VERTICAL TYPOLOGY AND CHRISTIAN WORSHIP

Horace D. Hummel

"Typology" is a word anything but unknown in Lutheran circles, but neither is it one of the more familiar ones. Years ago, the first time I lectured on the topic to a pastoral conference, when I was finished, I discovered to my dismay that not a pastor there had the foggiest idea what the word meant. I trust we have made a little progress since then, and especially in a distinguished audience as this I need not fear any tabula rasa on the subject. I pray that this essay will help elucidate an aspect of the topic which is often overlooked or slighted, and in so doing aid in meaningful, biblically-based participation in our worship.

Fortunately, my assignment is not to survey the whole area of typology, which might take several more symposia to accomplish. Usually when the concept is considered, we think of the horizontal dimension, from creation to new creation, from the fall into sin to the final redemption or the like. In brief, it is usually understood to refer to some event, person, place, or institution which anticipates and presages some event, person, place, or institution later in biblical history, mostly from OT to NT, although a little of it occurs within the OT itself. Some mere analogy must be present, but the subject must also be performative, not only reiterating but also recapitulating and consummating it (Irenaeus).

Thus, typology parallels or is the other side of the coin to prophesy. In a broader use of the term, it might even be considered a subdivision of prophecy. However, with "prophecy" we usually think of verbalizations, of explicit, spoken predictions by the prophets. In contrast, types by themselves tend to be mute. Their futuristic or eschatological import is not usually evident in the text and would remain unknown apart from their elucidation in the NT. (Inevitably, St. Augustine's famous "latent –patent" aphorism comes to mind). The usual language is type and antitype, corresponding to prophecy and fulfillment respectively. Inevitably the two overlap at times.

It has always struck me how analogous that correspondence is to our pairing of "Word" and "Sacrament". By "Word" we do not mean mere verbiage, but the proclamation of the *realia* of salvation, basically Christ and the salvation He offers. These physical *realia* are offered in the physical *realia* of baptism and the eucharist, which, however, would be mute and impotent without the dominical word accompanying them. Sometimes we use "Word" in a broad sense too, which is then subdivisible into

“Word” and “Sacrament”. Or we express their essential unity by speaking of absolution and preaching as the “spoken sacrament” and the sacraments as the “visible Word”.

It should come as no surprise that there is no total unanimity in the proper definition of typology. Some of the difference arises from the nature of Scriptures or of exegetical theology which does not express itself in abstractions. Even the word tupoj [typos] is used some fifteen times in the NT and twice in the LXX of the OT, but in varying senses. (The Hebrew tynbT; is used twenty times in the OT, but is translated differently.” In various applications F. Delitzsch called it a “norma normans.” And, of course, the idea is often present when that vocable is not used at all. Some of the variation in defining the term arises from the varying theological presuppositions of the interpreters. And some of it, I submit, is almost intrinsic to the supernatural process which it describes. No human vocabulary is ever going to be adequate to that task.

Other language besides “typology” has been and still is sometimes used. “Allegory” was probably the most frequently used term in the early church, pioneered perhaps by St. Paul, especially in Gal. 4:21ff. (Sarah and Hagar). Probably the best introduction to and survey of patristic use of typology is Jean Danielou’s *Sacramentum Futuri* (English translation subtitle: *Studies in the Origins of Biblical Typo*logy (1950), translated into English a decade later under the title, *From Shadows to Reality*. (The English title uses biblical language, but, regrettably, loses the “sacramental” dimension [efficaciousness through some external element]). Danielou has other important works in this area, perhaps most significantly his 1951, *The Bible and the Liturgy* (English, 1956). However, when one reads these books, especially the first, he is often hard put to distinguish what we would call allegory from typology. It is usually agreed that Pauline and patristic “allegory” ultimately differs radically from the Philonic type, usually called “symbolic” vs. the biblical “historical” type. Be that as it may, “allegory” has today almost universally come to imply an approach which demeans, ignores, or even denies the literal or historical sense of the text, and hence, is no longer useful. In contrast, typology builds on the literal sense, and, although aware of discontinuities, proclaims the extension, prolongation, and consummation of the literal sense of the text.

The fathers often also spoke of a “mystical sense”, especially in connection with the “mystagogy,” as they called it, of catechetical instruction. Contemporary Roman Catholic usage does not speak of any

"mystical sense", but in common talk about, say, the "paschal mystery" combines typological, liturgical, and sacramental perspectives. We are acquainted with the word "mystery" in the biblical sense, and even use "mystic(al)" in other contexts. But to speak of a "mystical sense" of Scripture would, if anything, probably suggest to us some sort of esoteric allegory or "mysticism" as a theological posture (not a positive epithet!). (It is perhaps worthy noting, however, that some of the theologians of Lutheran orthodoxy, most notable Calov (1612-1686) did speak of *sensus mysticus*, which he subdivided into allegorical, typical, and parabolic senses. But such language is alien to us today.)

