed me to an organ instructor who, he assured me, would ably assist in resurrecting whatever talent or skill lay buried deep within.

The reason I share that story with you is not simply because of this opportunity to return to the scene of the crime and confess publicly my artistic transgression, nor to assure the musicians among you that I pose no musical threat to you. Jim Brauer, Martin Jean, and other colleagues in the music study group of the North American Academy of Liturgy already know such to be obviously true. No, the reason I relate that story is to illustrate the subtitle of this presentation that audition is a risk. And in particular, that entering the auditory environment and broaching the sensorium of the Word is a disclosive and dangerous journey: that speaking the Word and, yes, even and especially hearing the Word, challenges us to have shields on our lips—and ramparts on our ears—to safeguard against the assault that surely awaits us in the confrontation with the *Verbum divinum*; that discovering a God who communicates through the auditory symbol and missions us in sound is a divinity who not only deploys dangerous media, but who discloses self in the same in dangerous, uncontainable ways. The reason I say this is because of the nature of the sound phenomenon itself, which is the raw symbolic, even sacramental material that God has chosen to mediate the divine self-disclosure.

There are, of course, a few presuppositions here that need to be acknowledged, which is about all we can do in the brief time before us. The first presupposition to admit is that worship is fundamentally a way of doing theology; that is to say, worship is a theological act. While there are many church documents and theologians who explicate this point for us, let me quote just one. In his wonderful text *Holy Things*, Gordon Lathrop writes "the meaning of the liturgy resides first of all in the liturgy itself. If the gathering has meaning for us, if it says an authentic thing about God and our world. . . then that becomes known while we are participating in the gathering. . . . The liturgy itself is primary theology, and no book of reflections can take its place in actually proposing symbols that hold and interpret modern life."¹ In simple language, if you want to discover what people truly believe, then discover the way they worship, and if you want to shape the way they believe, shape the way they worship.

A second and closely allied presupposition, noted in the previously cited quote from Gordon Lathrop, is that worship is a symbolic act. Aidan Kavanagh underscores this point by noting, "Christian discourse is radically

symbolic. . . Its discourse is sacramental because it is symbolic, and it is this sort of discourse necessarily.”² David Power concurs, and reminds us that “Liturgy is not simply a word. It is an act, an act for which symbolic language is the necessary medium, an act of faith and celebration on the part of the church, and an act of God by which the church is transformed in grace.”³

Thus, it is through the symbols, through the very symbolic activity that comprises our worship, that our faith and belief are both expressed and created. Thus one needs to take the symbols seriously. It is not enough, as Blessed Luther of Wittenberg taught us, to talk about the fullness of communion if you do so while withdrawing the cup from the community, in which case you have an idea but no symbolic resonance. Thus, as he wrote in 1519, it is necessary to free the cup from captivity and return it to the community in symbol and in truth: a realization that took my community 450 years to accept. So too with our auditory symbols, we need to take them seriously as essential symbols of faith. We need to attend to the arena of audition for, different than sight, it creates and expresses through its symbolization a very different image of God and Christian life and mission than do visual symbols.

The importance of this sometimes challenging reflective work is illustrated by another “Gehring” story—one that occurred at the end of my first semester of organ study at Valparaiso. It was during the mandatory jury performance before the organ faculty. I thought I had dispatched one of the little preludes and fugues by Bach with some aplomb. After the performance, Dr. Gehring rose and asked “Mr. Foley, have you studied any theory yet?” “No,” “I replied, “I begin studying theory next semester.” “Good,” he remarked. “You’ll play better after you have had some theory.” So too with ourselves: preachers, musicians, or other liturgical practitioners. Performing is insufficient without the critical reflection—the strong theoretical work that provides a basis for the performance. It is something of that critical reflection that I hope to do with you this afternoon.

Sound Effects

Human beings experience the world around them through a rich variety of senses. Each type of sensory perception allows a different mode of knowing and, therefore, a different kind of knowledge. If we could only see a clove of garlic, and not hear it as it separates from the bulb, feel its moistness as we peel away the skin, smell its pungent fragrance as it simmers in olive oil, or taste its distinctive contribution to a creamed salmon pasta sauce served over basil fettuccine, we would have incomplete and even faulty information about garlic. Each sense provides a unique and particular contribution to our apprehension of the world—a contribution shaped both by the material that is perceived as well as our own physiology of perception.⁴ As a particular type of sense perception, hearing enables a distinctive kind of knowing. Being heard, therefore, also results in a distinctive way of being known. For the Christian with ears of faith,

hearing enables a distinctive way of knowing God. Furthermore, apprehension of some revelation through hearing results in a distinctive way of being known by God, and thus being confronted and shaped for mission. This is true both because of the nature of sound as well as the physiology of human hearing.

