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Abstract

Preaching is a very important part of church ministry. The Reformed church has devoted their efforts and endeavors to the Word and preaching that delivers the Word. Therefore, homiletics has developed again and again. In classical preaching, homiletics has developed from traditional homiletics to new homiletics, even until postliberal homiletics. In these developments of homiletics, there are many parts to be dealt with regarding preaching, such as the communication between the preacher and the audience, narrative approaches in preaching, and so on. Worship as the context of preaching, however, has not been dealt with adequately in homiletics.

Preaching is a part of worship and almost all preaching occurs within worship. Preaching is closely connected with worship as a whole, as well as with other parts of worship. Moreover, worship is the context of preaching. Yet, worship as the context of preaching has not been considered in homiletics in many cases. Therefore, in this study the writer indicated that worship is the important context of preaching that we should pay attention to. The relationship between worship and preaching was also dealt with.

Worship affects preaching because worship as a whole is the context of preaching, which in turn is a part of that whole. In other words, worship should affect preaching and furthermore, the direction and focus of worship should affect the direction and content of preaching. Besides, preaching is defined in the worship service and clarified in the consideration of the relationship between worship and preaching.

The focus of worship is God. Not only worship in the Reformed church, but also all other worship services focus on God and God’s works. Worship is the place to reveal the glory and greatness of God, and the way that God is revealed is through preaching. Preaching, affected by the direction and focus of worship, should be God-centered. The content and purpose of preaching should be God and the glory of God.

The consideration of the relationship between worship and preaching not only defines
the content and focus of preaching, but can also show a new perspective about preaching. Through this consideration, the importance of the content of preaching is stressed and the importance of the form and style of preaching can be changed. Moreover, the concern of worship as the context of preaching can give a new method to criticize homiletics theories.

Thus, worship is an important element as the context of preaching. Worship should always be considered in homiletics. In addition, the relationship between worship and preaching should be continually considered and studied in homiletics.
**Opsomming**

Prediking is 'n baie belangrike gedeelte van kerklike bediening. Die Gereformeerde kerk het baie moeite gedoen met die sentraliteit van die Woord en prediking wat die Woord verkondig. Daarom het homiletiek telkens weer en weer ontwikkel. In klassieke prediking het homilitiek ontwikkel van tradisionele homilitiek tot nuwe homilitiek, selfs tot postliberale homilitiek. In hierdie ontwikkeling van homilitiek is daar verskeie aspekte waaraan aandag gegee kan word in verband met prediking, soos die kommunikasie tussen die prediker en die gehoor, narratiewe aanslagte in prediking, ensovoorts. Aanbidding as die konteks van prediking is egter tot 'n groot mate nog nie behandel in homilitiek nie.

Prediking is ‘n gedeelte van aanbidding en byna alle prediking vind plaas binne aanbidding. Predicking hou verband met aanbidding as ‘n geheel, sowel as met die ander aspekte van aanbidding. Bowendien is aanbidding die konteks van prediking. Tog is aanbidding as die konteks van prediking in vele gevalle nog nie oorweeg in homilitiek nie. Daarom het die skrywer in hierdie studie aangedui dat aanbidding die belangrike konteks van prediking is waaraan ons aandag behoort te gee. Die verhouding tussen aanbidding en prediking is ook aangespreek.

Aanbidding beïnvloed prediking aangesien aanbidding as ‘n geheel die konteks van prediking is, wat deel van die geheel uitmaak. In ander woorde, aanbidding behoort prediking te beïnvloed en verder, die rigting en fokus van aanbidding behoort die rigting en inhoud van prediking te beïnvloed. Prediking word omskryf in die erediens en maak die oorweging van die verhouding tussen aanbidding en prediking duidelik.

Die fokus van aanbidding is God. Nie slegs aanbidding in die Gereformeerde kerk nie, maar ook alle ander eredienste fokus op God en God se werke. Aanbidding is die plek om die glorie en grootheid van God te openbaar en die manier waarop God openbaar word is deur prediking. Prediking, beïnvloed deur die rigting en fokus van aanbidding, behoort God-gesentreerd te wees. Die inhoud en doel van prediking behoort God en die
glorie van God te wees.

Die oorweging van die verhouding tussen aanbidding en prediking definieer nie slegs die inhoud en fokus van prediking nie, maar kan ook ‘n nuwe perspektief aangaande prediking bied. Deur hierdie oorweging word die belangrikheid van die inhoud van prediking beklemttoon en die belangrikheid van die vorm en styl van prediking kan verander. Verder, die kommer oor aanbidding as die konteks van prediking kan ook ‘n nuwe metode bied om homilitiese teorieë te kritiseer.

Aanbidding is dus ‘n belangrike element as die konteks van prediking. Aanbidding behoort altyd in ag geneem te word in homilitiek. Verder, die verhouding tussen aanbidding en prediking behoort voortdurend in ag geneem en bestudeer te word in homilitiek.
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. PROBLEM STATEMENT

Everything that exists is affected by its environment, including human beings and human activity. Accordingly, it is very important to consider something or someone’s context. In the same manner, needless to say, preaching is also affected by its environment. Therefore, the individual who wants to study preaching should also research the context of preaching. While Thomas G. Long (1989:29) criticizes the herald image in his book, *The Witness of Preaching*, he insists that the context of preaching should always be considered.

What, then, is the context of preaching? What kind of the context should one consider? Long gives two factors, the church and the world, which one should consider to be the context of preaching, as follows:

> Preaching occurs in the context of the Christian community gathered for worship, but it also takes place “out there” in the world-on street corners, in prisons and hospitals, on campuses, and in public assemblies. Preaching in the church and preaching in the world are not fundamentally different kinds of preaching but different settings for the same activity of bearing witness to Christ.

(Long 1989:47)

Undoubtedly, preaching is performed in the context of the church or congregation and the world. However, one also should think about another context. When and where does the delivery of a sermon occur? The answer is worship: “A sermon is an oral interpretation of scripture, usually in the context of worship” (Artlett 1995:433). The
context of preaching is worship.

According to Webber (1992:45-54), the basic shape of worship is fourfold, as he writes in *Worship is a Verb: Eight Principles Transforming Worship*. These four shapes are the entrance, the Word of God, the Table of the Lord and the Dismissal. In addition, he states: “The second part of the worship service is organized around the Word of God and consists of two parts: the reading and preaching of the Word and the response to the Word” (1992:48). This shows that he gives a perspective where preaching cannot be separated from worship. In other words, preaching is part of worship. Sloyan (1996:228-229) also insists that all preaching is liturgical and the liturgical preaching is part of the whole rite in worship. Accordingly, Jarman (1963:136) points out that worship service is one of the factors in the context of preaching.

Nevertheless, in many cases, the relationship between preaching and worship has not sufficiently been deliberated. In *Preaching as worship: An Integrative Approach to Formation in Your Church*, Quicke (2011:27) points out that there is a widening gap between preaching and worship and that the relationship between preaching and worship seems to have broken down in many churches. Jarman (1963:144) further indicates that: “One of the difficulties we face today is that we still, even subconsciously, tend to separate word and sacrament, preaching and worship.”

When focusing on worship as the context of preaching, one can realize what preaching is and how one could deliver a sermon more clearly. According to Long (1989:29), the context necessarily affects both the content and the style of preaching. However, homiletics scholars have not yet adequately considered worship as the context of preaching. In many instances, they are also not concerned about the interaction between preaching and worship. Even though there are some scholars, Long for instance, who insist on the importance of the context, i.e. the world and congregation as the context of preaching, very few scholars have been concerned about worship as the context of preaching. Thus, Greenhaw indicates this situation as follows:
The relationship between the sermon and its context in worship has received relatively little attention from pastors and from scholars in the fields of preaching and worship.

(Greenhaw & Allen 2000:xii)

When there is no concern over the context of preaching, one cannot make an accurate analysis for preaching, because preaching is a unique event that is performed in worship. Therefore, it is needless to say that homileticians should be concerned about worship as the context of preaching in view of development of the study in homiletics. In addition, many of the arguments that follow must be understood against the background of the Korean Presbyterian context, where preaching always has been extremely highly valued, while liturgy, or worship, has often been placed in a subordinate position, to the point of total neglect.¹

1.2. AIM

This thesis will not be claiming that preaching is simply one of the orders of worship. Furthermore, the researcher does not wish to say that worship is more important than preaching; but will rather focus on the relationship and interaction between preaching and worship.

Long (1989:22-23) says that the congregation, the preacher, the sermon and the presence of Christ are the crucial ingredients of preaching. Cilliers (2004:22-24) also indicates that the basic elements of preaching are the crucified, resurrected Christ, the biblical text, the congregation and the preacher. However, the writer asserts that worship is an essential element like the other four elements. Therefore, the writer will endeavor to clarify the reason why worship is one of the important factors. This research will then

¹ In this thesis, the writer will briefly deal with the Korean church context in chapter 5.
indicate the interaction between preaching and worship. In particular, the researcher will show that how worship as the context of preaching will affect the direction and content of preaching.

1.3. HYPOTHESES

This proposed study will work with several hypotheses, namely:

• Worship as the context of preaching is the prominent element that should be considered in homiletics.

• Having concern over worship as the context of preaching can help us to come to know the identity of preaching more clearly.

• Through the studying of the relationship between preaching and worship, one can obtain the knowledge of the unique character of preaching.

• The direction and concept of worship can affect and ought to affect the direction and content of preaching.

1.4. METHODOLOGY

For this research, the writer will adopt Richard Osmer’s practical theological methodology. According to Osmer (2008:4), practical theology has four core tasks: descriptive-empirical, interpretive, normative and pragmatic tasks. “These four tasks constitute the basic structure of practical theological interpretation” (2008:4).
The first descriptive-empirical task is the gathering of information to discern patterns and dynamics (Osmer 2008:4). It is the answer to the question: “What is going on?” (2008:4). According to this step, the researcher will gather, through a literature study, information about preaching and worship in order to get to investigate the relationship and interaction between preaching and worship. Thus, in chapter 2, the researcher will examine the change of concerns in the discipline of homiletics in history. It can be expected to show that there are few concerns about worship as the context of preaching. In addition, the researcher will also examine the changing of the place of preaching in worship. It can help us to understand the relationship between preaching and worship.

The second interpretive task clarifies the reason why these patterns and dynamics are occurring by means of the assistance of theories of the arts and sciences (Osmer 2008:4). It is the answer to the question: “Why is this going on?” (2008:4). In chapter 3, the researcher will show the reason why many homiletics scholars have not been concerned about worship. For this purpose, this research will be helped by the study of the history of homiletics and liturgy.

The third step is the normative task. This task uses theological concepts to interpret particular episodes, situations or contexts, constructing ethical norms to guide our responses, and learning from “good practice” (Osmer 2008:4). The question for this task is: “What ought to be going on?” (2008:4). At this step, this research will attempt to analyze the relationship between preaching and worship, and the interaction between preaching and worship in chapter 4.

Finally, the pragmatic task will look at the strategies of action that will influence situations in ways that are desirable, and entering into a reflective conversation with the “talk back” emerging when they are enacted (Osmer 2008:4). “How might we respond?” is the question of importance for this step (2008:4). Chapter 5 will examine how to change the direction and content of preaching according to the direction and concept of worship.
2. SHIFTING THE FOCUS OF HOMILETICS AND 
CHANGING THE PLACE OF PREACHING IN WORSHIP

2.1. INTRODUCTION

Homiletics has continually developed from the era of the early church to the present. It is also true that there is no complete theory of preaching, and all theories of preaching have contributed to homiletics and church in their own way.

The time has come for homiletics scholars to become concerned about worship, given the reality that there is not much concern over worship as the context of preaching, as the writer indicated in the previous chapter. Therefore, in this chapter, the researcher will examine the shifting of the focus of homiletics by checking each theory of preaching to indicate that there is not much concern over worship as the context of preaching. The writer will then research the changing of the place of preaching in worship. This information may help to analyze the relationship between preaching and worship, and the interaction between preaching and worship for the next chapter.

_________________________

2In this research, the writer will use worship and liturgy as synonyms. There is, however, a small difference between worship and liturgy; when the term ‘worship’ is used, it refers to a broad and whole worship service. When ‘liturgy’ is used it stresses the ritual aspect of the worship service. However, there is no differentiation made between worship and liturgy in this research. Thus, Jasper (1986:314) defines liturgy in the following way: “In the singular the word ‘liturgy’ denotes as act of worship, more specifically the Eucharist”.
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2.2. SHIFTING THE FOCUS OF HOMILETICS

Rose (1997:13) says that there are three dominant voices in homiletics; traditional, kerygmatic and transformational theory. Similarly, the researcher divides the theory of preaching into traditional preaching, kerygmatic preaching, new homiletics, and postliberal homiletics. In addition, the researcher will briefly analyze the overview on each theory of preaching.

2.2.1. Traditional Theory of Preaching

Rose (1997:13) points out that the traditional theory is one of the longest-standing, dominant voices. This theory has been contributed by John A. Broadus, whose 1870 textbook defined preaching for the first half of the twentieth century. The traditional theory is grounded in homiletical rhetoric, and the purpose of this theory is to persuade and transmit the sermon's truth or message to the congregation (1997:13-15). Therefore, Broadus stresses “clearness or perspicuity” for transmission (1944:240). Furthermore, Cox, who is a prominent contemporary reformulator of traditional homiletics (Rose 1997:16), also highlights clarity (1985:218). He says that it is important to choose the right words for clarity and that clarity of expression will bring clarity of understanding (Cox 1985:219). In addition, he stresses clarity not only for the transmission of the message, but also for the interpretation the Bible (1985:61). Because of this emphasis on clarity, “traditional homiletics insists that a sermon's effectiveness is enhanced when the preacher can clearly summarize the sermon's message or truth into a single sentence” (Rose 1997:18).

What is the content of preaching? In traditional homiletical theory, the content of preaching is God's Word and revelation and being objective and propositional truth (Rose 1997:16). Traditional preachers believe that God’s Word is the objective and absolute truth (Cox 1985:54); this truth is waiting to be discovered in the Bible, as
**kerygma** or revelation (Rose 1997:17). Besides, in traditional views of preaching, the form of preaching focuses on the transmission objective truth via the sermon's message or central idea (1997:111).

### 2.2.2. Kerygmatic Theory of Preaching

The second is kerygmatic theory. Campbell (1997:117) calls it neo-orthodox homiletics. Rose explains kerygmatic theory as follows:

> A second major voice in the homiletical conversation shifts its primary indebtedness from John A. Broadus and his dependence on rhetoric to Greek Testament scholar C. H. Dodd and theologian Karl Barth. This second theory of preaching is marked by new emphases on the *kerygma* as the primitive and essential core of the gospel, the Word of God as an active presence in preaching, and the sermon as an event in which God speaks a saving word.

(Rose 1997:37)

In kerygmatic theory, the purpose of preaching is the transmission of the *kerygma* and the event of God's speaking (Rose 1997:37). There are many common points between the traditional theory and the kerygmatic theory (1997:37). The kerygmatic theory of preaching focuses on the content. It can be estimated that the kerygmatic theory is similar to the traditional theory, given that both of these theories focus on the Word of God as the content of preaching. However, there is little difference about the content of preaching: “If the what of preaching in traditional homiletical theory is propositional, objective truth, the what of preaching in this second theory is the *kerygma*, kerygmatic truth, or the gospel’s essential kernel, which communicates and effects salvation” (Rose 1997:40). And “sermonic forms seek to communicate the *kerygma* as both knowledge

2.2.3. New Homiletics


New homiletics endeavors to overcome the limitation of the previous theory, such as traditional homiletics. This theory has a different perspective on consciousness, as follows:

Inductive preaching assumes that a change of consciousness has occurred. What has changed is the rhetorical ground of persuasion.

This change of consciousness is attributed to a number of different causes. One group of theories points to the first television generation coming to maturity. Since television tells a story far better than it transmits data, narrative may have become the reflexive way of processing reality.

