

Concordia Theological Quarterly



Volume 73:1

January 2009

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Editorial | 2 |
| Maintaining the Lifeline of the Church: Pastoral Education for the Ministry of Spirit with the Word John W. Kleinig..... | 3 |
| Two Kinds of Righteousness and Moral Philosophy: <i>Confessio Augustana</i> XVIII, Philipp Melanchthon, and Martin Luther Klaus Detlev Schulz | 17 |
| Vertical Typology and Christian Worship Horace D. Hummel | 41 |
| Darwin at 200 and the Challenge of Intelligent Design Paul A. Zimmerman..... | 61 |
| Research Notes | 76 |
| Was Junias a Female Apostle? Maybe Not Why Was Jesus with the Wild Beasts (Mark 1:13)? | |
| Theological Observer | 81 |
| Expelled The Death of a Christian: Membership Loss or Gain? | |
| Book Reviews | 83 |
| Books Received | 95 |

Spirit, Righteousness, Typology, and Creation

This issue contains a wide range of articles on themes that recur in theology. In our lead article, John Kleinig probes the importance of the Spirit's work through the word of God in the seminary curriculum. Seminary students and pastors can easily slip into understanding their use of God's word as "professional activity." Kleinig stresses the value of helping future pastors approach their life-long study of God's word in a devotional manner that sees it as the means by which the Spirit shapes and refreshes them for service in Christ's church.

Luther's teaching about "two kinds of righteousness" has been receiving more attention in recent years. Detlev Schulz's article examines this theme in both Luther and Melancthon. He demonstrates the unanimity that existed in their understanding of the first kind of righteousness (passive) but contrasts their respective understandings of the second kind of righteousness (active). Schulz stresses the kind of influence that moral philosophy had on the understanding of civil righteousness in both reformers, especially on Melancthon's teaching of ethics as a rational pursuit of individual precepts.

When we hear talk of "biblical typology," we typically think of its horizontal dimension (e.g., creation to new creation). Horace Hummel contributes an article on vertical typology, namely the patterning that exists in biblical texts between heavenly reality ("up there") and earthly reality ("down here"). He focuses especially on the vertical typology evident in Old Testament texts about worship and then applies what is learned to understanding Christian worship.

Although Paul Zimmerman is known in our circles primarily for his service as the president of our colleges in Seward, Ann Arbor, and River Forest, he is also respected for his long-standing defense of the Genesis account of creation. In light of the publicity that Charles Darwin's 200th birthday will generate, Zimmerman has used his training in both theology and biology to challenge the theory of evolution once again. Not only does his article revisit Darwin and evolution, but it also engages the most recent research on intelligent design. These subjects resurface in Adam Francisco's discussion of the movie *Expelled* in the Theological Observer section.

Readers will notice a new section in this issue of CTQ entitled **Research Notes** (pp. 76-80). These and future contributions will be brief summaries of recent research that may be of interest to our readers. We hope these notes enrich your continued study of theology.

The Editors

Vertical Typology and Christian Worship

Horace D. Hummel

“Typology” is a word that is anything but unknown in Lutheran circles, though it is not one of the more familiar words. 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 Old Testament to New Testament, although a little of it occurs within the Old Testament itself. Some mere analogy must be present, but the subject must also be performative, not only reiterating but also recapitulating and consummating it.¹

Thus, typology parallels or is the other side of the coin to prophecy. In a broader use of the term, it might even be considered a subdivision of prophecy. With “prophecy” we usually think of verbalizations, that is, 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 New Testament.² The usual language is type and antitype, corresponding to prophecy and fulfillment respectively. Inevitably the two overlap at times.

This correspondence is analogous 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

¹ For a brief description of “recapitulation” in Irenaeus, see Justo L. Gonzalez, *A History of Christian Doctrine*, vol. 1, *From the Beginnings to the Council of Chalcedon*, rev. ed. (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1987), 165-168.

² Inevitably, Augustine’s famous aphorism comes to mind: “The New Testament is latent in the Old: the Old is patent in the New [*In Vetere Novum latet et in Novo Vetus patet!*]”; see *Quaestiones in Heptateuchum* 2.83, quoted in Saint Augustine, *Concerning the City of God against the Pagans*, trans. Henry Bettenson (London and New York: Penguin Books, 2003), 211 n. 76.