For example, sound phenomena are implicitly experienced as impermanent. One of the most frequently cited characteristics of sound events like speaking or singing are their transitory nature.⁵ Hearing can be considered a sophisticated way of marking time with the ear; that is, registering a sequence of sounds that eventually fade and come to an end. Sound events are impermanent and exist for the listener only in the doing of them—only for the duration of the performance. Thus sound events, like proclaiming the good news or pouring water into a font or chanting *alleluia*, are experiences of change: each syllable or splash or note quickly fades from the auditory arena as each is succeeded by a new and different sound.

Sound is also an experience of the intangible. The paradox of all sound phenomena like speech or bell ringing or music is that they are perceivable but elusive, recognizable but uncontainable. When sculptors, painters or architects ply their craft, they employ materials that before, during, and after the process can be touched, weighed, and measured. But when orators or musicians ply their art, no comparable material has been transformed. Although they may sometimes employ instruments, like the painter uses a brush or the sculptor a chisel, the real stuff of their art is simply air: controlled, manipulated, articulated, and punctuated, but air nonetheless. And air is a virtually imperceptible reality. This elusiveness in form and content is part of the reason why sound events like music are so often used for communicating with the equally intangible spirit world.

Sound events are also experienced as active and dynamic. This, again, is due to the nature of sound and to the physiology of hearing. Because sound events are fundamentally temporal events and perdure only as long as the sound is being generated, they have an inherent dynamism about them. Such dynamism is less easily predicate of the plastic arts since some artifact, such as a painting, continues to exist long after the artistic process is finished. Human physiology contributes to the illusion that sound events are dynamic events.⁶ The human ear, for example, is able to distinguish two clicks separated by only two or three thousandths of a second while the human eye can only distinguish the flashing of a light at between a fifteenth and sixtieth of a second. Beyond this point the human observer no longer experiences a flashing light but continuous illumination. Humans have more developed physiological capacities for hearing than for seeing. Thus “the ‘length of the present’ for the ear is of shorter duration than for the eye.”⁷

Sound is also an invitation to Engagement: As Plato, who died in 347 BC recognized, sound events like those created by the epic poets of his generation were not neutral occurrences that an impassive listener could

take or leave.⁸ Rather, sound events like poetry or music are essentially acts of engagement. A key reason Plato believed that poetry was dangerous and should be banned from his perfectly conceived Republic was that listeners were unable to distinguish themselves from the poetic event. The sound event disabled the listener from detaching self from the sound and, therefore, rendered the listener unable to distinguish between subject and object; between poem and listener; between poem and poet. Sound events, from this perspective, are not only active events in and of themselves, but dynamic to the extent that they engage the other and captivate the listener. To be in the presence of a sound event is to be engaged in that sound event and to be engaged with both the producer of the sound and with the others who hear it.

One aspect of human physiology that underscores not simply the dynamic but also the engaging nature of sound is the human ear. Unlike the human eye, the ear has no natural covering: there is no "earlid." The ear is born open to every sound. Thus the ear is the metaphor for human beings born open to engagement, not just with sounds, but with the people who produce them. Consequently, the ear could be considered a physiological metaphor for relationship. The assertion that sound events are not only dynamic but invitations into engagement leads us to a final assertion about the sound event: that they are not simply experiences of something other, but of another. Sound encounters are keyed to be personal encounters. Walter Ong explains this phenomenon in terms of "acoustic space." He writes, "Habits of auditory synthesis give rise to a special sense of space itself. For besides visual-tactile space there is also acoustic space. . . . We can apprehend space in terms of sound and echoes. . . . Space thus apprehended has qualities of its own."⁹

One of the characteristics of acoustic space is that it is fluid space. It is a sphere without fixed boundaries. Acoustic space does not, like visual space, contain a thing but is an arena delineated by activity.¹⁰ And such acoustic activity is translated by the human imagination as evidence of animation, of life, and particularly of human presence. Acoustic space, therefore, is what we might call "filled space." Because of its association with sound, acoustic space implies presence far more than does visual space. Noises one hears, for example, at night in the woods register in the imagination as presences—person-like manifestations—far more than do movements that one merely sees. In this sense acoustic space is precisely not "pure" space but is "inhabited space."¹¹

