

# **Open Church and Closed Worship?:**

A Practical Theological Study of the Dialectic Relationship

Between Fear and Hospitality in Worship

By

**Daewoong Lim**



Thesis Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of Master of Theology

at the University of Stellenbosch

Department of Practical Theology

Supervised by

**Professor Johan H. Cilliers**

**December 2012**

## **DECLARATION**

By submitting this thesis electronically, I declare that the entirety of the work contained therein is my own, original work, that I am the owner of the copyright thereof (unless to the extent explicitly otherwise stated) and that I have not previously in its entirety or in part submitted it for obtaining any qualification.

Date : December 2012

## ABSTRACT

In the rites of Christian worship, various aspects are operated, and some of them seem to have opposite attributes that cannot exist at the same place and be performed at the same time. Since all the aspects are so important to worship, we cannot over-stress or exclude either one of them. The relationships between the aspects being confronted with cause tensions in worship. The aim of this thesis is to synthesize these tensions, esp. concerning fear and hospitality in worship.

Fear and hospitality cannot be expressed with one perspective, because they in themselves have various aspects. Fear of God has a dimension of *Mysterium Tremendum* but, at the same time, it has a dimension of *Fascinatum*. Hospitality also has two dimensions: of God and of human beings. Thus, what is significant is to relieve the tension between fear and hospitality and the tension implied in themselves. To accomplish this goal, we endeavour to find the agent for the synthesizing the two aspects in worship so that they can stand in a dialectical relationship. We apply a Christological approach and pneumatological insights for this task. In Jesus a negative dimension of fear of God can be altered to hospitality of God while still grabbing a positive sense of fear of God in worship. Therefore, In Jesus fear and hospitality is synthesized. This synthesizing is different from blending or balancing fear and hospitality in worship just in quantity and quality for they cannot relieve the tensions.

Lastly, we deal with a matter of opening and closing as a pragmatic task. The church and worship can be open for God's hospitality, but at the same time they are closed to some for fear of God. Opening or closing in itself cannot be the solution for this contradiction. The answer for the matter of opening and closing lies in a dialectical relationship between fear and hospitality in Jesus Christ, because in Him all the tensions are relieved.

## OPSOMMING

In die rituele van Christelike aanbidding is verskeie elemente aan die werk, en dit wil voorkom asof sommige hiervan teenoorgestelde eienskappe het wat nie gelyktydig kan bestaan of uitgevoer kan word nie. Aangesien al die aspekte so belangrik is vir aanbidding, kan ons nie een van hulle oorbeklemtoon of uitsluit nie. Die verhoudings tussen die elemente gee aanleiding tot spanninge. Die doel van hierdie tesis is om die spanninge te sintetiseer, veral wat betref vrees en gasvryheid in aanbidding.

Vrees en gasvryheid kan nie met een perspektief uitgedruk word nie omdat hulle uit verskeie aspekte bestaan. Vrees vir God het 'n dimensie van *Mysterium Tremendum*, maar terselfdertyd ook 'n dimensie van *Fascinosum*. Gasvryheid het ook twee dimensies: van God en van die mens. Dit is dus betekenisvol om die spanning tussen vrees en gasvryheid en die spanning binne dié aspekte te verlig. Om hierdie doel te bereik, probeer ons om die agent te vind vir die sintese van die twee aspekte in aanbidding, sodat hulle in 'n dialektiese verhouding tot mekaar kan staan. Ons wend 'n Christologiese benadering en pneumatologiese insigte vir hierdie taak aan. In Jesus kan 'n negatiewe dimensie van vrees verander word in die gasvryheid van God, terwyl die positiewe sin van die vrees vir God in aanbidding beklemtoon word. Vrees en gasvryheid word in Jesus gesintetiseer. Hierdie sintetisering verskil van die vermenging of die balansering van vrees en gasvryheid in aanbidding in die hoeveelheid en kwaliteit omdat hulle nie die spanning kan verlig nie.

Ten slotte, behandel ons die aspekte van opening en sluiting as 'n pragmatiese taak. Die Kerk en aanbidding kan oop wees vir God se gasvryheid, maar op dieselfde tyd is hulle vir sommige geslote weens 'n vrees vir God. Om oop te maak of om te sluit kan op sigself nie die oplossing vir hierdie teenstrydigheid wees nie. Die antwoord vir opening en sluiting lê net in 'n dialektiese verhouding tussen vrees en gasvryheid in Jesus Christus, want in Hom is al die spanninge verlig.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I glorify God the Trinity who is the subject and the object of our worship. His grace leads me not to fall into the worldly thought when I write about God.

It was also God's providence to meet two mentors for this work: Prof Bethel Müller and Prof Johan Cilliers. Meeting two prominent scholars and studying under them was a wonderful experience. Whenever I had a theological bias and prejudice, they kindly, enthusiastically, and continuously, gave me sound advice and helped me maintain a balanced view.

Thanks to supporters in Korea: My mother and brother, father-in-law, mother-in-law, and sister-in-law (though she is in U.S.A.) for their support and devotion; Rev Geundoo Jung and Ulsan Presbyterian Church members for their spiritual and financial support; and many personal supporters. Also thanks to friends in South Africa: Fellowship Group and Music Ministry members in Christ Church for their prayers and encouragements; Mr Derrick Benson and Mrs Mariana Nesbitt who helped correct the English.

I am indebted to my precious family with whom I have not spent enough time as a husband and a father. Thus I am grateful to my son Yesong, daughter Yejin, and my wife Jiyoung Shim for their love and patience. Without them I could have not done this work.

Be the glory to God the Father through the Son Jesus Christ in the Holy Spirit evermore!

## ABBREVIATION

<i>ANF</i>	Ante-Nicene Fathers
<i>BDAG</i>	Bauer, W [1957] 2000. <i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> . rev by Danker, W F, Arndt, W F & Gingrich, W F. 3rd edition. Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press.
<i>BDB</i>	Brown, F, Driver, S & Briggs, C 2000. <i>The Brown-Drive-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon: with an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic</i> . Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers.
<i>CD</i>	Barth, K 1956-1975. <i>Church Dogmatics</i> , 4 vols. tr by Parker, T H L et al. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
<i>ESV</i>	English Standard Version
<i>Inst.</i>	Calvin, J 2006. <i>Institutes of the Christian Religion</i> , 2 Vols. reissued. tr by Battles, F L. ed by McNeill, J T. <i>The Library of Christian Classics</i> . Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
<i>KJV</i>	King James Version
<i>LW</i>	Luther, M 1960-1974. <i>Luther's Works</i> , 55 Vols. Palikan, J (for vols 1-30) & Lehmann H T (for vols 31-55) (eds). Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
<i>NIV</i>	New International Version

*NPNF 2nd* Schaff, P & Wace, H (eds) 1999. *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series*,  
14 Vols. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers.

*RSV* Revised Standard Version

## TABLE OF THE CONTENTS

DECLARATION	I
ABSTRACT	II
OPSOMMING	III
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	IV
ABBREVIATION	V
TABLE OF THE CONTENTS	VII

### CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1. BACKGROUND	1
1.2. PROBLEM STATEMENT	4
1.3. AIMS	6
1.4. HYPOTHESIS	7
1.5. METHODOLOGY	8
1.5.1. THE DESCRIPTIVE-EMPIRICAL TASK	9
1.5.2. THE INTERPRETIVE TASK	9
1.5.3. THE NORMATIVE TASK	10
1.5.4. THE PRAGMATIC TASK	12

### CHAPTER 2 FEAR AND HOSPITALITY OF GOD AND WORSHIP: *THE DESCRIPTIVE-EMPIRICAL TASK*

2.1. INTRODUCTION	14
2.2. GOD: FEAR AND HOSPITALITY	15
2.2.1. FEAR OF GOD	15



2.2.2. HOSPITALITY OF GOD-----	18
<b>2.3. FEAR: <i>MYSTERIUM TREMENDUM ET FASCINOSUM</i>-----</b>	<b>20</b>
2.3.1. THE <i>NUMINOUS</i> ACCORDING TO RUDOLF OTTO -----	20
2.3.1.1. The <i>Numinous</i> as <i>Mysterium Tremendum</i> -----	22
2.3.1.2. The <i>Numinous</i> as <i>Fascinatum</i> -----	24
2.3.2. AWE ACCORDING TO ABRAHAM JOSHUA HESCHEL -----	25
2.3.2.1. Awe as Tremor -----	26
2.3.2.2. Awe as Fascination-----	26
<b>2.4. HOSPITALITY: OF HUMAN BEINGS AND OF GOD-----</b>	<b>27</b>
2.4.1. HOSPITALITY AND INTIMACY-----	28
2.4.2. HOSPITALITY AND WORSHIP -----	29
<b>2.5. WORSHIP: FEAR AND CELEBRATION -----</b>	<b>32</b>
2.5.1. GOD’S OVERWHELMING PRESENCE -----	33
2.5.2. WORSHIP AS A CELEBRATION OF THE CHRIST EVENT -----	35
2.5.2.1. Worship and Feast-----	35
2.5.2.2. Celebration of Jesus with Fourfold Order -----	36
2.5.2.3. Celebration of Jesus with Bodily Action as a Response to Fear-----	38
<b>2.6. CONCLUSION -----</b>	<b>39</b>

**CHAPTER 3**  
**HISTORICAL OCCURRENCE OF**  
**FEAR AND HOSPITALITY IN WORSHIP:**  
***THE INTERPRETIVE TASK***

<b>3.1. INTRODUCTION -----</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>3.2. THE EARLY CHURCH: ESCHATOLOGICAL FEAR-----</b>	<b>42</b>
3.2.1. WORSHIP IN FEAR OF THE ROMAN PERSECUTION-----	42
3.2.2. WORSHIP IN FEAR OF GOD WITH ESCHATOLOGICAL HOPE: MARTYROLOGY -----	44
3.2.3. WORSHIP IN FEAR OF GOD WITH ESCHATOLOGICAL INVOCATION: <i>MARANATHA</i> -----	45
3.2.4. EVALUATION -----	46
<b>3.3. UNDER CONSTANTINE’S RULE: OFFICIAL HOSPITALITY -----</b>	<b>47</b>
3.3.1. FROM THE PERSECUTION TO THE OFFICIAL THEOLOGY -----	48
3.3.2. THE RESULT OF BECOMING OFFICIAL RELIGION – CONSTRAINED WORSHIP -----	49
3.3.3. THE RESULT OF BECOMING OFFICIAL RELIGION – WORSHIP FOR BETTER CAREER -----	50

3.3.4. THE RESULT OF BECOMING OFFICIAL RELIGION – WORSHIP IN THE EMPEROR’S SPLENDID BUILDING ----	51
3.3.5. EVALUATION -----	52
<b>3.4. THE MEDIEVAL AGE: PRETENDED FEAR -----</b>	<b>53</b>
3.4.1. PRETENDED FEAR IN A HIERARCHICAL SYSTEM-----	53
3.4.2. PRETENDED FEAR IN LUXURIOUS OUTWARD-----	55
3.4.3. EVALUATION -----	56
<b>3.5. THE REFORMATION: INVITATING HOSPITALITY -----</b>	<b>56</b>
3.5.1. THE WORD OF GOD-----	57
3.5.1.1. The Restoration of the Sermon as the Core of Worship -----	57
3.5.1.2. The Sermon in Vernacular-----	59
3.5.2. HYMNS -----	60
3.5.3. THE PRIESTHOOD OF ALL BELIEVERS -----	62
3.5.4. EVALUATION -----	63
<b>3.6. AFTER THE REFORMATION: LOST AND FINDING HOSPITALITY -----</b>	<b>63</b>
3.6.1. LOST HOSPITALITY-----	64
3.6.1.1. Too Didactic Worship-----	64
3.6.1.2. Lack of Communion -----	65
3.6.1.3. Lack of Participation -----	67
3.6.2. NEW CHALLENGES FOR HOSPITALITY IN WORSHIP -----	67
3.6.2.1. The Seeker Service-----	67
3.6.2.2. The Charismatic Movement -----	70
3.6.3. EVALUATION -----	72
<b>3.7. CONCLUSION -----</b>	<b>73</b>

**CHAPTER 4**  
**SYNTHESIZING FEAR AND HOSPITALITY**  
**DIALECTICALLY IN JESUS CHRIST:**  
***THE NORMATIVE TASK***

<b>4.1. INTRODUCTION -----</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>4.2. THE GLORY OF GOD: AN EXEGETICAL PERSPECTIVE-----</b>	<b>75</b>
4.2.1. GLORY IN THE OLD TESTAMENT: AWE AND FEAR IN THE REVELATION OF GOD-----	76
4.2.1.1. Glory: The Presence of God -----	76
4.2.1.2. The Symbols of the Glory -----	78
4.2.2. <i>SHEKINAH</i> : THE PROMISE OF THE IMMANUEL GOD IN THE OLD & NEW TESTAMENT -----	81

4.2.2.1. The glory of God and <i>Shekinah</i> -----	82
4.2.2.2. Intermittent and elusive dwelling of the <i>shekinah</i> : the Old Testament compared to the New Testament -----	82
4.2.2.3. Permanent or Intermittent Dwelling of the <i>shekinah</i> in the Incarnation: A Christological Interpretation -----	83
4.2.2.4. Permanent dwelling of the <i>Shekinah</i> in and through the Holy Spirit: A Pneumatological Interpretation-----	86
<b>4.3. JESUS CHRIST, THE RADIANCE OF THE GLORY OF GOD: A CHRISTOLOGICAL AND PNEUMATOLOGICAL APPROACH TO THE GLORY -----</b>	<b>89</b>
4.3.1. FROM FEAR TO HOSPITABLE GLORY: A CHRISTOLOGICAL REVOLUTION -----	90
4.3.1.1. The Glory without the Soteriology-----	90
4.3.1.2. The Glory with Doxology-----	92
4.3.1.3. Glorifying God through Jesus Christ: Synthesizing Soteriology and Doxology in Christology -----	93
4.3.2. TOWARDS AN ESCHATOLOGICAL GLORY MANIFESTED IN PNEUMATOLOGY -----	96
4.3.2.1. Participation in the Glory – Already but Not Yet-----	96
4.3.2.2. Becoming Glorious through the Holy Spirit: Synthesizing of Soteriology and Doxology in Pneumatology -----	98
<b>4.4. WORSHIP: ACTUALIZATION OF THE GLORY IN AND THROUGH JESUS CHRST -----</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>4.5. CONCLUSION -----</b>	<b>101</b>

**CHAPTER 5**  
**A WAY OF SYNTHESIZING**  
**FEAR AND HOSPITALITY IN WORSHIP:**  
***THE PRAGMATIC TASK***

<b>5.1. INTRODUCTION -----</b>	<b>103</b>
<b>5.2. EXCLUDING AND BLENDING: A MATTER OF EVANGELISM -----</b>	<b>105</b>
5.2.1. CONTEMPORARY WORSHIP MUST BE DISTINGUISHED FROM VERNACULAR -----	105
5.2.2. EXCLUDING FEAR IN WORSHIP -----	106
5.2.3. BLENDING FEAR AND HOSPITALITY-----	107
5.2.4. WORSHIP AND EVANGELISM -----	109
<b>5.4. AN EARLY MODEL FOR SYNTHESIZING FEAR AND HOSPITALITY IN WORSHIP: THE CATECHUMENATE -----</b>	<b>112</b>
5.4.1. THE CATECHUMENATE AND THE CHURCH -----	112

5.4.2. THE CATECHUMENATE AND WORSHIP-----115  
5.5. CONCLUSION ----- 117

**CHAPTER 6**  
**CONCLUSION**

6.1. THEOLOGICAL EVALUATION: WORSHIP, THE PLACE OF DOXOLOGY----- 119  
6.2. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: THE MATTER OF OPEN AND CLOSED ----- 120  
6.3. FOR SUBSEQUENT STUDY: TOWARDS TRINITARIAN WORSHIP ----- 121  
  
BIBLIOGRAPHY ----- 123

# CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1. BACKGROUND

What would happen when a creature encounters the Creator? Would it be a frightening experience like when Isaiah met God (Isa. 6:5)<sup>1</sup> or would it be one of joyful praise like after the Exodus (Ex. 15:1-18)? Both would be right. As sinners, human beings cannot stand in front of the holy God. In the Old Testament when the glory of the Lord filled the house of God, the priests were so in fear of God that they could not stand and minister (1 Kings 8:11; 2 Chron. 5:14). However, the same God, whose face we are not allowed to see (Ex. 33:20), commands us to seek, to call upon, and to come to Him (Isa. 55:6-7). Although we are not righteous, God reckons us as if we are (Gen. 15:6). Human beings are still unfaithful, but God declares them righteous. As Calvin (*Inst.* 3.14.2; 3.15.4) said, God imputes Christ's righteousness to human being.<sup>2</sup> However, there is still the tension between a faithful God and fallen human beings.