Another option is to speak of a "spiritual" sense. Initially there is something very attractive about such a usage, if one could, in effect, keep the initial letter capitalized, that is, relate it to the Holy Spirit who both inspired the sacred text, to begin with, and Who, in Word and Sacrament brings it out of the remoteness of ancient history. But, if ever, today would hardly be the time to champion the term, awash, as our culture is, in "spiritualities" of all sorts, usually totally subjective and tending in "new age" directions.

The point of this digression is to emphasize that there is nothing sacrosanct about the word "typology" or "typological". But if one is going to avoid positivism, historicism, literalism or some other "ism" which takes the Bible as a purely human document, or which does not let Scripture interpret Scripture, we are going to have to find some label for our stance. "Typology" today enjoys as wide a currency as any alternative.

Although it derives from a word frequently used in the Bible itself, it should be stressed that "typology" does not refer to some exegetical method by which one extracts meaning from Scripture, but primarily connotes an underlying mentality or confession. Because Yahweh is taken as constantly guiding history toward its Messianic goal, not merely occasionally bestirring Himself to intervene (although certain events and people will stand out), one sometimes gets the impression that, humanly speaking, the biblical writers made an almost random selection of examples to illustrate the point. That would explain why the OT is often quoted very freely in the NT, why it usually follows LXX rather than the Hebrew, and why modern scholars often vary as much as they do in their perceptions of what typological patterns are being followed. That is also why debate about precisely how many types or prophecies there are is misguided. All of the OT is prophetic (cf. our phrase: "prophetic and apostolic Scriptures"), and in the same broad sense all of it is typological, all of it Christological, all of it eschatological, etc. Basically then, "typology" is

simply an expression and exemplification of our conviction that type and antitype are of the same genus or family -–which we commonly refer to as the "unity of Scripture." For all the external differences, both are religions of grace, not of works, and both center in Jesus Christ.

Please permit me one other initial digression: a brief look at the history of typology in more recent times, especially since the Reformation. Let me call your attention to a CTCR study on "Prophecy and Typology", appendix R3-OIA, pp. 57-67 of the "synodical reports" in the workbook for the 1998 convention. Its points are extensively documented, and I shall not repeat them here. Contrary to what some have thought it demonstrates the extent to which Luther used typology throughout his life. It includes a couple of quotations from the Apology to show how sympathetic the confessors, as a whole, were to the broader typological reading of the OT. It uses not only the word *typus*, but also *umbra* (Skia/) [skia] and *imago (*eikwn*)* [eikōn] to describe the relation of the two testaments to one another. Calov has already been mentioned, but he was only one of the theologians of Lutheran Orthodoxy who discussed the topic.

One is not surprised that Rationalism and Pietism did not concern themselves much with the subject, although one should give honorable mention to Bengel, who especially with his *Gnomon Novi Testamenti* is often hailed as one of the forerunners of *Heilsgeschichte,* a viewpoint with many affinities to typology (developed elsewhere by Danielou, and Cullman in *Salvation in History*). For Lutherans, another damper on the study of typology in this period came from the Reformed side with its excessive use of the term especially in its "covenant" or" federal" theology, classically represented by Cocceius' work. Some later works from this school were more moderate, perhaps especially Patrick Fairbairn, whose *The Typology of Scripture* remains useful if used with discretion.

Higher criticism naturally dismissed typology as an antiquated approach. As far as I know, little attention was paid to the subject in those circles until the rise of so-called "biblical theology" under neo-orthodox auspices after the world wars. Its endorsement by giants in the field like Eichrodt and von Rad gave respectability to the topic, and considerable literature on the subject was generated, but in the last decade or so other interests have largely displaced it.

In the LCMS, however, attention to typology seems to have been part of its theological horizon from the outset The CTCR report singles out a work by one D. C. G. Hoffman, entitled *Institutiones Theologiae Exegeticae* ("Methods/Principles of Exegetical Theology"; 1876) which was used as a

hermeneutics text during Walther’s presidency, and which devotes some 20 pages to the proper interpretation of types. Later LCMS exegetes, however, probably reacting to the increasing threat of historical-critical scholarship, took a dim view of the subject (e.g., Stoeckhardt, Laetsch, and others). In recent times the attempt by (what became) the Seminex faculty to use typology as a means to deny actual predictive prophecy did not endear the subject to the more conservative-minded. During the same period, interestingly, the Wisconsin Synod tended toward a more positive view of the subject, evidenced especially in August Pieper’s *Isaiah II* . Only in very recent times has typology become more familiar in LCMS, although not without opposition.

Let me now turn to the topic at hand. I shall first attempt to survey the major biblical evidence for “vertical typology” (or “verticality”, if you will) and then make a few suggestions on how awareness of it should inform and enrich our worship.