It is in the acoustic arena that Martin Buber's relational paradigm of the "I-Thou" becomes fully possible.¹² Buber believed that the two ways of being in the world can be expressed as either "I-it" or "I-You."¹³ Relationship is an experience of I-You, an experience of reciprocity, of engagement and response. This is precisely the dynamic that is embodied in acoustic space. The intimacy of hearing and speaking—not just watching or looking—but audition, which so often leads to touching, both metaphoric and physical,

leads us to a different way of knowing, a different way of being known: both with each other, and with the God of Jesus Christ.

The Judeo-Christian Tradition

It is clear, at least from my own perspective, that different sense perceptions lead to different ways of knowing and being known and is critical in assessing revelation in the Judeo-Christian tradition, which is more an auditory than a visual event. It is generally true that auditory images dominate the stories of divine manifestation in the Old Testament. This can be demonstrated in a number of ways.

First, there is what might be called the preparatory nature of the visual manifestation of God in the Old Testament. As Kittel notes, accounts of seeing God in the Hebrew Scriptures simply provide the setting for the revelation of the word that follows as, for example, in the vision of the prophet Isaiah (6:1ff) or Ezekiel (1:1ff). "When God appears, it is not for the sake of the theophany, but in order. . .to cause [God]self to be heard indirectly or directly. The decisive religious statement is: 'Hear the Word of the Lord' (Isa 1:10; Jer 2:4; Am 7:16)." ¹⁵ When God is "visible" this divine presence is often visually obscured. God is never adequately or completely seen. As Samuel Terrien elucidates this point, "Either there is too much light, in which case the storytellers emphasize the blinding quality of the experience, or there is too little light—the experience occurs in the gloom of night or in a cloud of total darkness—and the storytellers pile up synonyms for obscurity in order to stress divine invisibility." ¹⁶

Thus, for example, in the previously noted divine "vision" of Ezechiel, the prophet describes the Lord's appearance (Ezek 1:28b) in this way: "Upward from what resembled his waist I saw what gleamed like electrum; downward from what resembled his waist I saw what looked like fire; he was surrounded with splendor. Like the bow which appears in the clouds on a rainy day was the splendor that surrounded him" (Ezek 1:27-28a). This is a description the prophet himself calls "the likeness of the glory of the Lord" (Ezek 1:28b) more than it is a vision of God.

In the Hebrew Scriptures a true vision of God is something both exceptional and dangerous.¹⁷ Thus, when Moses realized that the Lord God was revealing Self in the burning bush, "Moses hid his face, for he was afraid to look at God" (Exod 3:6). Later in Exodus, God announced to Moses that, though God will "make all my beauty pass before you. . .but my face you cannot see, for no [one] sees me and still lives" (Exod 33:19-20). While it is true that in some cultic contexts, "to see God" often had the positive meaning of experiencing the presence of God in the Temple (for example, Pss 42:3; 84:8; Isa 38:11), in other contexts, such as Exodus 33, it could be life-threatening. When Isaiah saw Yahweh in the Temple, he feared for his life (Isa 6:5), and when Amos saw the Lord in his fifth vision (Amos 9:1), destruction and death ensued.¹⁸ Closely related to this pattern in which auditory imagery prevails over visual imagery in divine manifes-

tation is the ban against visual depictions of God at the heart of Israel's law (Exod 20:4; Deut 5:8). The aniconic tradition in Israel is not only ancient but also without a real parallel in the ancient Near East.¹⁹ While it is true that a variety of graphic designs, images, and decorations did grace various Jewish buildings,²⁰ "no certain image of Yahweh has so far been found at any Israelite site."²¹