Horace D. Hummel is Professor Emeritus at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri and has served as a Lecturer in Old Testament at the Lutheran Seminary in Novosibirsk, Russia. He resides in Escondido, California.

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 unanimity in the proper definition of typology. Some of the difference arises from the nature of the Scriptures or exegetical theology which does not express itself in abstractions. Even the word τύπος [*typus*] is used some fifteen times in the New Testament and twice in the Septuagint of the Old Testament, but in varying senses.³ In his preface to his Psalms commentary, Franz Delitzsch calls the life of David a *vaticinium reale* of Christ.⁴ 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 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 Paul, especially in Galatians 4:21–31 where it is used of Sarah and Hagar. Probably the best introduction to, and survey of, patristic use of typology is Jean Daniélou’s *Sacramentum Futuri*, translated into English under the title *From Shadows to Reality*.⁵ Daniélou has other important works in this area, perhaps most significantly *The Bible and the Liturgy*.⁶ When one reads these books, however, especially the first, it is often hard to distinguish what we would call “allegory” from “typology.” It is usually agreed that Pauline and patristic “allegory” ultimately differs radically from the type used by Philo, usually called

³ The Hebrew תְּבִיטָה is used twenty times in the Old Testament but is translated differently.

⁴ C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, *Commentary on the Old Testament*, vol. 5, *Psalms*, trans. Francis Bolton (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1866-91; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1996), 41. Citation is from the Hendrickson edition.

⁵ Jean Daniélou, *Sacramentum Futuri: Études sur les Origines de la Typologie Biblique* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1950); *From Shadows to Reality: Studies in the Biblical Typology of the Fathers*, trans. Wulstan Hibberd (London: Burns & Oates, 1960). The English title uses biblical language, but, regrettably, loses the “sacramental” dimension, that is, efficaciousness through some external element.

⁶ Jean Daniélou, *Bible et Liturgie: La Théologie Biblique des Sacraments et des Fêtes D’après les Pères de l’Église* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1951); *The Bible and the Liturgy* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1956).

“symbolic” versus 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 church 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 common talk about 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. Yet to speak of a “mystical sense” of Scripture would, if anything, probably suggest some sort of esoteric allegory or “mysticism” as a theological posture.⁷

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 first inspired the sacred text and who in word and sacrament brings it out of the remoteness of ancient history. Yet 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.” 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, then a label will have to be found for this position. “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. Since Yahweh is taken as constantly guiding history toward its Messianic goal, not merely occasionally bestirring himself to intervene (although certain events and

⁷ It is worth noting that some of the theologians of Lutheran orthodoxy, most notably Abraham Calov (1612-1686), did speak of a *sensus mysticus*, which he subdivided into allegorical, typical, and parabolic senses. See also Benjamin T. G. Mayes, “The Mystical Sense of Scripture According to Johann Jacob Rambach,” *CTQ* 72 (2008): 45-70.

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 Old Testament is often quoted very freely in the New Testament, why it usually follows the Septuagint 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 Old Testament is prophetic (consider the phrase “prophetic and apostolic Scriptures”), and in the same broad sense all of it is typological, all of it christological, all of it eschatological, and so forth. 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 focus on grace, not works, and both center in Jesus Christ.

I. Typology Since the Reformation

It is beneficial also to take a brief look at the history of typology in more recent times, especially since the Reformation. The study on prophecy and typology from the Commission on Theology and Church Relations (CTCR) of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod (LCMS) is extensively documented.⁸ Contrary to what some have thought, it demonstrates the extent to which Martin Luther used typology throughout his life. It includes a couple of quotations from the Apology of the Augsburg Confession to show how sympathetic the confessors, as a whole, were to the broader typological reading of the Old Testament.⁹ It uses not only the word *typus*, but also *umbra* (σκιά) and *imago* (εἰκών) to describe the relation of the two testaments to one another. Abraham Calov (1612–1686) was only one of the theologians of Lutheran Orthodoxy who discussed the topic.¹⁰