Usually, when we speak of typology, as noted earlier, we think of its horizontal aspect, and pay little attention to the vertical. This concentration on the horizontal corresponds, of course, to the thrust of the Gospel from creation to parousia, from the Fall to the fall of the “last enemy’. The Christian faith seeks neither escape from the body after the fashion of gnostics or mystics, nor retreat into the psychological in interiority or solipsism of much contemporary “spirituality.” But conscious, explicit neglect of the vertical aspect runs the risk of thinking of God as purely immanental, part of the historical process, and subject to our manipulation as “co-creators.” (It is ironic that the medieval *quadriga*, for all of the “*Affenspiel”* often connected with it, did climax in a search for the “anagogic” (from the Greek for “lead up”) sense of the text.

How then does the vertical intersect with the horizontal? I have usually employed an illustration to attempt to answer the question. It limps, but I fear any human attempt to explain the transhistorical or suprahistorical without denying the genuinely historical will. I resort to the picture of the two-story universe which the Bible assumes throughout, and to which the Christian church also subscribes, although often quite nominally. What we know as “history” proceeds on two parallel tracks. Man, the creature, on the lower, empirical track likes to think that he is the maker of history, “the master of his fate, the captain of his soul” (McVeigh!). But “He who sits in the heavens laughs” (Ps. 2:4). Man has his measure of freedom, of course (*De servo arbitrio*), but the ultimate decisions are made above. The Hebrew root j pv

[š-p-t], usually translated "judge/judgment" etc., refers not only to condemnation, as it tends to be heard (although often enough that is the application), but simply decisions or verdicts of the heavenly court. These apply not only to the "justification" of the individual (qdc = jpv) [š-p-t = ts-d-q] but to the right ordering, as He wills it, of the entire universe. I have always like to quote Dorothy Sayers' (*A Man Born to Be King)* "The resurrection is the only thing which ever *really* happened". Not, of course, that what we know as the "historical" is an illusion, but that it has ultimate content or significance only *sub specie aeternitatis.*

In my illustration, I draw the two parallel tracks as beginning or first diverging at the Fall, and not converging again until the parousia. I use the language of verticality (heaven as "up" and earth as "down") because it is the language of Scripture itself. It is from God's perspective anthropomorphic in nature and not to be pressed literalistically. It is one of the many "metaphors" (?) God Himself has graciously condescended to give us so that communication might be possible.

As with the continuousness of horizontal typology, so also with the vertical: in a sense, God alone is intervening in earthly history all the time, but there are certain times and places where that intervention is more obvious. Explicit typological language may not always be used, but the vertical dimension is obvious nonetheless. We are usually not told in concrete terms what transpired when the "word of Yahweh" came to the prophets, although sometimes we meet the language of dreams and visions (hzx) [(ch-z-h)]. Various theologoumena are used when God intervenes more personally. For lack of a better term, I prefer to label them "hypostases", because I understand them all as manifestations of the pre-incarnate Christ/ the logoj "asarkoj [logos asarkos], i.e., ways in which He was "incarnationally" present on earth before the incarnation itself. Besides "word" used in that sense, we have the "angel of Yahweh" (when paralleled with Yahweh Himself), "name", "glory", "spirit", and "wisdom". We understand all these as reaching their climax in the incarnation proper, but continued until the second coming by the Holy Spirit operating through Word and Sacrament.

There are two areas of Scripture where the upper track regularly descends and guides the horizontal. These are the realms of warfare and of worship. Explicit typological language is not ordinarily used of the first, but it is of the second.

The area of warfare is subsidiary to our primary concern with worship, so we consider it first. It is all but certain that the epithet, "Sabaoth" which so often follows the divine name is probably best translated "armies". "Hosts" is, I think, archaic, and the "power and might" of LW and LBW is an unacceptable paraphrase because it replaces a very concrete word with two abstractions. Already in the "Song of the Sea" (Ex. 15:3), Yahweh is described as a "man of war". Not any wars, of course, but only those of His people, and only when they do His bidding. Long before the temple fell in 587, the prophets were predicting that Yahweh could and would fight against His own people if they abandoned Him. Use of the word is associated especially with the ark of the covenant, which led the Israelites into battle. We used to speak freely of "holy war", but its use by radical Muslims to translate *jihad* has usually today led to the substitution of "Yahweh's war."

A few examples illustrate the concept. In Josh. 5:13-15, as Joshua is reconnoitering Jericho, a heavenly visitor suddenly appears and identifies Himself as "the commander of Yahweh's army", that is the commander-in-chief of the combined armies of heaven and earth. In II Kings 6 when Elisha's servant is frightened by the Syrian armies which had surrounded Dothan, Elisha prays that God would open his eyes so that he would see that "the mountain was full of horses and chariots of fire round about Elisha." And in Daniel 9-10 the angel Gabriel makes Daniel wait 21 days until Michael comes to relieve him in the battle against "the prince of the kingdom of Persia" before he can answer Daniel's prayer for the real (ultimate) meaning of the "seventy years" of captivity prophesied by Jeremiah. And his interpretation of the seventy years as seventy *weeks* of years is one of the Bible's own clearest examples of typological exegesis.