(Edwards 1995:226)

According to Rose (1997:59), the aim of new homiletics is that a sermon should be an experience that transforms the listener. She also says that “Preaching’s goal is to facilitate a sermonic event that changes the worshiper’s values, worldviews or reality” (Rose 1997:60). Campbell indicates the common ground in narrative preaching, as
All of them, in reaction against cognitive-propositional preaching, give a central place to human experience in preaching; at the heart of narrative preaching in its various forms is the “experiential event” evoked by the sermon. In addition, all of the authors struggle to relate two different stories or worlds — the “biblical world” and the “contemporary world” — through the sermon. Finally, all of the writers offer a formal understanding of the role of narrative in preaching, with a specific emphasis on parable and plot. These three matters are central to the various forms of narrative preaching.

(Campbell 1997:117)

In addition, new homiletics focuses on the congregation, specifically on the questions; “Who is the congregation?” and “How can communicate with congregation”. Craddock (1979:62), as one of the new homiletics scholars emphasizes the right to participate for hearers. These stresses are derived from focusing on the sermon form. Therefore, Campbell (1997:117) indicates that the new homiletics has shifted the focus from the sermon content to the sermon form. It means that “they have to do not just with what is preached but how one preaches” (Craddock 1979:20). Then, “sermonic forms seek to convey an experience that transforms the congregation's values, attitudes, ways of being in the world, or worldviews” (Rose 1997:111).

New homiletics theory has various perspectives on the content of preaching. Rose explains this point in the following manner:

If preaching's content in traditional theory is universal or propositional truth and its content in kerygmatic theory is kerygmatic truth, its content under the transformational umbrella is not as easy to identify. Perhaps “existential truth”, broadly defined, both hints at the commonly held convictions and emphases and reflects shared understandings of the Word, the kerygma,
revelation, and truth.

(Rose 1997:62)

Different to traditional and kerygmatic theory, new homiletics theory does not stress the objectivity of the Word any more (Rose 1997:63). This perspective causes a waning confidence in the theology present in a sermon (1997:65-66).

2.2.4. Postliberal Homiletics

Postliberal homiletics develops out of the criticism on the new homiletics. Although new homiletics has contributed to the development of homiletics, it cannot overcome the issue of church decline. Campbell criticizes the new homiletics as follows:

However, despite these contributions, one can hardly argue that these developments have resulted in a more vital and faithful church. Indeed, the mainline church has itself been in decline during the period in which narrative preaching has thrived. In addition, it is questionable whether many forms of narrative preaching are adequate for the current American context, in which a biblically illiterate church finds itself in an increasingly minority situation in an increasingly secular culture.

(Campbell 1997:121)

Campbell (1997:167-180, 189-220) also indicates the importance of the identity of Jesus of Nazareth for the preaching content. The primary aspect is the character, not the plot in homiletics (1997:172). Narrative homileticians pay little attention to the matter of character, because they focus on the plot (1997:173). In addition, Campbell emphasizes that preaching should contribute to build up the church based on the
cultural-linguistics model, as follows:

The function of preaching is not that of locating individual human needs and then offering God as an answer or solution to them— the issue in liberal, problem-solution preaching (including some of its newer narrative and inductive forms). Rather, the sermon moves from the identity of Jesus Christ to the “upbuilding” of the church.

(Campbell 1997:221-222)

With regards to this aspect, one can say that postliberal homiletics pays attention to both the content and the function of preaching.

2.2.5. Little concern over worship in homiletics

These brief overviews of each homiletic theory can help us to become aware of which part there has been concern over. Traditional and kerygmatic theories of preaching have had the most concern for the content of preaching. New homiletics has paid attention to the form of preaching; how to deliver a sermon. Besides, postliberal homiletics, which criticizes former theories of preaching and shows the new way, has concentrated on the content and aim of preaching. However, these concerns of each theory do not pay attention to worship as the context of preaching.

In fact, there is little concern over worship, especially in the traditional theory of preaching. John A. Broadus, who is an important traditional homiletics scholar, wrote about the “conducting of public worship” as one chapter in his book, On the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons. In this chapter, he criticized the tendency of immoderate focus as an element of preaching in worship, and then emphasized the balance and relationship between preaching and other worship elements (Broadus
1944:357-377). In addition, Cox wrote about “the context of preaching” as the second part in his book, *Preaching*. In this part, he dealt with culture and worship as the context of preaching.

Nevertheless, the development of homiletics has not reached the point where attention is paid to worship as the context of preaching (Greenhaw & Allen 2000:xii). In practically, Craddock, who is one of the core new homiletics scholars, uses the word “worship” only five times in his book, *As One Without Authority*³. Campbell, a postliberal homiletics scholar, mentions “worship” 24 times in his book, *Preaching Jesus*. Furthermore, these mentions do not connect with the content in terms of the context of preaching.

In conclusion, it can be said that although homiletics has developed and is still developing with various concerns, it has not sufficiently reached the point where it is concerned about worship as the context of preaching and the interaction between preaching and worship.

### 2.3. CHANGE OF THE PLACE OF PREACHING IN WORSHIP

According to McGrath (McGrath 2007:290), preaching has been valued as an important means of teaching congregations, offering them guidance on practical issues, and encouraging them to remain faithful in Christianity. Therefore, it can be said that preaching has built the church and fed the people of God. However, the value has been located in a different place throughout church history.

---

³ *As one without Authority* is a remarkable book in new homiletics. According to Campbell (1997:118-119), this book is undoubtedly the most important homiletics text in the past twenty-five years.
2.3.1. Early Church Worship

Early church worship was affected by the synagogue (Killinger 1993:433; Senn 1997:68). “The chief element in the worship practiced in the synagogue was the reading and exposition of the Law” (Martin 1974:66). The reading of scriptures in the early church followed the established practice of the synagogue (Brenner 1961:29-30, Comfort 1993:296). In addition, exposition about the scriptures in synagogue worship connected the worship part to the preaching in the early church.

Whaley (2001:59) says that: “Worship in the New Testament includes preaching, Scripture readings, house meetings, confessions, fellowship, prayer, breaking of bread, singing, and communion” (Acts 2:42; 20:7; Col. 3:16; 1 Tim. 2:1-2; 4:11-16; Heb.13:15; James 5:16). In addition, Webber (1992:45) divides the ancient order of worship more simply into two parts: the Word of God and the Table of the Lord. Cullmann (1953:27) also states that early Christian worship was distinguished between gatherings for the proclamation of the Word and the gathering for the Lord’s Supper. “This first part of the service was often the only way in which believers came to know the Bible, and therefore this part of the service was rather extensive – sometimes lasting for hours” (González 2010:109). With regards to this aspect, we can be certain that the early church emphasized the Word of God.

However, in early church worship, the central act of worship was communion (Cullmann 1953:29; Macleod 1965:61; González 2010:108,115,117,147). Early communion services admitted only those who had been baptized. After dismissing those who were not baptized with a prayer and blessing, the second part of the service occurred (Reed 1959:76; Senn 1997:54; González 2010:109). The early church remembered Jesus Christ and performed the Lord's Supper according to His command (1 Cor. 11:24). It was a visible word of God and the center of worship. Why does worship need a visible word? Why is a visible word important? Senn explains this by indicating that:
Why are such “visible words” needed? They are needed because human communication is more than the transmission of propositions. The gospel is not proclaimed by stating propositions; it is proclaimed by the acts of preaching and ministering sacraments. Preaching is not giving a lecture; it is an incanting, a posturing, a storytelling, a proclaiming. The forgiveness of sins is not promised only by sentences, but by sentences joined to a bath, the laying on of hands, and communal eating and drinking. It is interesting to consider that the words that accompany these sign-acts can be changed, but the visible elements cannot be changed. No matter what words surround the baptismal rite, its central feature will still be washing with water. No matter what words of prayer and proclamation are said over the bread and cup, there is still no Holy Communion without eating the bread and drinking from the cup. This is exactly why repetition is a common feature of ritual, because the visible words at the heart of the rites are irreplaceable.

(Senn 1997:31)

From this perspective, it can be estimated that in early church worship, the Lord’s Supper had traditionally been the central act of Christian worship.

**2.3.2. Middle Age Worship**

The Middle Ages is a vast period of time, spanning approximately from 600 to 1500 CE (White 2010:75). The Middle Ages can be divided into two or three periods, the Early Middle Ages and the Late Middle Ages, or the Early Middle Ages, the High Middle Ages and the Late Middle Ages. In this thesis, the writer roughly divides it into two periods, the Early Middle Ages and the Late Middle Ages. “The Early Middle Ages from 604 CE (death of Gregory I) to 1085 (death of Gregory VII) and the Late Middle Ages from 1085 to 1517 CE (Luther's 95 theses)” (White 2010:75).
2.3.2.1. The Early Middle Ages

In the Early Middle Ages, preaching was an important element, as is clear from the following:

The toleration of Christianity in the Empire (313), with the rapid increase in churches, gave great stimulus to preaching. At that time also came the great concern of the Church with its doctrine, and this gave fresh scope to the sermon as a means of instruction in the Christian *credenda*. Names like Athanasius and St. John Chrysostom, Ambrose of Milan and Augustine of Hippo, recall that there were great preachers in those days, some of whose discourses became of lasting theological importance.

(Dobson 1941:161-162)

Meanwhile, the Western Roman Empire had been collapsed by the movement of peoples known as the “barbarian invasions” (Edwards 1995:195). The Western Roman Empire’s collapse and the barbarian invasion made Christianity change in various ways. In the Middle Ages, liturgical shifts were affected by changes of philosophical and theological understanding and socio-cultural history (Pecklers 2003:61). Holland explains political and social changes as follows:

Drastic political and social changes occurred, resulting in profound alterations in the lives of the people. Cities and towns suffered losses of population and wealth; agriculture became the main productive occupation; feudalism began to emerge; travel became extremely hazardous; war, arson, and plundering became common practices; famines were frequent, and plagues destroyed people and livestock; education and the arts suffered tragically. The nomadic German invaders, vigorous though they were,
differed greatly from the cultivated people of southern Europe, and they succeeded in destroying most of the cities Rome had built in western Europe. In their place, many small kingdoms were established, most of which were short-lived.

(Holland 1980:31)

There were not only these political and social changes, but also changes in philosophical and theological understanding. Edwards explain this in the following manner:

Since the preaching of the Western church had been so intimately connected with Roman culture, a time came when no one had the confidence any longer to compose entirely new sermons. All authentic Christian proclamation was felt to have taken place in the past golden age of the Latin Fathers. The result is that the only new homiletical materials created during the period were not new sermons but collections of patristic sermons called homiliaries by later scholars.

(Edwards 1995:195)

Some can say that this situation led to the weakening of preaching. Regarding this point, Holland insists that the weakening of preaching in this period occurred as follows:

By this time the prominence of preaching was already diminishing, and the sermon was being replaced by more formal liturgies and an increasing emphasis on the mass. The kerygma, or basic proclamation of the gospel, was largely ignored as sermons/homilies focused on the importance of churchly duties, special observances, relics, and the like.

(Holland 1980:31-32)
Accordingly, Dobson indicates the reason why church declined in the Middle Ages:

One important reason for the medieval decline of the church was a lost sense of the ministry of the Word, resulting in the ill-training of the clergy, and neglect of the vernacular sermon as a means of both systematic instruction and ‘edification’, the building-up of Christian character.

(Dobson 1941:162)

Thus, it can be said that in the Early Middle Ages, although there were some famous preachers, the stressing of the Word and preaching in worship gradually declined.

2.3.2.2. The Late Middle Ages

In the Late Middle Ages, there was a decline in preaching because of the ignorance of both the clergy and laity (Dobson 1941:161). Usually, priests were not concerned about the Word of God. During that period, the church focused on the ritual of mass. “It seems that the importance of the liturgy exclusive of the sermon was emphasized to such an extent that preaching generally went into decline” (Cox 1985:44). Furthermore, the corruption of church resulted in this situation getting worse. Under superstitious and magical liturgy, the sermon naturally became relatively unimportant (Killinger 1993:434). Skudlarek criticizes the perspective of the church about the sermons, as follows:

Older Roman Catholics will still remember the days when it was not uncommon for the priest to remove his chasuble before proceeding to the pulpit for the Sunday sermon, thereby giving quite clear visible expression to the understanding that the sermon was an interruption of the mass.
Cox (1985:43) also points out that worship can hinder preaching, at least, preaching in the regular services in the late Middle Ages. Of course, there are a few exceptions. For instance, “John Wyclif (1320-84) and his preachers in England foreshadowed the Reformation Movement, the main intention of which was to restore the ministry of the Word to its due place in worship” (Dobson 1941:163). With regards to this aspect, Hughes Oliphant Old (2002:1) estimates that “we would be terrible misled if we imagined that the Protestant Reformers rediscovered preaching”. Nevertheless, in the Late Middle Ages, preaching was belittled and it was hard to obtain the place of preaching in worship. Holland indicates that “preaching was greatly neglected, and over wide areas and through long years there was almost no preaching at all” (1980:35). This means that, although there were good preachers and preaching, at that time, it usually did not occur within worship. From this perspective, Cox insists:

In the later centuries of the Middle Ages, preaching flourished and became a high art as it was practiced by the Scholastics in the monastaries. Also, preaching by traveling friars was received with popular enthusiasm. This could not be said for the preaching in the Mass. There the people heard significant preaching usually only during fast or festival. Priests preferred to preach on the saints rather than on the gospel lessons.

Thus, generally speaking, preaching did not enjoy a prominent place in worship, although there were some great preachers and some enthusiasm for preaching and the Word in the Middle Ages. “Many in the Middle Ages believed that the Christian’s life was sustained by the sacraments, so that preaching was not necessary” (Sweazey 1976:7).
2.3.3. Reformation Worship

“The church, by Reformed definition, exists where the word is preached in its purity, where the sacraments are properly administered, and where discipline is exercised” (Hesselink 1998:377). From this perspective, the reformers focused to reform the word and the sacraments in worship, especially preaching as the Word in worship became the significant part. The Reformers believed in the power of the Word and that the recovery of the Word could bring about the recovery of the church, as follows:

The Reformation saw a renewed confidence in preaching. The Reformers, like all good revolutionaries, were absolutely convinced of the power of speech – free, brave, godly speech. After all, didn’t the Reformers set the preached word of God over the pronouncements of church authority? Of all things, they set an ordinary pulpit up against the papacy. Of course, they believed that preaching, instigated by the Holy Spirit, was truly God’s word.

(Buttrick 1994:38-39)

Thus, it can be said that “the Reformation had restored the sermon to its historic importance in the service” (Reed 1959:94). McKim shows an example of John Calvin to explain this situation in the following manner:

John Calvin, among others, saw the word as primary to the worship of God. He believed Christ made three demands of the worshiping community: to preach the word, to offer public prayers, and to celebrate the sacraments. The fact that Calvin considered the preaching of the word as the first essential of the worship experience is evident in the life of the church in Geneva, where three parishes held fifteen services weekly, all containing sermons.

(McKim 1992:305)
Not only John Calvin, but also Martin Bucer stresses the first principle of liturgical recovery is adherence to “the clear and plain declarations of Holy Scripture” (McKim 1992:305). This highlight of preaching is also found in the work of Martin Luther. McKim continually maintains that the Reformation brings preaching as the main part in Reformed worship, as follows:

With the Reformation came the renewal of preaching. It has been suggested this was the greatest preaching revival in Christian church history. The Reformers, strongly indebted to those of the German humanist movement who attempted to reform the worship from within the Roman tradition, soon realized that a more radical reform movement was required. They expanded the practice of preaching still further and gave it new functions and character. In most Reformed churches there were two or three sermons on the Lord’s Day and several throughout the week. The church was hungry for the word preached. Modern parishioners would be startled both by the length and solidity of sermons and the quantity desired by the congregation.

(McKim 1992:306)

After the 16th century, there was a Word-centered tradition of worship in Protestantism. The sermon was the central and all-important feature of the service of worship and Protestant churches have been reinforcing the conviction that the sermon is the central element of Christian worship (White 1980:131; Skudlarek 1981:65-66; McGrath 2007:295). Of course, undoubtedly, other orders are also important, for example the Holy Communion. The Reformers Luther and Calvin had tried to make the Lord's Supper primary in the normal Sunday morning worship, but they were unable to achieve it in practice (Willimon 1989:70,73). In fact, the Reformers tried to rebuild the worship of the early church. In the early church, the main part of worship was preaching and communion. Therefore, it is needless to say that the Reformers endeavored to obtain the balance of the Word and the sacraments because they intended not innovations of
worship but restoration of the ancient Christian worship (McKim 1992:305). However, in the end, preaching became the central element after the Reformation in Protestantism. It is as a result of this situation that it can be estimated that the sacrament was the center of worship in the early church, although preaching was also a main part of worship.