One is not surprised that Rationalism and Pietism did not concern themselves much with the subject, although honorable mention should be given to Johann Albrecht Bengel (1687–1752), who especially with his *Gnomon Novi Testamenti* is often hailed as one of the forerunners of

⁸ Commission on Theology and Church Relations, “Appendix R3-01A: Prophecy and Typology,” in The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, *Convention Workbook: Reports and Overtures, 60th Regular Convention* (St. Louis: The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, 1998), 57–61, <http://www.lcms.org/graphics/assets/media/CTCR/Prophecy%20and%20Typology.pdf> [all page numbers are from the *Convention Workbook*].

⁹ Ap IV, 395; VII, VIII; XXIV, 36, 37, 53; see “Prophecy and Typology,” 58.

¹⁰ “Prophecy and Typology,” 58.

Heilsgeschichte, a viewpoint with many affinities to typology.¹¹ 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 Johannes Cocceius’ work.¹² Some later works from this school were more moderate, perhaps especially Patrick Fairbairn (1805–1874), whose *The Typology of Scripture* remains useful if used with discretion.¹³

Higher criticism naturally dismissed typology as an antiquated approach. Little attention was paid to the subject in those circles until the rise of so-called “biblical theology” under neo-orthodox auspices after the two world wars. Its endorsement by giants in the field like Walter Eichrodt and Gerhard 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.¹⁴

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 D. C. G. Hoffman (1703–1774), entitled *Institutiones Theologiae Exegeticae*, which was used as a hermeneutics text during Walther’s presidency and which devotes some twenty pages to the proper interpretation of types.¹⁵ Later LCMS exegetes, however, probably reacting to the increasing threat of historical-critical scholarship, took a dim view of the subject.¹⁶ 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,

¹¹ Johann Albrecht Bengel, *Gnomon Novi Testamenti* [*Exegetical Annotations on the New Testament*] (Tübingen: Henr. Philippi Schrammii, 1742). The *Heilsgeschichte* viewpoint was developed by Daniélou (See n.4 and 5.) and also Oscar Cullmann, *Salvation in History*, trans. Sidney G. Sowers (New York: Harper & Row, 1967).

¹² *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, 3rd ed., s.v. “Cocceius, Johannes.”

¹³ Patrick Fairbairn, *The Typology of Scripture: Viewed in Connection with the Whole Series of the Divine Dispensations*, 2 vols. (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1911).

¹⁴ On Walter Eichrodt (1890–1978) and Gerhard von Rad (1901–1971), see James K. Mead, *Biblical Theology: Issues, Methods, and Themes* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2007), 42–44.

¹⁵ Carl Gottlob Hoffman, *Institutiones Theologiae Exegeticae in Usum Academicarum Praelectionum Adornatae* (St. Louis: Ex Officina Synodi Missouriensis Lutheranae, [1876]). Its title refers to “Methods/Principles of Exegetical Theology.”

¹⁶ For example, Georg Stoeckhardt, *Christ in Old Testament Prophecy*, trans. Erwin W. Koehlinger (Fort Wayne, IN: Concordia Theological Seminary Press, 1984), and Theodore Ferdinand Karl Laetsch, *Bible Commentary: Jeremiah* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1952).

interestingly, the Wisconsin Synod tended toward a more positive view of the subject, evidenced especially in August Pieper's *Isaiah II*.¹⁷ Only in very recent times has typology become more familiar in the LCMS, although not without opposition.

II. The Biblical Evidence for Vertical Typology

The word "typology" usually occurs with reference to its horizontal aspect, and little attention is paid 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." Yet conscious, explicit neglect of the vertical aspect runs the risk of thinking of God as purely immanent, part of the historical process, and subject to our manipulation as "co-creators."¹⁸

How then does the vertical intersect with the horizontal? An illustration—poor though it be—may be helpful. It is 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, while "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 שפט (usually translated "judge/judgment") refers not only to condemnation, as it tends to be heard (although often enough that is the application), but simply to decisions or verdicts of the heavenly court. These apply not only to the "justification" of the individual (צדק שפט) but to the right ordering, as he wills it, of the entire universe. As Dorothy Sayers put it, the resurrection "is the only thing that has ever really happened."¹⁹ 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 the illustration, the two parallel tracks begin or first diverge at the fall and do not converge again until the parousia. The language of

¹⁷ August Pieper, *Isaiah II: An Exposition of Isaiah 40–66*, trans. Erwin E. Kowalke (Milwaukee, WI: Northwestern Publishing House, 1979).