Nor does warfare language leave us in the NT era. From Herod's attempt to kill a possible competitor to the apocalyptic battles of the book of Revelation spiritual war continues, no longer against political entities or "flesh and blood", but, in St. Paul's words, "against the principalities, against the powers, against the world rulers of this present darkness, against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places" (Eph. 6:12). In fact, a "theology of the cross" implies a victory, and victories follow wars. Exodus and Paschal typology, arising in their own martial contexts, are in my experience better reflected in our Easter hymns and liturgies than in our preaching. To mention just one more example: in Luke 10 when the 70 return rejoicing from their missionary journey, our Lord's exclamation is: "I saw Satan fall like lightning from heaven."

When we turn now to verticality in the area of worship, we cannot leave the realm of warfare behind too hastily. The role of Urim and Thummin, held in the high-priest's breastpiece, often gives battle instructions. The psalms pick up the theme of conflict and often celebrate the victory God has/does/will give(n) at various points. The prophet Elisha enlists the services of a harpist-minstrel in order to aid a Judah-Israel-Edom coalition in a major battle against Mesha, king of Moab (II Kings 3) and the Chronicler often writes a sort of eschatological history, eternity already invading time. E.g., in II Chronicles 20, in a battle against Moab and Ammon, king Jehoshaphat fields an army in the form of a chanting temple choir, and the enemy is routed. Such a pericope probably reflects the empirical side of ancient warfare, but implies a suprahistorical component as well. And in the NT, Revelation 4 ushers us into a worship scene, but what unfolds in apocalyptic language is martial to the core.

Much biblical parenesis uses battle metaphors, perhaps most famously I Thess. 5:8: "Put on the breastplate of faith and love and for a helmet the hope of salvation." *LW* has an entire section captioned "the church militant" beginning with *A Mighty Fortress."* Thoughtless use of war and worship language might produce the ultimate oxymoron, or even encourage some jungistic chauvinism, but if deployed correctly, it may aid the worshippers in remembering what their Christian worship and life are all about. At worship, Christian warriors celebrate the victory already won on Calvary and are empowered to continue to "fight the good fight" until the end.

At the center of the verticality of OT worship is, of course, the altar, so much so that the Bible almost takes it for granted. There is no recorded command to start building them, and never is there any real discussion of their significance as such. The Hebrew word, xBzmi [*mizbeach*], is purely functional in meaning, signifying simply a place for sacrifice. There are plausible arguments suggesting that possibly the altar was thought of as a "miniature mountain of God", a place symbolically closer to heaven and thus a natural place to communicate with God. Ezekiel's word for "altar" is laerhh; [harel] = "mountain of God", written as one word (Ezekiel 43:15-16), and may be an alternate form of the enigmatic layra] [ariel] applied to Jerusalem in Isaiah 29:1 (traditionally often translated "lion of God," which makes no sense in the context, whereas "mountain of God" just possible might). But this is partly speculation, and, if

so, the Bible never develops the idea. It may belong more to the study of the history of religions, where there are many parallels, than to biblical theology.

The smoke of the sacrifice, together with incense, are partly objectified "sacramental" forms of prayer, and forgiveness of sins is explicitly promised to the believer through them, not *ex* o*pere operato,* but in prospect of Christ's all-availing sacrifice. It is repeatedly described as a "pleasing smell" to God – language which could be misunderstood as the pagan notion of pacifying or propitiating an angry deity, but in biblical context must be understood as eucharistic in intent , a God-pleasing way of expressing thanksgiving. The metaphor continues to be used in the NT, both of Christ's sacrifice, and of "sacrificial" Christian living.

One pericope that clearly depicts the intimate vertical connection between altars and heaven is that of the annunciation of Samson in Judges 13. The heavenly messenger, (the angel of)Yahweh will not tell Manoah and his wife His name, but only that it is al,P,[pele'] ("wonder/mirracle/sign" – a word closely related to the semantic field of "type"). Neither will He join them in a meal. He will only accept a burnt-offering, and when they make one, He ascends into heaven in the flame and disappears.

Most OT mention of altars concerns those in the tabernacle/temple. (I shall treat those two structures together, because except for dimensions, they are virtually identical.) How important altars were is seen in the fact that the shrines contained two of them. The large "bronze altar" at the center of the outer courtyard was the focal point of most of the activity around the structures. But there was also the "golden altar", the altar of incense, at the foot of the steps leading into the holy of holies, where Yahweh sat enthroned in his "house" between the wings of the cherubim above the ark. That same vertical correspondence with heaven is evidenced by the fact that the ark can be labeled both God's throne and His footstool, depending on perspective. The two perspectives are also reflected in the tendency to use the verb !kv [sh-k-n] of Yahweh's "incarnational" presence on earth (cf. the derivative noun, "Shekinah", sometimes used later of Christ and/or of the Holy Spirit) and a different verb, bvy[y-sh-v] of His enthronement in heaven.