Why did the sermon become so important? “In the first phase of Protestant history, the justification for the breach with the medieval church was of paramount importance” (McGrath 2007:291). Because of this need, the Reformers believed that when the truth is preached, a true Christian church can be present (McGrath 1988:217-218). McGrath points it out as follows:

An episcopally ordained ministry is therefore not necessary to safeguard the existence of the church, whereas the preaching of the gospel is essential to the identity of that church. ‘Where the word is, there is faith; and where faith is, there is the true church.’ The visible church is constituted by the preaching of the Word of God: no human assembly may claim to be the 'church of God' unless it is founded on this gospel.

(McGrath 1988:203)

Greenhaw also explains why the Word and the preaching of the Word were so important for the Reformers:

A decisive element of the Reformation was the assertion that the Word of God was efficacious for justification. With this assertion, the reformers elevated the status of preaching from an edifying discourse to a revealing word of grace. God, through the Holy Spirit, effects the salvation of Christ for the hearer of the word. Until the Reformation, this power had been held to adhere in the ecclesially administered sacraments. Clearly, there was preaching, even strong biblical preaching, prior to the Reformation; it is only that the Reformation posited a more autonomous character of the word.
Therefore, it can be said that the Reformers highlighted preaching. Ulrich Zwingli, a pioneer of the reformation in Switzerland, devised an order of worship that placed the sermon, rather than the Eucharist, at its center (Edwards 1995:206). As a result, the sermon was restored to prominence in most Protestant worship.

2.3.4. Contemporary worship in Protestantism

In recent decades, numerous Christian denominations have reformed and renewed their worship structures (Johnson 2009:xxi). The order of worship has become simple, but worship itself has had variety. Music has become an important position in worship and other elements, like drama and movies, have been used in worship. However, traditional elements like preaching or the Eucharist still remain essential factors. Broadus points out that there are two tendencies about the perspective for preaching and other elements of worship, as follows:

Two tendencies are to be observed in modern evangelical churches with respect to preaching and worship. One would make preaching primary and the other parts of the church service secondary, at best, nothing more than preparatory to the sermon. The other would give small consideration to the importance of the sermon, magnifying the other parts, which by way of distinction are called “elements of worship”.

(Broadus 1944:357)

However, in Protestantism, the Eucharist is usually not a main part in worship. While there is preaching in every Sunday worship service, the Eucharist is not performed every Sunday in the worship service. Thus, White insists that the Eucharist practically
cannot have been a main part in worship in the following manner:

The eucharist is usually not the most important service for most Protestants, at least not in terms of frequency. Most Protestant worship, historically and at present, has not made the eucharist its central service. Thus the services recorded in *Coena Domini I* may have been used only three or four times a year, and there are groups for whom an annual celebration of the eucharist is sufficient. For major segments of their history, churches that now have weekly celebrations were quite content with only occasional ones. The eucharist is encountered far less frequently than weddings and funerals in many congregations and deserves, just as much as they do, to be called an “occasional” service. To focus solely on the eucharist means to ignore what happens on almost every Sunday during the year. When the eucharist is celebrated, it is often tacked on to the end (or beginning) of the usual Sunday service.

(White 1989:14)

González echoes White, indicating that Protestant churches highlight preaching more than the Eucharistas:

From that time, and throughout most of its history, the Christian church has seen in communion its highest act of worship. Only at a relatively recent date has it become common practice in many Protestant churches to focus their worship on preaching rather than on communion.

(González 2010:108)

From this perspective, it is true that the legacy of the Reformation that stressed the sermon has remained as strong as ever in contemporary worship. Willimon (1981:92) points out that “In the centuries after the Reformation, many churches fell into worship
patterns that were mostly words: the pastor's duty was mostly to speak and the congregation's duty was mostly to listen”. White also further explains how important preaching is in worship, mentioning the length of preaching, as follows:

For most Protestants, preaching is the most lengthy portion in the service. At least a third of the time of worship is usually allotted to the sermon, and it frequently occupies half or more of the time that the community is assembled. It is not a coincidence that most Protestant ordained ministers are referred to not as priest, presider, or prayer leader but as preacher.

(White 1989:20)

Furthermore, Duba shows the stress of preaching in Protestant churches by indicating that they “emphasized preaching and came to be known as churches of the word, while the Roman Catholic Church was known as the church of the sacrament” (Duba 1995:423).

In conclusion, one can say that preaching has occupied the main position in the worship service in contemporary Protestant churches. There are three ways to receive grace from God in the Reformation tradition; the Eucharist, preaching and prayer. However, preaching has become the major means, the main channel of grace and Christians have converted and formed intellectually (Edwards Jr 2004:829). Thus, Hall and Heflin (1985:19) refer to the reality that contemporary churches keep the prominence and significance of the Word in worship going.

2.3. CONCLUSION

In the first part of this chapter, this research dealt with the main concerns in each homiletic theory. Through this analysis, it was revealed that there is little concern with
worship as the context of preaching. “Older books on preaching often emphasized how closely preaching and worship belong together” (Quicke 2011:27). However, recent theories do not have this concern with worship. Therefore, the time has come that homiletics scholars should become concerned about worship.

In the second part of this chapter, this research attempted to analyze what the church of the past has stressed in worship services. Through this research, it can be said that after the Reformation, preaching has been placed as the main part in worship and church ministry in the Protestant church. This tradition that has highlighted preaching has had not only a positive effect, but also a negative effect on the church.
3. THE REASON WHY THERE HAS NOT BEEN MUCH CONCERN IN HOMILETICS ABOUT WORSHIP AS THE CONTEXT OF PREACHING

3.1. INTRODUCTION

Homiletics has been continually developed from the era of the early church to the present and will continue to develop. In the beginning, homiletics developed in support of rhetoric (Rose 1997:13). In addition, homiletics also focused on the content of preaching (Campbell 1997:117). After the dawn of the twentieth century, new homiletics has been derived pretty much from the development of preaching in various parts. While traditional homiletics concentrates on rhetoric and the content of preaching, recent homiletics focuses not only on the content, but also on the congregation, Holy Spirit, cultural context and the method of delivering a sermon. Although there are these various domains of study in homiletics, it is true that not much study has been done on worship, the main place in which preaching occurs. Therefore, it is a quite correct assertion that: “Many books on homiletics proceed with sublime disregard of the fact that preaching is an integral part of Christian worship and cannot properly be considered in isolation from this context” (Forrester, McDonald & Tellini 1983:48).

David M. Brown indicates that we should understand preaching’s context, that of the worshiping community, as follows:

As we saw in the last chapter, the first “nesting” of preaching is its evangelical framework. The second is its worship environment. While there is preaching that occurs outside corporate worship (particularly some evangelistic preaching), most preaching in the evangelical Christian tradition occurs within corporate worship. So it is important that we
understand how preaching is contextualized in the worshiping community.

(Brown 2003:60)

However, this need has not been adequately met by homiletics. Why is there so little concern over worship when people think about preaching? In this chapter, the writer will attempt to analyze the reason why homiletics has not been concerned with worship as the context of preaching. This will contribute to the understanding of the problem about the little concern with worship, and through this analysis, the way how this matter can be overcome, can be indicated.

3.2. THE REASON WHY THERE IS NOT MUCH CONCERN OVER WORSHIP

There are several reasons why many homiletics scholars have not been concerned about worship. Some reasons are because of a direct cause and others are as a result of indirect causes. Each reason connects with the others.

3.2.1. Preaching-centered tradition in worship

The main reason can be found in the preaching-centered tradition. It is connected to other reasons. Furthermore, the preaching-centered tradition is the starting point for the other reasons. Hence, this reason is essential.

“The sermon is an integral part of the ordinary worship of the Church” (Allmen 1962:32). Skudlarek (1981:65) also says that “it was the sermon that was the central and all-important feature of the service of worship”. Besides, Greenhaw and Allen (2000:xi)
indicate that: “Preaching is a prominent part of most services of worship in the church”. It is the reality and a fact, whether it is appropriate and right for the whole of worship and preaching or not. For this reason, Forrester, McDonald and Tellini point this situation out as follows:

Almost all the churches are today rediscovering the vital unity of Word and Sacrament and seeking to express it more adequately in their worship. But it still remains true that many in the Reformed and Lutheran churches regard worship as essentially preaching, with the rest of the service seen as no more than the preliminaries to the sermon. And there are still seminaries and faculties of theology where detailed attention is given to training in homiletics but very little time is devoted to the principles of liturgy; so that clergy who have almost complete freedom in the construction and content of public worship have a very sketchy preparation for this vital part of their role.

(Forrester, McDonald & Tellini 1983:47-48)

After the Protestant Reformation, the Protestant Church has highlighted the Word and preaching the Word as analyzed in the second part of chapter 2. Greenhaw explains this highlighting as follows:

The liturgical context of preaching may receive diminished attention for preaching in this vein. At points, liturgy is nearly eclipsed by preaching. The centrality and prominence of pulpits in many Reformed churches bears physical witness to the place of preaching. While it is quite likely one will discover a Protestant church debating the frequency of celebrating the Lord's Supper, quarterly preaching services would be inconceivable.

(Greenhaw 1995:479)
It is needless to say that the absoluteness of faith to receive salvation has led to the stressing of preaching in the Protestant tradition. Paul proclaims the relationship between the Word and faith that leads to salvation in the following manner: “So faith comes from what is heard, and what is heard comes by the preaching of Christ” (Rom. 10:17). With regards to this aspect, preaching has carried out an important role in the Protestant Church. Accordingly, Dobson (1941:164) insists that: “Preaching has played a profoundly important part in the life, growth and influence of the Church”. However, the highlighting of preaching has both pros and cons, merits and demerits.

In fact, the highlighting of the Word and preaching itself is not the problem. It is an important legacy of the Reformation and should be maintained in the Protestant Church. Practically, the Protestant Church has done well to maintain this legacy. This tradition also results in the Reformed church being spiritually rich. The laity can learn and have more knowledge of the Bible, and as a result, the church can be healthy. If that is the case, what is then the problem? When we say that the legacy is good for the Church, can we accuse the legacy?

People should know that there is nothing in the world that is perfect. In addition, too much is just as bad as too little. The problem is that the highlighting of the Word and preaching brings the excessive overcharge to highlight preaching in church, particularly in worship. Broadus (1944:357) refers this situation in the following way: “The service of worship has too often become a ‘preaching service’ in which other element are no more than an emotional barrage to soften up the congregation for the preacher's attack”. Willimon (1984:39) also echoes Broadus, stating: “Many of us Protestants have conceived worship as preaching and listening to preaching”. Furthermore, John Killinger indicates this as follows:

Church members in the Protestant traditions have often used the phrase “going to preaching” as if it were synonymous with "going to worship."

This is because of the inordinate weight given in their churches to the
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4 RSV
theology of conversion and the concomitant importance of preaching, which often consumes as much of the liturgical agenda as all the other elements of worship combined.

(Killinger 1993:432)

Knox (1957:75) also indicates:

Sometimes, to be sure, the service of worship has been subordinated to the sermon, the whole to the part, and has been thought of as merely a setting for the preacher’s discourse. Hymns, confessions, even prayers, have been conceived of as merely preparing the way for the sermon.

(Knox 1957:75)

In addition to these explanations, the excessive overemphasis of preaching can bring about the neglecting of worship. Besides, the excessive overcharge to stress preaching in the church and worship service can break the balance between the elements of worship and result in an excessive dependence on preaching and the preacher. In almost all instances, preaching occurs in the worship service and is connected with other liturgical elements. Worship is not only to listen to preaching; worship is an encounter between God and the people of God. In this perspective, in worship, the people of God not only listen to the word of God, but also respond to the revelation of God by hymns, prayer and offerings. Therefore, all elements of worship are also significant. Thus, Cilliers (Cilliers 2004:18) stresses: “Preaching must not be overestimated, but neither underestimated”. Yet, these are usually neglected.

In conclusion, although the Word-centered legacy in the Protestant church is proper and good, if it brings excessive overemphasis of preaching in church, it can be said that the preaching-centered tradition can cause the disregard for worship as the context of preaching. This disregard results in other reasons that there is not much concern over
3.2.2. The independence of preaching in worship

Preaching usually occurs in worship (Artlett 1995:433). Evidently, preaching is only one of the elements in worship, although it has been regarded as the most prominent element. Thus, Allmen (1962:33) insists that “the sermon is not the whole of the service”. Each element in worship affects the others. Preaching should serve the whole of worship, and the whole of worship should serve the preaching (Quivik 2009:7). Therefore, this interaction should be always considered. Broadus (1944:358) indicates the balance and harmony of all parts of worship in the following manner: “The evaluation of the sermon as an act of worship will accentuate at the same time the worship value of song and prayer and reading. The need is not more of one and less of the other, but of fusing all into a harmonious worshipful whole.” In addition, Bailey strengthens this perspective as follows:

Quite frankly, we must work simultaneously on preaching and worship. We cannot drop one for the other and maintain the strength needed. We cannot major on one without the other and have the balance needed. We cannot emphasize one without the other and have the truth required.

(Bailey 1984:186)

However, the balance is broken; the integral relationship between preaching and liturgy is not supported any more (Skudlarek 1981:65). The overemphasis of preaching in worship that was analyzed in the previous section provokes the independence of preaching in worship. In other words, the preaching-centered tradition results in all the other elements being subordinate to preaching (Knox 1957:75). Unfortunately, the preaching-centered tradition has led to the independence of preaching in worship.
Overemphasis of preaching brings independence of preaching in worship. In this case, there is no consideration about the connection and interaction with other elements of worship. Therefore, Jarman (1963:144) indicates that there is a tendency to separate word and sacrament, and preaching and worship. Although there is the indication, it is frequently forgotten that preaching itself is a worshipful element and that preaching occurs in worship (Quicke 2011:97). This means that it is impossible to separate preaching and worship. Craddock (1985:42) warns that when preaching is seen apart from worship, the preacher can become arrogant and boastful. It is the reason why the preacher can think in the following manner: “This audience came to see and hear me.”

Nevertheless, preaching usually becomes an independent and exclusive element in worship in many cases. Daw criticizes this problem as follows:

Perhaps the greatest impediment to the integration of preaching into liturgical worship is a lingering assumption that the two do not belong together. Like those optical illusions where figure and ground move back and forth between the dark and light portions, our eucharistic liturgies often seem constructed so that either what happens in the pulpit is experienced as a delay in getting to the Table or the receiving of Communion feels like an appendage to the preaching and hearing of the Word. We have a hard time keeping Word and Table balanced and complementary.

(Daw 1994:4)

In conclusion, when preaching is thought to be an independent element in worship, it cannot be considered to be in connection with other elements. This, naturally, leads to the reality that worship as the context of preaching is not considered.
3.2.3. Lack of concern for liturgy in the Protestant Church

The Protestant church has not had sufficient concern over liturgy. Absolutely, the Protestant church has believed that worship is the essential vocation of the church and they have truly tried to rebuild and revive the worship service. Nevertheless, the Protestant church cannot overcome the excessive overemphasis of preaching in worship. As a result, they have focused not on the whole worship service, but on preaching. In other words, the Protestant church has not been adequately concerned about liturgy. Thus, Allmen indicates that “the theme of “worship” has never been treated as a major one in the thinking of the Reformed Churches” (Von Allmen 1965:13).

First of all, this is because of reforms against the superstitious belief in rites in the Roman Catholic Church. For example, Zwingli replaced the Latin liturgy with a German one, where communion was administered only four times each year. What was important to Zwingli was not how often to have communion, but that all church members should have it together (Senn 1997:362-363). Although Reformers like Luther and Calvin tried to create a balance between preaching and communion (Willimon 1989:70,73), preaching became the center in the Protestant Church and their worship and they cannot restore the balance in worship. Quicke criticizes this situation as follows:

Worship lies lower down the priority list behind preaching, leadership, pastoral care, and administration. Hubris plagues the act of preaching; rightly convinced of preaching’s importance, preachers can wrongly become self-important. Investing all their effort in sermon-making, and claiming its importance for proclaiming the gospel (Rom. 10:9), they can sideline worship as a secondary matter.