In the Bible, God is depicted as having a dual nature, who is the object of fear and welcomes His people at the same time. Although these two attributes of God seem to be a contradiction, they are consistent. Theologically, it can be expressed as God's "transcendence" and "immanence" (cf. Grenz & Olson 1992:11).

This God who has a dual nature created human beings to declare His praise (Isa. 43:21). This is

---

<sup>1</sup> Unless otherwise stated, all English Scriptures are cited and quoted from *RSV*, the Hebrew from *BHS* and the Greek from *UBS*<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> For the difference between "imparted" and "imputed" righteousness, see McGrath (1999:119-122).

echoed in the first exchange of the Westminster Larger Catechism:

Q1. What is the chief and highest end of man?

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

To praise, to glorify, and to enjoy can be encapsulated in one word: to communicate. As Wainwright (2006:9) argues "humankind is seen throughout Scripture as made by God sufficiently like himself for communication to take place between the Creator and the human creature, a personal exchange in which each partner is meant to find satisfaction". The place in which man communicates with God is worship. In worship, God reveals Himself to us in the Word and the Sacraments, and we praise, pray to, and devote ourselves to God. Thus, in worship we confront the tension between the God who would be pleased to accept our worship, and the God who bans us to enter His presence. Accordingly, God's dual nature is mirrored in worship, which has also a dual nature.

In traditional worship, the use of drums and guitars are not allowed; only silence fills the church. The sermon is normally delivered by a one-way method, not a communicative way; the Sacraments lost their celebratory character. Webber (2006:23) says worship is like a festival in many ways "because it brings the past into the present by telling and acting out the work of Christ". We, thus, celebrate Jesus for what He has done for us. In this worship, the focus is on Jesus' redemptive work for us. However, in a certain worship, penitence is placed in the center for the same reason, focusing on Jesus' suffering and death for us. The confession of sin, in this worship, is wrongly regarded as the center of the Eucharist; and the Baptism, many times, is followed by the remorse of the conscience for not having lived in God's way. Webber (2006:97) criticizes this confession-centered Eucharist in Protestant worship:

Since Calvin, we Protestants have stressed the self-examination of the communicant too much. It isn't that a confession of sin shouldn't accompany Communion. Rather, a confession should be made and then we should get on to the primary emphasis of the Communion, which is God's grace, not our

unworthy state.<sup>3</sup>

It seems that now in many denominations liturgical or traditional worship has lost its place. The seeker service, which was started at Willow Creek Community Church where Bill Hybels served, in 1992, has had a tremendous influence on the worship of many churches.<sup>4</sup> This new form of worship has been invented for unbelievers or newcomers, who also feel the tension between fear and hospitality. As they enter the church building at service time, they would sense the tension between people welcoming them and the unfamiliar atmosphere of Christian worship. They are unfamiliar with the order of worship. They do not know how to sing the hymns, where to find the book of Nehemiah in the Bible is, when they should stand up, whether or not to take the bread and the wine. They struggle to understand the long dogmatic sermon. They might have come to the Sunday service on invitation of their neighbour, but as the service is continuing, they may forget the hospitality of their neighbour or the usher, instead, the strangeness of the order of service might make them uncomfortable. To prevent this strange-feeling of newcomers, the worship which focuses on hospitality and familiarity, like seeker service, has been developed.

In the mean time, the liturgical movement has also developed continuously. Its origin is debatable: Chandlee (1986:308) says it originated in the Roman Catholic Church in France during the nineteenth century. Lang (1989:342, 510) argues that the liturgical movement began when St. Pius X, who was elected Pope in 1903, formulated the revolutionary program for it in his *Motu Proprio Tra le sollecitudini* (“Among the Concerns”) on Church music. Moreover, in Funk’s view (1990:714) the liturgical movement was started in 1909 with Dom Lambert Beauduin’s declaration about the liturgy of Benedictine monasteries at the Malines Congress. However, what Schmemmann ([1966]2009:13) says looks acceptable that the movement began almost simultaneously in different parts of the

---

<sup>3</sup> Although Webber refers to Calvin in somewhat negative terms, as if because of him the Eucharist of the Protestant Church has had a penitential atmosphere, Calvin himself aimed at a two-fold purpose – celebration and communion – of the Eucharist when he served the church of Geneva and Strasbourg (Maxwell 1960:112).

<sup>4</sup> Redman (2002:5) traces the origin of the seeker service to the eighteenth century: “today’s seeker service [...] comes from a long family history. Its pedigree includes revivalists and evangelists who sought to combine worship and evangelism, going back at least to colonial America”. He also states that “Willow Creek Community Church in suburban Chicago is widely regarded as the birthplace of the seeker service movement” (Redman 2002:3).

Christian world in the years following the First World War. Thereafter, the liturgical movement has influenced various denominations. This movement urges the revival of traditional worship and moves in quite the opposite way to a seeker service or evangelistic worship. Although its purpose is not to resuscitate the liturgy of the Early Church in the present, it aims to restate fundamentals in forms and expressions which can enable the liturgy to be the living prayer and work of the church today (Chandlee 1986:314). Schmemmann ([1966]2009:14) asserts that the liturgical movement is the answer against the cultural and psychological enthusiasm in Christian worship:

The best answer to this is the fact that the liturgical movement has appeared everywhere closely bound up with a theological, missionary and spiritual revival. It has been the source of a greater realization by Christian of their responsibility in the world. It has been a revival of the Church herself.

On the one hand, the activities have emerged which say that in the new generation worship should be changed, on the other hand, there are those who prefer the traditional worship. Even in the most conservative denominations, people would like to accept the method of contemporary worship, while other churches still do not allow any new means of worship such as drama, videos, and dance.

## **1.2. PROBLEM STATEMENT**

In his book, *Beyond the Worship Wars*, Long (2001:13) suggests nine characteristics of vital and faithful worship. The first two are the “experience of mystery” and “hospitality to strangers”. He argues that these two aspects need to be demonstrated in worship equally, though they are seemingly opposite terms. Emphasizing the mysterious facet of worship, Long (2001:18) argues: “true worship involves human beings falling down before God’s presence. Worship is about awe, not strategy”. Highlighting hospitality, Long (2001:34) insists: “when you stand there in the entrance of your church, offering hospitality to these visitors, you are doing far more than simply being a nice person issuing a cheery welcome. You are showing the hospitality of God”. Whereas Long discusses “mystery” and “hospitality” separately, Lathrop deals with the terms “strangeness” and “welcome” in juxtaposition.



According to Lathrop (1993:120) “God is other, ancient and unknown. Yet, God is gracious”. Because God has the dual nature, Lathrop (1993:121) presumes that at least two words are in need of speaking about God<sup>5</sup>, i.e., it is natural that two words are needed to describe the two sides of God. He maintains that worship is always strangeness even to believers, stating nobody has ownership of worship and worship cannot be tamed (Lathrop 1993:121-123). Though it is somewhat different from what Long and Lathrop says, Saliers also formulates the dual nature of worship well. For Saliers (1994:22), this duality of worship can be expressed in “human pathos” and “divine ethos”. He defines the meaning of “human pathos” and “divine ethos”; and formulates the relationship between them as follows:

By pathos I mean the human suffering of the world. Human emotions and passions, despite vast differences in cultural patterns, provide access to what is counted real. By the divine ethos, I mean the characteristic manner in which liturgy is a self-giving of God to us, the encounter whereby grace and glory find human form. Christian liturgy transforms and empowers when the vulnerability of human pathos is met by the ethos of God’s vulnerability in word and sacrament.

In this thesis, the terms that Long describes as “mystery” and “hospitality” – that Lathrop describes as “strange” and “welcome”, and that sometimes can be said “traditional” worship and “contemporary” worship – are used as “fear” and “hospitality”. Although sometimes “awe”, “awe-inspiring”, or “mysterious” can be used for a similar meaning to “fear”, “fear” is the most suitable term to express the fright aspect of the experience of encountering God, an aspect of respect as well. “Hospitality” is a good term which can refer to God’s gracious salvation through the redemptive work of Jesus and our response to our neighbours as well.

The problem is how the relationship between fear and hospitality can be synthesized dialectically. Although Long and Lathrop have argued the status quo that worship has a dual nature, they have not provided the agent for the synthesis between them. Fear and hospitality in worship should stand in a dialectic relationship; otherwise it would lose its inherent dual nature. The two dimensions of worship can be over-emphasized. Indeed, in certain periods in the history of the church the dimension of fear

---

<sup>5</sup> He quotes Köberle in this matter, “Here on earth we can never rightly say the truth of God with just one word, but always only with two words”. A Köberle, *Rechtfertigung und Heiligung* (Leipzig: Dörffling und Franke, 1929).

has been over-emphasized while the dimension of hospitality has been ignored, and vice versa. Every time a new wind has blown, either fear or hospitality has been stressed or excluded in worship. However, both should be demonstrated in Christian worship. Thus, it is important to recognize what should be the agent for the dialectic relationship between fear and hospitality, whether or not to accept the change in worship. Otherwise, the nature and concept of worship will be changed whenever the winds of popularity blow.

### 1.3. AIMS

One of the aims of this thesis is to show that worship has two aspects. On the one hand, certain areas in worship should focus on hospitality and church members should welcome visitors. On the other hand, worship should maintain its sense of fear and mysterious, for it is the time the divine God reveals Himself to the congregation.<sup>6</sup>

However, it is not enough to mention merely there are two dimensions in worship. It is also necessary to explain how they are related to each other. The relationship between the two terms which coexist in worship needs to be synthesized dialectically. This does not mean that fear and hospitality should be balanced or blended. Webber (1996:31) proposes that we should change our worship “because the world view of our culture is changing”. Furthermore he (1996:43) suggests four acts of worship as a foundation of traditional and biblical worship. The four acts are: 1) we enter into God’s presence; 2) we hear God speak; 3) we respond with thanksgiving; and 4) we are dismissed to love and serve. On this foundation Webber offers a new form of contemporary worship. In this way he blends tradition and contemporary; mystery and participation; viz. fear and hospitality. However,

---

<sup>6</sup> However, God’s self revelation does not always mean fear or awe. In the Old Testament it was always awesome and fear for people to see God’s presence. He reveals Himself hidden in clouds thus it was an invisible revelation (Ex. 16:10, 24:16, 40:34, 35; Num. 16:42; 1 Kings 8:11; 2 Chron. 5:14; Isa. 4:5; Ezek. 1:28, 10:4). In addition His revelation was only temporal. However, in the New Testament He reveals Himself in visible flesh in the incarnated Jesus and He lives permanently within His people (John 1). In Jesus God shows His hospitality admitting people to draw near to Him. The detailed discussion about the visible or invisible revelation of God is argued in chapter 4 with some exegetical works.

balancing or blending fear and hospitality in quality and quantity can confuse worship. Long (2001:12) criticizes this matter as follows:

Most notably, Robert Webber, professor of theology at Wheaton College and a distinguished expert on worship, has argued persuasively for “blended worship”, a style that mixes traditional and contemporary, old and new, substance and relevance. If traditional worship is formal and contemporary worship is informal, then blended worship moves back and forth between these two styles. If traditional worship is word-driven and punctuated by organ music, and contemporary worship is music-driven with pianos, drums, and guitars, then blended worship has both. Blended worship has both hymnbooks and overhead projects, printed prayers and free prayers, sermons and talk-back sessions. [...] Webber has a fluid and sophisticated understanding of “blended” worship, but the bare word “blended” tends to convey the idea of a mix-and-match approach – a dash of contemporary thrown in with a measure of traditional. Too many congregations, in my view, have adopted this compromise – we’ll do a traditional hymn, then we’ll do a praise song. We’ll have the classic structure, but we’ll spice it up with skits. A little of this and a little of that, and everyone will be happy.

Thus, the purpose of this study is not only to show the existence of two different terms in worship, but also to propose how they can stand in dialectic relationship. To do this task, the agent who can synthesize this relationship theologically should be offered. This thesis offers that Jesus is the agent, viz. within Christological approach fear and hospitality can be synthesized dialectically. However, the role of the Holy Spirit in this work must not be excluded. Thus, the dialectic relationship between fear and hospitality in worship is also dealt with in the perspective of pneumatology as well as Christology.

## **1.4. HYPOTHESIS**

Four hypotheses are structured this thesis:

- 1) The aspects of fear and hospitality are vital for Christian worship. Given the link between them, the relationship between them have to be synthesized dialectically.
  
- 2) To know history is to understand better who we are and the world we are living in (Williams

2005:1). This is the significance of history. Contemporary Christian worship is the result of the repetition of the liturgical trials and errors in history. During certain periods in the history of the church, fear in worship was emphasized, while in other eras hospitality of worship was accentuated without the agent who can synthesize them dialectically.

3) An accountable theology is needed for the dialectic relationship between the two facets of worship. To do this, the Christological approach is crucial because worship is indeed the celebration of the Christ event (Webber 2006:45). In Him, the relationship between fear and hospitality can be synthesized dialectically. At the same time, however, the pneumatological application also takes significant place in it for we worship God through the work of Jesus Christ in the Holy Spirit.

4) In practical theology, genuine belief should be manifested in proper practices.<sup>7</sup> Evangelistic worship has tried to change the aspects of awe-inspiring, rigidity, or boring in traditional worship into familiarity and hospitality. Those who uphold evangelistic worship assume that evangelism and worship can coexist. However, there should be a distinction between the terms “worship” and “evangelism”, because they are different in purposes and methods. Evangelistic worship opens worship in order to open the church, but there should be a distinction between “opening church” and “opening worship”: Church should be open but some part of worship cannot be open.

## 1.5. METHODOLOGY

In his book, *Practical Theology: An Introduction*, Osmer offers four questions that can guide the interpretation and response to certain situations: What is going on?; Why is this going on?; What ought to be going on?; And how might we respond? In addition, he formulates four core tasks of practical theological interpretation that are the answers to these questions: the descriptive-empirical

---

<sup>7</sup> For more on the relationship between belief and practice, see A Pauw, “*Attending to the Gaps between Beliefs and Practices*” in M Volf and D C Bass eds *Practical Theology: Beliefs and Practices in Christian Life* (Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2002).

task, the interpretive task, the normative task, and the pragmatic task (Osmer 2001:4). This forms the backbone of this thesis.

### **1.5.1. THE DESCRIPTIVE-EMPIRICAL TASK**

In the descriptive-empirical task, it is important to collect information to answer the question “What is going on?” and to interpret the situation or context in which we are. Osmer (2001:47) offers five reasons why the descriptive-empirical task is needed. Of the five reasons, the following three are relevant for the current study:

- To develop a better understanding of the “culture” of a congregation.
- To develop a better understanding of the local context of the congregation.
- To enhance their understanding of different groups in the church.