The book of Exodus shows the importance of the tabernacle by devoting nearly half its space to the subject, and, in effect, covers the entire subject twice. First (chaps. 25-30) God commands Moses in some detail how to construct the tabernacle and its appurtenances (imperatives = "prescriptive") and then (chaps. 35-40) repeat almost verbatim how Moses obeyed (indicative = "descriptive").

But that entire section is introduced (Ex. 25:9) by the command that the construction of the tabernacle should follow the tynib.T; [tavnith] that God will show him. The command is repeated in 25:40. The word, a derivative of hnb [b-n-h], "build" is usually translated "pattern/model/blueprint" or the like. Use of the word "see", however, indicates a vision of a completed structure, not merely a blueprint. LXX renders it with tupoj [typos] (Exodus 25:40). Just how the heavenly counterpart of the tabernacle and all its components would look or function on the second story defies human comprehension, and we simply have to put it in the "anthropomorphic" category.

However, that is not the point of the word or the verses. The direction is from heaven to earth, not the other way around. It does not intend to reveal heavenly mysteries, but to validate the earthly structure and its rites. And that is why I argue the term "typology" is preeminently appropriate. Without the heavenly word, command, and model, tabernacle and temple were both nothing more than human structures, each with parallels in the pagan world. It is the same principle as with horizontal typology or prophecy: Apart from revelation and divine validation, we have nothing but impotent, human words, works, and hopes.

So pivotal was this principle of reflection of a heavenly prototype that it is repeated when the temple replaces the tabernacle (I Chr. 28:19; strangely absent from the Kings text). St. Stephen refers to it in his sermon before his martyrdom (Acts 7:44), and the author of Hebrews cites it in his argument for the superiority of the new covenant (Heb. 8:5). Both use the word tupoj [typos], although Hebrews uses tupoj for the heavenly model and anti,tupoj [antitypos] for the earthly copy (the latter also called u`po,deigma [hypodeigma], "image, and skia/[skia], "shadow"). Others references appear in the apocrypha and pseudepigrapha, as well as in rabbinic thought. It was commonplace in the thought of the ancient Near East.

Often the significance of the temple is extended to the entire city of Jerusalem/Zion. The two names are somewhat interchangeable, but often "Jerusalem" is simply the name of another city, whereas

"Zion" depicts an elect, holy city, the capital of a Spiritual kingdom (often so used in messianic contexts). (Compare the fair number of contemporary churches called "Zion", but none "Jerusalem", to the best of my knowledge). The eternal significance of the "city of God" (St. Augustine) is never explicitly expressed in typological terms, but both the vertical and the horizontal dimensions of the concept are clearly present. When Sennacherib was threatening Jerusalem in Hezekiah's day, Isaiah proclaims "the inviolability of Zion", an umbrella which in that case also covers the earthly city. But the term came to be misunderstood as "the inviolability of Jerusalem" in a political and military sense, so a century later both Jeremiah and Ezekiel have to preach "*Ierusalem delenda est"* if it did not repent. Ezekiel expresses it in terms of the dAbk' [kavodh], God's "incarnational presence" in the city. When the dAbk' [kavodh] forsakes the city and resides on the Mt. of Olives (Chapter 11), Jerusalem is only another city of wood and stone, ripe for destruction. But God's promises will not be permanently thwarted. In Chapter 43, is is prophesied that the dAbk' [kavodh] will return to the new Jerusalem, described in semi-apocalyptic terms, that is, in God's good time, perhaps only eschatologically, but certainly nonetheless. So it is of the Christian churches; individual structures and church bodies may fall, but "the gates of hell shall not prevail" against the church itself.

Some of the psalms, often called "Hymns of Zion" describe Jerusalem in supra-historical terms, often employing ex-mythological language to describe Zion's universal and cosmic significance (e.g., Psalm 46 with its "river", the starting point of "A Mighty Fortress", or Psalm 48's "in the far north"). Some of our other hymns follow them, e.g., "Glorious Things of Thee are Spoken" (LW #294).

Does this really change in the NT? "Jerusalem" loses its physical or geographical sense, but as "Zion" still remains the "navel" or "center" of the whole earth (as mediaeval cartographers often depicted it) in a theological sense. Our Lord often tells his unconvinced disciples that he dei/ [dei], "must" go up to Jerusalem, anagkh, "necessity," [anangke] is laid upon Him. The Son of Man can suffer and die nowhere but in Jerusalem. Why? Because He (Israel reduced to one), must recapitulate and consummate the journey of Israel, completed by David, through the wilderness to the promised land and Zion – but, of course, His victory will be accomplished by His death and resurrection. Similarly, the sacrifices and the OT ordinances

were commanded to be performed ~l'A[l. [l^{e}‘olam], but Christ is the ~l'A[[‘olam], the essence of time and space, virtually ~l'A[itself, and so He becomes the climactic and pivotal sacrifice.