(Quicke 2011:28)

5 "Unlike Zwingli, Martin Bucer’s Strasbourg reform and John Calvin’s work in Geneva defended the practice of weekly Eucharist on the Lord’s Day since that tradition was founded in the Christian scriptures” (Pecklers 2003:70).
In a sense, it can be said that the Reformers were more concerned with the preaching of the Word than the liturgy or worship. In other words, preaching-centered worship resulted in the tendency to regard preaching as an independent element in worship and it is the cause of not having much concern over other elements of worship more and more.

Some assert that the Roman Catholic Church has, in a sense, had more concern for the liturgy than the Protestant church. In Protestantism, the prominent concern for the liturgy took place after the second Vatican Council in the twentieth century (Metzger 1997:7; Mitman 2010:22). In addition, Greenhaw and Allen (2000:xii) asserts that in the Protestant church, consideration for the liturgy was sparked by the Second Vatican Council. Not only these scholars, but also White, continue to indicate it as follows:

For the first time in almost four centuries, developments in Roman Catholic worship have been of immense interest to many Protestants. If the postwar period was a time of Protestant ideas coming to the forefront in Roman Catholic thinking, the post-Vatican II era has been a time of Roman Catholic ideas shaping Protestant worship. Protestants have now returned the compliment by borrowing much that is new in Roman Catholic worship.

(White 1989:34)

While homiletics developed, liturgy has not sufficiently been developed in the Protestant Church. For that reason, the study of Protestant worship has received help from the study of Roman Catholic worship in many cases (White 1989:13). Therefore, it can be said that the consideration and concern regarding liturgy in the Protestant Church is owed to the Roman Catholic Church. Actually, the Second Vatican Council already indicated the relationship between preaching and worship, as Burghardt writes:

Reacting to a long-standing aberration wherein the homily was seen as an interruption unconnected to the liturgy proper. Vatican II insisted that the homily is “part of the liturgical action,” is “part of the liturgy itself” (Sacred
Liturgy 35 and 51). The homily is not only part of the Mass; it is part of all sacramental celebrations. The homily is not an extraneous activity inserted into something more accurately designated as liturgy. The liturgy of the word and the liturgy of the Eucharist make up one unified liturgical celebration, one single act of worship.

(Burghardt 1995:258)

As a result, there is some stress between the interaction and relationship between preaching and worship in the Protestant Church. In fact, the stress is the legacy of the Reformation (Mitman 2010:22). Reformers tried to restore the worship practices of the early church (McKim 1992:310). It means to restore the word and communion. Practically, it had more focus on communion rather than preaching in worship of the early church. However, Protestants lost this legacy. Therefore, Cox insists in the following way that we ought to be concerned about worship:

Not only should we find help for our preaching from a better understanding of the worship in biblical times but we should also find help in the experience of the church since. We ought to know our own worship tradition well - and the reasons for it.

(Cox 1985:47)

In conclusion, worship has been not considered fairly in Protestantism. Without a doubt, the lack of concern over liturgy and worship naturally brought about a lack of concern over worship as the context of preaching. In other words, the lack of concern and study about worship results in the failure to consider the relationship between preaching and worship.
3.3.4. Disregard about the unique nature of preaching

There are several natures of preaching. Some are essential natures, while others are natures that can distinguish it from one that is similar when it is compared with preaching. Craddock gives an example of how difficult it is to have a satisfactory definition of preaching, as follows:

Imagine that you are approached by a student who has just come from a seminary class. This student describes the session that day by saying the professor lectured for forty minutes and then preached the last ten minutes of the period. With no further description, how do you understand the shift from lecturing to preaching? What was the difference? The professor departed from prepared notes? The delivery was more lively and animated? The content was more personal in terms of both the lecturer's and the students' involvement in the material? Did the professor become less descriptive and more hortatory, maybe even warning or scolding a bit? Did the students continue to take notes, take more notes, or cease writing during that ten minutes? Once you have said to yourself what was involved in a move from lecturing to preaching, share the hypothetical situation with another. Is that person's response the same as yours? We all know and yet none of us seems to know what preaching is.

(Craddock 1985:16-17)

This given example shows how difficult it is to distinguish between preaching and lecturing very well. Both have a verbal character and use the Bible as text. Both speakers are usually an ordained priest. If these premises are correct, what is the difference between preaching and lecturing? How can we distinguish between preaching and lecturing in seminary? Another question would be: “What is the difference between preaching and leading a Bible group?” What is unique about the character of preaching? The unique character of preaching bears a direct relation to the place where preaching
takes place, that is, worship. It means that the liturgical character of preaching can be the unique character, and through this character, we can distinguish between preaching and others. Therefore, Tisdale (1995:87) asserts that one of the marks distinguishing Christian preaching from other speech is that preaching is liturgical and occurs in worship. With regards to this aspect, Gerlach and Balge indicate it in the following manner: “A sermon according to its nature is an act of worship” (Gerlach & Balge 1982:12). Moreover, J.Y. Lee echoes them, stating: “The one thing that makes preaching truly distinct from other forms of oral delivery is that its context is always worship” (Lee 1997:41).

Preaching is a characteristic event that takes place in worship. Therefore, “preaching can never be understood apart from worship” (Sweazey 1976:4). However, there is disregard for this nature of preaching in many cases. Preaching has been considered as an element that has no connection with worship, but as an independence element. In the end, although there is no intentional neglect of the relationship between preaching and worship, consideration about the place where preaching takes place, worship as the context of preaching, has usually been neglected. Ultimately, this disregard in homiletics can result in a lack of concern for worship as the context of preaching.

3.3.5. The Development of Homiletics

Ironically, the other reason is the development of homiletics. Absolutely, the development of homiletics itself is not a problem. It is proper, and homiletics should develop continually. Practically, homiletics has continually developed in various parts from the era of the early church to the present.

The most important word in practical theology in recent years was “interdisciplinarity” (Dingemans 1996:91). Without a doubt, homiletics also needs interdisciplinary research. In fact, homiletics has had help from other disciplines such as, not only theology like
biblical theology, but also rhetoric, linguistics and communication theory. These are very helpful for the development of homiletics. However, this development of homiletics results in homiletics focusing only on the sermon itself. Homiletics scholars have expanded their field to the audience or congregation and social culture and context of the world. Nevertheless, they cannot expand their concern to liturgics, which is the closest field.

“The sermon belongs to the lifelong worship tradition of the Church” (Dobson 1941:161). In addition, “sermon and liturgy must be complementary” (Allmen 1962:33). Hence, homiletics cannot be separated from liturgics. It means that homiletics and liturgics should develop together. In fact, many homileticians are also liturgics scholars. Yet, in many cases, homiletics and liturgics do not develop together. Although preaching and worship, homiletics and liturgics are very close fields, these are not sufficiently considered together. Homiletics and liturgics have each developed in their own way. Ironically, each development has resulted in the alienation of the two realms. This situation can link with the previous reason, a lack of concern for liturgy in the Protestant church.

Homiletics has continually developed in various parts. Yet, the development of homiletics results in homiletics being very shortsighted about worship. Quicke, in his book *Preaching as worship*, asserts this myopic perspective about preaching. He indicates that the shortsighted view of seeing preaching leads preachers to separate their task from worship (Quicke 2011:39). In other words, it can be said that even though homiletics has developed until now, having help from other disciplines, the development gave homiletics a myopic thought. Homiletics has not considered worship as its partner. Furthermore, homiletics has thought that the sermon is the center in worship. In fact, the center in worship should be not preaching, but Scripture (Sloyan 1984:12,43; White 2001:170).

In conclusion, the development of homiletics brings a rather myopic perspective about worship. Even though homiletics has affected other disciplines, there is little interaction
with liturgics. Rather, the development of homiletics leads homiletics to focus on preaching itself without concern for worship, that is, preaching’s partner and its context.

3.3.6. Loss of the legacy of Homily

Undoubtedly, almost all preaching occurs in worship. However, there are some exceptions. In other words, preaching can be divided into preaching in worship and preaching out of worship\(^6\). From this perspective, Long, in his book, *Witness of Preaching*, explains this distinction as follows:

> Christian preaching bears witness to Christ both in the church and through the church to the world. Preaching occurs in the context of the Christian community gathered for worship, but it also takes place "out there" in the world-on street corners, in prisons and hospitals, on campuses, and in public assemblies. Preaching in the church and preaching in the world are not fundamentally different kinds of preaching but different settings for the same activity of bearing witness to Christ.

(Long 1989:47)

This perspective that preaching is divided into two kinds of preaching has existed from the period of the early church. Traditionally, there has been a tradition to divide “homily” and “sermon”. In fact, it is hard to define these (Waznak 1998:15). Approximately, homily is a classic form of liturgical preaching and occurs after the proclamation of the

\(^6\) It can be controversial. In fact, the researcher does not agree with this division. In these days, preaching should always be in worship and when we say preaching, preaching is only this. Preaching out of worship should be distinguished from preaching in worship. It means that preaching out of worship is not preaching in the sense of the word as we use it today. It is another notion. When we have this concept, we can distinguish between preaching and a lecture or preaching and leading a Bible group. However, this discussion is beyond this thesis theme. Therefore, in this thesis, the researcher does not deal with it. The researcher accepts the reality to divide preaching into preaching in worship and preaching out of worship for the ease of discussion in this thesis.
gospel within the worship service (Slovan 1995:311-312). Sermon, in general, occurs outside of the context of worship. Fuller refers to the sermon and explains what is meant by a ‘sermon’: “Mediaeval revivals of preaching occurred largely outside the context of the liturgy, and it was devotional and moralistic rather than expository” (Fuller 1986:485). This division comes from Origen:

Origen (185-253) differentiated between the logos or sermo and the homilia or tractatus. The sermo followed the shape of classical rhetoric in convincing and persuading. The homilia or tractatus, on the other hand, arose out of the total liturgical action. It flowed directly from the scripture and was a free and popular exposition and application of scripture and liturgical action.

(Duba 1995:422)

Augustine also distinguished between homily and sermon:

Augustine too distinguished between homily and sermon, the former being used as in Origen and the latter (the sermo) referring to a discourse in a great basilica. The sermo had a more systematic structure, building up an argument by logical steps and reaching a conclusion which combined the completed argument with an appeal to the hearers. Increasingly, it reproduced the procedures and devices of classical rhetoric, and was a form that was to have much influence on the Christian tradition of preaching.

(Forrester, McDonald & Tellini 1983:67-68)

Duba explains a sermon in Augustine’s period in the following manner: “This period sees the rise of thematic and doctrinal preaching that may have taken place apart from the liturgical assembly. There was a formalizing of the catechizing function apart from worship” (Duba 1995:422).
This division means that it is also a good explanation of the features of preaching. In other words, preaching has several features and these terms, ‘homily’ and ‘sermon’, is a good explanation to help to show preaching’s features. Yet, in the present day, this distinction is not followed strictly in the Protestant Church. ‘Sermon’ does not only mean that it takes place apart from the liturgical context. Besides, a sermon is not only thematic and doctrinal preaching. There is no difference between them and sermon often becomes a synonym for preaching. One difference is that generally, homily is not used in the Protestant Church, but is rather usually used in the Roman Catholic Church.

Recently, this division, which was used in the past, was recalled by Roman Catholics (Burghardt 1995:257). Roman Catholics prefer to use the word ‘homily’ instead of ‘sermon’ (Duba 1995:422). In fact, while Roman Catholics recovered the importance of preaching, they recovered the word ‘homily.’ Waznak indicates this recovering as follows:

Roman Catholics generally use “homily” to name the renewed form of preaching initiated by the liturgical reforms of the Second Vatican Council. It is that form of preaching which flows from and immediately follows the scriptural readings of the liturgy and which leads to the celebration of the sacraments. In current Catholic parlance “homily” is distinguished from “sermon” where the latter names a form of preaching that is not necessarily connected to the biblical and liturgical texts and is heard outside the context of the liturgy. Many use “sermon” to describe pre-Vatican II preaching and “homily” to refer to the kind of preaching envisioned by the council.

(Waznak 1998:1)

In the Roman Catholic Church, this effort is the result of refocusing about preaching. It seems that this effort is correct, to obtain a balance between liturgy and preaching (Burghardt 1995:258). However, the Protestant Church, which has the tradition of being preaching-centered, has lost the notion of homily that reveals the liturgical feature of
preaching. It is for this reason that the Protestant Church does not use the term, homily. Obviously, the Protestant Church may divide preaching into two aspects; preaching in church and preaching outside church. However, the Protestant Church does not keep and develop the notion of homily. The loss can be used to explain why the Protestant Church has had a lack of concern for worship. In a sense, the Protestant Church has not developed the term of ‘homily’, but the term of ‘sermon’. In other words, the Protestant Church has lost not only its concern for worship or liturgy, but also liturgical preaching, that is, the homily. This loss becomes the reason that homiletics has not had much about worship as the context of preaching.

3.3. CONCLUSION

In this chapter, the writer researched the reason why there has not been much concern in homiletics about worship as the context of preaching. The writer gave six reasons: Preaching-centered tradition in worship; Independence of preaching in worship; Not much concern over liturgy in the Protestant Church; Disregard for the unique nature of preaching; Development of Homiletics and the Loss of the legacy of Homily.

These reasons are closely connected to others and interact with each other. The preaching-centered tradition is the main reason and it is the center in this situation. Preaching-centered tradition is caused of an excessive overemphasis of preaching. The excessive overemphasis of preaching brings about the independence of preaching in worship and having little concern over worship. Besides, it brings disregard about the unique nature of preaching, which connects with worship as the context of preaching. In addition, the development of homiletics makes homiletics to focus on itself. Thus, these are causes that homiletics has not had a concern for worship, the context of preaching.

Therefore, in order to overcome this problem, the recognition is needed that preaching is merely one of the parts of worship. In addition, it also needs to emphasize not only
preaching, but also worship as the context of preaching.
4. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN WORSHIP AND PREACHING

4.1. INTRODUCTION

“Preaching is sometimes assumed to be a peculiarly Christian phenomenon and to characterize particularly the Reformed Christian tradition” (Forrester, McDonald & Tellini 1983:65). Therefore, Christians, especially in the Reformed Church, have paid a lot of attention to preaching. Moreover, they will continually pay attention to preaching. To develop preaching, there have been numerous endeavors and studies in homiletics. Several theories of preaching have appeared in homiletics and these theories have contributed to the development of preaching. There have not, however, been many attempts to investigate preaching through a better understanding of the relationship between preaching and worship. This means that there is not much concern over worship as the context of preaching.

Preaching is within the context of worship and one of the parts of worship. Worship and preaching have a profound relationship. Therefore, it is quite natural to consider the relationship between worship and preaching in homiletics. Yet, contrary to the natural expectation, there is not much concern over worship in homiletics. As a result, little attention has been paid to the relationship between worship and preaching in the study of preaching. In chapter 3, the researcher showed the reason why homiletics scholars are not concerned about worship. Through these analysis and research, it was shown that there is the tendency in church to be preaching-centered. In addition, the tendency to be preaching-centered brings about an excessive emphasis on preaching in the church. The excessive emphasis on preaching has led to a disconnected consideration of the relationship between worship and preaching. Eventually, in other words, there is not much concern over worship as the context of preaching in homiletics.
Therefore, in this chapter, the researcher will examine the relationship between preaching and worship that is disconnected by several reasons; especially how worship as the context of preaching affects preaching as a part of worship. Furthermore, the researcher will show the direction and character of the relationship. As a result, the direction and purpose of preaching will be clearer.

4.2. THE IMPORTANCE OF THE CONTEXT AND CONSIDERATION OF WORSHIP AS THE CONTEXT OF PREACHING

Context or environment are very important concepts for various fields (Duranti & Goodwin 1992:1). The environment and context of something affect it; the whole affects the part. In practice, each and every living organism is affected by the condition of its environment. The polar bear can be a typical example; due to global warming, the ice in the North Pole is quickly melting and as a result, the survival of the polar bear is threatened. This means that the environment and context affect the survival of the polar bear.