¹⁸ 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.

¹⁹ Dorothy L. Sayers, *A Man Born to Be King: A Play-Cycle on the Life of Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ* (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1990), 290.

verticality (heaven as “up” and earth as “down”) 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 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 (πῑπ).²⁰ Various theologoumena are used when God intervenes more personally. For lack of a better term, these may be called “hypostases,” because they are all manifestations of the pre-incarnate Christ/λόγος ἄσαρκος, that is, ways in which he was “incarnationally” present on earth before the incarnation itself. Besides “word” used in that sense, there are other terms such as the “angel of Yahweh” (when paralleled with Yahweh himself), “name,” “glory,” “spirit,” and “wisdom.” All these are understood 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.

III. Warfare and Vertical Typology

The subsidiary area of warfare is considered first. It is all but certain that the epithet “Sabaoth,” which so often follows the divine name, is probably best translated “armies.” “Lord of Hosts” is archaic, and the “Lord God of pow’r and might” of *Lutheran Book of Worship*, *Lutheran Worship*, and *Lutheran Service Book* is an unacceptable paraphrase because it replaces a very concrete word with two abstractions.²¹ Already in the

²⁰ E.g., Gen 15:1; 2 Sam 7:4, 17; 1 Chr 17:3, 15; Ezek 1:1-3; 7:1, 13.

²¹ This phrase appears in three settings for Holy Communion in *Lutheran Book of Worship* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1978), 69, 89, 110; in *Divine Service II* in *Lutheran Worship* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1982), 170, 189; and in the first two settings for the Divine Service in *Lutheran Service Book* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 2006), 161, 178.

"Song of the Sea," Yahweh is described as a "man of war" (Exod 15:3). 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 BC, 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. It used to be that the term "holy war" was spoken freely, but its use by radical Muslims to translate *jihad* has led to the substitution of "Yahweh's war."

A few examples illustrate the concept. In Joshua 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 2 Kings 6 when Elisha's servant is frightened by the Syrian armies that 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" (2 Kgs 6:17). In Daniel 9-10, the angel Gabriel makes Daniel wait twenty-one 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. 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 cease in the New Testament 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 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, seem to be better reflected in Easter hymns and liturgies than in Easter preaching. Here is one more example: When the seventy return rejoicing from their missionary journey in Luke's Gospel, our Lord's exclamation is: "I saw Satan fall like lightning from heaven" (Luke 10:18).

IV. Worship and Vertical Typology

In turning to verticality in the area of worship, the realm of warfare should not be left behind too hastily. The role of Urim and Thummim, held in the high-priest's breastpiece, often were to give battle instructions. The book of Psalms picks up the theme of conflict and often celebrates at various points the victory God has given or will give. 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 (2 Kings 3), and the Chronicler often writes a sort of eschatological history, eternity already invading time. For example, in 2 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. In the New Testament, Revelation 4 ushers us into a worship scene, but what unfolds in apocalyptic language is martial to the core.

Much biblical parenthesis uses battle metaphors, perhaps most famously 1 Thessalonians 5:8: "Put on the breastplate of faith and love and for a helmet the hope of salvation." Both *Lutheran Worship* and *Lutheran Service Book* have an entire section captioned "the church militant," the former beginning with "A Mighty Fortress."²² Thoughtless use of war and worship language might produce the ultimate oxymoron, or even encourage some jingoistic 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 (1 Tim 6:12; cf. 2 Tim 4:7).