The one great exception to these generalizations about visions of God comes from Exod 24:9-11. In this unusual passage, God was seen directly by humans who actually ate and drank with God: "And they beheld the God of Israel. Under his feet there appeared to be sapphire tilework, as clear as the sky itself. Yet he did not smite these chosen Israelites. After gazing on God, they could still eat and drink." As if to emphasize the point, the passage twice reports that Moses and his companions saw God. Terrien suggests that this story is "without parallel in the Hebrew tradition" and was shocking to Hellenistic Jews who added the phrase "God is not seen, only the place where he stood" to verse 10 of this chapter.²² While this text is extreme, it does represent a pattern in stories of divine revelation that emerged from the southern tradition—although it is not clear that the story of Exod 24:9-11 itself had such an origin. This pattern, as Terrien describes it, is one in which southern theologians increasingly interpreted divine presence and divine revelation through the theologoumenon of the glory.²³ This pattern, however, is a latter development in the history of ancient Israel, while the emphasis on the preparatory, obscuring, and dangerous nature of visual encounters with the divine seems to be older and foundational.²⁴

It is also in the New Testament that there is a dominance of auditory over visual imagery for revelation and faith. Although the verbs of seeing outnumber the verbs of hearing in the New Testament, this does not mean that seeing is the more important of the senses. It is true that at some moments seeing is more highly esteemed than hearing (John 8:38) in the redemptive enterprise. The sense of sight takes on particular significance in the gospel of John.²⁵ In general, however, the visual does not replace the auditory in the New Testament at moments of revelation or faith, where "there can be no doubt as to the primacy of hearing."²⁶ Even when the New Testament depicts revelatory events in visual terms, such events usually acquire their true significance through what is heard. For example, the appearance of the angel acquires its true significance through the accompanying message at the annunciation (Luke 1:28-37); the baptism of Jesus acquires its true significance with the voice after Jesus' baptism (Mark 1:11); and, the transfiguration acquires its true significance with the revelatory word (Matt 17:5). As Amos wilder summarizes,

The New Testament speaks of the divine apprehension in terms of all the senses, not only hearing and sight but touch and smell (the last in the form of incense and fragrant odours). Yet the hearing mode is primary. The spirit may be rapt in vision, but it is with the heart that [one]

hears the word of faith and with [one's] mouth that [one] confesses and is saved (Rom 10:8-10). Language, then, is more fundamental than graphic representation, except where the latter is itself a transcript in some sense of the word of God.²⁷

One result of this auditory dominance in Judeo-Christian revelation is a particular set of insights about the God of Jesus Christ, achievable only by means of the auditory sensorium. For example, one of the most celebrated and distinctive aspects of the God of the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures is that this God intervenes in history. Not merely remembered as acting "once upon a time" or in some other mythic moment,²⁸ the God of Moses and Jesus intervened in specific times and places, liberating the Hebrews from Pharaoh and Jesus from death.

We have already noted that one of the most frequently cited characteristics of sound events like speech or music is its transitory nature. Sound events are time-bound, history-bound events. Because of this existential quality, the sound phenomenon of our worship is able to image a God who, in the Judeo-Christian tradition, intervened in time and reveals Self in human history. Furthermore, this time-bound art has the ability to engage the community in the present reality of worship and signal that union with God is an existential possibility, here and now.

While the God of Judeo-Christian revelation is perceived as One who intervenes in history, it is also clear that this is an elusive presence. The God of Abraham and Jesus is One who is both present and hidden.²⁹ The paradox of Judeo-Christian revelation is that the Divine Self is both recognizable while remaining the unnameable "I am who I am" (Ex 3:14). Even Christianity, which claims for itself the incarnate revelation of God in Jesus Christ, must reckon with a savior who came once in time and who will come again at the end of time. In the interim, however, while we long for and sometimes succeed in experiencing "real presence," we also struggle with God's "real absence."³⁰ It is through the sound sensorium that we continuously and effectively rehearse this presence and absence.

Besides being a God who is remembered as having intervened in human history, the God of Jews and Christians is also perceived as a dynamic and responsive God. This characteristic not only emphasizes God's historical intervention but further expresses the belief that God has been and continues to be engaged in the individual and corporate lives of humankind. The "call-response" dynamic of the scriptures presents a God who continuously initiates encounters and, with astounding regularity, calls upon unsuspecting prophets (Jer 1:4-8) and unwilling disciples (John 1:46-49). Moreover, it is the promised continuation of this divine dialogue that gives these religions life. This, again, resonates well with our auditory experiences.