My students know that one of my constant refrains is the unfortunate tendency to present the antitypes (and the fulfillment) as though they “dead-end” in Christ. In one sense, this is proper, and an essential part of the Gospel: tete,lestai [tetelestai]! Easter was the te,loj [telos]. In principle, there is no more to come. Apart from this “omega point”, typology would have no anchor or ultimate referent.

But there is also the “not yet”. We use an A.D. calendar, which rather expresses the now-not yet paradox. We await a “second coming”, although in the NT itself the distinction is semi-artificial. The “end of the ages” (ta. te,lh tw/n aivw,nwn) [ta telē tōn aiōnon] has come upon us” (I Cor. 10:11), but the day and hour of the end no one knows. In the OT this paradox is also expressed: prophecies which were fulfilled in Christ and those which we still await are often telescoped or juxtaposed.

I realize one is playing with words somewhat, but it is also part of the Gospel that these promises are “fulfilled” in us. This is the role we usually associate with the Holy Spirit, who buries us with Christ into His death in the waters of baptism, and nurtures that new life in preaching and the Eucharist. In Christ, He brings us out of Egypt, “the house of bondage”, and through the wilderness of our own futile “search for God” to Zion, although from another perspective the journey is not yet complete. But Heb. 12:12 emphasizes the “already”: “You *have* come to Mt. Zion, and to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to innumerable angels in festal gathering, and to the assembly of the first-born who are enrolled in heaven--.” Presumably, St. Paul has something like this in mind when he counsels (I Cor. 11:2-16) that a woman at worship should have a veil on her head “because of the angels” (cf. the “angels” of the seven churches in Revelation 1-3, possibly patrons or guardians (and reflected in traditional names of churches). Similarly in Gal. 4:25 ff. St. Paul writes: our home is in “the Jerusalem above, which is free, and she is our mother; we like Isaac are children of promise.” (I have often wondered whether in their own context the Masoretes did not have some such vertical typology in mind by consistently using the *qere perpetuum* of pointing Jerusalem as a dual (~yIl;v'Wry>, although the consonanted text has the *yodh* of the

dual ending only 5 times, mostly in very late texts, and LXX plainly heard the Kethiv's *-êm* ending as reflected in the NT and virtually all other non-Hebraic texts.)

But there is still another phase of the fulfillment: "the fulfillment of the fulfillment", the consummation, the Second Coming, the parousia – whatever you wish to call it. As mentioned, OT Messianic and eschatological prophecies demand that we include this final dimension. This is not a theme which suffers from overuse in our preaching, not even at the end of the church year (a sort of liturgical "type" of the second coming), or in Advent, which is not intended to be limited to our Lord's first coming. No wonder pastors seem not to know what to make of the many judgment oracles in the prophets; they largely solve that problem by ignoring it.

Should it be different in principle with vertical typology? Can it biblically be limited to when He came "down" and took upon Himself our flesh? Does He not constantly come down in the means of grace? The temple built with stones was destroyed, but Christ describes Himself as the antitype of the temple. If we do not in good Protestant fashion misunderstand the NT descriptions of the church as the "body of Christ" as mere metaphors, we will more easily understand and resist merely institutional or individualistic understandings of what "church" means. Likewise with koinwni,a| [koinonia] or fellowship. Likewise also with "land"; we have no "holy land" in the literal sense as fulfillment of OT land prophecies, but rather a "kingdom", of which we pray constantly in the second petition. Ironically, "land" with heaven as its antiype we have never had difficulty with: Our bodies are described as temples of the Holy Spirit (I Cor. 6:15), or "lively stones" (I Peter 2:4). We give logical priority to the *Christus pro nobis* (justification), but not at the expense of the *Christus in nobis* (the "mystical union"). And when all is fulfilled, St. John on Patmos sees "the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming <u>down</u> out of heaven from God" (Rev. 21:2), but he "saw no temple in the city, for its temple is the Lord God the Almighty and the Lamb" (21:22). Virtually all biblical ecclesiology is contained in such language, and it should pervade the self-understanding and deportment of each congregation as well as of the entire "communion of saints."

As the altar was central in the tabernacle/temple, so it is in our churches. Architecturally we know little of altars in the earliest Christianity, but the NT clearly uses the word as a virtual synonym of church. In I Cor. 10:18 ff. The "cup/table of the Lord" is contrasted with meat sacrifices on pagan altars. Similarly, Heb. 13:10 says "we have an altar" in contrast to pagan sacrifices. In Rev. 6,8 and 9, St. John is using

tabernacle/temple language, but the application is plainly to the NT, where a heavenly temple is pictured as continuing to be a tynIb.T; [tavnith] a tupoj [typos] of the Christian church.

It is no accident that, for the most part, only churches which confess a “Sacrament of the Altar” have an altar at the center of the chancel, and the choir is not seated behind a reading desk as though giving a concert, but somewhere out of sight, so that the focus is on altar and pulpit. (I personally prefer an eastward altar with its “sacramental” and “sacrificial” postures, because of the explicit reverence shown to Him who really presides over the service. Nor am I impressed by round churches with an altar in the middle, both because of the excessive focus it seems to place on the human presider, and because of the distraction of watching people opposite you).