In short, the descriptive-empirical task is demanded to understand not only ourselves but also others and environments surrounding us. That is why Osmer names the sub-title of the descriptive-empirical task as “priestly listening”. To do this task, fear and the hospitality in worship are discussed in chapter 2 to recognize that both are decisive dimensions in worship. Someone who experiences only intimacy-emphasized worship may struggle to understand that there is also fear-centered worship. Likewise, people who are oriented to fear-centered worship cannot consider contemporary worship as true worship. In this regard, the descriptive-empirical task is helpful for the dialectic relationship between fear and hospitality in worship. Suffice it to note that this is where Long and Lathrop have stopped.

### **1.5.2. THE INTERPRETIVE TASK**

The question Osmer (2001) asks in the interpretive task is, “why is this going on?” He (2001:4)

asks this question “to understand and explain why these patterns and dynamics are occurring”. In this thesis, the question is changed to “how has this been going on?” As Schmemmann ([1966]2009:11) says “it is natural that without an explanation of its historical development there could be no objective understanding of the real nature of worship, and without this there could be no thought of correct comprehension or true interpretation”. Thus, to study how worship has been changed in history can be the groundwork for seeking why this is going on now.

In chapter 3, certain epochs of history are interpreted in terms of emphasizing either fear or hospitality in worship. The epochs are: The Early Church under Roman persecution; the reign of Constantine; the Medieval Age; the Reformation; and after the Reformation. It is beyond the scope of this thesis to present the two-thousand year history of the church. Thus, pointing out a specific form of worship in a specific period is the delimitation of this thesis.

### **1.5.3. THE NORMATIVE TASK**

Through chapters 2 and 3, it will be proved that there has been a tension between the dimensions of fear and hospitality in worship. Seeking the agent for the dialectic relationship between two facets of worship, the normative task is highlighted in chapter 4. It is a matter of “what ought to be”. What should be an accountable theology, especially in terms of the dialectic relationship between fear and hospitality in worship? It is explained mainly with Christological approach. Wainwright (1980:47-48) points out that Christology is the foundation of Christian worship:

There is no doubt that worship constituted the primary locus of Christ’s recognition as Lord by Christian believers. He was confessed as Lord at baptism [...] He was invoked as Lord in the Christian assembly [...] He was already worshipped as Lord by Christians, in anticipation of the day when every knee should bow [...] This very early feature of Christian worship was fundamental to the formation and development of Christological doctrine and thought.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> However, James Dunn (2010) argues in his recent book, *Did the First Christians Worship Jesus?: The New*

To synthesize the dialectic relationship between fear and hospitality in worship, various theological studies are demanded. Theologically, the tension between God's wrath and God's love is resolved in the incarnation of Jesus and His reconciliatory work. That is, only the person who is forgiven by Jesus' redemptive work can avoid God's wrath and enter the place of worship to meet the God of love. However, the supportive work of the Holy Spirit which maintains us in the faith in Jesus must not be excluded. Therefore, mainly a Christological approach is used, but at the same time, a pneumatological application is also discussed.

Osmer (2001:161) says that in practical theology, there is a need for cross-disciplinary dialogue to interpret an issue or context. Adding to the theological approach, in chapter 4, biblical exegesis is used with the term "glory (כְּבוֹד, δόξα)" to prove that Christ is the agent who synthesizes the dialectic relationship between fear and hospitality in worship.<sup>9</sup> In the Old Testament, encountering God's glory commonly hidden in the cloud is fearful experience for the people of Israel. However, turning to the New Testament, people praise God and His glory revealed in Jesus (cf. Luke 2:8-20). This glory – Jesus Himself – will allow believers to enter heaven (Rev. 21:24). Likewise, the exegetical study on the glory of God shows that there are different meanings in the glory of God before and after Jesus' birth in terms of the relationship between fear and hospitality. This prompts the question: How can we glorify God? Wainwright (1979b:497) answers this question as follows: "the praise of God in worship, doctrine, and life".<sup>10</sup>

We can glorify God through Jesus' redemptive work for us in the Holy Spirit. Thus, worship is the place for glorifying our salvation. Theologically saying, doxology is the proper reaction to soteriology;

---

*Testament Evidence*, that it is difficult to say with certainty that the Early Church worshipped Jesus. He offers three reasons: 1) People who thought they worshipped Jesus could be confused the meaning of "idolatry" and, in his words, "Jesus-olatry"; 2) People could be confused whether Christianity is "monotheism" or Trinitarianism that Jesus-centered; 3) There was skepticism of Jesus' divine nature among the people.

<sup>9</sup> According to Osmer (2001:163-164), there are four kinds of cross-disciplinary dialogue: intradisciplinary dialogue, interdisciplinary dialogue, multidisciplinary dialogue, and metadisciplinary dialogue. Though the difference between intradisciplinary and interdisciplinary dialogue is vague, Osmer takes Christian education in the study of practical theology as an example of interdisciplinary dialogue. Thus, it can be said that using biblical exegesis in this thesis belongs to interdisciplinary dialogue.

<sup>10</sup> These three areas are also the subtitle of his book, *Doxology*.

Jesus is the key to this doxology, viz. doxology is toward Christology; and the Holy Spirit keeps us to glorify God in worship which means pneumatology also takes its place in doxology.

#### 1.5.4. THE PRAGMATIC TASK

When practical theology focuses solely on application, it would be called merely pastoral theology that seeks only to train future clergy to apply theological work within the congregation (Root 2009:59). However, practical theology is broader than pastoral theology (Heitink 1999:129). That means practical theology is not merely about praxis, but also concerns theory. In practical theology, there is constant interaction between text and context, theory and praxis (Heitink 1999:153). One of the purposes of practical theology is to suggest a principle of action. Liturgically saying, *Lex orandi est lex credendi et agendi*, “the rule of prayer is rule of belief and of action”<sup>11</sup>, reflects this relationship between praxis and theory in practical theology. We seek the principle of action in chapter 4, and deal with the application of the principle in the worship context in chapter 5. For the praxis involves biblical, theological, and historical hermeneutics in it. This hermeneutics determines our action as the answer for “how might we respond?”

In this thesis, our action is focused on what we must open and what we must leave closed. Firstly, what we must open is the church. This means both a church building and us as the temple of the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. 6:19) should be open to unbelievers or newcomers. Insisting that we should show hospitality to visitors and strangers, Long (2001:34) states that “the stranger at the door is the living symbol and memory that we are all strangers here [...] We were pilgrims and wanderers, aliens and strangers, even enemies of God, but we, too, were welcomed into this place”. The church should always be open and we should show our neighbours God’s love and hospitality. Friendly architecture and furniture that make newcomers feel welcome should always be in the mind of members of the

---

<sup>11</sup> “[A] maxim usually attributed to Pope Coelestinus or Colestine I (A.D. 422-432)” (Muller 1985:175).



church council. Secondly, what we must not open is worship. That does not mean unbelievers cannot enter the worship place, but means that worship should not be focused on unbelievers. Though we should concern strangers who are not familiar to Christian worship, the fact that Jesus is the core of the worship cannot be altered. It must be stressed that only believers can worship God with true knowledge about Him. Thus, evangelistic worship, which tries to mix evangelism for unbelievers and worship for believers in one service, must be criticized in this regard. Instead, the strict catechism of the Early Church that allowed catechumen to participate in the service of the Word, but excluded them from the service of the Eucharist, should be encouraged. By doing so, they clarified that the church should be open, but some part of worship should be closed.

**CHAPTER 2**

**FEAR AND HOSPITALITY OF GOD AND**

**WORSHIP:**

***THE DESCRIPTIVE-EMPIRICAL TASK***

**2.1. INTRODUCTION**

It is vital to understand what is going on in the descriptive-empirical task (Osmer 2001:4ff). As regards the current study, to understand what is going on or what is happening as we worship God, what we should know is that there are the two dimensions of fear and hospitality in worship at the same time. In his book, *Beyond the Worship Wars*, Long (2001:15ff) deals with the elements of mystery and hospitality separately. However, the two dimensions of worship take place coincidentally.

Nevertheless, in this chapter, we analyze fear and hospitality separately to build the foundation of the subsequent study. This analysis should involve God's attributes, for He is the one whom we worship, and worship inherently reflects God's attributes. Thus, in worship God's multiple attributes are revealed – God of love and God of justice; God who relates to the world as the transcendent and, at the same time, the immanent One; God as both beyond the world and present to the world (Grenz & Olson 1992:11). It is the same as worship which has dual characters – an awe-inspiring and hospitable celebration. Buttrick (1992:220) defines Reformed worship as follows: “Reformed worship can be described as “objective”; with awe it glorifies the sovereign God, yet it is essentially thankful”. This paradoxical facet of worship is also examined. Moreover, the other nature of worship, hospitality is

dealt with in relation with worship.

We start with observation of the dual nature of God and then deal with the diverse meanings of fear, hospitality and worship.

## **2.2. GOD: FEAR AND HOSPITALITY**

### **2.2.1. FEAR OF GOD**

As Barth (*CD* II/1:183) says “God is known only by God; God can be known only by God”. It is impossible for creatures even to call God’s name unless He gives His name to us (*CD* II/1:59). This hiddenness of God is closely connected with God’s holiness and our sinfulness.<sup>12</sup> As the Early Church Father Ambrose stated in *Death as a Good* (11.49), if human beings would be blinded when they look straight at the sun’s ray, how can we bear when we look at God’s face? Augustine also said, in *Letter* (147.31), that as a mortal being, human beings cannot see God’s eternal face in this life (Lienhard 2001:151). Human beings cannot look upon God and survive: the gap between the finite and the infinite is too great; it is an experience of which man is incapable (Durham 1987:452).

Even though human beings encounter God, it is a dreadful experience for them. The Bible shows how God is terrifying for human beings so much so that anyone who meets Him would die. God said to Moses “you cannot see my face, for man shall not see me and live” (Ex. 33:20). God, thus, covered Moses with His hand until He passed by him. Moses could only see God’s back (Ex. 33:23).<sup>13</sup> Gideon the judge thought that he would die when he saw God’s face (Judg. 6:22-24). Isaiah also assumed that he would die when he appeared in God’s presence. The fear that Isaiah felt was derived from the gap

---

<sup>12</sup> The hiddenness is not God’s sole character; God reveals Himself to sinful human beings. The argument about the other nature of God is discussed later.

<sup>13</sup> Luther (*LW* 5:44) says that even Moses’ requirement to see God is related to our sinful nature, saying “[Moses’] inquisitiveness [about viewing God’s face] is original itself, by which we are impelled to strive for a way to God through natural speculation”.

between the divine God and sinful nature of human beings (Isa. 6:8). Throughout Scripture the encounter with God brings fear; when a sinful human meets the holy God, he/she is overawed and often becomes acutely conscious of his/her sin and unworthiness to stand in the divine presence ( Gen. 3:10; Ex. 3:6; 20:18; Judg. 6:23, 13:22) (Wenham 1994:223).

The confrontation with God the Holy One in the Bible is not confined within the rational, moral, or sentimental categories of the human mentality (Leonard 1993:74). The experience of *numinous* also cannot be explained by those categories. It is a totally unexpected experience. Though C S Lewis calls his book *Surprised by Joy* because the unexpected experience of meeting Jesus made him joyful, it was dreadful experience for Moses, Gideon, and Isaiah. Furthermore, the terrible incident of Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, shows us that even worshipping God can be dangerous. They were consumed by the fire coming from the presence of the Lord and died before the Lord, because they intended to offer “unholy fire before the Lord, such as he had not commanded them” (Lev. 10:1-2). This reminds of us that we cannot worship God in our convenience but must keep the way that God commanded. Human beings cannot see God unless He would say “peace be to you; do not fear, you shall not die” (Judg. 6:23). Otherwise, meeting God or worshipping God just becomes a terrifying experience. Therefore, in the face of great power, or majesty, or beauty, what human beings characteristically feel and sense is humility (Wettstein 1997:388).

The ark of God is the visible entity from which we see how encountering God causes fear in man.<sup>14</sup> The ark of God was built in the wilderness period of Israel to be a house of God, so that He could dwell among His people.<sup>15</sup> That is why the ark was built as the first item and was the most sacred object in the tabernacle. Though the ark of God played an important role in various ways – leading Israel to the promised land, crossing of the Jordan (Josh. 3-4), conquering the land (Josh. 6), and reiterating the covenant at Mount Ebal (Josh. 8:30-35) – the most important function of the ark

---

<sup>14</sup> Though the ark was called by different names, such as “the ark of the testimony” (Ex. 25:22), “the ark of the covenant” (Num. 10:33), “the ark of the Lord” (Josh. 6:11), “the ark of God” (1 Sam. 3:3), “the ark of the Lord God” (1 Kings 2:26), “the holy ark” (2 Chron. 35:3), and “the ark of thy strength” (Ps. 132:8), it is called “the ark of God” in this thesis to accentuate that it is the symbol of God’s presence.

<sup>15</sup> The difference between temporary dwelling of God in the Old Testament and permanent dwelling in the New Testament is discussed in Chapter 4.

was the symbol of God's presence (Ex. 25:8-10). The fact that the ark of God is the symbol of God's presence was so universally acknowledged (Hague 1997:503) that the Philistines were afraid when they heard the ark of God coming to Israel's camp, saying "a god has come into the [Israel's] camp" (1 Sam. 4:7). The ark is not the only symbol of God's presence; manna, the tabernacle, and the temple also symbols of God's presence and divine glory. However, in this chapter, we only deal with the ark of God because it is the most dominant symbol of the fear of God.<sup>16</sup>

Having been the symbol of God's presence, it was forbidden to touch the ark directly, for it means the same as touching Him. Therefore, God commanded the making of rings to put the poles in for carrying it instead (Ex. 25:13-14). After being anointed (2 Sam. 5), the first thing David wanted to do was to move the ark of God into the city of David (2 Sam. 6). However, since the oxen which were carrying the ark on the new cart stumbled, "Uzzah put out his hand to the ark of God and took hold of it" (2 Sam. 6:6). He immediately died beside the ark of God because of this, the same as Nadab and Abihu. At that moment, he might have forgotten about the holiness of God and his own sinfulness. Cartledge (2001:435) says that "Uzzah's helping hand showed entirely too much familiarity in dealing with the holy ark". Brueggemann (1990:249) also separates welcome or familiarity from God's holiness: "the ark must not be presumed upon, taken for granted, or treated with familiarity. The holiness of God is indeed present in the ark, but that holiness is not readily available. To touch the ark is to impinge God's holiness, to draw too close and presume too much". Uzzah thought he would meet God's hospitality, but what he experienced was fear of God. Uzzah could not reach to God but died in front of Him. It seems to show us that sinful human beings never meet the divine God by their own means. Being frightened David said, "how can the ark of the Lord come to me?" (2 Sam. 6:9)<sup>17</sup>

Although God's purpose of creating human beings was to communicate with them, it is not permitted for human beings to face Him, touch Him, and stand before Him, for their sinful nature is incompatible with God's holy nature. This paradoxical relations between divine God and sinful

---

<sup>16</sup> The other symbols are dealt with in chapter 4.

<sup>17</sup> When David carried the ark of God in the way God commanded (1 Chron. 15:2) the ark came to him with peace, and stayed there until it was finally placed in Solomon's temple (1 Kings 8).

human beings is echoed by Barth (*CD II/1:40*) when he says that though God reveals Himself to us, what we can know about Him is only “in His mystery”.

However, fear or awe is not the only feeling when we encounter God. God is also hospitable to His people. His self-revelation and His hiddenness always accompany each other (*CD II/1:55*). The only way human beings encounter God and not die is shown in God’s gracious toleration to sinners. Hospitality is another name for God’s grace.