This can also be applied to human beings and human society. There are simple examples; when the weather turns cold, people wear thicker clothes, but when hot weather sets in, people wear thin and short clothes. It means that the weather is the environment and context affecting human life. Moreover, individuals interact not only with other persons and groups, but also with their environment. Someone’s home or social environment influence their personality and character. Environment also affects individual life and individual development. Therefore, social psychology has studied the connection between human development and the context of a human being. The core point is that “individuals develop in an ever-changing environment” (Bolger et al 2007:1). Thus, it cannot be emphasized enough that environment and context in sociology and biology is very important.
The consideration of context or environment is important not only for social psychology and biology, but also for theology. In the interpretation of the Bible, a verse should be interpreted depending on the chapter or the whole of the Bible. In other words, “we should interpret each part in light of the whole.” (Zuck & Campbell 2002:72). This is the basic rule of Bible interpretation and the significant tradition in the Reformed church. What is more, consideration of cultural context is a very important notion to understand the meaning of the Bible. The Bible is not the work of our times; it was written several thousand years ago. Besides, it was written in a different place and culture. Therefore, it is natural to consider the contexts and times of when the Bible written and for a fuller understanding of the Text. Therefore, occasionally, biblical theology depends on archeological evidence and studies about ancient societies. Yet, it does not mean that archeology can prove the Bible. It can only support the Bible. In his book, *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology*, Malina insists that for a better understanding of the New Testament, it is important to consider the bigger picture, cultural cues, as follows:

To avoid the pitfalls to understanding posed by ethnocentrism, it is useful to try to get the bigger picture. … When we understand a word, we mean that we know how it can he used in context with other words, a larger frame. We understand what bone, leg, finger, or head signify in their relation to the larger structure of which they are parts. In our culture, the fall of an apple is understood only in the larger frame of gravity.

(Malina 2001:13)

The consideration of context is significant not only in hermeneutics, but also in practical theology. Especially, for the interpretation of certain events, the context should be considered (Osmer 2008:7). In other words, “contextual analysis is an important dimension of practical theological interpretation” (Osmer 2008:12). It is because an event can be understood in light of the whole, or the context.
Homiletics, one aspect of practical theology, has conceived the importance of the context or bigger picture. Like the assertion of Malina, consideration of the relationship between the whole and the part is also essential in homiletics (Nieman 2008:6). Generally, when this is said about the context or bigger picture of preaching, it means that the context is the situation of the time, or the congregational context or culture. In the same standpoint, Long (1989:196) asserts that when preachers deliver a sermon, the preachers should consider their context, politics and social situation. He considers the context of preaching as follows:

> Preaching does not occur in thin air but always happens on a specific occasion and with particular people in a given cultural setting. These circumstances necessarily affect both the content and style of preaching, and if we think of preaching as announcing some rarefied biblical message untouched by the situation at hand, we risk preaching in ways that simply cannot be heard.

(Long 1989:29)

Cilliers (2004:30-31) insists that preachers should hear the congregation’s specific voice. He (2004:31) indicates that if a preacher does not hear the voice of the congregational context, the preacher cannot echo the voice of God. Furthermore, McClure and Allen stress the consideration of congregational context as follows:

> The congregational context affects what people expect from sermons, the issues on their minds and in their hearts when the minister stands up to preach, and other aspects of receptivity. Indeed, in an important respect, preaching differs from most other forms of communication: Preaching takes place in a local community over long periods of time. While other modes of communication take place in particular contexts (every mode has its context, by definition), few other contexts are as long-lasting. The preacher, therefore, is called to have an unusual depth of awareness of the
congregational culture and to think strategically about how sermons interact
with that local setting.

(McClure & Allen 2004:6)

The consideration of cultural and congregational context is very important in preaching. A preacher can realize the proper methods and content of preaching when he or she pays attention to the context. Through the consideration of the context, it can be possible to form a message that is relevant to the audience and is for the audience. This consideration of context is not only in current tendency, but also richly in the past (Nieman 2008:13-17). In addition, this consideration has continually been developed until now. At first, the consideration of context focuses on the congregational one. Yet, it has been developed focusing on social and cultural contexts. Thomas Troeger (2003:22-23) presents cultural analysis as a way of understanding worship and preaching. Especially, he shows that cultural analysis can clearly help to see the action of Christ in the world, as follows:

The tools of cultural analysis help us understand how the gospel becomes incarnate in a particular culture. Without such awareness, we may rush to judgment against practices that are different from our own without taking time to consider how they may be yet another way of God’s presence being manifest in the world.

(Troeger 2003:23)

In homiletics, the context of preaching that we should consider is not only culture and the congregation. Worship is another important context of preaching, and is a bigger picture we should consider as the context of preaching. Worship should be considered as the context of preaching because preaching generally occurs within worship (Wolterstorff 1992:271). In other words, in a sense, it can be said that worship is the
whole or bigger picture and that preaching is part of that whole. Therefore, Cox (1985:29-50) shows that not only culture as the context of preaching should be considered, but also worship as the context of preaching. In his book, *Partners in preaching: clergy and laity in dialogue*, showing preaching situations, Howe (1967:54-56) indicates worship as the context of preaching for dialogue between man and God:

A third part of the preaching situation is worship. It is the context for the dialogue between man and God which is the primary concern of preaching. … If preaching is a dialogue between the Word of God and the word of man, and worship is dialogue between the relationship with God and the relationship with man, then it should follow that preaching has to have a contextual relationship in worship.

(Howe 1967:54)

Worship as the context of preaching is a very simple concept. In fact, it is commonplace to say that worship is the context of preaching. It does not need extensive research. It could be too easy and simple to be considered. This simple principle, however, can be disregarded by many people. Just the same, unfortunately, worship as the context of preaching is not sufficiently considered in homiletics.

Of course, there are some books that have this perspective, considering worship as the context of preaching. The book edited by David M. Greenhaw and Ronald J. Allen, *Preaching in the Context of Worship*, is such a representative book. Besides, there is also William Skudlarek’s book, *The word in worship: preaching in a liturgical context*. In addition, in his book, *Preaching as worship: an integrative approach to formation in your church*, Michael J. Quicke insists that the preacher should be concerned about worship as the bigger picture. He criticizes myopic preachers who have separated their

---

7Although Cox asserts that worship is the context of preaching, his perspective has limitations. His perspective about worship is that worship is the environment that makes the atmosphere of preaching. In other words, worship is a certain step of preparing the mind and heart to receive the preacher’s message (Cox 1985:38).
task from worship. Thus, these assertions should be listened to carefully. Worship is considered as the context of preaching in homiletics. The reason is that preaching is one part of worship and that preaching connects with worship. Furthermore, it can be said that worship as the context or environment of each element of worship affects each elements in the worship context.

In conclusion, consideration of the context is quite important. Why? It is because the context affects its parts. In other words, the whole affects the part. The whole can give a big clue as to how to interpret the part. Therefore, if someone wants to investigate something, he or she should first examine its context. This can also apply to homiletics. Worship as the whole interprets each element of worship as the part. It means that worship as the whole part can interpret preaching as a part of the whole, worship. Therefore, in homiletics, worship should be considered as the context to help to understand preaching.

4.3. PREACHING AS PART OF WORSHIP

The preaching-centered tradition has put preaching in the supreme position in church. Besides, preaching became an independent element in worship, as the writer analyzed in the previous chapter. The independent character of preaching brings disregard for the relationship with other elements in worship. Practically, in many worship services, the relationship between preaching and worship is not considered (Willimon 1989:124). Howe criticizes this problem, stating: “Few church people were able to identify much connection between the service and the sermon, which leads one to believe that few ministers plan the service and sermon to be two complementary aspects of one experience” (Howe 1967:54). Knox also indicates this situation in the following manner:

Sometimes, to be sure, the service of worship has been subordinated to the sermon, the whole to the part, and has been thought of as merely a setting
for the preacher's discourse. Hymns, confessions, even prayers, have been conceived of as merely preparing the way for the sermon; and the sense of the reality and importance of common worship has been lost.

(Knox 1957:75)

As the researcher has been examining, however, preaching is not isolated from worship (Gerlach & Balge 1982:1). It should be remembered that preaching is within a worship context and it should be always considered within this context (Cox 1985:38; Day 2005:6). Therefore, Sweazey asserts that “preaching can never be understood apart from worship” (Sweazey 1976:4). Pearson echoes Sweazey, indicating: “Preaching can no more exist without worship than the diver without air” (Pearson 1962:126). It can also be said that preaching itself is an act of worship (Broadus 1944:357; Cox 1985:40). Then, the sermon and worship should keep the relationship complementary (Allmen 1962:33). The reason is that preaching is a part of worship.

Preaching should always be concerned with as a part of worship. The relationship between each element within worship is important to investigate each element itself. Thus, Prior (1967:408) asserts that the elements of worship, such as praise and prayers, should be considered with the sermon to keep balance and harmony. With regards to this aspect, Foley indicates the significance of the relationship between preaching and worship as follows:

Unfortunately, much preaching during liturgy is not liturgical preaching. It occurs in the liturgy but is not of the liturgy. Those who would preach at liturgy need to attend critically to the relationship between the homiletic act and worship. One way to sharpen these skills and so develop a clearer understanding of the integral relationship between the homiletic act and the liturgical event is to underscore the disparity which commonly occurs between preaching and worship.
In conclusion, preaching is not an independent part in worship, but a profoundly relevant aspect of worship as the whole. Worship is the context of preaching. In the previous section, the writer showed that the consideration of context is significant; and one of the contexts that should be considered is worship. This means that the relationship between preaching and worship should be always considered. Moreover, studying worship as the context of preaching is important for the understanding and analysis of preaching more clearly.

4.4. THE ROLE OF PREACHING IN WORSHIP

Preaching has a significant role in worship. Generally, preaching occupies the longest time of a public worship service. In reality, preaching has been in the best and basic interest of church ministry. Pastors put their hearts into preparing a sermon throughout the entire week and concentrate to deliver the sermon in Sunday worship. However, the role of preaching should be understood in the worship service. When we understand the role in worship, we can understand the relationship and interaction between preaching and worship. Therefore, it is important to understand the role and purpose of preaching in worship.

“Christianity understands worship as the encounter with God’s Word; speech and hearing are indispensable to the authenticity of this meeting; God becomes really present with his people in his Word” (Forrester, McDonald & Tellini 1983:48). In a sense, preaching has become a significant element in worship because it is one of the methods of the revelation of God Himself, and an encounter between God and the people of God in worship. Therefore, Nieman shows the role of preaching for an encounter between God and us as follows:
Preaching bears a living encounter between the God we know chiefly through Jesus and a contemporary people that trusts this God as the source of their life. This encounter happens not as a mental idea or a vague force but through direct divine participation in actual human reality.

(Nieman 2008:6)

In this encounter, preaching and the reading of scripture can be the way of the revelation of God, and prayer, hymns and offerings can be the way of the response of God’s people. Absolutely, it cannot be distinguished easily, and there are elements that have a character of revelation and response at the same time, such as Holy Communion. Nevertheless, worship is the place for revelation and response. The response to God is praise, adoration and thanksgiving. Preaching is the main way to reveal God.

Preaching reveals God and His work. God preaches to us through a sermon. In the same perspective, Buttrick (1992:319) insists that through preaching, Christ continually speaks to the church. Moreover, through the church listening to the preaching, Christ speaks to the world. Therefore, it can be said that preaching is grace: “I speak, yet, not I; Christ speaks through me.” In the light of this, it can be said that “preaching is speech by God rather than speech about God” (Allmen 1962:7). In addition, “ultimately, preaching is God’s word, not our word” (Buttrick 1994:38). Besides, Forrester, McDonald and Tellini show a similar perspective, as follows:

In worship we hear the Word of God addressed to us, calling us, encouraging us, challenging us, forgiving us, nourishing us, uplifting us, strengthening us. All this implies that we must have, as it were, a sacramental understanding of the Word in worship, just as we must understand the sacraments as encounters with the God who addresses us in his Word.

(Forrester, McDonald & Tellini 1983:48).
In conclusion, the role of preaching is to reveal God in worship. God’s people can meet God through the listening to the preaching. In other words, preaching is a way of connection between God and his people. In this point of view, the role of preaching that has a strong relationship with worship, should be understood within worship, and preaching as the way of the revelation of God serves as the encounter with God in worship.

### 4.5. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PREACHING AND WORSHIP

“Worship is at the center of the Christian life … (And) Preaching is a prominent part of most services of worship in the church” (Greenhaw & Allen 2000:xi). Hence, Brunner (1968:129) maintains that there is no worship without preaching. Nevertheless, preaching is not everything and is not an independent element in worship. Preaching is within worship, and preaching as a part is affected by worship as the whole. In addition, preaching works with worship because “they are complementary; both are necessary, for they interpret and illumine one another and neither in itself is complete or adequate (Forrester, McDonald & Tellini 1983:47). Thus, to understand the relationship between preaching and worship is remarkably important.

Preaching is affected by worship as whole. Therefore, it is true that the content and direction of preaching is determined by the destination of worship (Macleod 1967:66). Cox insists: “Worship that has in it “the shape of large design” suggests the most important themes for preaching” (Cox 1985:39). Greenhaw and Allen echoes Cox by indicating: “Because the service of worship is (or should be) an integrated whole, the liturgy can help shape the content and tone of the sermon” (Greenhaw & Allen 2000:xiii). Of course, the opposite is also possible: “The phrase “what we say” indicates that a rite is involved; “what we do” implies ceremony; and the combination of these forms the ritual” (Macleod 1967:66).
In a sense, it can be said that preaching and worship are closely connected. The reason is that preaching is continually affected by worship to build the destination and content of preaching. Worship can not only give a guideline for preaching, but can also be received as some explanation about worship from preaching. Skudlarek explains this connection in the Eucharist as follows:

If people come together to make eucharist, the word addressed to them should have something to do with the “why” and “how” of giving thanks; if the service is one of reconciliation, then the word of scripture should be used to address the “why” and “how” of being reconciled.

(Skedlarek 1981:97-98)

As it is clear from this assertion, worship as a whole can affect the content of preaching. In his article, A Sketchbook: Preaching and Worship, David Buttrick shows how preaching is connected to worship very well. He associates the definition of worship with the content and direction of preaching, in the following manner:

Underlying the problem of definition lies a deeper issue: ‘Models’. We can psyche out sets of assumptions which seem to lurk in the several definitions. There are definitions (a) which stress benefit. In such schemes, worship is ‘therapy’ or ‘motivation’ or even ‘catharsis’ and, therefore, preaching is ‘insight’ or ‘inspiration’ or a ‘climax’ in worship. Other systems seem (b) to feature content, viewing worship as either dramatic enactment of ‘Holy History’, or as a didactic moment in which tablets of law tumble down. In such schemes, preaching is ‘recital’ or ‘revelation’. Finally, there appear to be (c) definitions which are relational in which preaching and worship are Wort and Antwort. Of course, schemes may be intermixed or confounded by various understandings of God and of Church.

(Buttrick 2005:188)
In a sense, the focus of worship can be the guideline for preaching and other elements of worship. In other words, the direction of preaching should connect with worship’s goal. It means that the purpose and direction of preaching should be controlled by worship as a whole. Furthermore, preaching should contribute not only to worship as the context of preaching, but also to other elements of worship. J.Y. Lee clearly explains the relationship between preaching and worship, as follows:

Preaching is the heart of the worship service. Just like the heart, which supplies the blood to the whole body, preaching makes the Word of Christ accessible to the whole worshiping congregation. The worship service must, therefore, be understood in terms of an organic whole, where every part of the body is intimately connected to every other. When every part of the service is well coordinated and connected like the living body, preaching is alive and effective. When we compare preaching to the heart and the body to worship service, preaching is like the heart helping the blood reach every corner of the body through all the clear and interconnected arteries. Just as the heart is inseparable from the body, preaching is inseparable from the worship service.