But wherever placed, it is no accident that it is the so-called “liturgical Churches” which make altars central. Administration of the Eucharist (as somewhat also of baptism) even in its barest form is a rite and naturally attracts other rites, as it apparently did in the earliest evidence available to us from the early church. As we know, the basic shape of that liturgy has endured now some two millenia with surprisingly little change. And few, indeed, are the individuals with both the bibical-theological and literary ability to write anything matching it. The details may be “adiaphora” (a drastically and radically overused and abused term today), but, as is evident already in FC X, this is hardly license to abandon it and become virtual Baptists or Pentecostals. Some of what one observes in many “contemporary” services can hardly be described as anything but “useless, foolish spectacles, which are not beneficial for good order, Christian discipline, or evangelical decorum in the church,” (FC, SD 7).

I have now obviously sidled into the more difficult part of this essay: the application of biblical principles to Christian worship today. It is no easy task. For one thing, it is easy for a lecturer to make suggestions in the abstract. But, whatever their merit, it is the pastors on the front lines who will have to test and implement them. And, secondly, there are simply a staggering number of variables to take into account. No two congregations are alike, and no pastor is a clone of another. I shall barely venture into the special problems posed by ethnic groups, the number of which, at least in our larger cities, seems almost legion. It would be foolhardy not to try to accommodate some of their unique cultural traits, but, in addition to doctrinal concerns, I also believe that there is such a thing as a Lutheran “culture” or ethos. The relation between “cult” (= liturgy) and cultures is not merely etymological. Any vibrant religion or tradition (“the

living faith of the dead" Pelikan) is bound to be culture-creating, although, undoubtedly, with some adiaphorous influences from the national or ethnic culture. An example fresh in my mind is Russia, where our churches follow the traditional liturgy quite faithfully, but where chanting and incense do not pose the problems they would in America. What very limited experience I have otherwise indicates that the elements of the liturgy (and in some cases, *LH* simple translated) is not all that impossible, although one must "make haste slowly".

To really address the problems of the erosion or perversion of our worship we must, in my judgment, take another look at our entire educational enterprise. Worship is not essentially didactic, but it presupposes a thoroughly informed clergy and laity. The primary responsibility is that of the seminaries, and that problem, I think, is just beginning to be addressed. The pattern has been one short course, mostly on liturgical etiquette, no electives on the subject, and no advanced degree programs. Those who taught the subject were usually trained primarily in music, which, naturally, remained their major interest. And this in glaring contrast to the great amount of attention paid to homiletics, which I certainly shall not criticize as such, but only the gross imbalance. No wonder that when the liturgy of our Saxon German services disappeared, there was a great vacuum. For a time *LH* brought some external liturgical unity, but with little real comprehension or appreciation, and with a pervasive anti-Catholic animus, no wonder the siren call of American evangelism, recently centered especially in Pasadena, with its specious promises of "church growth" through the use of "user-friendly" services, so-called "praise songs" and the like, proved to be irresistible to many, and that battle continues.

Parallel to adequate training of the clergy must be thorough catechesis of the laity. One still hears alarming reports of the abbreviation of time devoted to instruction of both adult converts and young catechumens. Catholicism seems to have considerable success with its "Rite of Christian Initiation for Adults" program, where other adult members serve as "sponsors" until the initiate is ready for confirmation. To the best of my knowledge, however, this program has rarely been adopted by Lutherans. I am not convinced that we are using our educational system to its best advantage. Sunday school children are all too often taught to sing silly ditties which will never be heard again instead of being introduced to the treasury of great hymns and a liturgy they may use all their lives. Sometimes it seems to be little better

when full-time day schools are maintained. Similarly choirs may edify us with an unfamiliar piece, when they might better aid the congregation in learning hymns and chants which could be used repeatedly.

In summary, I believe we need to communicate both the "Paradise on Earth"(vertical typology) and "paradise Restored" (horizontal) dimensions of worship. Somehow it must be communicated that when the worshippers enter the sanctuary they have momentarily left ordinary time and space. We really are in God's "house"! Although rooted in a different culture and spared the ravages of the Enlightenment and the iconoclastic tendencies of many Reformation churches, in my judgment, no church does this better today than eastern Orthodoxy. The reputed reaction of Vladimir's envoys from Kiev still rings true: in contrast to synagogues or mosques, the envoys reported that when they visited churches they felt uncertain whether they were on earth or in heaven. That such an external context is in the service of a theology which we could never own as "orthodox" is a reminder it cannot stand alone as a vehicle of a pure Gospel, but many aspects of it would certainly not detract, and would probably contribute and enrich, if properly explained and understood.

If the proper kind of "superhistoricality" is to be established, it must begin with the worshippers' realization that they are standing on "holy ground", that is, that they come as unworthy and unclean who have no right to enter except through confession and absolution (preferably private, but why not both?). A baptismal font situated in the narthex would constantly remind how and where we were first and must continuously be "reborn."