### **2.2.2. HOSPITALITY OF GOD**

The term hospitality is somewhat broad and can refer to a variety of charitable actions. However, Arterbury (2002:54) indicates that some scholars define hospitality as the kind treatment of especially strangers or travelers. The early Christians regarded their identity in relation to the stranger, the sojourner, or the foreigner (Oden 2001:36), not only given their political location in the Roman Empire, but also because the Bible shows that we are strangers in the world. God gives His hospitality to us, strangers.

God commanded His people to provide hospitality to strangers, for they were also strangers in the land of Egypt (Lev. 19:33-34). In harvest time, one must not seek to maximize his/her profit, but must leave the gleanings for those who are in need (Deut. 24:19-22), though he/she has the right to take all of the sheaves. The accounts of Abraham and Sarah entertaining angels, Abigail placating David, and the widow of Zarephath caring for Elijah also show us that hospitality is a virtue throughout the Old Testament. At times, hospitality was requested to be given to God’s people, e.g., when Lot insists that the angels spend the night with him (Gen. 19:1-3). At other times hospitality was demanded to be provided even to enemies as a sign of God’s reconciliation, as when Isaac made a feast for Abimelech (Gen. 26:26-31), or Elisha mediated peace between the Arameans and the Israelites (2 Kings 6:8-23) (Bretherton 2006:129). Israel’s deep sense of God as the hospitable host is another feature of

hospitality in the Old Testament. Having taken possession of the Promised Land, the Israelites always had to remember that their home belonged to Yahweh (Lev. 25:23) and that they, like their forebears, remained sojourners and passing guests in God's eyes (Ps. 39:12) (Koenig 1992:300). All they possessed was from God who shows them His hospitality so that they can show God's hospitality to others.

It is the same in the New Testament where hospitality is treated as a moral imperative. In Rom. 12:13; Heb. 13:2 and 1 Pet. 4:9, Christians are exhorted to provide hospitality for others. In addition, Matthew points out that hospitality cannot be negotiated because believers' response to Christ's disciples is their response to Christ himself (Matt. 25:35, 38, 43, 44. cf. also Gal. 4:14) (Arterbury 2002:56). In the story of Cornelius we find the non-negotiable dimension of hospitality as God's commandment. Arterbury (2002:72) articulates how Peter showed God's hospitality even though it would break the custom of that time:

In Acts 10:1-11:18, Luke explicitly refers to the custom of hospitality while narrating a radical change in the theology and praxis of the early church. First, because of a vision and the instruction of the Holy Spirit, Peter broke with tradition and offered hospitality to the Gentile emissaries. Next, he broke with tradition and accepted hospitality from Cornelius. This included both entering Cornelius's home and eating with him. Finally, Cornelius and his entire household were converted, after Peter testified to what God had done and after God had given the Holy Spirit to them. As a result, Peter's theological framework for evaluating people was drastically revised. In the midst of these three hospitality scenes, Peter was able to recognize that fearing God is more important to God than racial heritage.

What we can deduce from the above is that, for Christians, hospitality springs not from our thinking or custom but from God's thought and plan. This means hospitality is a part of God's work for us, not merely moral behaviour.

Not only with the biblical exegetical approach but also with a theological analysis, we can acknowledge that hospitality is linked to God's plan and work for us. Theologically, we are under God's wrath, i.e., we cannot be close to God. However, Jesus' reconciling work has saved us from the wrath, and this opened the possibility to come to God. That is the most hospitable work of God for us.

Once we were not people of God but now we are; once we had not received His mercy but now we have (1 Pet. 2:10) by God’s hospitable grace through the work of Jesus Christ our Lord in the Holy Spirit. We are the recipients of God’s abundant and costly hospitality to us through the death and resurrection of Jesus (Bretherton 2006:138). In the name of Jesus, God welcomes us into worship with His hospitality, even though we are still sinful. God is the host and we are guests of God’s grace in worship. Worship is the place where God’s divine hospitality comes down to us, the beneficiaries. For this matter, when we gather to worship our practice of hospitality to others should reflect God’s gracious welcome. When we personally have opportunities to act as hosts who welcome others, making a place for strangers and sojourners, we must not forget God is the real host and we are to show His hospitality, not our own (Pohl 1999:157).<sup>18</sup>

### **2.3. FEAR: *MYSTERIUM TREMENDUM ET FASCINOSUM***

The Latin word *numen* means “a divine spirit, a presiding deity” (Muller 1985:204). In its theological meaning, *numinous* is described as “elements in the experience of the holy that are fascinating, awe-inspiring, and mysterious” (McKim 1996:190).<sup>19</sup> It was, however, Rudolf Otto ([1923]2010:7) who made the word *numinous* from the Latin word *numen* as the Latin word *ominous* is derived from *omen*.

#### **2.3.1. THE *NUMINOUS* ACCORDING TO RUDOLF OTTO**

In *The Idea of the Holy*, Otto ([1923]2010:5) criticizes the notion that sometimes “holy” is used in

---

<sup>18</sup> The argument about how we show God’s hospitality in worship is discussed later.

<sup>19</sup> Although etymologically *numinous* is adjective form, in this thesis, it is used as a norm. Many scholars (cf. Streetman 1980; Lattke 1985; Hood 2004; and Cilliers 2009a) also use the *numinous* mainly as a norm, because the adjective *numinous* is acknowledged as a specific theological term.



a merely ethical meaning –“completely good”.<sup>20</sup> He sought to give a new characterization that identified the essence of religion as being more than doctrine, dogma or practice. “Religious feeling” is what he found as the new characterization for holy (Hood 2004:146). Though the holy includes moral significance, it includes something we cannot define, but only feel. For Otto, “there are inexpressible components in the consciousness of human beings, and that this consciousness forms part and parcel of anthropology” (Cilliers 2009a:36). There is no religion in which this “something” does not live as the real innermost core, and without it no religion would be worthy of the name (cf. Cilliers 2009a:37; Otto [1923]2010:6). It is out of the question to explain “something” in our language, for it belongs to the matter of the irrational. Otto ([1923]2010:7), thus, differentiated the rational and the non-rational. Though religions contain rational facet, the response to the holy is not expressed in a rational or lingual sense. It can be only described in a non-rational or extra linguistic sense.<sup>21</sup> Here Otto uses the term *numinous* to characterize this “something”.

Otto “found[s] many corresponding themes between his own thought and that of Schleiermacher, especially the idea that human beings have an innate feeling of dependency” (Cilliers 2009a:36). However, for him, the elements in the *numinous* is more than the feeling of the dependence that Schleiermacher declared<sup>22</sup>; rather it is “creature feeling” that is “the emotion of a creature, abased and overwhelmed by its own nothingness in contrast to that which is supreme above all creatures” (Otto [1923]2010:10). The *numinous*, or the creature feeling, can be experienced in two ways: as an object of fear (*mysterium tremendum*) or as attraction (*fascinatum*) (cf. Lattke 1985:359; Cilliers 2009a:37).

Streetman (1980:380) regrets that Otto’s English works are not commonly known as they deserve

---

<sup>20</sup> Allen (1911:254) points out that other religious words are also used for sentimental meaning: “Awe, for instance, usually accompanies a sense-perception of the stupendous power and magnitude of nature; wonder, a recognition of the limitations of our knowledge; admiration, mainly an aesthetic perception; reverence, always a moral perception”.

<sup>21</sup> For a detailed study on Otto’s view on language, see Wenderoth (1982).

<sup>22</sup> Lattke (1985:356), however, indicates that Bultmann criticized Otto for misunderstanding Schleiermacher in this matter: “This reproach, that Otto has completely misunderstood Schleiermacher, appears in Bultmann’s lecture notes for his *Theologische Enzyklopädie*, read five times between 1926 and 1936, and only recently published for the first time. These lectures give us an idea of Bultmann’s *public* remarks on Otto at the University of Marburg. Bultmann attacks Otto’s confusion of God with the irrational, and declares the true *numinosum*, with its elements of the *tremendum* and *fascinatum*, to be the awareness of the enigma of our existence”.

to be. Nevertheless, he states that “it is difficult, even today, to emerge from the serious academic study of religion without some kind of exposure to the thought of Rudolf Otto” (Streetman 1980:366) . In terms of liturgy, maybe Otto’s main contribution to worship is to ask how a transcendent God can be revealed in the created world via Christian worship, and to answer the question through the concept of the *numinous*.

### 2.3.1.1. The *Numinous* as *Mysterium Tremendum*

As mentioned above, the idea of the *numinous* is not merely about the personal moral consciousness concerning the perfect One, but signifies the gap between the Creator and creatures. It can only be felt, not taught. When sinful human beings experience this, it is impossible even to preach, sing, or worship: Indeed, sinners cannot do anything but keep the silence in front of the overwhelming solemnity. The prophet Habakkuk declared that “the Lord is in his holy temple; let all the earth keep silence before him” (Hab. 2:20), using the interjection חָשׁוּ “hush!; keep silence” (*BDB* s.v. חָשׁוּ:245), to avoid disorder among the people. However, all creatures irresistibly must be silent before God’s divine presence.

Otto ([1923]2010:12-13) calls this fearful feeling before the Creator *mysterium tremendum*. He separates *mysterium* and *tremendum* in order to analyze each separately. He ([1923]2010:13,20,23 and 25) points out three elements of *tremendum*: “awefulness”<sup>23</sup>, “overpoweringness”, and “energy”; and explains *mysterium* with a conception of the “wholly other”.

The first element of *tremendum* is “awefulness”. Sometimes the feeling of *mysterium tremendum* leads in our deepest worship to an experience of a tranquil mood, and other times it comes to us thrillingly vibrant and resonant until our soul resumes its profane and non-religious mood of everyday

---

<sup>23</sup> Although “awfulness” is correct word, we use “awefulness” as Otto used it in his book.

experience (Otto [1923]2010:12-13).<sup>24</sup> When we worship God this feeling of awe disappears whereas this frightening feeling remains after worship of demons (Otto [1923]2010:17). Only in the Creator this “awefulness” that creatures feel is resolved. Otto uses the adjective “tremor” which is in itself familiar to us as the natural emotion of fear. However, this fear which *tremendum* contains, is more than etymological fear. Otto explains that the Hebrew word שָׁרָא “hallow” in the Bible does not merely mean natural fear, but means the fear of God the Creator. Because the fear of God is not the same as the etymological meaning of fear, he agrees with what Luther says: “the natural man cannot fear God” (Otto [1923]2010:13-15), by which Luther means that without the faith in or the knowledge about God nobody can fear God. Otto also explains the term ὀργή Θεοῦ, “wrath of God” which corresponds to the Hebrew word שָׁרָא in the New Testament. This term is also different from natural wrath, as שָׁרָא is different from natural fear. If anyone is accustomed to think of the deity only by its rational attributes, he/she cannot avoid this wrath of God (Otto [1923]2010:18-19), for God’s wrath cannot be avoided by rational preparation or readiness, but only by grace. Thus, the fear of God in the Old Testament is synonymous with the wrath of God in the New Testament.<sup>25</sup> Both of them point to our sinful nature.

The second element of *tremendum* is “might”, “power”, or “absolute overpoweringness” (Otto [1923]2010:20). This forms the raw materials of the *numinous* for the feeling of religious humility. At this point, Otto criticizes Schleiermacher’s “feeling of dependence” again. For him, it is rather “self-depreciation” in front of the mighty God. A creature only feels “I am nothing, you are all” before the “overpoweringness of *tremendum*”.

Thirdly, there is the element of “energy” or “urgency”, which is expressed symbolically, e.g., vitality, passion, emotional temper, will, force, movement, excitement, activity, violence (Otto [1923]2010:23). One of the expressions of this energy is God’s mystic love, but this love is different

---

<sup>24</sup> For Otto, what makes this divergence is whether or not he/she has the Holy Spirit in him/her (cf. [1923]2010:61-63).

<sup>25</sup> Fear of God becomes clearer; and wrath of God is resolved in and through Jesus’ reconciling work. A more detailed argument follows in chapter 4.

from secular love, for it is depicted as a “consuming fire” in the Bible (Heb. 12:29). In this regard, this mystic love and ὀργή Θεοῦ have the same energy, but are directed differently (Otto [1923]2010:29).

Otto distinguishes between *mysterium* and *tremendum*, though they are common in some aspects. He urges us to express a mental reaction to *mysterium*. That specific expression he suggests can be expressed as “stupor” (Otto [1923]2010:24). No one can say what exactly is going on when he/she meets an object that is beyond his/her grasp, or a science that he/she cannot understand. The matter of “stupor” cannot be dealt with in the way we deal with a certain problem. A problem can be solved by an intelligible principle, but not the matter of “stupor”. It takes its place in the area of mystery as Otto ([1923]2010:28) remarks:

The truly “mysterious” object is beyond our apprehension and comprehension, not only because our knowledge has certain irremovable limits, but because in it we come upon something inherently “wholly other”, whose kind and character are incommensurable with our own, and before which we therefore recoil in a wonder that strikes us chill and numb.

### 2.3.1.2. The *Numinous* as *Fascinosum*

As such, Otto mentions the daunting elements in the *numinous*. However, according to him, it is clear that the *numinous* has at the same time another aspect, in which it shows itself as something uniquely attractive and fascinating. As Cilliers (2009a:38) points out “the approach to God does not only entail an experience of *tremendum*, it also attracts us towards God (*fascinans*)”.

Thus, the *numinous* has two ambivalent dimensions: 1) an element of shaking fear or repulsion; and 2) an element of powerful attraction or fascination.<sup>26</sup> Otto ([1923]2010:31) argues that the two attributes of the *numinous* point to “these two qualities, daunting and the fascinating, now combine in a strange harmony of contrasts”. However, this element of attraction has, unfortunately, never been

---

<sup>26</sup> Referring to media, Fuller (2009:58) says it can be found in movies and avant-garde music – for instance, Stanley Kubrick’s movie, *2001: A Space Odyssey* (1968) or Gyorgi Ligeti’s music – that the experience of encountering mystery causes wonder, fear, awe, and fascination.

emphasized by Otto's interpreters as much as it deserves to be (Streetman 1980:370). Nevertheless, it is obvious that Otto himself distinguishes those two dimensions of the *numinous* or the experience of encountering the Creator ([1923]2010:31):

The daemonic-divine object may appear to the mind an object of horror and dread, but at the same time it is no less something that allures with a potent charm, and the creature, who trembles before it, utterly cowed and cast down, has always at the same time the impulse to turn to it, nay even to make it somehow his own. The "mystery" is for him not merely something to be wondered at but something that entrances him; and beside that in it which bewilders and confounds, he feels a something that captivates and transports him with a strange ravishment, rising often enough to the pitch of dizzy intoxication; it is the Dionysiac-element in the numen.

This element of fascination can be expressed as bliss or felicity, which is far more than the mere natural feeling of being comforted, or of reliance, or of the joy of love. Although this bliss or felicity has the opposite direction to ὀργῆ Θεοῦ, they both contain fundamentally non-rational elements: the elements of *mysterium tremendum* and *fascinosum* (Otto [1923]2010:32).

In short, Otto's view on the *numinous* cannot be expressed in the perspective of morality, etymology, or rationality. It is beyond our comprehension. Emphasizing the two dimensions of the *numinous*, Cilliers (2009a:38) argues that Otto's theories underline the fact that our experiences of the Holy are complex and not to be taken too lightly: "In this *tension* [between tremendous and fascination] within which Otto operates, the approach to God is a deeply human and existential experience, but never equal to sentimentalism or emotionalism. It is also a deeply divine experience, born out of the revelation of God, but never abstract or inhuman".