(Lee 1997:43)

Therefore, there is an intimate relationship between preaching as a part and worship as whole. The purpose and destination of worship as whole and context affect the direction and content of preaching as part of worship. In other words, the direction and content of preaching should connect with the purpose and destination of worship; it cannot be independent of one another. This relationship should be considered in homiletics.
4.6. ANALYSIS OF THE BIGGER PICTURE, WORSHIP

Preaching as a part should be affected by worship as a whole. It means that through the analysis of worship, preaching cannot only be analyzed, but should also be analyzed. When worship is analyzed as the context of preaching, preaching can be analyzed more profoundly. Thus, it is now time to examine worship as the context of preaching to have a new way of understanding preaching.

4.6.1. What is worship and what should worship be?

What is worship? What is the direction and purpose of worship? Quoting James White, David G. Buttrick (2005:188) refers to how difficult it is to define what worship is. One of the reasons is that there is no precise definition of worship in the Bible. Furthermore, the form of worship has been continually changed throughout church history. In the Protestant church, there are diverse forms of worship. As a result, it is hard to distinguish (Rice & Huffstutler 2001:2-3). Nevertheless, there is a common agreement what worship is and what the purpose of worship is. In this section, the researcher will examine this commonly held agreement of what worship is and what the destination of worship is.

There are several ways to define and investigate what worship is. First of all, there is an etymological way. Besides, it can be the way to investigate the definitions of scholars concerning worship. White (2001:17-46) classifies these ways in the following manner: to examine the term in use, key words in Christian worship, and description of the outward and visible forms. It is needless to say that each way has its pros and cons. The etymological way has the possibility that it cannot be applied to the practical nature of worship. Examining the term in use can also lack the nature of the principle of worship. Therefore, it should be combined with the following means to study what worship is and what the purpose of worship is.
The first is the etymological way. In the Bible, when it is read in the original language, we can also obtain more information. In the Old Testament, there is no general term for worship. Instead, many words are used to describe the actions of worshiping the Lord (Leonard 1993:3). Whaley, in his book, *Called to Worship: The Biblical Foundations of Our Response to God's Call*, shows each word for worship as follows:

In Scripture, the Hebrew word for worship is *shachah*, meaning “to kneel, stoop, prostrate oneself, or throw oneself down, in reverence.” Closely related are the Hebrew words *shabach*, “to shout to the Lord”; *yadah*, “to worship with uplifted hands”; *huhd*, “to celebrate God foolishly and boast about His attributes (love, mercy, goodness, etc.)”; and *tehillah*, “to sing spontaneous songs of praise.”

(Whaley 2009:xiv)

In the New Testament, the situation is similar. There is no term that exactly corresponds to worship (Leonard 1993:15). Nevertheless, it can be analyzed through investigating words related to worship. Whaley also shows each word for worship as follows:

In the Greek, the word for worship, *proskuneo*, means to express deep respect or adoration — by kissing, with words, or by bowing down. Associated words include *epaineo*, “to commend or applaud”; *aineo*, “to praise God”; and *sebomai*, “to revere.”

(Whaley 2009:xv)

Thus, according to the etymological way, it can be said that worship is to revere and praise God. To reveal this meaning, each word has the meaning of action as to sing, applaud, kneel, stoop, and bow.

The second is by examining the definition of each scholar and inspecting the term in use.
In the *Westminster Dictionary of Theological Terms*, worship is defined as “the service of praise, adoration, thanksgiving, and petition directed toward God through actions and attitudes. Christian worship is Trinitarian in form as praise is offered to God through Jesus Christ by the power of the Holy Spirit” (McKim 1996:307). Martin Luther says that Christian worship is our Lord Himself that talks to us through his holy word and we talk to him in prayer and songs of praise (White 2001:22). Dobson defines worship by stating that “worship is the acknowledgment, by appropriate words and acts, of the worship-ship of God” (1941:31). James White, in his book, *Introduction to Christian Worship*, introduces the definition of Paul Hoon and Peter Brunner, who stated that worship is God’s revelation of himself and man’s response(1980:17-18). Pecklers defines worship in the following manner: “Christian worship is ultimately about praising and thanking God as we recall God’s mighty deeds and as we come to re-discover our own identity as Christ’s body in this world” (Pecklers 2003:30). In a sense, it can be said that worship can be summarized as “revelation” and “response”. God reveals himself to the people of God and the people of God respond to God. In the light of this, it can thus be said that worship is an encounter with God. Therefore, Forrester, McDonald and Tellini assert, “worship should be an encounter with God in which we enjoy him” (Forrester, McDonald & Tellini 1983:5).

The third means is to examine the key word and highlighted point in worship. Willimon indicates what the point of emphasis and the direction of worship are, as follows:

Christian worship has its primary focus in the praise and adoration of God; all other activity is secondary to our response to a loving Creator. Worship has no more worthy purpose than the proclamation, praise, and adoration of God. Whenever worship is used for some other purpose-worthy though it may be- it is being used and thereby abused. The focus of worship is God, not us. Whenever we use worship to educate, titillate, soothe, anger, instruct, judge, or do other things to people, the primary focus of worship has shifted from God to us.
Pecklers (2003:30) also stresses that worship is not for us or about us. Instead, worship is for God and about God’s work. Besides, Macleod indicates the goal of worship in the following manner: “The goal of worship is a high encounter between who God better and ourselves more deeply, and by means of this knowledge to praise and serve his name” (Macleod 1967:66). Moreover, Carlton asserts what the focus is in worship, as follows:

True worship is man’s perpetually repeated concentration of attention upon God. It is the conscious and deliberate turning of man’s whole personality toward God as an end in himself. It is the acknowledgement of “worthship,” the ascription of supreme worth to God and the manifestation of reverence in his presence. Worship is the spontaneous response of the spirit of man when he is confronted by the God of the Christian revelation, a response of awe arising out of the awareness by thought and feeling that God is God and we are creatures.

In his book, Worship is a verb, Webber shows eight principles for transforming worship. In this book, he (Webber 1992:16, 21-41) indicates “worship celebrates Christ” as the first and foundational principle, as follows:

The first principle is the foundational principle of our worship. Worship proclaims Christ through the Word and recalls the death and resurrection of Christ at the Table. Worship focuses on the victory of Christ over the powers of evil, the sacrifice of Christ, which brings forgiveness of sin, and the example of Christ's self-giving love, which empowers our life in faith. It is the work of Christ that we celebrate in worship. For this is what extols the character of God and expresses the reason God is worthy of our worship.
Principle One declares that worship is the Gospel in motion.

(Webber 1992:16)

This first principle connects the other principles and is the foundational principle. Therefore, the second principle is “Worship tells and acts out the Christ-Event”. It is the extension of the first principle. Thus, it can be said that the main and staring point of the direction of worship is to focus on Jesus Christ, the second Person of the Trinity. At the end, according to Webber, the destination of worship that people should pursue for revival and transformation worship is God-centered.

Thomas Long, in his book, *Beyond the Worship Wars: Building Vital and Faithful Worship*, also insists what true worship is:

Just so, at the heart of worship is an encounter with the living God, and true worship involves human beings falling down before God’s presence. Worship is about awe, not strategy. If we are trying to find ways to “get” people to church, maybe we can succeed in enticing them, but if we are trying to find ways to “get” people truly to worship, we cannot. The burning bush was not choreographed to appeal to Moses’ instincts for worship, it was the manifestation of God’s presence before which Moses could only flee or bow down. When Jesus walked across a storm-tossed sea to his disciples, as they struggled to keep their boat from being swamped by the staggering waves, they worshiped him (Matt. 14:33). They did so not because the experience was entertaining, educational, or aesthetically pleasing but because it involved an overwhelming experience of the Other. In worship, human beings respond to the God who is already there, and our worship is the fullness of what pours out of us when we become aware of God’s presence-awestruck praise, immeasurable joy, trembling confession, grateful self-giving.
What is then the focus of worship? The focus is not on human beings, but on God and God’s works. We should praise and honor God in worship. It is the destination of worship. “God is the focus of Christian worship” (Greenhaw & Allen 2000:xi). If God's own attributes and actions are not considered in worship, the entire purpose of worship is lost. Therefore, “worship should never be human-centered” (Quicke 2011:70).

In conclusion, examining in a synthetic way, the common agreement as to the definition of worship is adoration and reverence for God. God reveals Himself in worship and human praise and honor respond to His revealed glory. Although human beings are essential participants in worship, they cannot be the center of worship. If worship is not focused on God but on human beings, this worship should be regarded as failed worship.

4.6.2. Worship in Reformed theology

Thought and ideology affect society and human life. In the same manner, theology determines the direction of church ministry and Christian life. In a sense, observation on theology is momentous to understand each church ministry such as mission, education, worship and so on. Thus, it can be said that worship as the context of preaching bears the same relation that theology bears to ministry.

Worship is a significant divine action in church. In addition, “liturgical reflection enhances the church’s self-understanding” (Wolterstorff 1992:275). Therefore, it can be said that theology is expressed in worship (Leith 1992:5). In other words, worship is affected by theology and worship depends on theology. Therefore, understanding theology is significant because it will help us to better understand worship.

Furthermore, the theology as the foundation of ministry should be systematic. Theology,
mainly systematic theology, has a coherent and consistent character. Therefore, theology and theological action should not be in contradiction. Rather, they should support each other. Sproul explains this concept as follows:

Every doctrine of the faith touches in some way every other doctrine. For example, how we understand the person of Christ affects how we understand his work of redemption. If we view Jesus merely as a great human teacher, then we are inclined to see his mission as primarily one of moral instruction or influence. If we regard him as the Son of God incarnate, then this frames our understanding of his mission. Conversely, our understanding of the work of Christ also influences our understanding of his person.

(Sproul 2005:24-25)

In this section, the researcher will examine worship in Reformed theology because the researcher is in the tradition of Reformed theology. Of course, worship within the Reformed church follows Reformed theology. Therefore, to understand worship in the Reformed church, it is necessary to understand the basic concept of Reformed theology. The reason is that it connects to the coherent and consistent character of theology.

What is Reformed theology? “The Reformed or Calvinist tradition is rooted in the Augustinian tradition of the Western church and, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, found its antecedents not only in the works of Augustine himself but in the medieval Augustinian tradition” (Muller 2004:130). There can be several explanations to what Reformed theology is, however. It is hard to describe what Reformed theology is because there are enormous diversity within the Reformed tradition (Smit 2011:313).

What is the main idea of Reformed theology? First of all, “Sola Scriptura”, “Sola Gratia” and “Sola Fide” can be said to be the main principles for Reformed theology. It is the guideline to distinguish Reformed theology from Roman Catholic theology.
Besides, when it is said that Reformed theology and Calvinism is the same, it can be said that five points of Calvinism; "Total depravity", "Unconditional election", "Limited atonement", "Irresistible grace", "Perseverance of the saints" form the core of Reformed theology. Another is the “sovereignty of God”; “popular estimates of the reformed tradition have always identified it with the sovereignty of God and with predestination” (Leith 1992:5). Meeter and Marshall (1990:22) also insists that the sovereignty of God is a fundamental principle and that the Calvinists have built up their whole theology on this principle.

As is clear from these discussions, there are various definitions of Reformed theology. It can be said, however, that there is a fundamental principle that can combine these assertions. Through the consideration of these assertions, it can be said that the acceptable main principle is God-centered; the fundamental principle of Reformed theology is God-centered, the reason being that this principle is the root to build up all other principles, such as the sovereignty of God and predestination. The researcher indicated earlier that theology is systematic. Moreover, Reformed theology is very systematic. It is the character of Reformed theology. The fundamental principle builds up whole system of theology (Meeter & Marshall 1990:22). It means that the first principle underlies the whole system. For example, “limited atonement” is connected with the doctrine of the sovereignty of God and with predestination, while the sovereignty of God and predestination are connected by virtue of both being God-centered. At the end, all doctrine is restrictive to be God-centered. The thought of God-centered end the sovereignty of God and predestination comes from the sovereignty of God and is God-centered.

The God-centered principle is the starting point to do Reformed theology. Therefore, Sproul asserts: “Reformed theology is first and foremost theocentric rather than anthropocentric. That is, it is God-centered rather than man-centered” (Sproul 2005:25). Leith also stresses that “the emphasis on the majesty and lordship of God has always been a theme of Reformed theology” (Leith 1992:7). In addition, it is obviously indicated in the first exchange of the Westminster Larger Catechism:
Q1. What is the chief and highest end of man?

A1. Man’s chief and highest end is to glorify God, and fully to enjoy him forever.

Therefore, where should the worship of the Reformed church following Reformed theology go? What is the destination of worship in the Reformed church? The answer is God. Worship in the Reformed church should be the place to glorify God. With regards this aspect, in *Encyclopedia of the Reformed Faith*, Old defines worship in the following manner: “Worship is the service of God’s glory” (Old 1992:410). Buttrick defines Reformed worship as follows: “Reformed worship can be described as “objective”; with awe it glorifies the sovereign God, yet it is essentially thankful” (1992:220).

In fact, there is no necessity for such discussion about Reformed theology, because in a certain aspect, systematic theology itself always focuses on God. Actually, theology is the study of God. God is the starting point in theology. Therefore, Wilson asserts in the following manner what the focus is for systematic theology:

The first lesson from systematic theology is that we keep God near the center of our discussions, instead of affording occasional glimpses of God at the periphery. Too often as preachers we are tempted to think that we are preaching about a doctrine, or a truth, or a story, or a text, and we forget the more basic focus, that we are preaching God. Systematic theologians often agree that their appropriate focus is first on God, God’s self-disclosure in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ, in particular, and in human history in general.

(Wilson 1995:83)

It means that the character of theology is to focus on God. Furthermore, Reformed
theology has more concern with God.

It is not true, of course, that the consideration of people who are gathered for worship should be eliminated in worship. On the contrary, Reformed theology elevates the value of human beings (Sproul 2005:25-27). On account of worship being an encounter between God and God’s people, people should always be a concern, the reason being that people are a significant element that composes the relationship in the encounter. Nevertheless, it is not going to change that the first and supreme purpose of worship is adoration and reverence for God. At the end, the worship, focusing on God, should affect preaching as a part of worship.

In conclusion, worship in the Reformed church focuses on the glory of God; although this discussion is of no matter if the focus of Reformed theology is not referred. It is because worship already has a God-centered character. By dealing with Reformed theology, however, this assertion that worship should focus on God and God’s work will be firmed up.

4.7. DIRECTION AND CONTENT OF PREACHING IN WORSHIP

What should the content of preaching then be? Following the direction of worship, what is the direction that preaching should take? Above all, preaching should be God-centered and preaching should reveal the glory and greatness of God.

4.7.1. The Direction of preaching: Proclaiming the glory of God

The direction and purpose of preaching is to glorify God. Preaching should be God-centered and should proclaim the glory of God. This direction connects the direction of
worship. As the researcher examined in the previous section, the focus of worship is God Himself. Especially, worship in the Reformed church should concentrate not on human beings, but on God. In worship, preaching should serve and support the direction of worship. Besides, preaching should become the method to establish the encounter between the people of God and God. In this encounter, preaching is the way to reveal God. It means that preaching reveals God in worship. Therefore, the focus of preaching should not only be God, following the direction of worship, but also help people to obtain knowledge about God. It means that preaching should reveal who God is because worship is the place where people encounter God. God is pleased to reveal Himself for His people.

4.7.2. The content of preaching: Proclaiming the work of God

What does it mean to focus on God in preaching? How can we focus on God in preaching? What should the content be in preaching to glorify God? To focus on God, preaching should proclaim the glory of God; to proclaim the glory of God, in preaching, the preacher should say who God is. The content of preaching should be who God is. God is revealed Himself in preaching. God preaches to his people about who He is through a sermon. The people of God can meet God through hearing the Word of God, that is, preaching.

How can we know who God is? How can people then realize God’s glory and greatness? The answer is through hearing about the works of God; we can know who God is when we hear about his works. In other words, the people of God can recognize God’s glory and greatness when they hear what He has done. In fact, the Bible is the story about God’s work, and when we read the Bible, we can come to the realization of who God is. When we read that God created the world in Genesis, we can realize that God is the Creator. When we read the resurrection of Jesus in the Gospel, we can realize Jesus is the Son of God and the Savior. In this perspective, preaching should be the
proclamation of the works that God has done, is doing and will do. The preacher should contain the work of God in his or her preaching. Therefore, Webber indicates: “Worship connects me with the past, gives meaning to the present, and inspires hope for the future as my soul and spirit become blended again into the drama of Christ's life, death, and resurrection” (1992:23).