At the center of the verticality of Old Testament 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 altars, and never is there any real discussion of their significance as such. The Hebrew word *מִזְבֵּחַ* is purely functional in meaning, signifying simply a place for sacrifice. There are plausible arguments suggesting that 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 *הַרְהָאֵל*, "mountain of God," written as one word (Ezek 43:15-16), and may be an alternate form of the enigmatic *אֲרִיאֵל* applied to Jerusalem in Isaiah 29:1 (traditionally often translated "lion of God," which makes no sense in the context, whereas "mountain of God" might). This is partly speculation, and, if so, the Bible never develops the idea. It may belong

²² For the hymns on the church militant, see *Lutheran Worship*, #297-305, and *Lutheran Service Book*, #655-669 ("A Mighty Fortress" is #656). There was no separate section for the church militant in *The Lutheran Hymnal* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1941); "A Mighty Fortress" (#262) was among the hymns listed under the heading of "Reformation."

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 opere operata*, but in prospect of Christ's all-availing sacrifice. It is repeatedly described as a "pleasing smell" to God—language that 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 New Testament, 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 פֶּלֶא ("wonder/miracle/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 Old Testament mention of altars concerns those in the tabernacle/temple.²³ 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. 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 שָׁכַן of Yahweh's "incarnational" presence on earth (consider the derivative noun, "Shekinah," sometimes used later of Christ and/or the Holy Spirit) and a different verb, יָשַׁב, 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, in Exodus 25–30, God commands Moses in some detail how to construct the tabernacle and its appurtenances (imperatives =

²³ I shall treat these two structures together, because, except for dimensions, they are virtually identical.

“prescriptive”) and then, in Exodus 35–40, repeats almost verbatim how Moses obeyed (indicative = “descriptive”).

That entire section is introduced, however, by the command that the construction of the tabernacle should follow the תבנית, the pattern, that God will show him (Exod 25:9). The command is repeated in Exodus 25:40. The word, a derivative of בנה, “build,” is usually translated “pattern,” “model,” or “blueprint.” Use of the word “see,” however, indicates a vision of a completed structure, not merely a blueprint. The Septuagint renders it with τύπος. Just how the heavenly counterpart of the tabernacle and all its components would look or function on the second story defies human comprehension and simply must be put in the “anthropomorphic” category.

That, however, 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. That is why 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 (1 Chr 28:19; strangely absent from the Kings text). 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 τύπος, although Hebrews uses τύπος for the heavenly model and αντίτυπος for the earthly copy (the latter also called ὑπόδειγμα, “image,” and σκιά, “shadow”). Other references appear in the OT Apocrypha and OT 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).²⁴ The eternal significance of the “city of God,” as Augustine called it, is never explicitly expressed in typological terms, but

²⁴ Compare the fair number of contemporary churches called “Zion,” but none “Jerusalem,” to the best of my knowledge.

Augustine called it, 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. 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 *קְבוּד*, God's "incarnational presence" in the city. When the *קְבוּד* forsakes the city and resides on the Mount of Olives (Ezekiel 11), Jerusalem is only another city of wood and stone, ripe for destruction. Yet God's promises will not be permanently thwarted. In Ezekiel 43, it is prophesied that the *קְבוּד* 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 (Matt 16:18).

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. For example, consider Psalm 46 with its "river," the starting point of "A Mighty Fortress," or Psalm 48's "in the far north." Some other hymns follow them, for example, "Glorious Things of Thee Are Spoken."²⁵

Does this really change in the New Testament? "Jerusalem" loses its physical or geographical sense, but as "Zion" it still remains the "navel" or "center" of the whole earth in a theological sense.²⁶ Jesus often tells his unconvinced disciples that he "must" (*δεῖ*) go up to Jerusalem; *ἀνάγκη*, "necessity," 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 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 Old Testament ordinances were commanded to be performed *לְעוֹלָם*, "forever," but Christ is the *עוֹלָם*, the essence of time and space, virtually *עוֹלָם* itself, and so he becomes the climactic and pivotal sacrifice.

²⁵ "Glorious Things of Thee Are Spoken," *The Lutheran Hymnal*, #469; in *Lutheran Worship*, #294, and *Lutheran Service Book*, #648, "You" replaced "Thee" in the title.

²⁶ Mediaeval cartographers often depicted Jerusalem as the center of the whole earth.