### **2.3.2. AWE ACCORDING TO ABRAHAM JOSHUA HESCHEL**

As we have discussed, Otto's concept of the *numinous* can be encapsulated in *mysterium tremendum et fascinosum*. This duality of the numinous is echoed in Abraham Heschel's theology on awe. "Though Heschel does not refer to Otto's *The Idea of the Holy* in his discussion of awe directly,

his writings show that he, like Otto, views mystery as both overwhelming and fascinating” (Merkle 1975:588).

### 2.3.2.1. Awe as Tremor

According to Heschel, it is not through logic and reason that we come to know God, but through the awareness of the ineffability. This is not an aesthetic experience in which one may rest (Friedman 1976:68), but a feeling of what Otto calls *mysterium tremendum*. Heschel uses the word “tremor” to express this feeling. It does not make us shrink from the awesome but humbles us before the divine presence (Merkle 1975:588). Heschel (1955:76-77) distinguishes between fear and awe: there are men who fear God lest they be punished in this life or the life to come. Awe, however, is the sense of wonder and humility inspired by the sublime or felt in the presence of mystery. “Fear is a surrender of the succors which reason offers; awe is the acquisition of insights which the world holds in store for us” (Heschel 1955:77). Otto says that the *numinous* is inexpressible; likewise, awe is beyond our emotion for Heschel. The beginning of awe is a wonder, and as a way of understanding awe is the insight into a meaning greater than ourselves (Heschel 1966:88). Thus, awe is a sense of transcendence and is beyond our comprehension (Heschel 1966:89).<sup>27</sup>

### 2.3.2.2. Awe as Fascination

As Otto formulates that there are two dimensions of the *numinous* – *mysterium tremendum et fascinans*, Heschel views both “tremor” and “fascination” as aspects of awe (Merkle 1975:588). For Heschel, awe does not merely make us shrink from the awe-inspiring object, but also, on the contrary, draws us near to it. This is why awe is compatible with both love and joy (Heschel 1955:77). It is a

---

<sup>27</sup> Although Heschel separates the meaning of awe from fear, this thesis does not draw a distinction between the two words in this regard.

yearning love for the divine in whose presence we shudder with adoration (Merkle 1975:589). Thus, God's presence to man is an indication of God's concern for us. Such a God is not the "wholly other"; not completely silent and unknown (Merkle 1975:592). Even though it seems that the Lord does not answer our prayer, God is not always silent (Heschel 1955:69); even in awe He responds to our invocation.

## **2.4. HOSPITALITY: OF HUMAN BEINGS AND OF GOD**

Hospitality<sup>28</sup> is, basically, an act of love. That means it is not an exclusive quality of Christianity. The traces of hospitality are found in various cultures and religions. The Good Samaritan paradigm and the Golden Rule paradigm have been widely practiced in the Mediterranean world and even in China (Newlands & Smith 2010:113). Koenig (1992:299) also says that hospitality was a common virtue in the biblical era: "[T]he practice of receiving a guest or stranger graciously was common to many social groups throughout the period in which the OT and NT were composed". Thus, an important question for us is what the inherent character of Christian hospitality is.

Hospitality is an outwardly personal behaviour but, at the same time, also an institutionally rooted practice. "It requires institutions with an identity, history, and purpose, whether family, church, or larger community" (Pohl 1999:57). We can show our intimacy by doing kind deeds. However, when we remember God's hospitable actions for us that He has saved and allowed us to draw near to Him, we realize that showing hospitality is not to be confined to personal moral behaviour. Thus, though hospitality seems to be a human activity of love, the outstanding characteristic of hospitality is related to God as the initiator of hospitality.

First, we focus on the difference between hospitality and intimacy which are defined as kindness

---

<sup>28</sup> A good study in hospitality published recently is that of George Newlands and Allen Smith, *Hospitable God: The Transformative Dream* (Farnham/Burlington: Ashgate, 2010). They broadly deal with hospitality in perspectives of history, culture, politics, and literature, though the perspective of sociology, applying it theologically to the church. However, the following argument delimits hospitality in the context of worship only.

of human beings. Then hospitality, which is God's favour for us, to worship is following.

#### **2.4.1. HOSPITALITY AND INTIMACY**

Williams (1989:71) links the virtue of tolerance with personal good behaviour: "When tolerance is a substantive value it is on a particular conception of the good; that is, the good of individual autonomy".<sup>29</sup> However, hospitality goes beyond moral action. Keifert (1992:80) distinguishes hospitality from other virtues that "hospitality to the stranger implies wisdom, love, and justice – rather than intimacy, warmth, and familiarity".

Sutherland (2006:xiii) defines hospitality as follows:

In the light of Jesus' life, death, resurrection, and return, Christian hospitality is the intentional, responsible, and caring act of welcoming or visiting, in either public or private places, those who are strangers, enemies, or distressed, without regard for reciprocation.

Following this definition, it can be deduced that hospitality is derived from and focused on Jesus. Hospitality is initiated by God and not by human beings' behaviour. Thus, hospitality in this thesis does not mean tolerance or intimacy, but God's hospitable invitation to worship through the redemptive work of Jesus. False hospitality proves human beings' goodness, whereas true hospitality leads people to God (Long 2001:33-34). Hospitality is the action of God to us; it is not our kindness or gentle favour to others. Long (2001:31) distinguishes between hospitality and intimacy, pointing out that the central problem with intimacy is that it cannot carry the full freight of human nature and human need. In other words, showing intimacy cannot be a solution of any problems that human beings struggle with. However, in God's hospitality, which is related with His plan and work for us, as discussed above, human beings can be saved from their sin.

Being intimate with neighbours is not always commanded to Christians. The early Christians

---

<sup>29</sup> Quoted from Bretherton (2006:147).



refused to welcome two categories of people: 1) those who persists in an immoral lifestyle (1 Cor. 5:9-11); and 2) those who propagated false teaching (2 John 9-11) (Pohl 1999:80). That means that keeping the church's identity, as the holy community, is more important than being kind to others if they threaten the unique character of Christian belief. Not only in the biblical period but also in the present time, being intimate sometimes clash with maintaining holiness. What God wants us to do is not to show our good behaviour, but to show God's hospitality to sinners so that they know God's concern for them; and at the same time keeping our identity as Christian as well.

#### **2.4.2. HOSPITALITY AND WORSHIP**

According to Wright (1994:34), liturgical worship "inspires awe" but "lacks intimacy" as the following remark exemplifies:

It [liturgical worship] emphasizes a vertical relationship with God, rather than a horizontal relationship with others. Liturgical worship may actually work against intimacy: Silence and contemplation reign before the service, rather than conversation. Liturgically designed sanctuaries, built with high, arching ceilings, seem cold and impersonal. Seating arrangements keep people from seeing the faces of other worshippers. The rows of pews force people to focus on the backs of heads and the altar area. Liturgical worship generates little in the way of intimacy and warmth.

Maybe Wright is right only to a certain extent. Warm ambience and friendly greeting is important to worship. However, people need not only to be greeted but also be humbled in front God as they enter the worship place; not only to be welcomed by church members but also by God (Lathrop 1993:128; Long 2001:19). To be welcomed by people and to be accepted by God is different. People may create welcoming atmosphere, but without acknowledgement that worship is God's invitation to sinners, the worship cannot show God's hospitality. Sinners can be changed to worshippers, when they believe God has saved them by His grace; and God calls them to worship with His hospitality. This hospitality of God should reinforce our love both for God and for our fellow human beings. Because God's hospitality makes us worshippers, we show His hospitality to others in worship. Thus, worship is the

place through which hospitality flows from God through us into others. A life of hospitality begins in worship, with the recognition of God's grace and generosity. Hospitality is not firstly a duty and responsibility; it is firstly a response of love and gratitude for God's love and welcome to us (Pohl 1999:172). We were pilgrims, wanderers, aliens, strangers, and even enemies of God, but we, too, were welcomed into worship by His hospitality. The stranger at the door is the living symbol and memory that we are all strangers. The church is not our house, but God's. We do not have to be bound to show our intimacy but shows hospitality of God in worship.

According to Long (2001:26), people come to worship with two needs: the hunger for communion with God and the hunger for human community. The God who created Adam to communicate with Him, gave him Eve to communicate with. It can thus be said that God wants us to communicate with others as well as with Him. The one thing that can be deduced from this fact is that the hunger for God and for others should not be in opposition to each other. Human and divine hospitality can be satisfied in at the same place and time, viz. the place of worship. However, when some people who want to get warm relationship with others come to worship, the dimension of fear of God or awe in worship can frighten them (Long 2001:28). To avoid this awe-inspiring or fearful atmosphere in worship, many churches have emphasized friendliness and intimacy-oriented elements such as popular-like songs, sermons with audio-video materials. That is what Long (2001:5ff) calls "Willow Creek force". However, within that human beings' hospitality, fear and hospitality cannot stand in a dialect relationship. That is merely emphasizing hospitality while the aspect of fear is ignored. More importantly, this hospitality is focused on human beings' convenience, not the hospitality as God's invitation to worship through Jesus' redemptive work for us. It is not about a problem of how many hospitable programs there are in worship, viz. not a matter of quantity; or a problem of how the programs make people comfortable, viz. not a matter of quality; but a problem of how can people worship within fear and hospitality of God that are given in worship.

It can solve the problem of whether or not to alter the order of worship for newcomers' convenience when we look at how Jesus showed His hospitality to sinners. Jesus did not abandon

God's will to be intimate with people, nor shun them for being impious, but He inspires them to resemble God's holiness. Instead of having to be set apart from or exclude pagans in order to maintain holiness, it is Jesus' hospitality to the pagans, the unclean, and sinners that shows His holiness to them. Instead of sin and impurity infecting Him, it seems Jesus' purity and righteousness somehow infects the impure, sinners, and the Gentiles (Bretherton 2006:130). In short, people were changed, not Jesus. This is the way to show God's hospitality to people without renouncing our faith or changing the order of our worship. We do not need to change our rite because it seems strange to the newcomers; rather, we should lead them into worship showing the rite we normally practice. The best way to help and nourish others is to have them worship in a proper way. As Long (2001:39) points out, the way faithful congregations invite people to offer themselves to God is just to furnish a well structured worship service, not to alter worship for their sake.

Worship is the best way that God's hospitality is demonstrated. However, this does not mean worship is the only place for hospitality. The main purpose of worship would then be evangelism. Long (2001:31) warns about this reversal: "[W]hen we think about the goals of worship exclusively in intimate terms – either intimacy with God, intimacy with others, or both – the result is that worship is diminished". Many Christians are anxious to be intimate when they meet newcomers, thus, they are shackled by warmly welcoming them in an artificial manner and talking a lot to make them feel at home. However, Lathrop (1993:128-129) argues that the hospitality should be paired with the reverence. According to him (1993:129):

We warmly welcome someone we do not know, but we make no inquiry after job or status or reason for coming. Small talk is not needed here. Jockeying for position and power should be excluded. Rather, if needed, we show or simply explain something about the meeting to follow: the book, the bulletin, the manner of communion. Welcome and reverence are not incompatible. On the contrary, their combination assures us that the welcome is to something more than just ourselves, or, on the other hand, that the center of the meeting is constantly being made accessible.

Helping newcomers concentrate on worship is itself the best way to demonstrate hospitality.

## **2.5. WORSHIP: FEAR AND CELEBRATION**

Encountering God has two implications for us: before God's overwhelming presence we are in fear, and in God's love and work for us we feel His hospitality. The two dimensions are coalesced in worship that worship is the place God invites us with His hospitality, at the same time we meet Him with fear.

As we have discussed through the theology of Rudolf Otto and Abraham Heschel, awe, mystery, and fear of God can be aspects of enmity to worship, as well as amity. In addition to those feelings, a stranger-feeling makes people hesitant to come to worship God. Christians and non-Christians alike, sometimes feel that it is not easy to join Christian worship. It is held on Sunday morning when they want to rest. When they come into the church to participate in worship service, they meet a strange setting: a strange way of speaking in prayers; baroque style hymns; long and boring sermons; and the Eucharist of which they do not understand what is happening. Those aspects can make people hesitant to come to worship.

However, it must not be forgotten that worship is always a reaction to God's hospitable invitation. As worship starts, the presider calls the attendees to worship. However, neither the presider nor the preacher calls people to worship; the God who created human beings in His image, also invites them into worship to grow into His likeness. The purpose of our lives as His creatures given by God is to glorify and enjoy Him forever. In this regard, liturgy can be understood to be the dialogue between God and humankind (Wainwright 2006:9-10). Thus, God's hospitality and our response to that are decisive aspects of worship as well as fear and awe (Long 2001:47). As mentioned above, God's hospitality is shown in Jesus' redemptive work for us. Thus, in worship we celebrate Jesus in God's hospitality.

First, the dimension of fear in worship is dealt with, and worship as celebration of Jesus is followed.

### 2.5.1. GOD'S OVERWHELMING PRESENCE

According to Van den Brom (1993:22-23), human response to glory can assume several different forms: “such as the exclamation ‘YHWH is Glorious’; but it can also be expressed by gestures such as covering one’s face; turning away; or prostrating oneself upon the ground”. He adds that human beings can also “suppress their response” or “reject them or ignore them”. However, for worshippers, it is the privilege being invited to worship God. God is worthy to be worshipped (Van den Brom 1993:21); and we worship Him though we do not deserve to do.

Worship is “gestures of awe and self-negation” (Leonard 1993:73) and expresses the *numinous* (Smart 1972:51). God’s presence in worship is so overwhelmed that we cannot express or praise that, but only prostrate one-self or keep silent. This is echoed in Otto – in appendix VIII to his book, *The Idea of the Holy*, he ([1923]2010:216-220) describes and analyzes the Quaker’s silent worship.<sup>30</sup> Otto prefers silent worship on two points: “first, the silence is qualitatively different and better than worship with words”. Second, “silence, as Otto envisions it, is the ‘culmination and climax’ of the religious service at its most appropriate” (Wenderoth 1982:43). For Otto, silence is better than word to express God’s overwhelming presence. We are attracted to the presence of God, but at the same time, paradoxically, also want to flee from this overwhelming mystery. We have no words left to describe what we experience. It is truly an inexpressible feeling, but best articulated in silence (Cilliers 2009a:39).

However, keeping silent is not all we can do. Worship does not entail God’s action solely, it is the nature of worship to embrace human beings’ response to God’s divine revelation (White 2001:23; Webber 2006:111-117).<sup>31</sup> The problem, however, is that before His overwhelming presence, human

---

<sup>30</sup> For more detailed study of Quaker worship, see Creasey (1986:454-455) and White (1989:135-149).

<sup>31</sup> However, when we say worship consists of two parts, it should be emphasized that God’s revelation and our response do not carry the same weight. The proper response to God can be generated and empowered by the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. 12:3), not by us (cf. White 2001:23).

beings do not have anything to say but feel fear as the priests fell down when God's divine glory filled the temple (1 Kings 8:10-11). Even for believers, encountering God is a dreadful experience, because they know God is the Judge as well as the Saviour. Mackey (2003:26) explains the relationship between judgment and worship as follows:

The believer, in the presence of God, is in a position of judgment and worship. To worship is to stand judged as a creature in the presence of the Creator – it is to realize what we are in the awareness of who God is. Worship is an event thoroughly calling for the presence of awe.