Referring to a discussion with Henry Jauhiainen, Webber shows that the preacher should proclaim the work of God as the content in preaching, as follows:

Pastor Jauhiainen’s point is extremely important. We don't go to worship to celebrate what we have done. We don't say, “Look, Lord, isn't it wonderful that I believe in you, follow you, and serve you!” No! We go to worship to praise and thank God for what he has done, is doing, and will do. God's work in Christ is the focus of worship. And it is the focus we need to recapture as we seek to renew our public worship experience.

(Webber 1992:30)

In worship, the sacrament as the visible word is to reveal and remember the work of God. When people eat the bread and drink the wine, they remember the crucified Jesus Christ and realize God’s love again. In the same way, preaching reveals God and God’s work. At that time, the people of God can celebrate and praise God in worship.

4.8. MORE FOCUS ON THE CONTENT THAN THE FORM OF PREACHING

In the same way that the destination of worship can guide the content of preaching, it can also give a new approach to the preaching style. Many homileticians have argued about which one is the best form for preaching. When we focus on the purpose and
destination of preaching and worship, we can become free of the immoderate argument of preaching form. In other words, it does not matter whether it is inductive or deductive preaching. In worship, preaching can use not only a narrative style as preaching method, but also a traditional style. Whatever style or method a preacher takes for preaching, however, he or she should preach the glory of God. Whether following the traditional theory of preaching or the new homiletics theory, preaching should proclaim God’s greatness. The thing we should be concerned about is which method can best be matched with this congregation and which style matches this scripture best. The better form and method of preaching is the one which is better to serve the direction of worship.

These assertions can be similarly found in Campbell’s book, *Preaching Jesus: New directions for homiletics in Hans Frei’s postliberal theology*. Campbell also asserts not the method of preaching, but the content of preaching. Campbell (1997:190), continually insists that the most important consideration for preaching is Jesus Christ. Of course, his concern is not the relationship between worship and preaching. Having the help of Hans Frei however, he insists on postliberal preaching, concerning the identity of Jesus Christ as an ascriptive logic in the gospels:

Thus, what is important for Christian preaching is not “stories” in general or even “homiletical plots,” but rather a specific story that renders the identity of a particular person. The ascriptive logic of the gospels provides both constraints and guidance for Christian preaching. … Preaching that ignores the ascriptive logic of the gospels – grammatically, preaching in which Jesus is not the subject of his own predicates – comes in for critique. On the other hand, Frei’s “narrative theology” suggests the positive directions that preaching, including “narrative preaching,” should take. Such preaching should adhere to the ascriptive logic of the gospels and dare to preach Jesus of Nazareth in all his particularity by rendering him as the subject of his own predicates.
Evaluating Frei’s assertion, he continually asserts that the core of preaching and worship is Jesus, the One of the Trinity, as follows:

As has become abundantly clear by now, Frei had no real stock in narrative form or stories per se. His concern was the particular story of Jesus in the gospels, and, in the fullest sense, the story of God in the entire Bible. Frei knew that Christians do not worship a particular genre, but rather the One whose identity is rendered through the story.

Besides, he insists that the main topic of preaching is not the method of preaching, but the content of preaching. He shows a new perspective on inductive preaching (Campbell 1997:93). This is the opposite of Craddock’s assertion that the form and content of preaching go together with the sermon (Craddock 1979:3). Regarding the assertion of Campbell, one can say that it is of no matter whether one uses inductive or deductive preaching. When the content of preaching is seen to be the core in preaching, concern over the method or style of preaching can obtain a new perspective.

4.9. STRENGTHS OF CONSIDERING WORSHIP AS THE CONTEXT OF PREACHING

There are several strengths for the consideration of worship as the context of preaching. It can recover the disconnected relationship between worship and preaching. Besides, it can not only transform the worship service, but also bring a new perspective to homiletics.
4.9.1. Recovering the balance between each elements of worship

First, the consideration of worship as the context of preaching can recover the balance between each element in worship. In one way, it can be said that the preaching-centered tradition broke the balance in worship. Preaching become the center and all the other elements become subordinate parts to preaching. Yet, the consideration of worship can recover the balance between worship and preaching. The perspective that worship is the context of preaching stresses the relationship and interaction between worship and preaching. This perspective can bring about the consciousness that preaching is not everything, but just one of the whole elements in worship. Therefore, this perspective respects not only preaching, but also the other elements in worship. Although preaching occupies the longest time and receives the most concern from preachers in worship, this perspective tries to keep the balance in worship.

4.9.2. Reforming the worship service

The second is that the consideration of worship as the context of preaching can reform the worship service. Absolutely, worship renewal does not depend on our effort. “Good worship depends on divine favor, an action from above” (Webber 1992:15). Nevertheless, it is Christian belief that the Holy Spirit and the grace of God may be present in the fervent desire to renew worship and endeavors to revive worship. The consideration of worship as the context of preaching can revive and serve the destination of worship. If preaching remains an isolated part in worship, it is possible that the preacher could focus not on the whole worship service, but simply on delivering a sermon. When the preacher has the perspective of consideration of worship as the context of preaching, however, the preacher will try to focus on the whole worship service. Thus, the consideration of worship as the context of preaching serves to reform
worship.

4.9.3. Overcoming myopic preaching

Consideration of worship as the context of preaching can also overcome myopic preaching. Myopic preaching is indicated by Quicke in his book, *Preaching as worship: An integrative approach to formation in your church*. Myopic preachers only focus on their sermon in worship and have a limited perspective of worship. Therefore, they need to have a bigger picture of worship and preaching. With insufficient consideration of worship, they can have a wide vision of preaching. From this perspective, Quicke asserts: “Worshipless sermons are the sad and inevitable outcome of myopic preaching. Theologically thin, spiritually disconnected, empty of God, silent about his grace, self-satisfied, and self-oriented, such sermons are devoid of worship” (2011:58). He suggests an alternative, a 360 degree model, to overcome the myopic perspective for preaching. Borrowing from the perspective of Quicke, the right consideration of worship and preaching can overcome the myopic perspective of preaching and worship.

4.9.4. Showing a guideline for the content of preaching

Consideration of worship as the context of preaching shows a guideline for the content of preaching. It can be a guideline not only for the content and theme of preaching, but also for the interpretation of the Text to deliver a sermon. In other words, because of the direction of preaching is already given, the interpretation and analysis of the Text should follow the direction of preaching. Of course, it does not mean that the direction of preaching limits the interpretation of the Text. Yet, interpretation for preaching needs to be affected by the direction of preaching.
A text in the Bible can be interpreted in various ways. When there are many interpretations of the same text, which interpretation is proper and right? At that time, the consideration of worship as the context of preaching can give guidelines for the content of preaching and interpretation for a text.

4.9.5. Giving a new perspective for preaching

Like the researcher analyzed in the previous section, consideration of worship as the context of preaching shows a new perspective not only on the content, but also on the form and style of preaching. When the content of preaching is stressed, concern over the form and style of preaching naturally declines. Of course, the form and style of preaching is still important. The form and style of preaching can support the effective delivery of a sermon. Therefore, the preacher should prudently consider the style of preaching. Nevertheless, the form and style of preaching cannot exceed the importance of the content of preaching. In this perspective, consideration of worship as the context of preaching can show a new way to consider the form and style of preaching.

4.10. CONCLUSION

Preaching is not isolated from worship. Preaching is part of worship and can be understood within the whole; worship. Moreover, preaching usually occurs within a worship service. Therefore, worship should be considered the context of preaching.

Worship as the context of preaching affects both the content and the direction of preaching. It is the reason that the whole can affect the part. In other words, the whole bears the same relation to the part that worship bears to preaching. Therefore, the destination of worship should be associated with the destination of preaching. From this
perspective, the researcher ascertained the purpose and direction of worship. The purpose and destination of worship is God. The destination of worship should be God-centered. Thus, preaching should always be God-centered, following the destination of worship. So far as preaching is within the context of worship, it should remain associated with worship. In addition, the destination and content of preaching cannot move away from the destination and direction of worship. Therefore, preaching should serve as the destination of worship. Preaching reveals the works of God and proclaims the greatness of God. God reveals Himself in the preaching and is glorified in the worship.
5. PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF THE DIRECTION AND CONTENT OF PREACHING IN WORSHIP

5.1. INTRODUCTION

Worship and preaching have a profound relationship. Worship is quite an important element in analyzing preaching. Therefore, the researcher examined the relationship between worship and preaching in the previous chapter. As a result, it was shown that worship is the context of preaching and that this context affects the content and direction of preaching.

Worship is a place where God is revealed and where people to respond to the revelation of God. In worship, preaching becomes the way to reveal God. Especially, God speaks to and is revealed to people through preaching. The direction and focus of worship is God and God’s works. This God-centered concept belongs not only to worship in Reformed theology, but also to general worship. This focus and direction of worship affect the direction and purpose of preaching.

How can this concept then be applied to homiletics theory? How can this concept be practically applied to preaching ministry? Furthermore, in the application of this concept, which one should be considered? In this chapter, the researcher will show the practical applications of the relationship between worship and preaching. Suggestions will also be made about the content and direction of preaching in worship. In addition, the researcher will show which one should be considered when preaching is considered in relation to worship.
5.2. PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

When worship is considered as the context of preaching in practical ministry, what is the preacher asked to do? How can the consideration of worship as the context of preaching be applied to preaching?

5.2.1. The need for an understanding of what worship is

First, there is the need for an understanding of what worship is. Preachers should understand what worship is. Of course, it can be changed depending on their theological position. Moreover, it is impossible to say exactly what worship is, because worship is a mysterious event and there is much tension in worship, such as tension between the “already” and the “not yet” (Cilliers 2009). Tisdale (2001:177) asserts that there is no one “right” way to worship God. However, we can understand the direction and purpose of worship.

The researcher suggests, however, that the direction and content of worship is God-centered, following not only Reformed theology, but also general agreement with the concept of worship. Worship is God-centered, not human-centered. Worship is an encounter between God and the people of God. Therefore, worship should be a time and place of mystery. It is what people really want to experience in worship. Therefore, Long insists: “What are our deepest needs? First and foremost, we need mystery, that is, we need God. Specifically, we need to be in communion with God, to belong to God, to be in right and loving relationship with God” (2001:19).

If there is no understanding of the direction and point of worship, it will affect not only worship, but also preaching. There are several misunderstandings about worship. “How people define worship shows its relative value to them. When understood in limited ways, worship is inevitably devalued” (Quicke 2011:40). Quicke (2011:40-43) indicates

Rather, worship must always begin with God, who reveals his intentions in Scripture that worship be God-centered, God-empowered, all-inclusive, continuous, and focused on his glory … True worship *centers on God*, for it only occurs because of God’s *worthship*. Remove God’s own attributes and actions and worship loses its entire purpose. Worship should never be human-centered.

(Quicke 2011:69-70)

Ultimately, this understanding of the direction and point of worship can give an appropriate and balanced understanding of preaching.

Besides, Thomas Long, in his book, *Beyond the Worship Wars: Building Vital and Faithful Worship*, remarks on a weakness of contemporary worship, “*the Willow Creek force*”, in the following manner:

The Willow Creek approach (and here I speak less of the Willow Creek congregation per se and more of the whole movement toward seeker-friendly, contemporary worship) puts too much distance between itself and the Christ-centered, historically informed, theologically shaped worship that constitutes the great tradition of Christian prayer and praise that is obedient to the Gospel. It turns out in the end to be a pretty shallow pool in which to learn how to swim with maturity as a Christian.
Absolutely, Long does not insist that church should go back to traditional worship, that is, “Hippolytus force”. He indicates a third way to make a vital and faithful congregation. Asking “why do people come to worship?” he gives the answer as the first principle: The Presence of Mystery. He remarks on the misunderstanding of worship, as follows:

It is important to keep reminding ourselves of the strange truth that, odd as it may sound, worship is best measured not by how popular, inspirational, beautiful, educational, musically rich, poetic, or exciting it is. Good worship often is all of these things, indeed true worship has its own beauty, takes dramatic shape, summons the best of language, music, and the arts, and powerfully lifts the human heart. But if we make any of the equalities the goal or primary standard of worship, we have badly missed the point. In essence, worship is what happens when people become aware that they are in the presence of the living God. Trying to turn worship into something useful outside this encounter or attempting to make it cosmetically more appealing misunderstands its basic character.

Furthermore, he remarks that one of the weaknesses of contemporary worship weakens the tradition of being Christ-centered. The researcher also does not advocate a return to traditional worship. The thing that is stressed in the worship of the church is the tradition of being God-centered.

In conclusion, through the understanding of the direction and purpose of worship, preaching can be understood more exactly. The reason is that worship as the context of preaching affects the content and purpose of preaching.
5.2.2. Preaching should follow the direction of worship

After an understanding of the direction of worship, the preacher should follow the direction of worship. Preaching should be guided by the direction of worship. Therefore, the content and purpose of preaching is to reveal God’s glory and honor.

There is a broad distinction between the assertion that the direction of preaching is God-centered and the assertion of other scholars. For instance, in new homiletics, the goal and point of emphasis of preaching is human experience. Then, Campbell remarks: “The emphasis on the “experiential event” can be seen in all of the major works of narrative homiletics, despite their different appropriations of narrative for preaching” (1997:122). Quoting Craddock, he indicates the focus of new homiletics preaching in the following manner: “The focus of preaching is finally the individual hearer” (Campbell 1997:133). He further remarks “The emphasis on experience brings with it the danger of theological "relationalism" – a relationalism that dares to make no claims for God apart from the experience of human beings” (Campbell 1997:141). Thus, according to Campbell’s logic, in narrative preaching theory as representative of new homiletics, the goal of preaching cannot associate with the goal of worship. The reason is that worship should focus on God, God’s work and God’s revelation. Given that the focus of narrative preaching is the individual hearer, however, it does not associate with the destination of worship. It is theological inharmoniousness.

From this perspective, it can be said that in the Reformed church, meticulous care is required for the preacher who subscribes to the new homiletics theory, if he or she thinks about theological coherence and consistency. According to Campbell (1997:156), the new homiletics theory is based on the liberal theological tradition that focuses more on human beings. In fact, it is true that the Reformed tradition is also concern about human beings and the experience of human beings in the worship service. Worship is an encounter between God and the people of God. It means that the people of God are an
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8 Related to this issue, Cilliers (2008:431-448) indicates that not only preaching, but also worship should be controlled by Scripture. In fact, the core in worship is not preaching, but the Bible text.
important component in worship, and that they experience a mystery in worship. Nevertheless, it is also true that worship should be God-centered not human-centered, and that preaching in worship should follow the destination of worship. In worship, the relationship between God and human beings is not in contrast. It is not separation and contrast but a matter of priority. It is important that we should understand the tension and the priority. Regarding this point, when we consider the purpose of worship, God-centeredness, the new homiletics theory does not associate with the destination of worship. The researcher does not deny the new homiletics theory. Campbell (1997:121) who criticized the new homiletics theory, also recognizes the merits of the new homiletics theory. The problem is that, given that the focus of narrative preaching is the individual hearer, it does not associate with the destination of worship. Therefore, preachers who want to apply their concern about the direction of worship should carefully apply the new homiletics theory to their sermons. In the light of this, the new homiletics theory should consider new ways of considering worship as the context of preaching.

5.2.3. The distinction of preaching in and outside of worship

Preaching, following the direction of worship, should be God-centered. God-centeredness is a guideline for preaching. Should the entire content of preaching then always be God-centered? In other words, should preaching always proclaim God, God’s greatness and the works of God?