Closely related to the dynamic character of the Judeo-Christian God is the relational basis of this revelation. The God of Jews and Christians not only reveals Self in time—in a dynamic way that calls forth an individual

response from believers—but is a God who also calls into relationship with Godself and each other. The appropriate response to this revelation is not simply personal belief and activity but the forging of a common identity and way of life as a people (Ex 6:6) as a community (Acts 2:42). Ultimately, the God of Judeo-Christian revelation is one who calls forth a network of relationships, sealed in a covenant. Again, it is hearing more than seeing that is the appropriate metaphor for relationship.

Finally, not only is the God of Judeo-Christian revelation recognized as a power intervening in history and calling us into relationship, but more so is this God imaged as a person who intervenes on behalf of a beloved. Time and time again the scriptures present to us a God imaged as mother (Isaiah 66:13), lover (Song of Solomon 2:8), friend (Titus 3:4), and father (Luke 11:2). Not an impersonal natural power or some arbitrary force of fate, this is a personal God who loves.

An auditory theology is a great joy and comfort, for it underscores the dynamic, interactive, personal, yet elusive engagement of the eternal one in our worship, our lives, and our collective history. The joy and delight of an auditory theology—and worship that explores the full range of the acoustic sensorium—has another side to it, however, and that is its sound challenge. Entering into the auditorium of God's presence makes clear demands on us; exposing ourselves to the initiative of the divine *dabar* exacts an unavoidable toll; encountering the dynamic *Verbum* confronts whatever instinct we might have for standing back and watching, by demanding our full and responsible engagement. To affirm the blessing of a sound theology is first and foremost to accept the mission to be a hearer, a listener, an auditor of the Word. That is sometimes difficult for those of us who perceive ourselves first of all as speakers, teachers, evangelizers, and proclaimers of the gospel. The truth of the good news, however, is that gospel must articulate us before we articulate the gospel.

Any preacher who dares proclaim the word knows first the challenge of encountering that word, listening to the word, allowing it to wash over us, probe us, undo us, and recreate us in its image. Preaching, therefore, is not first about speaking but first about listening. So is the ministry of prayer leadership. In teaching beginning presiders at worship, and working with seasoned prayer leaders, I am always surprised that, while many have taken time to listen to the Scriptural word before the worship, few have attended to the prayers, hymns, and other texts that dominate the assembly's public prayer. How can we expect to pray publicly what we have never taken time to hear in preparation for that public moment?

Musicians as well—who hour after hour play the notes, rehearse the phrasing, prepare the registration—seldom hear the hymn, the text, the prayer, or the mission. Musical leadership is a primordial auditory venture. Musicians are specialists in sound theology; thus they must be our best listeners to the word and hearers of the divine call. Preachers, presiders, and musicians, of course, are only specialized and visible examples of what

undergirds the entire Christian journey. For to be a Christian, as Rahner³¹ and others have so cogently explained, is first of all to be an auditor of the message, an auditor of the word. And this auditory mission translates into a special kind of attentiveness—listening for the divine revelation at every turn, in the most unexpected places and time, and from the most unexpected sources. And sometimes those sources are right in our midst, sitting among us, but nonetheless marginalized, overlooked, and ignored as a source of the word. Like the children and youth in our assemblies.

True, we like their presence in the assembly. We like them to put in a polite appearance, but we expect or even allow little more. We don't give them too many opportunities to direct the worship, instruct, or admonish, for if they had those opportunities, they might show us just how dangerous and challenging worship and broaching the presence of God could be—as happened one Sunday morning in a small Midwest town, when one adolescent who was having more than his share of difficulties with his parents was asked to read a section from Paul's letter to the Corinthians. He began, "Love is patient and kind," but then interjected "but love isn't always easy." He continued, "Love is not jealous, it does not put on airs, it is not snobbish," but then he added, "but sometimes love needs to withdraw." And so he went on through the entire thirteenth chapter of Paul, reading and commenting, proclaiming and glossing, until he got to the final line of the reading—the middle of that chapter, verse 8, which he read with unsteady voice, "Love never fails." Then he looked up and saw his parents, on the verge of divorce, sitting together in a pew over on the side of the church, and added, "but sometimes it does."