Then, what should be the behaviour of sinners? If we compare the impeccable God to us, worship can become the place of penitence. For Barth, according to Boulton (2008:41), worship is the first behaviour of fallen Eve to manifest her gesture of adoration. Worship, therefore, “with its characteristic adoration and reverence and confession and praise, effectively excludes all equality of friendship from the relationship of humanity to God” (Boulton 2008:41). Adam and Eve stood in front of God as sinners and worshipped Him with awe and fear of judgment for what they had done. What they meant by worship was to avoid God's wrath. Worship takes place “over against God”. However, it is inevitable that “worship is also a withdrawal from the original face-to-face encounter with God” (Boulton 2008:42). The more we worship God, the more we feel we are receding from Him. The more we adore God, the more we feel we are sinners. That is a tragedy of human beings.<sup>32</sup>

Accordingly, a fear-experience in worship, which contains the *numinous* and the mysterious aspect, is significant and without it, Christian worship cannot be authentic. However, unfortunately, we so seldom experience fear, awe, and reverence in our churches today. All too often, the atmosphere seems to work against reverence. Contemporary churches are characterized by a sense of “overfamiliarity” which is an inappropriate way to approach God (Webber 2006:5-6). Saliers (1996:20) complains that the worship of contemporary American churches, Protestant and Roman Catholic alike, is “domesticated”. He says it is pleasant, even user-friendly, but something is missing

---

<sup>32</sup> Although we are sinners and our worship is not perfect, God accepts our worship. That is grace. God will judge us, but it is clear that those who believe in Jesus are not condemned (John 3:18). The argument about worship as grace is discussed later.

at the heart of our practices as well as our theology – awe in the presence of God. Webber (2006:24) also shows his regret for the absence of the mysterious aspect in contemporary worship:

There was a time when the idea of mystery was more a part of our thinking than it is now. God was in his heavens – high, holy, and lifted up. In worship there was a sense of awe and reverence on the presence of the One who was wholly other. But now we have either reasoned God out of existence or so reduced him to clichés and formulas that the mystery has disappeared.

Regarding this matter, Brueggemann (1990:249) warns as follows: “when people are no longer awed, respectful, or fearful of God’s holiness, the community is put at risk”. It is sensible to criticize only friendly-focused worship which is absent of any sense of awe or fear of God, because “awe forms the backbone of liturgy” (Cilliers 2009a:43).<sup>33</sup> However, it is also true that, at the same time worship itself has a celebratory nature which seems to be incongruous with fear.

## **2.5.2. WORSHIP AS A CELEBRATION OF THE CHRIST EVENT**

### **2.5.2.1. Worship and Feast**

Holman (2001:168) traces the meaning of the term “feast” to the Latin *festus*, in which we recognize the root *fes-*, which means “ceremony” or “rite”. He argues that a feast has three characteristics: 1) It is something extraordinary; 2) it is a social event; and 3) it synthesizes past, present, and future. By the meaning and characteristics of feast, we can argue that worship and feast have something in common. First, within the basic meaning, worship and feast both are inherently ceremony or rite. To give a feast or worship, settled programs or forms are needed. Second, from the three characteristics that Holman suggests, we also can deduce commonness between them: 1) Both are extraordinary, because they “interrupt the series of ordinary days in order to commemorate a joyful fact” (Holman 2001:168). In terms of worship, the joyful fact that must be commemorated is what Jesus Christ has done for us. 2) Both are social event. A person cannot hold a rite of feast or

---

<sup>33</sup> The criticism to excluding fear and awe to accentuate familiarity in worship is dealt with in chapter 5.

worship alone. According to Barnard (2001:188), Schleiermacher does not explain worship as personal action, but relates worship with culture when he introduces his definition of worship in the first chapter of the first part of his *Practical Theology*.<sup>34</sup> As such, Schleiermacher does not speak of worship apart from culture, i.e., worship cannot be studied as an isolated phenomenon, but only in its dynamic relation to culture and to people. Schleiermacher also uses, alike Holman, the word “interrupt” to define worship and feast. Schleiermacher finds “the core of his definition of worship in the notion of an interruption of the rest of life”, then he defines feast as follows: “When people break the continuity of labour and business and gather in larger groups for a common activity, we speak of a feast” (as quoted in Barnard 2001:188). As such, Schleiermacher agrees with Holman that worship and feast are social events. And 3) both synthesize past, present, and future. Commemorative character of both makes this synthesis possible.<sup>35</sup>

Jesus analogizes the Kingdom of God to a feast: “The kingdom of heaven may be compared to a king who gave a marriage feast for his son” (Matt. 22:2). Worship is God’s feast for us to celebrate His Son. Vatican II reminds of us this celebratory aspect of worship saying that the Lord’s Day is original feast day of Christ. Worship as feast is held on “the eighth day of the week” which commemorates Christ’s resurrection as the beginning of a new creation (McDermott 1990b:200). Although worship is the place of fear as mentioned above, at the same time, it is the place where God’s invitation is sent and God’s hospitality is shown to the attendees.

### **2.5.2.2. Celebration of Jesus with Fourfold Order**

Muller (1985:46) envisages the “Christ event” theologically as “a term for the incarnation of Jesus Christ”. Webber (2006:45) expounds it more liturgically with the terms revelation and incarnation,

---

<sup>34</sup> According to Cilliers (2009b:3), for Schleiermacher, “worship begins when a human being knows “I am”. But saying “I am” is not meant to be an individualistic experience – it always take place in communion with others”.

<sup>35</sup> Synthesizing past, present, and future can be expressed with actualization of past and future glory into present. Detailed discussion about the actualization is given in chapter 4 in the relation between glory and worship.



comparing them to the Word and the Eucharist: “Worship tells and acts out the Christ-event. [...] Worship is patterned after God who revealed Himself and God who became incarnate. Therefore, the twofold focus of worship is the Word (the Bible as the symbol of God speaking) and the Table (bread and wine as the symbol of God acting to save us)”. Protestant theologian Robert Webber and Roman Catholic theologian Jovian Lang agree that worship celebrates the Christ event in today’s church so that Christians commemorate Him in their life:

Worship is not a mere memory or a matter of looking back to a historic event (that is an Enlightenment notion). Rather, worship is the action that brings the Christ event into the experience of the community gathered in the name of Jesus (Webber 1994:67);

Celebration in the liturgical sense entails coming together to commemorate the announcement and actuation of the Mystery of Christ in the *today* of the Church (Lang 1989:93).

Then, how can we celebrate the Christ event in our worship? What order is the best fit to celebrate Jesus? The order of the worship service is strange to some people, especially to newcomers to the church. They do not know when they should stand up; close their eyes; sit down again; whether or not to clap their hands; and whether or not to take the bread and the wine. Complicated orders in worship can be obstacles to invite a neighbour into our worship to celebrate the Christ event. It thus seems to close the church door to neighbours. According to Schmemmann ([1966]2009:35), the order of worship is changeable for each era and each congregation:

In other words the written Ordos were originally the expression of local rules, the description of how the Church’s liturgical tradition was observed under given conditions in a given period. [...] We come to the conclusion, therefore, that the Ordo is problematical both in scope and content, and that selectivity and judgment are required in its use; i.e., the application of criteria and premises which are not found within it in explicit form.

However, this does not mean that we can structure worship for our convenience. Indeed, we do not have to invent our worship to manifest the Christ event, or try to enliven our worship to create a celebratory ambience, because the Gospel story already has celebration and drama in it (Long 2001:44). Worship is inherently celebration and this dimension of worship is manifested through

proper order. Long and Webber suggest a fourfold order for the celebration of Christ event respectively: the fourfold order is, according to Long (2001:47) “Gathering, Word, Eucharist, Sending” and according to Webber (2006:45) “Entrance, the Word of God, the Table of the Lord, and Dismissal”.<sup>36</sup> It is obvious that the most basic and rudiment shape of worship is fourfold, because this order is the best fit to celebrate what Christ has done for us. Moreover, this fourfold order shows what Jesus wants us to do and to be. Christ is to be experienced by the people from the beginning to the end of the fourfold order (Webber 1996:91). No matter how varied worship is, this typical fourfold patterns of worship is focused on the Christ event. Thus, Webber (1996:39-40) argues that worship should not be goal-driven but Christ-driven:

When Christ is the center of worship, all of the goals for worship are achieved: Christ-centered worship educates, evangelizes, heals, develops spirituality –and is most enjoyable. A Christ-centered worship – which is event-oriented worship – can never be static and merely intellectual because what happens is an actual and real communication of the power and benefit of the life, death, and resurrection of Christ.

Because worship itself is inherently festive, no one has to design it artificially to be shown as celebration. The only thing the church must do is to celebrate the Christ event by the Word, the Sacraments, the hymns, and movements.

### **2.5.2.3. Celebration of Jesus with Bodily Action as a Response to Fear**

With hardly any exception, all denominations involve the various actions in their worship: e.g., kneeling down, bowing down, closing eyes, standing up, and raising hands. In addition to the complicated order such bodily actions could be further hindrances to newcomers. However, these actions are in two ways significant in worship as a proper reaction to God’s grace.

---

<sup>36</sup> Applying the traditional elements of the fourfold order to worship as a celebration does not mean that they are to be blended. What we should be careful is that put contemporary programs into the traditional fourfold worship to make balance in quality or quantity. However, by suggesting this fourfold order here, we can expect how Christ event synthesizes fear and celebratory aspect in worship through the order.

Firstly, these actions are not merely physical movements, but signal to whom we worship (Smart 1972:6). As Wainwright (1980:37) states, these bodily movements are inescapable in Christian worship indeed: “The original religious impulse to prostrate oneself upon the sudden appearance of the overwhelming *numen* is ritualized into bows and genuflections in the context of cultic repetition”. In short, prostration is a natural human beings’ response when they encounter God. For Otto([1923]2010:16), it is not an abnormal thing that the unique experience of God’s presence causes the unique physical reaction such as “cold blood” feeling and even the symptom of “creeping flesh”. Physical action, which can be seen, heard, and felt is so important in worship that Long (2001:22-23) argues that a worship leader’s voice, posture, language, and gesture are and should be the vehicle of fear of worship.

Secondly, the celebratory aspect of worship entails bodily responses: standing, bowing, kneeling, and clapping of hands. Such bodily actions manifest worshippers’ inner feelings that they communicate with each other in their devotion to the Lord (Lang 1989:93). Bodily action accompanies a natural response when we meet joyfully to celebrate. The inward corroboration of the confessional joy of worship is demonstrated in outward actions. Long (2001:36) indicates that the physical environment of worship which is related to bodily action and can show our hospitality to newcomers, also should be conducive for faithful worship:

[I]n newer church designs and in many older church rehab projects, increasing attention is being given to the foyer or narthex as a space of welcome. Larger, well-lit and comfortably decorated spaces with plenty of room for convention communicate hospitality.

## **2.6. CONCLUSION**

Fear and hospitality form the dual nature of worship. They are manifested simultaneously in faithful worship and neither can be overemphasized or disregarded. All worshippers should admit both are vital for Christian worship. It is not the matter of personal, denominational, or cultural

preference. In addition, it must be stressed again that these two elements cannot be balanced or blended, but stand in dialectic relationship. Therefore, how to make their relationship dialectically within the proper agent should be the next argument. However, before doing that, in the next chapter we discuss how fear and hospitality have been stressed or excluded historically.

**CHAPTER 3**

**HISTORICAL OCCURRENCE OF**

**FEAR AND HOSPITALITY IN WORSHIP:**

***THE INTERPRETIVE TASK***

**3.1. INTRODUCTION**

As we have observed so far, fear and hospitality are decisive aspects of worship. However, they are not only used in Christian worship, but also for personal feeling or social virtue. The authentic fear in worship commences with God's divine presence, but other factors can also cause the feeling of fear in worship. Although it is not the same fear we discussed in chapter 2 as a proper response to God's presence, there are many things which are wrongly regarded as fear in worship. Those emotions of fear make people not come to worship place. The authentic hospitality leads people into worship, but human beings' hospitality is shown in order to gather people in worship. God's hospitable invitation to worship is given through the redemptive work of the Son in the Holy Spirit. However, the hospitality of human beings' – whether it is a person or a church – only makes themselves look better.

Fear and hospitality have been occurring in Christian worship, whether or not to have liturgical meaning. Therefore, the importance of interpretation has arisen. How do we interpret fear and hospitality in worship which have been found in history? This chapter, by and large, deals with emotion of fear which make people hesitate to come to worship; and discusses hospitality which calls people to worship but is different from God's hospitality. To describe the interpretive task, we look at

the occurrence of fear and hospitality in particular periods in history. The periods are: the Early Church, the era of Constantine's reign, the Medieval Age, the era of the Reformation, and after the Reformation. Worship in all periods contains fear and hospitality. However, in certain periods, fear is more stressed than hospitality, and vice versa. In this chapter, we argue that fear and hospitality takes turns in being emphasized in Christian worship.

The interpretive task is bound to the previous task – the descriptive-empirical task, to which we can apply a theological criterion. In other words, in chapter 2 we dealt with the inherent characteristics of the fear and the hospitality which have significance in Christian worship. In the current chapter, we deal with our interpretation of fear and hospitality which has been occurring in worship in the light of the theological perspective.

## **3.2. THE EARLY CHURCH: ESCHATOLOGICAL FEAR**

The Early Church was dominated by a powerful sense of being in and with the risen Lord. At the same time they expected the *parousia* – i.e., that the weekly gathering of the church was in an eschatological rather than a historical and commemorative time model (Talley 1973:213). Worship in eschatology means, on the one hand, they expect “all in anticipation of the banquet of the final Kingdom when the Messiah will sit at table with his people” (Wainwright 1979c:496); on the other hand, as Brunner (1968:194) indicates, this eschatological expectation has both fear and hope at the same time because the Lord will come as the Saviour and the Judge as well. Thus, when we focus on the eschatological aspect in the Early Church worship, both fear and hospitality are to be dealt with. However, in this section we focus on the notion of fear that was more prevalent during that period.

### **3.2.1. WORSHIP IN FEAR OF THE ROMAN PERSECUTION**

In A.D. 111, Pliny the Younger was appointed the governor of Bithynia, where many Christians lived. He wanted Christians to pray to Roman gods; to burn incense before the image of the emperor; and to curse Christ. However, he heard that true Christians never did those things (González 1984:40). Because persecution of Christians at that time had not been severe yet, he wrote the letter to the emperor to report what he had done and to seek the emperor's advice. As quoted in Johnson (2009a:85), the Emperor Trajan's answer was that:

It is impossible to formulate a general principle that can be applied as a fixed norm. These people [Christians] are not to be sought out; if they are brought before you and found guilty, they must be punished. Yet if anyone denies being a Christian and proves this by offering supplications to our gods, this person shall be pardoned as being repentant however suspect this person's former conduct may have been.

This policy that "Christians were not sought out; but if they were accused and they refused to worship gods, they had to be punished" is echoed in Tertullian's treatise, *Apology* (Johnson 2009a:116). Indeed, it was general policy in the second century in the Roman Empire (González 1984:41).

Under the policy, it was possible to be accused by neighbours for being Christian. Thus, not to be accused the Christians had to be intimate with their neighbours (cf. González 1984:48). However, this intimacy cannot be regarded as true hospitality because it neither could show God's hospitality nor lead their neighbours to worship. Rather, there was another kind of fear in worship: being accused and persecuted for worship, though this fear is not related to the fear of God. Thus, on one hand, many people rejected to worship God for fear of being accused; on the other hand, many people worshipped God in spite of the fear. Catacombs, which were worship places for the Christians in Rome,<sup>37</sup> were the representative dimension of worship of that time – darkness, silence, death, and awe-inspiring.<sup>38</sup> Christians dreamed of the *parousia* to make their persecution and suffering bearable. Thus, it is not accidental that the worship of the Early Church had many eschatological aspects in it: e.g., martyrology as an eschatological hope, *maranatha* as an eschatological invocation.

---

<sup>37</sup> According to McKim (1996:39), "catacombs [...] most were in Italy, particularly Rome".

<sup>38</sup> That does not mean that the Early Church worshipped only within gloomy atmosphere. There were also bright sides like "Love Feast" (cf. Baker 1986), and the Eucharist itself contains a celebratory aspect. However, this chapter stresses the fear and awe-inspiring dimension of the Early Church.