In fact, preaching can contain all content. It is not true that preaching should only speak about God and God’s work. In preaching, the preacher can also speak about human beings and human being’s concerns. For example, it is also possible to preach a pastoral care sermon. Willimon (1995:361) indicates that a pastor is also caring for the people of God while he or she is preaching, although preaching is to proclaim the Word of God. Therefore, there is also pastoral care preaching. Besides, preaching can deal not only
with God, but also the church’s problems. Therefore, Cilliers asserts: “Preaching is essential for the welfare of the church” (2004:19). Yet, although these statements are true, the preaching does not get out of focusing on God. Although the preacher can deliver a sermon that includes everything in its content, he or she should still focus on God in preaching. It means that, first of all, the content of preaching should focus on God; this should be the start and the end of preaching. God-centeredness is the priority of the content of preaching. Other themes can be subordinately dealt with.

The important thing is that preaching occurring in worship should focus on God. It is needless to say that preaching in worship cannot escape from this theme. The reason is that preaching is part of worship and cannot disconnect itself from the relationship with worship as a whole. In this perspective, out of worship, the pastor can teach different themes for the congregation. The pastor can deal with people’s problems when he or she visits members of the congregation. The pastor can discuss and give suggestions about concerns of the church in bible study groups. Out of worship, preaching can contain all contents and themes. In the worship service, however, the pastor should focus on God. The reason is that preaching in worship is limited and guided by worship. In fact, many homiletics scholars miss this distinction. If we go a step further, there can also be some discussion on the definition of preaching. Nevertheless, in homiletics, we need to distinguish between a sermon in worship and a sermon outside worship.

5.3. OVERCOMING NEW HOMILETICS

The consideration of worship as the context of preaching can bring new ways to understand preaching. It is through the analysis of worship that preaching can obtain a new understanding of the direction of preaching. Then, the direction of preaching can help us to understand the method of preaching. Therefore, Rose (1997:99) asserts that the direction and purpose of preaching combines with new understandings of the content and method of preaching.
In fact, new homiletics theory is the main stream in homiletics. The reason why is not only because this theory is the latest one, but also because it has a very broad spectrum. Especially, new homiletics theory has contributed to the method of preaching. The theory has tried to overcome the limitations of traditional preaching theory. Campbell (1997:121) shows the contributions of new homiletics: To emphasize the importance of the biblical text, to enrich the form of the sermon, to bring a new appreciation for the indicative character of the gospel, to highlight emotion in preaching and to highlight the role of the imagination in preaching. There are still limitations in these attempts, however. Campbell also shows these limitations of contemporary narrative homiletics as new homiletics theory, as follows:

By focusing narrowly on homiletical technique, contemporary narrative homileticians have not given adequate attention to the larger context of preaching, particularly the context of the community of faith within which preaching takes place. They have ignored the communal practices that are essential for a truthful hearing of the gospel. In their focus on discrete experiential Word-events, contemporary homileticians have neglected the intimate relationship between preaching, polity, and discipleship. They have overlooked not only the political nature of Christian preaching, but also the importance of a disciplined community for a "new hearing" of the Word.

(Campbell 1997:144-145)

As is clear from these assertions of Campbell, there are some limitations in narrative homiletics as new homiletics theory. In addition, the researcher indicates another limitation to the limitations of contemporary narrative homiletics. Like Campbell points out that narrative homiletics does not concern itself with the context of the community of faith as the large context, the researcher indicates that narrative homiletics does not concern itself with worship as the context of preaching. Campbell also presents postliberal preaching theory as the alternative way for new homiletics theory, while the
researcher asserts that the consideration of worship as the context of preaching can be the alternative way for new homiletics to overcome the limitations of new homiletics. This alternative way is not the way that investigates technique or forms of preaching. It is not hermeneutics and communication theory. It is a new way to investigate what preaching is and what the destination of preaching is.

5.4. THE PARADOX OF PREACHING

The main point of preaching should be God-centered. In humanism’s perspective, however, the highlighting of theocentrism is behind the times. This can be unwelcome in the contemporary church where people are affected by secularism. Sometimes, it can even be seen as folly. From this perspective, Paul says: “For the word of the cross is folly to those who are perishing, but to us who are being saved it is the power of God” (1Cor. 1:18). In their book, Preaching Fools: The Gospel as a Rhetoric of Folly, Campbell and Cilliers insist: “The gospel is foolishness. Preaching is folly. Preachers are fools” (Campbell & Cilliers 2012:1). In a manner of speaking, the proclamation of the gospel disrupts the world’s understandings of power and wisdom. The way that Jesus shows is a different way compared to the way of the world.

The truth is paradoxical. The truth is not only simple, but also complex. Preaching that preaches the truth is also a paradox. When the God-centered gospel is preached, many people can have antipathy and hostility towards the gospel. For example, from the perspective of some people, the doctrine of the unconditional grace of God is criticized because it leads to the ignoring of the responsibility of human beings. Some would say that being centered on God leads to a disregard for human dignity. This is not true, however. God-centered worship can result in human beings being happy and satisfied. Long indicates this, as follows:
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What are our deepest needs? First and foremost, we need mystery, that is, we need God. Specifically, we need to be in communion with God, to belong to God, to be in right and loving relationship with God. The 16th century Heidelberg Catechism points to this need to belong to God when it begins with the following question and answer: "What is your only comfort, in life and in death? That I belong-body and soul, in life and in death-not to myself but to my faithful Savior, Jesus Christ."

(Long 2001:19)

The worship, praise and adoration of God is the great tradition of the church. The church has worshiped God until now. Through preaching, the church has proclaimed God’s greatness in worship. This worship owns delight and pleasure. It is a paradox.

How can we celebrate and enjoy in worship that focus on God? The reason is that the people of God and people who love God can celebrate and enjoy God. Long shows this in the follow manner:

Worship is a lot like falling in love. When someone falls head over heels for another, adoration flows naturally from the lover toward the loved one. This adoration is not primarily about anything else, nor does it serve any utilitarian purpose outside the love relationship. Indeed, in the presence of the loved one, the lover cannot help but adore, and apart from the beloved, nothing can provoke adoration-not perfume or soft music or dim lights or wine and roses.

(Long 2001:18)

Moreover, when the people of God praise and worship God, they can have true complacency. Then, Quicke refers to this as follows:
Giving God glory is therefore the largest purpose in the cosmos. Humans are at their most alive when worshiping our loving Creator God. Two thousand years of Christian theology, spirituality, and practice can only touch the surface of the comprehensive reality that is Christian worship.

(Quicke 2011:72)

This connects to the proclamation of Isaiah: “The people whom I formed for myself that they might declare my praise” (Is 43:21). In addition, the Holy Spirit gives rise to the people of God being satisfied with only God.

Willimon (1995:362) indicates that to be concerned and care for individual struggles in life is having respect for the listeners in worship. Of course, it could be possible. There is no need to separate the benefits of God and of human beings, however. Worship is an encounter between God and people. When the people of God meet God, they will realize who they are and receive the answer to their question. It is like the experience of the writer who wrote Psalm 73. The writer, who has several questions about the righteous of God, confesses, “Until I went into the sanctuary of God; then I perceived their end” (Ps 73:17). The writer received the answer in an encounter with God. In the same perspective, Cilliers refers to this discovering as follows:

In worship human beings discover that they are (here). Without this discovery worship in the true sense of the word could hardly be possible. Worship should therefore create spaces where this deeply human need to discover who (and that) you are can be accommodated, and indeed fostered. In worship the being-functions of human beings are to be considered before attending to the doing-functions; these being-functions can, however, not be manipulated or controlled (either by liturgical order or denominational confession), but are in effect part and parcel of the event of the liturgical
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Therefore, it can be said that when the glory of God is proclaimed through preaching, worship that is an encounter between God and people can give satisfaction not only to God, but also to human beings.

The preacher and the congregation can face a paradoxical situation when they follow the direction of worship, being God-centered. The God-centered concept does not disturb human rights and human dignity, however. Basically, the welfare of the people of God can be found in God. Therefore, the preacher should declare the glory and honor of God. It is the way for the people of God.

5.5. PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR THE KOREAN CHURCH

The researcher analyzed the situation in the Korean context as indicated previously. It was shown that worship or liturgy is emphasized less than preaching and the relationship between worship and preaching has not sufficiently been considered.

5.5.1. The need for the consideration about the relationship between worship and preaching

First, there is the need for recovering the relationship between worship and preaching. Preaching has been situated at the center in ministry for the Korean church, and the role of preaching in worship is absolutely emphasized (Kim 1995:65; Kim 2006:16; Kim
2013:11-15; Lee 2013). In other words, preaching has always been extremely highly valued, while liturgy or worship is placed in a subordinate position, up to the point of being totally neglected. Therefore, in many cases, the relationship between preaching and worship has not sufficiently been deliberated.

In the Korean church, one of the problems related to preaching is the excessive pursuit of blessings (Kim 2000:133). This notion emanates from shamanism. "Shamanism is regarded as the foundation of Korean culture, because it is an indigenous religion which deeply penetrates the ethos and life of the Korean people" (Lee 1997:29). Thus shamanism has a desire to avoid disasters and misfortunes, to get wealthy, and to live a healthy, long and enjoyable life on earth (Kay 1990:6). As a result, the influences of shamanism lead the destination of preaching to secular materialism. “To meet shamanistically oriented audience expectations and to attract more people, some preachers overemphasize the benefits of blessings in their sermons” (Kay 1990:7). This tendency of preaching does not match the destination of worship. Thus, the Korean church should recover the fact that the purpose and focus of preaching is God-centered, when considering the focus of worship. And that the consideration of the relationship between worship and preaching can help to recover the focus of preaching.

5.5.2. The distinction of preaching in and outside of worship

When worship as the context of preaching is considered, the focus of preaching should be God-centered. In other words, the content of preaching should be focused to bring honor and glory to God. Only then can the other contents be dealt with outside of
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worship.

In the Korean church, there are several worship services and meetings in a week, such as the Sunday morning service, the Sunday afternoon or evening service, the Wednesday evening service, the Friday night prayer meeting and the early morning prayer meeting. In fact, except for the Sunday morning service, the other services are not official and formal worship services. These are generally prayer meetings, even though people call these worship services. However, these meeting have the order of a sermon.

To have several and various meetings is of great merit for the Korean church. Thus, there is a need that preachers should distinguish the contents of their preaching in several meetings. Preaching, following the direction of worship, should be God-centered. In the light of these, it can be said that the sermon of a Sunday morning service should follow the direction of worship. Yet, in other meetings, the content of preaching can have various themes and purposes.

5.6. CONCLUSION

In this chapter, the researcher showed practical suggestions to apply the consideration of worship as the context of preaching. The first step is to understand the focus of worship. Worship focuses on God. Worship should follow a God-centered concept. The second suggestion is that preaching should constitute following the direction and focus of worship. Because worship’s focus is God-centered, preaching should proclaim the glory and honor of God. Although preaching can deal with various contents, the content cannot go over the focus, that is, God-centeredness. Lastly, a distinction should be made between preaching outside of worship and preaching within worship. The content and direction of preaching in worship should be restricted by the direction and focus of worship. The content and direction of preaching outside of worship can have any
content, however. This concept can give a new guideline to the teaching ministry in the church.

Many have not considered worship as the context of preaching and the relationship between preaching and worship. It leads to the disconnection between worship and preaching. Like the researcher examined in the previous section, preaching of new homiletics that focus on the individual hearer cannot associate with the goal of worship that focuses on God. It brings theological inharmoniousness. Therefore, the consideration of the relationship between worship and preaching can give a new tool to criticize the new homiletics theory in a way.
6. CONCLUSION

This thesis examined the relationship between worship and preaching. Through this examination, it can lead to a better understanding of preaching. Although worship is the very significant context of preaching, there is not much concern over worship and the relationship between worship and preaching. Therefore, the writer showed that worship is an important context that we should pay attention to with regards to the relationship between worship and preaching.

In chapter 1, the researcher brought up the problem with worship and preaching; worship is a significant element as the context of preaching. There is not much concern over worship and the relationship between worship and preaching. This became the motivation for this thesis. In this chapter, the researcher dealt with the plan for the research, following Osmer’s practical theological methodology. Each chapter is analyzed to show the relationship between worship and preaching, following Osmer’s theological methodology.

Chapter 2 focused on each homiletic theory and in which issue it is interested in. Traditional homiletics theory stresses the clarity of content and delivering of a sermon. Therefore, traditional homiletics is interested in rhetoric. Similar to Traditional homiletics, Kerygmatic homiletics theory also stresses the content of preaching. New homiletics theory focuses on the style and form of preaching to deliver a sermon efficiently. Moreover, new homiletics is concerned with the congregation. Postliberal homiletics theory has concentrated on the content and aim of preaching. Thus, it can be said that there is little concern over worship as the context of preaching. In other words, although each homiletics theory has developed, there is not much concern over worship as the context of preaching and the relationship between preaching and worship.

In addition, Chapter 2 also researched the change of the place of preaching in worship to
indicate that the church has stressed the sermon in the worship service in the past. Through this research, the writer showed that preaching has been placed as the main part of the worship service after the Reformation.

In chapter 3, the writer showed that the reason why there has not been much concern in homiletics about worship as the context of preaching. The reasons are; The preaching-centered tradition in worship; The independence of preaching in worship; Not much concern over liturgy in the Protestant Church; Disregard for the unique nature of preaching; Development of Homiletics and the Loss of the legacy of Homily. The writer also indicated that these reasons are closely connected to the others and interact with each other. Above all, a preaching-centered tradition is the main reason for the other factors.

According to Osmer’s methodology, chapter 4 is the normative task. In this chapter, the writer analyzed the relationship between preaching and worship. In this analysis, the writer illustrated the reason why the context is important and why worship is the context of preaching. Worship as the bigger picture and the whole, affects the content and direction of preaching. Therefore, in this chapter, what worship focuses on and what the destination of worship is was dealt with. The focus of worship is God. Worship should be always God-centered. This direction affects the content and direction of preaching. It means that preaching always focuses on God and God’s works. Preaching should proclaim the glory and greatness of God. As is clear from these assertions, the consideration of worship as the context of preaching gives guidelines for preaching. It cannot be achieved by the homiletics theory that has been studied until now. The consideration of worship as the context of preaching has several strengths: Recovery of the balance between each elements of worship; Reforming the worship service; Overcoming myopic preaching; Giving a guideline for the content of preaching; and Giving a new perspective for preaching.

In conclusion, what is then the relationship between worship and preaching? Worship is the context of preaching. Worship as the context affects preaching’s direction and
preaching should serve the destination of worship. Preaching is the way to reveal God for the people of God and through this revelation, the glory of God is revealed in worship.

Chapter 5 dealt with practical applications and suggestions of the consideration of the direction and content of preaching in worship. These are the applications and suggestions: The need for an understanding of worship; Preaching should follow the direction of worship; The need of the distinction between preaching within and outside of worship. Lastly, the writer indicates that the consideration of worship as the context of preaching can provide a new method to overcome the limitations of new homiletics, such as postliberal preaching theory that is given as a counterproposal for new homiletics.

As a result, almost all preaching occurs in worship. It is common sense. However, this has often been ignored in homiletics. Worship is the context of preaching and we should also consider factors such as the congregation and culture. Considering worship as the context of preaching is very important, the reason being that the context as a whole or bigger picture affects part of the context. It means that worship as the context of preaching affects preaching as part of worship. The relationship between worship and preaching is very close. Therefore, homiletics should be concerned about the relationship between worship and preaching. Yet, many do not pay attention to worship as the context of preaching and the relationship between worship and preaching. The writer strongly recommended that we should pay attention to worship as the context of preaching in homiletics. In addition, through studying worship and the relationship it has with preaching, preaching can be analyzed more accurately.

In conclusion, this thesis concludes that following:

First, worship as the context of preaching is the prominent element that should be considered in homiletics.
Secondly, through studying worship and the relationship with preaching, the writer showed that the content and direction of preaching is affected by the destination and purpose of worship. The focus of worship is God-centered. Therefore, the content and focus of preaching should be God-centered, following the focus of worship.

Thirdly, studying the relationship can help us to come to know the identity of preaching more clearly. It means that preaching is defined in the worship service and clarified in consideration of the relationship between worship and preaching.

Lastly, through the studying of the relationship between preaching and worship, homiletics can obtain a new perspective to better understand preaching. In other words, it can bring about a new perspective, not only on the form and style of preaching, but also on the content of preaching. Moreover, there is the consideration that the relationship can give a tool to criticize the new homiletics theory and can show a new perspective of Reformed homiletics.
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