The tendency to present the antitypes (and the fulfillment) as though they “dead-end” in Christ is unfortunate. In one sense, however, it is proper and an essential part of the gospel: τετέλεσται! Easter was the τέλος. In principle, there is no more to come. Apart from this “omega point,” typology would have no anchor or ultimate referent. There is also the “not yet.” Even the AD calendar expresses the “now-but-not-yet” paradox. The Church awaits a “second coming,” although in the New Testament itself the distinction is semi-artificial. The “end of the ages” (τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων) has come upon Christians (1 Cor 10:11), but the day and hour of the end no one knows. This paradox is also expressed in the Old Testament: prophecies which were fulfilled in Christ and those still awaited are often telescoped or juxtaposed.

While this may be playing with words somewhat, it is also part of the gospel that these promises are “fulfilled” in the Church. This is the role usually associated with the Holy Spirit, who buries the Christian with Christ into his death in the waters of Baptism and nurtures that new life in preaching and the Eucharist. In Christ, he brings the church out of Egypt, “the house of bondage,” and through the wilderness of the futile “search for God” to Zion, although from another perspective the journey is not yet complete. Hebrews 12:12 emphasizes the “already”: “You *have* come to Mount 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, Paul has something like this in mind when he counsels that a woman at worship should have a veil on her head “because of the angels” (1 Cor 11:2–16).²⁷ Similarly in Galatians 4:25–31, Paul writes that home is in the Jerusalem above, which is free, and she is our mother; we, like Isaac, are children of promise.²⁸

There is still another phase of the fulfillment: “the fulfillment of the fulfillment,” the consummation, the second coming, the parousia. As mentioned, Old Testament Messianic and eschatological prophecies demand the inclusion of this final dimension. This is not a theme which suffers from overuse in the Church’s preaching, not even at the end of the church year (a sort of liturgical “type” of the second coming), or in Advent,

²⁷ See the “angels” of the seven churches in Revelation 1–3, possibly patrons or guardians and reflected in traditional names of churches.

²⁸ 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 (ירושלם), although the consonanted text has the *yodh* of the dual ending only 5 times, mostly in very late texts, and the Septuagint plainly heard the Kethiv’s *-ēmi* ending as reflected in the New Testament and virtually all other non-Hebraic texts.

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 human 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 one does not, in good Protestant fashion, misunderstand the New Testament descriptions of the church as the "body of Christ" as mere metaphors, then it will be easier to understand and resist merely institutional or individualistic understandings of what "church" means. Likewise with *κοινωνία* or fellowship. Likewise also with "land"; the Church has no "holy land" in the literal sense as fulfillment of Old Testament land prophecies, but rather a "kingdom," for which she prays constantly in the second petition of the Lord's Prayer. Ironically, one never has difficulty with "land" when heaven is its antitype. Bodies are described as temples of the Holy Spirit (1 Cor 6:15) or "lively stones" (1 Pet 2:4). Logical priority is given to the *Christus pro nobis* (justification), but not at the expense of the *Christus in nobis* (the "mystical union"). When all is fulfilled, John on Patmos sees "the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down 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" (Rev 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 churches. Architecturally little is known of altars in the earliest Christianity, but the New Testament clearly uses the word as a virtual synonym of church. In 1 Corinthians 10:18-22, the "cup/table of the Lord" is contrasted with meat sacrificed on pagan altars. Similarly, Hebrews 13:10 says "we have an altar" in contrast to pagan sacrifices. In Revelation chapters 6, 8, and 9, John uses tabernacle/temple language, but the application is plainly to the New Testament, where a heavenly temple is pictured as continuing to be a *תִּבְנִיַת*, a *τῦπος* 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.²⁹ 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. The basic shape of that liturgy has endured now some two millennia with surprisingly little change. Few, indeed, are the individuals with both the biblical-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 Formula of Concord 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 X, 7).