### 3.2.2. WORSHIP IN FEAR OF GOD WITH ESCHATOLOGICAL HOPE: MARTYROLOGY

Many Christians died due to the Roman persecution. Even at the moment of death, they envisioned heaven to which they were going. Martyrdom has been a part of Christianity from the beginning. Christians were to uphold Jesus' last commandment, even though the world would shake or they would be dragged before kings and governors (Luke 21:12) (Jungman 1966:175).

With eschatological hope, the veneration of martyrs arose from the second century (Bradshaw 1996:91). This was called martyrology – the idea for commemoration of the martyrs. Initially, the term martyrology was the list of the names in chronological order of persons who have died for the faith. However, it had been changed into denoting the official calendar of feasts celebrated in the church (Lang 1989:388). Martyrology contains the deeds of the martyrs and other saints so that the Christians could keep the faith like them (White 2001:42). In his letter, *To the Presbyters and Deacons*, Cyprian of Carthage (Johnson 2009a:157) wrote:

Lastly, also note the days when they [those in prison] pass from this life so that we can commemorate them among the memory of the martyrs; as a matter of fact, Tertullian [...] has written and is writing and indicating to me the days on which our blessed brethren in prison pass to immortality by means of a glorious death, and here we celebrate offerings and sacrifices to commemorate them. These, with the Lord's protection, we will soon celebrate with you [...].

The book of martyrology was arranged according to the day of the martyrs' death. The commemorative feast for them was held on that day at their grave (Klauser 1979:87; cf. also Lang 1989:388-389). However, the day of their "death" was gradually called their "birthday". This indicates the conviction that for those who had suffered and died for the Christian faith, death was the gateway to a new beginning, eternal life in heaven with Christ, in whose suffering they had participated (Willimon 1989:41; Bradshaw 1996:91). Thus, martyrology and the continuing feast of commemoration of the martyrs has an eschatological aspect.



As Bradshaw (1996:92) indicates, though the Early Church did not worship the martyrs, it is obvious that the martyrdom influenced the worship in the Early Church. Because many Christians were facing death, this eschatological expectation that God will come to lead them into the eternal home with Him was conclusive ambience of the Early Church. They gathered in worship with fear of being accused and persecuted; and gathered with fear of God who will come to save and judge. Thus, their fear had two elements: their social position and God. In addition, the two elements were combined into an eschatological hope.

### **3.2.3. WORSHIP IN FEAR OF GOD WITH ESCHATOLOGICAL INVOCATION: *MARANATHA***

The phrase of eschatological invocation *Maranatha* is known as it was used in the Early Church worship as a prayer for the second coming of Jesus. Hitchcock and Brown (1885:51-52) agrees that *Maranatha* has generally been understood to refer to the second coming of our Lord, though Chrysostom and some other Greek Fathers seem to have understood it as referring to the first coming. Martin (1976:128, 131; cf. also McKim 1996:167) argues that *Maranatha* can be understood either as an indicative (1 Cor. 16:22) or an exhortation (Rev. 22:20):

This ejaculation may mean either, “The Lord has come” (is coming), or (on the division of the letters as above) “Our Lord, Come!” It looks backward to all that the coming of Christ into the world has meant, and is an acknowledgement of praise. It has also a present significance, as it bids the assembled Church recognize that the Lord is in the midst and has come to greet His people (Martin 1976:131).

However, Cullmann (1954:13) focuses more on Rev. 22:20 saying that *Maranatha* is an imperative – “Our Lord, Come!”, that is to say a prayer which is an eschatological invocation, and not an indicative – “Our Lord is coming”. Saliers (1994:50) agrees with this, saying *Maranatha* is the urgent imperative as the final prayer in the New Testament. In the *Didache*, *Maranatha* also has eschatological meaning:

Remember, Lord, Thy Church, to deliver it from all evil and to make it perfect in Thy love, and gather it from the four winds, sanctified for Thy kingdom which Thou hast prepared for it; for Thine is the power and the glory forever. Let grace come, and let this world pass away. Hosanna to the God (Son) of David! If anyone is holy, let him come; if anyone is not so, let him repent. Maranatha. Amen.<sup>39</sup>

Martin (1976:128) says that “nothing is more characteristic of early Christian assemblies than the devotional exclamation *Marana tha* (1 Cor. 16:22).”<sup>40</sup> The eschatological invocation *Maranatha* shows us how the Early Church expected the *parousia*. The persecution they suffered strengthened the expectation of the *parousia*. Because eschatology does not merely mean future things, the early Christians had to examine their word and deed before the Coming Christ. Thus, not only did they worship with fear and awe of God, but also lived with fear and reverence *coram deo*.

### 3.2.4. EVALUATION

Eschatology itself does not always refer to fear in worship in separation of grace, because it also has a celebratory aspect. Worship celebrates the Christ event. Eschatological hope gives a festive mood to worship.<sup>41</sup> However, it should be stressed that the Early Christians were persecuted by the Roman Empire. They could not celebrate worship as we do today, but pathetic elements like martyrdom and catacomb were always on their minds.

They celebrated the Eucharist admitting only those who were baptized. That meant much to them, because by being baptized they declared that they were Christians; it also meant that they would do not hesitate even to die for the Lord. Only those who would die for Him could join the worship.

---

<sup>39</sup> According to Hitchcock and Brown (1885:lxxxviii), a relatively large part of the *Didache* is occupied by eschatology.

<sup>40</sup> For the study of the meaning of *Maranatha* within the etymological analysis between  $\mu\alpha\rho\nu\nu\alpha\ \theta\alpha$  and  $\mu\alpha\rho\nu\ \alpha\theta\alpha$ , see Wainwright (1978:69-70).

<sup>41</sup> For the study of the various liturgical tension, see Cilliers (2009b). In this article, he observes four fundamental liturgical tension: “between being and becoming, between time and space, between awe and expression, and between laughter and lament”.

### 3.3. UNDER CONSTANTINE’S RULE: OFFICIAL HOSPITALITY

Constantine and Licinius met at Milan in February of 313, the latter having accepted, temporarily at least, the Christian God. In the spring of that year the Edict of Milan – a monotheistic and pro-Christian document which guaranteed absolute toleration and full restitution of all confiscated property – was issued.<sup>42</sup>

When I, Constantine Augustus, and I, Licinius Augustus, met under favorable circumstances at Milan and were considering everything that pertained to prosperity and the public good, we thought – among other things which we believed would benefit many – that regulations in regard to reverencing the deity should be enacted first. In this way we could give Christians and others full freedom to follow whatever religion they chose so that whatever divinity exists in heaven may graciously look upon us and upon all who are subject to us. [...] We have decided that you should be completely aware of this so that you might know that we have given these same Christians the freedom and liberty to observe their own religion.

-Letter of Constantine and Licinius (Johnson 2009b:126)

Many scholars agree that it was a decisive hour in the history of the Early Church when, in February 313, the emperor Constantine issued the so-called “edict of toleration” at Milan, granting to Christians full freedom of religion and worship, and ordering the restitution of the church’s property and her places of worship (Bradshaw 2002:211; Jungman 1966:122; cf. González 1984:124). Two aspects regard the edict are of significance to the current discussion: 1) The edict had finished the persecution. That meant the Christians did not have to be in fear of being accused or persecuted as they worshipped. The way they worshipped would also change; 2) Constantine, the emperor, showed “his” hospitality to the Christians that allowed them to worship God. As we have observed in chapter 2, God’s hospitality is to be shown and taught in Christian worship, but because of the edict it was

---

<sup>42</sup> It is vague who issued the Edict. Whereas Jones (1979:43) claims that Licinius issued the edict at Nicomedia, Bradshaw (2002:211) says, as known more generally, that it was Constantine. However, Leithart (2010:98ff) argues that the standard account about the edict from Milan and Constantine or Licinius was fictional, in his recent book, *Defending Constantine: The Twilight of an Empire and the Dawn of Christendom*.

possible to think that Christians could worship God by the emperor's hospitality. In this section, we observe how Constantine's hospitality influenced Christian worship; and how Christian worship degenerated by the hospitality.

### 3.3.1. FROM THE PERSECUTION TO THE OFFICIAL THEOLOGY

Eusebius of Caesarea, who regarded the Roman Empire and Constantine as God's methods for the new era of Christianity (cf. González 1984:129-135), declares that it was the religious incentive for Constantine's decree: "Constantine also decreed that one day should be regarded as a special time for prayer, namely, the first and principle day, the day of our Lord and Saviour" (Johnson 2009b:316). However, Constantine did not seem to state this law for the Christian's sake, because it was commonly known that he was warmly disposed towards sun-worship (Rordorf 1968:163).<sup>43</sup> As Rordorf (1968:164) argues, although Constantine was not a Christian it is possible that by means of this step he wished to show his support for the Christians who had already grown considerably in number. In other words, Constantine's decree reflected his political ambition.

The persecution seemed to have ended, and the emperor's hospitality, which was followed by privileges to Christians, started. Constantine's conversion, whether it was true or not, impacted all elements of Christianity. Worship was most influenced of all because it was linked directly to the Christians' daily life. Jones (1979:44) shows how the worship was altered before and after Constantine:

Between the reigns of Hadrian and Diocetian, as a test of loyalty to the Roman state, Christians were required to offer sacrifice before the emperor's image, to take oaths by the emperor's fortune, and to

---

<sup>43</sup> Constantine's letter to Helpidius proves that Constantine promulgated the law concerning Sunday for the sake of agriculture: "The Emperor Constantine to Helpidius: All judges, townspeople and all occupations (*atrium official cunctarum*) should rest on the most honorable day of the sun. Farmers indeed should be free and unhindered in their cultivation of the fields, since it frequently occurs that there is no more suitable day for entrusting seeds of corn to the furrows and slips of vine to the holes (prepared for them), lest haply the favourable moment sent by divine providence be lost" (Rordorf 1968:162).

swear by the emperor's health or safety. Refusal to comply with any of these led to the death penalty. Emperor worship was an abuse which could not be tolerated by the early Christians. For them, God alone was to be worshipped. The emperor, as a man, deserved only human honor. Under Constantine, however, Christians comprised half of the empire's population, and no longer were forced to bow to the emperor; rather, he bowed his knee to their Christ.

As such, Constantine opened worship to everyone. As a result of this "Constantine Peace", all classes of people could come towards Christianity (Jungman 1966:122). Compared to the previous era, it was easy to come to the place of worship, for in this era people did not have to worry about being accused or persecuted.

However, being comfortable does not always give a merit for worshippers. González (1984:136) argues what resulted the openness of Christianity after edict of Milan as follows:

The narrow gate of which Jesus had spoken had become so wide that countless multitudes were hurrying past it – some seemingly after privilege and position, without caring to delve too deeply into the meaning of Christian baptism and life under the cross.

Worship was widely open that many people came to church to be Christians. However, they did not have to be in fear of persecution; they did not have to consider martyrdom; they were baptized without serious consideration being Christian; they worshipped God with the emperor's hospitality, not God's; they could worship God without fear of Him, but with gratitude to the emperor. Thus, fear of God was not decisive aspect in Christian worship. People thought it was the emperor's hospitality which allowed them worship God freely. They wrongly regarded that they could worship without Christ's mediatory work for them. The two inherent characteristics of Christian worship – fear and hospitality of God had weakened by those elements.

### **3.3.2. THE RESULT OF BECOMING OFFICIAL RELIGION – CONSTRAINED WORSHIP**

As noted above, Constantine promulgated the law that Sunday is the day of rest. Not only did he enact the law of rest, but also order that all people should attend the Sunday service:

As to the others who were still ignorant of divine truth, he [Constantine] issued a second statute that they should appear on the Lord's Day on an open plain near the city. There, at a given signal, they were all to offer God a prayer that they had previously learned (Johnson 2009b:316).

Christianity was not a persecuted religion any longer, but became the official religion of the Empire. This means that everyone was forced to worship. Worshippers were not in fear of God any more, but felt feeling of fear that they would be out of the emperor's favour. Worship did not mean to them to God's hospitable invitation through Jesus' redemptive work. Fear and hospitality in worship seemed not to have been the decisive dimensions of Christian worship.

### **3.3.3. THE RESULT OF BECOMING OFFICIAL RELIGION – WORSHIP FOR BETTER CAREER**

González (1984:154) points out the benefits for some Christians who followed the emperor's policy, when he gives the account of the bishop of Carthage: "Constantine was issuing legislation in favour of Christianity, such as tax exception for the clergy. On the basis of his instructions to North Africa, only those in communion with Caecilian<sup>44</sup> could enjoy these benefits – or receive any of the gifts that Constantine was offering to the church". When we look on Klauser's statement (1979:33), we can surmise what benefit would be granted to some Christians who were closer to the emperor's side than others:

When Church and State went into partnership under Constantine, the first Christian emperor, the ruler persuaded the bishops to take over and to exercise some of his own prerogatives. In 318, Constantine handed over to them the power of jurisdiction in civil proceedings between Christians and other Christians, and also between Christians and non-Christians, and no one was allowed to appeal against their judgments.

The distortion did not stop at acquiring advantage from the emperor, but proceeded to obtaining the benefit for oneself. For instance, since the Bishop of Rome himself had almost the same dignity as the emperor, like the emperor he could claim the right to have his portrait hung in public buildings,

---

<sup>44</sup> Who was admitted by the emperor, whereas Donatus was disregarded.

and even in church; to be greeted on his arrival at church by a choir of singers; and to be waited on at the throne and the altar; and to have people genuflect to him and kiss his foot (Klauser 1979:34). Thus, for some Christians, if not all, to be Christian did not mean to be persecuted, rather it was a chance to get better career. To worship did not mean to be invited Christ event via God's hospitality, but to join social event via the emperor's hospitality.

### **3.3.4. THE RESULT OF BECOMING OFFICIAL RELIGION – WORSHIP IN THE EMPEROR'S SPLENDID BUILDING**

When Christianity was still an illegal religion, the Early Church had to worship in makeshift quarters. That is why we have very little documentary or architectural evidence of the architectural setting of Christian worship before Constantine (White 2001:91). However, things changed when Christianity became the official religion. Davies (1986:26) speaks of this matter as follows: “[After the edict of Milan] Its architecture accordingly was made to correspond with civic and imperial forms, and so the basilica became general in both east and west”. According to Egeria's *Pilgrimage to the Holy Places*, Constantine built the big church building on Golgotha: “[T]hroughout the year the people always gather on Sunday behind the Cross in the major church built at Golgotha by Constantine” (Johnson 2009b:343). The church and other buildings Constantine had built were very luxurious. In point of fact, it rather seemed to have been extravagant. According to Johnson (2009b:344), Egeria says: “What can I say about the splendor of the buildings themselves which Constantine and his mother, employing all the resources of his empire, have endowed with gold, mosaics, precious marble, the major church as well as the Anastasis, the Cross, and the other holy places in Jerusalem”. Those luxurious church buildings are also spoken of Sozomen's *Church History* (Johnson 2009c:339):

As to places of prayer, Constantine ordered the restoration of churches that were sufficiently large; others were wonderfully increased in length and height; elsewhere new buildings were constructed

where previously none existed. The emperor furnished money from the imperial treasury. Writing to the bishop of each city and to the provincial governors, he asked them to contribute whatever they wished.

These church buildings show the emperor's hospitable favour to the Christians. However, this hospitality could not lead people to worship God, rather it made people forget God's hospitality as they looked at the splendid inside of the building. White (2001:92-93) points out how the worship places became sumptuous comparing it with the worship place of the time of being persecuted: "The worship in these magnificent new buildings matched all the sumptuousness of the imperial court – a far cry from that of the persecuted Christians huddled together in secret meetings". Surely there was no more fear of death and tears of losing family or friends for persecution, but it is doubtful whether Christians who were persecuted for many years could worship God feeling hospitality or comfort in the emperor's luxurious places.