Maybe it is safer to keep our young people marginalized, silenced, rather seen than heard, for if we give them a place at the heart of our worship, they may tell us things about themselves, about ourselves, and maybe even about God that the so-called adults may not be ready or even able to hear. Listening to the marginalized, the overlooked, the silenced is a gospel attitude, a gospel virtue that must be cultivated by those who profess to be ministers of the word, and who, by their baptism into the priesthood of all believers, proclaim themselves to be Christian *auditores*. And if we listen—especially to the marginalized—with an ear in the chest, if we listen with our hearts, we might discover a God we never expected, a mission we never envisioned. Acquiring a Christian acoustic is a dangerous thing. Discovering and nurturing the ear in the chest and the hearing heart can be hazardous to the Christian status quo, for it rejects the surface analysis we so glibly mouth and pushes us into the interior where truth resonates with truth, and gospel echoes with justice.

Those of us who are first called to be auditors of the divine are not trained to hear a text, but cued to hear a person; for the divine source is the one who calls us by name and, in turn, invites us to speak in the intimacy of Jesus Christ, to whom be all glory and honor and praise, now and forever. Amen.

notes

- ¹ Gordon Lathrop, *Holy Things: A Liturgical Theology*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993:5.
- ² *On Liturgical Theology*, New York: Pueblo Publishing, 1984:45-6.
- ³ *Unsearchable Riches: The Symbolic Nature of Liturgy*, New York: Pueblo Publishing, 1984:144.
- ⁴ Much of what follows is a condensation of work previously published in "Toward a Sound Theology," *Studia Liturgica* 23:2, 1993:121-139.
- ⁵ "The crucial quality about music, which distinguishes it from most of the visual arts, is a temporal one," John Booth Davies, *The Psychology of Music*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1978:47.
- ⁶ Much of what follows is taken from the discussion of "The Musical Present" in Davies, 48-51.
- ⁷ Davies, 49.
- ⁸ For an introduction to this facet of Plato's thought, see Eric Havelock, *Preface to Plato*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1963.
- ⁹ Walter Ong, *The Presence of the Word: Some Prolegomena for Cultural and Religious History*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967:163.
- ¹⁰ Edmund Carpenter and Marshall McLuhan, "Acoustic Space," *Explorations in Communication*, eds. Edmund Carpenter and Marshall McLuhan, Boston: Beacon Press, 1960:67.
- ¹¹ Ong, 64.
- ¹² Walter Ong, "'I see what you say:' Sense analogues for Intellect," *Interfaces of the Word*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1977:140-141.
- ¹³ Martin Buber, *I and Thou*, trans. and introduced by Walter Kaufmann, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1970.
- ¹⁴ Much of what follows is condensed from chapter one: "The Auditory Environment," in my *Foundations of Christian Music: The Music of Pre-Constantinian Christianity*, Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1996.
- ¹⁵ Gerhard Kittel, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 1:218.
- ¹⁶ Samuel Terrien, *The Elusive Presence*, Religious Perspectives 26, San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1978:69.
- ¹⁷ Kittel, *TDNT* 1:218.
- ¹⁸ Michael Barré, "Amos," *New Jerome Biblical Commentary*, 13:23.
- ¹⁹ Terrien, 163.
- ²⁰ See, for example, Joseph Gutmann, *No Graven Images: Studies in Art and the Hebrew Bible*, New York: Ktav, 1970.
- ²¹ Richard Clifford, "Exodus," *New Jerome Biblical Commentary* 3:33.
- ²² Terrien, 135.
- ²³ Terrien, 136-138.
- ²⁴ Some have also suggested that there was an ancient strata in Israel's history that put emphasis on vision rather than hearing in divine revelation. As Sanders, for example, notes, "Anciently a prophet was called a 'seer' (1 Sam 9:9). The emphasis on word rather than vision may be connected with the Hebrew rejection of idolatry and, indeed mistrust of any visual aids to religious faith such as are found in most religions, including Christianity itself." J.N. Sanders, "Word," *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, 1962:4:869.
- ²⁵ Wilhelm Michaelis, "orao," *TDNT* 5:361-364.
- ²⁶ Michaelis, "orao," *TDNT* 5:348.
- ²⁷ Amos Wilder, *Early Christian Rhetoric: The Language of the Gospel*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971:11.
- ²⁸ Mircea Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane*, trans. Willard R. Trask, New York: Harper & Row, 1961:110-111.
- ²⁹ Terrien, 470.
- ³⁰ Donald Grey, "A Real Absence: A Note on the Eucharist," *Living Bread, Saving Cup*, ed. R. Kevin Seasoltz, Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1982:190-196.
- ³¹ Karl Rahner, *Foundations of Christian Faith*, trans. William Dych, New York: The Seabury Press, 1978:24ff.