V. Application to Christian Worship

The application of biblical principles to Christian worship today is no easy task. First, whatever might be the merit of suggestions made in the abstract, it is the pastors on the front lines who will have to test and implement them. Second, 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. Then there are the special problems posed by ethnic groups, the number of which, at least in 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, 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 is bound to be culture-creating,³⁰ although, undoubtedly, with some adiaphorous influences from the national or ethnic culture. An example is Russia, where the Lutheran churches follow the traditional liturgy quite faithfully, but where chanting and incense do not pose the problems they would in the United States. The elements of the liturgy –

²⁹ I personally prefer an eastward altar with its “sacramental” and “sacrificial” postures because of the explicit reverence shown to our Lord 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.

³⁰ Jaroslav Jan Pelikan referred to tradition as “the living faith of the dead”; see *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine*, vol. 1, *The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971), 9.

and, in some cases, *The Lutheran Hymnal* (TLH) simply translated—are not all that impossible to introduce, although one must “make haste slowly.”

To really address the problems of the erosion or perversion of worship it is necessary to take another look at the 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 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. This is in glaring contrast to the great amount of attention paid to homiletics, which is not to be criticized as such but only the gross imbalance. No wonder that when the liturgy of the Saxon German services disappeared, there was a great vacuum. For a time TLH 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. The Roman Catholic Church seems to have considerable success with its “Rite of Christian Initiation for Adults” (RCIA) program, where other adult members serve as “sponsors” until the initiate is ready for confirmation. This program has rarely been adopted by Lutherans. The Lutheran educational system could be used to better 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 with an unfamiliar piece when they might better aid the congregation in learning hymns and chants which could be used repeatedly.

In summary, the church needs to communicate better 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. Christians 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, no church does this better today than the Eastern Orthodox Church. 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 Lutherans 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, both private and corporate. A baptismal font situated in the narthex would constantly remind how and where the Christian was first and must be continuously "reborn."

The architecture and furnishings of the church play a role. There is much to love in the biblical phrase "the beauty of holiness" (Pss 29:2, 96:9; 1 Cor 16:29; 2 Cor 20:21). There is a theoretical danger here of theatricality or of aestheticism, but that danger is slight. Even the most makeshift worship space can be partially transformed by judicious use of banners. Vestments, paraments, and 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. Many will know of 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 Lutheran church architects, so that often few externals differentiate Lutheran from Protestant churches. Finally, "the abomination of desolation . . . standing in the holy place" (Matt 24:15; see Mark 13: 14), that is, 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—an unobjectionable idea 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, one should 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. The *Te Deum* expresses this well:

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 pow'rs 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. . . .³¹

Even if the Service of the Word is entirely spoken, the familiar chant tones at the beginning of the Anaphora ("rising"/"raising"), which almost immediately exhorts us to "*sursum corda*," "lift up your hearts," are uplifting. The LCMS continues to impoverish itself by rejecting eucharistic prayers, as though it needs to reprimarize 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 the Lord's command in the Words of Institution, "remember" not only Christ's death and resurrection but also his second coming (as though it were past) in the anamnesis, thus transposing the order of historical time and ushering the congregation 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" (Acts 3:21; ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων).

Isaiah heard the seraphic choir sing the Trisagion in the eighth century BC (Isa 6:1-3), and toward the end of the first century AD John saw 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 eight hundred 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 a sampling

³¹ *Lutheran Service Book*, 223.

of what will occupy the church throughout eternity. Already now they allow Christians to discern the intimate link between the worship offered on earth and the liturgy of eternity. The present worship of the Christian on earth is a sort of apprenticeship for what is to come. Faces are turned toward God, not toward society. Any instrumental approach to the liturgy, for example, for outreach or for catechesis, misunderstands the doxological essence of what a vertical typology can teach, 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 *real* history, and his thoughts are oriented toward the eschatological convergence of the two tracks into which the savior initiates him. Even someone who wanders in off the street might, pray God, sense that a double church is present,³² and through the “poor lisping, stammering tongues” of the congregation 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.”³³

³² Origen speaks of a “double church” of men and angels in *On Prayer* 31.5 in *Origen: An Exhortation to Martyrdom, Prayer and Selected Works*, trans. Rowan A. Greer, *The Classics of Western Spirituality* (New York: Paulist Press, 1979), 167.

³³ See, Robert Louis Wilken, “With Angels and Archangels,” *Pro Ecclesia* 10 (2001): 460–474.