The architecture and furnishings of the church play a role. I love the biblical phrase, "the beauty of holiness" (Ps. 29:2; 96:9; I Cor. 16:29; II Cor. 20:21). There is a theoretical danger here of theatricality or of aestheticism, but I rate that danger as slight. Even the most makeshift worship space can be partially transformed by judicious use of banners. Vestments, paraments, stained glass windows (especially if a cryptographer is not needed to understand them) contribute. Candles signify Christ as "light of the world." Incense and chanting characterize something not of everyday time and space. A prominent crucifix highlights the "theology of the cross." (A bare cross will do, but not as well, and still reflects the Reformed iconoclasm which substituted them.) And whatever happened to statuary? Most of us will know of our older churches which almost unfailingly had at least a statue of Christ in the reredos, and often some or all of the apostles as well. The barren "less is more" ideal of the Reformed seems to have overtaken most of

our church architects, so that often few externals differentiate Lutheran from Protestant churches. And finally I feel strongly that “the abomination of desolation . . . standing in the holy place” (Matt. 24:15; cf. Mark 13:14), i.e., the American flag, should be expelled from the sanctuary. Perhaps so soon after 9/11 is not the time to emphasize it, but it signals a confusion of throne and altar, of civic religion and an awareness that our true citizenship is in heaven. If a church wishes to demonstrate its patriotism (which is surely not objectionable as such) the flag and other patriotic emblems can be displayed many other places on the church premises.

In discussing the text of the ordinary of the liturgy, I would concentrate on the Sanctus and the words which introduce it, “together with angels and archangels and all the company of heaven.” In the liturgy earth joins heaven to glorify God. Listen to the words of the *Te Deum*: “We praise you, O God, we acknowledge you to be the Lord; all the earth now worships you, the Father everlasting. To you all angels cry aloud, the heavens and all the powers therein; to you cherubim and seraphim continually do cry! Holy, holy, holy Lord, God of Sabaoth heaven and earth are full of the majesty of your glory. The glorious company of the apostles praise you; the goodly fellowship of the prophets praise you; the noble army of martyrs praise you; the holy church throughout all the world does acknowledge you. . . .”

Even if the liturgy of the Word is entirely spoken, I always personally feel let down if I do not hear the familiar chant tones at the beginning of the Anaphora (“rising”/”raising”), which almost immediately exhorts us to “*sursum corda”*, “lift *up* your hearts.” And the LCMS continues to impoverish itself by rejecting eucharistic prayers, as though we need to repristinate precisely the Reformation battles, and as though thoroughly evangelical ones could not be composed which would not compromise *solus Christus* and *sola gratia*. After a short doxology, most eucharistic prayers, in obedience to our Lord’s command in the Words of the Institution, in the anamnesis “remembers” not only Christ’s death and resurrection, but also his second coming (as though it were past), thus transposing the order of historical time and ushering us into transhistorical time. The form of most eucharistic prayers holds the whole history of salvation (including the Old Testament!) before the believer, suggesting by words or concepts taken from the Bible how the Bible is to be understood from Genesis to Revelation, from creation to “the time for establishing all that God spoke by the mouth of his holy prophets (apokatasta,sewj pa,ntwn [apokatastaseōs pantōn] Acts 3:21).

Isaiah heard the seraphic choir sing the Trisagion in the eighth century B.C. (Is. 6:1-3). And toward the end of the first century A.D. St. John sees four living creatures seated around the heavenly throne who "*never cease* to sing, 'Holy, holy, holy,'" (Rev. 4:8). The only possible non-rationalistic explanation for the similar reports is that the seraphim had been singing the hymn without interruption over the intervening 800 years. The prayers introducing the Sanctus emphasize that, if the angels praise God without ceasing, what they do is the *telos* toward which everything else tends. Singing the Sanctus will not someday be replaced by something else. They are words on loan from the heavenly choirs, and give us a sampling of what will occupy us throughout eternity. But already now they allow us to discern the intimate link between the worship we offer and the liturgy of eternity. Our present worship is a sort of apprenticeship for what is to come. Our faces are turned toward God, not toward society. Any instrumental approach to the liturgy, e.g., for outreach or for catechesis, misunderstands the doxological essence of what a vertical typology can teach us, that it is not primarily intended to edify man but to contemplate and thank the Triune God and what the Son came *down* to do "for us men and for our salvation."

Thus, the worshiper is reminded of the upper track of history of which we spoke earlier, of *real* history, and his thoughts are oriented toward the eschatological convergence of the two tracks into which the Savior is initiating us. And even someone who wanders in off the street might, pray God, sense that a double church is present (Origen), and through our "poor lisping, stammering tongues," might hear, if only as an echo in the distance, the thunderous sound of the church above joining the angels in singing, "holy, holy, holy". (Cf. R.Wilken, *Pro Ecclesia*, X, 4 (Fall, 2001), 460-474).