### **3.3.5. EVALUATION**

Constantine gave hospitality to Christians allowing Christians to worship; opening the church to everyone; and even enforcing people to attend the Sunday worship services. However, it cannot be regarded as true hospitality. As we examined in chapter 2, God invites us to worship through redemptive work of Jesus. That is God's hospitality which leads people true worship. Thus, worship is the best way in which God's hospitality is demonstrated to us through Jesus.<sup>45</sup> However, Constantine's hospitality is derived from himself – his political favour and ambition. His hospitality did not provide true worship to people, but distorted worship. The main concern of the attendees was attending itself – to show themselves to the emperor, not to get political and social disadvantage.<sup>46</sup> That is, Constantine's official hospitality made worship official action. The true fear and hospitality

---

<sup>45</sup> The Holy Spirit also involves God's hospitality in worship by keeping us in faith in God and maintaining us worship God. For a detailed argument about the role of the Holy Spirit is dealt in chapter 4.

<sup>46</sup> For recent research about Constantine, see Leithart (2010). The author deals with Constantine in detail concerning his personal background, and cultural and political background of that period as well. Opposing John Howard Yoder's so-called Constantinism, Leithart tries to be fair to Constantine.



were hidden in the worship under the emperor's hospitality.

### **3.4. THE MEDIEVAL AGE: PRETENDED FEAR**

As noted above, God's overwhelming presence makes people be in fear. It is obvious that human beings cannot make the awesome experience. However, the Medieval Church designed to produce an atmosphere of fear in worship whether or not to intend, because they knew they could not have God descends. Nevertheless, they wanted to create the reverent ambience of worship. In this section, how the medieval worship produced fear in worship is formulated in two points: making a hierarchical system, building the luxurious worship place.

#### **3.4.1. PRETENDED FEAR IN A HIERARCHICAL SYSTEM**

Calvin (*Inst.* 4.4.4) dislikes the term "hierarchy" saying that is "improper term" because "the Holy Spirit willed men to beware of dreaming of a principality or lordship as far as the government of the church is concerned". Luther gave the theology of "the priesthood of all believers" to break down the gap between clergy and laity.<sup>47</sup> A hierarchical system in church was also to be broken down. González (1984:134) argues that imperial Christianity which was made by Constantine partly caused the hierarchical system:

[T]he net result of those buildings, and of the liturgy that evolved to fit them, was the development of a clerical aristocracy, similar to the imperial aristocracy, and often as far from the common people as were the great offices of the Empire. The church imitated the uses of the Empire, not only in its liturgy, but also in its social structure.

The stages of holiness, with clerical and religious communities at the top and lay people at the

---

<sup>47</sup> The detailed argument of the theology of "the priesthood of all believers" is discussed later.

bottom, shows the rigid hierarchy of that time (White 1989:41). The Medieval Church planned a hierarchically structured institution (Davies 1986:28). It was thus not an accident that the separation between clergy and laity was the result. The notion of liturgy as a communal public work became a very tenuous conception indeed (Senn 1997:221).

Though clergy and laity contributed their own devotions in worship, those devotions were regarded to be of a different stratum. The laity contributed worship with obedient passivity, feeling God is the absolute fear to whom they cannot reach with their contribution. As McDonnell (1967:112) analyses, it was difficult for a man to meet his God and speak with Him apart from the ceremonial Sacramentalism, the ritual processions, and the sanctimonious externality of the official church. The laity must be dependent on the clergy to be close to God. As we have observed in chapter 2, fear or awe of God has a dual dimension: *tremendum mysterium et fascinosum*. However, in the medieval worship the laity only felt fear of frustration for their incapacity. McDonnell (1967:139-140) well formulates about how hierarchical system – clericalism – distinguished clergy from laity and deformed worship in the Medieval Ages:

Romanism, as Calvin experienced its ecclesiology on the pastoral level and as he interpreted it, was a clerical reality. An ecclesiology which is given to an exaggerated supernaturalism will also be given to various kinds of selectivity, a selectivity to the point of placing a part of the Christian community over against the other. Within the church there is the elite to whom the most sacred tasks are entrusted, and this in some exclusive sense. The clerical elect, who are supposed to perform their liturgical role within the community, become separated from the community, and both the clerical group and their cultic tasks become highly structured, self-contained, self-perpetuating, having their justification in themselves, unrelated to the worshipping community of God's people. The clerical elect appropriates to themselves the title and function of God's people. Just as the church becomes identified with the clerical elite, so the worshipping activity of the church becomes identified with clerical worship. The clerical initiate, having appropriated both Word and sacrament, feeds his soul with ritual splendor and liturgical mystery within the sanctuary while the faithful noncleric, fed on neither the Word of Christ nor the body of Christ, stands in reverent passivity, beholding from beyond the sanctuary grill the glory of the real Israel at worship. Because he must have the strong food of Christ's Word and Christ's body and has not received it – he turns to the peripheral, to relics and pilgrimages and indulgences. And the cleric liturgizes further, content to speak to his God in Latin and to his people not at all.

One of the different classes between clergy and laity is the use of the Latin language. As in the last

sentence of quotation from McDonnell above, the Latin was the official language in worship. But the problem was that laities could not understand it. This alienation could be found in the music in the worship of that time. In medieval worship, there were so many hymns, but all those were not done by laities but by choirs, because those were in Latin (White 2001: 120).<sup>48</sup> That is why choir stalls were one of the most important spaces in worship of the Medieval Age (White 2001:95). The devotion of lay people and the choirs were not regarded as being of the same class.

In this section “fear” means to make people hesitate to come to worship. With privilege like a hierarchical system and the use of the Latin, the Medieval Church distinguished clergy from laity. Under the hierarchy system in which laity could not participate in worship properly, worshippers only felt fear of God who is too high for them to reach, thus, they hardly felt God’s hospitality which is supposed to be given to them in the worship. Because this fear is different from the fear of God we have argued, we would like to call it “pretended fear”.

### **3.4.2. PRETENDED FEAR IN LUXURIOUS OUTWARD**

According to González (1984:125), after Constantine’s conversion, the incense which was used as a sign of respect for the emperor, began appearing in Christian churches. Besides, ministers’ garments became more luxurious and church buildings did not have simplicity any longer. As he (González 1984) indicates “Gospel was first of all good news to the poor”, but “beginning with Constantine, riches and pomp came to be seen as signs of divine favour”. For the poor, this luxurious Christianity is not good news, rather, it banned them to come to worship place. These luxurious buildings were too splendid to come in for the poor.

Constantine built many church buildings to show his hospitality; and the Medieval Church built high and grandeur buildings. On one hand, they wanted to show their richness, and on the other hand,

---

<sup>48</sup> For example, *Kyrie* (Lord, Have Mercy), *Gloria in Excelsis* (Glory Be to God on High), *Credo* (I Believe), *Sanctus* and *Benedictus* (Holy, Holy, Holy ... Blessed is He), and *Agnus Dei* (Lamb of God).

they wanted to show how God's church is magnificent and awesome. However, any visible enmity cannot show fear of God unless God institutes.<sup>49</sup> It was just "pretended fear".

### **3.4.3. EVALUATION**

Through the hierarchical system and luxurious buildings with sacred utensils, the Medieval Church tried to produce an atmosphere of fear in worship. However, this pretended fear cannot refer to and be remind of the fear of God. It could not lead people to worship. Rather, pretended fear provoked the laity to be antagonistic to worship. The laity focused on their private mass – the low mass which was one of the presentations of the antagonism to the medieval worship. God gives us fear and hospitality at the same time, but pretended fear in the Medieval Church never gave hospitality to laity, but threw them out of worship.

### **3.5. THE REFORMATION: INVITATING HOSPITALITY**

The medieval worship built the wall of the hierarchy system and luxurious ornaments which disallowed laities to participate in the worship. The laities were discouraged because they could not come close to God without clergies' help. It seemed to clergies were reverent and divine. Thus, it was fear and respect of the clerics not of God. However, the emergence of the Reformers broke down the wall and hospitably invited the laities into worship. McKee (2003:10) encapsulates how the Reformers invited people into worship through true understanding of worship and accountable theology:

All worship was to be conducted in a language the people could understand, and it should also be corporate; the priest could no longer commune alone in the Lord's Supper, but the congregation was to

---

<sup>49</sup> The representative symbol of fear of God is the ark of God. The argument about the ark of God is in chapter 4.

share in both bread and wine. The people should also have a voice in the praise of God and public prayer, usually through singing, and this meant greatly simplifying the music. Normally everyone would sing in union, one syllable per note, so that the text could be understood and the whole people might pray with mind and voice. The seven sacraments were reduced to the two that Christ had instituted – baptism and the Lord’s Supper – and these acts were not considered saving in themselves, without faith. The same standards were to apply to the lives of all Christians, since all are equally saved by faith and not by their own acts of holiness. Protestant clergy were therefore strongly urged to marry: there was no holy status for celibate people, no orders of monks or nuns. Families and communities were all to practice the same kind of biblical piety.

By the phrase of that worship must “be conducted in a language the people could understand”, we can deduce the necessity of the sermon in vernacular, not in the Latin; of that “people should also have a voice in the praise of God”, the need of hymns for all, not for choirs solely, is emerged; and of that all Christians “are equally saved by faith”, proper theology which breaks down a hierarchical system in church can take its place. Now we discuss about sermon and hymns in the vernacular, and then the theology of “the priesthood of all believers”.

### **3.5.1. THE WORD OF GOD**

Brüki (2006:437) argues that “[i]t is generally recognized that the incalculable gain of the Reformation was the discovery of the Word of God freshly alive and evangelical”. The sermon is not the object proclaimed without requesting any response, but invites a response from the hearer because it brings a person before God – *Coram Deo* (Senn 1997:306). Thus, the restoration of the Word of God changed the status of the laity: from passive observers to the active participants; from being in fear of all pretended fear to being given hospitable invitation to worship.

#### **3.5.1.1. The Restoration of the Sermon as the Core of Worship**

“The sermon belongs to the lifelong worship tradition of the Church” (Dobson 1941:161).

Preaching had played an important role in the Early Church worship according to Irenaeus's treatise (*ANF 1:330*), *Against Heresies*:

As I have already observed, the Church, having received this preaching and this faith, although scattered throughout the whole world, yet, as if occupying but one house, carefully preserves it. She also believes these points [of doctrine] just as if she had but one soul, and one and the same heart, and she proclaims them, and teaches them, and hands them down, with perfect harmony, as if she possessed only one mouth. For, although the languages of the world are dissimilar, yet the import of the tradition is one and the same. [...] [A]s the sun, that creature of God, is one and the same throughout the whole world, so also the preaching of the truth shineth everywhere, and enlightens all men that are willing to come to a knowledge of the truth.

The sermon was a normal part in the liturgy of the Early Church, but towards the Middle Ages the role of preaching decayed (Dobson 1941:162). Various factors contributed to the sermon ceasing to be a normal part in liturgy: “[M]ass conversions, the multiplication of presbyterial masses, the decay in educational standards, the Western development of low mass” (Fuller 1986:485). The low mass, which was usually meant in the opposite to the high mass (Lang 1989:374), was also called the “said mass”, the “read mass”, or “private mass”. The low mass was familiar to the laity, rather than to the clergy (Crichton 1986:365). The low mass was the result of effort for listening to the Word in worship. The Medieval Church did not totally lack in sermon at all, but lacked in sermon in normal church services. The medieval preachers were usually itinerant professionals, normally friars, who came to a city to preach a series of special sermons during special seasons, most commonly Advent or Lent (Kingdon 2004:51). However, the problem was that the preaching service took place outside of the worship (Brüki 2006:437). It occurred largely outside the context of the liturgy, and more importantly, the sermons were devotional and moralistic rather than expository (Fuller 1986:485).

Against this background, the Reformers whose first concern was the Word of God underlined the significance of the Word in worship. In England, John Wycliff and his colleagues played an important role as forerunners of the revival of the Word of God. According to Dobson (1941:163), the main intension of John Wycliff and his colleagues were to restore the ministry of the Word to its due place in worship. Luther's first and foremost critique of the state of liturgical life in the churches as he

encountered it, was that “God’s Word had been silenced, and only reading and singing remain in the churches” (*LW* 53:11)<sup>50</sup>. Calvin shared the common Protestant conviction that preaching the Word was one of the most critical factors that needed to be re-introduced and maintained as a vital part of public worship (McKee 2003:17). For Calvin, the Word of God is the foundation of the church (*Inst.* 4.2.4); faith rests upon God’s Word (3.2.6); thus, as long as the church is bound to the Word, the presence of Christ is always in His church (4.8.10).

### 3.5.1.2. The Sermon in Vernacular

As noted above, the Word of God was proclaimed in the Medieval Church. However, it is worthless to be preached in the language that people cannot understand, i.e., preached in the Latin. As Wainwright (1979a:465) indicates “language is not to be understood apart from the community which uses it and the activities and self-understanding of that community”. This is linked to the definition of the vernacular: “the native language of a country, region, or culture” (McKim 1996:297). The Reformers noticed the importance of vernacular well. Luther published his major reforming treatises of 1520 in German, to ensure a wide readership for his ideas. Zwingli ensured that his ideas were published in his native Swiss-German; and Calvin in his native French. Thus, it was crucial for them that their theological ideas were being read in their native languages.

The Reformers were also aware of the importance of preaching in the vernacular, and of ensuring that the liturgy is to be understood by all those taking part in worship (McGrath 1999:235-236). Dobson (1941:163) evaluates Wycliff that he and his colleagues “gave a vast stimulus to vernacular preaching”. For Zwingli, the most important thing was the preaching of the Bible in the language of the people (McKee 2003:11). Though vernacular preaching is not mentioned directly in the *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, Calvin (*Inst.* 3.20.33) argues that prayer should be in the language of the people, which supports the liturgy in the vernacular. For the Reformers, ministers were not priests as

---

<sup>50</sup> Quoted from Senn (1997:304).

privileged intercessors any more but preachers and pastors who preach in the vernacular and take care of people with God's hospitality.

Sermon in vernacular has much meaning in our argument of dialectic relationship between fear and hospitality. Worshippers must acknowledge fear and hospitality of God via the Word of God. The Bible is the only way from which we hear how God is fear for us; how God gives His hospitality through Jesus' redemptive work. However, how can worship which is held the language people cannot understand, show God is fear for us and God gives His hospitality for us? God's love for human includes the human's mind and intelligence. That means the language used in worship should be in the vernacular, otherwise worshippers cannot understand what is happening. Lack of understanding is not the Christian way to achieve the sense of mystery in worship (Wainwright 1979a:468-469). To show God's hospitality, to make the language of worship in the vernacular is vital. Furthermore, being preached in the vernacular itself was a hospitable invitation to the people who were in fear of worship which was held in the clergy's side and was held in the Latin language.

### **3.5.2. HYMNS**

The use of the vernacular, one of the most distinctive emphases of the Reformation and the method of a hospitable invitation to worship, was not limited only to preaching but applies also to hymns. Luther's main creative contribution to worship was his use of popular German hymns in worship service (Willimon 1989:65). For Luther, it is obvious that the laity, not a choir alone, should sing a song which is the ordinary part of worship (White 2001:121). Over the winter of 1523-24 Luther and his Wittenberg colleagues began writing vernacular hymns for congregational use (Leaver 2004:314), and Luther himself wrote and composed at least thirty seven hymns and tunes (White 2001:123). Luther published *Formula Missae* in 1523 which was written in the Latin. He did not seem to replace vernacular song instead of Latin all at once, but gradually (*LW* 53:36):



I also wish that we had as many songs as possible in the vernacular which the people could sing during Mass, immediately after the gradual and also after the Sanctus and Agnus Dei. [...] The bishops may have these hymns sung either after these Latin chants, or use the Latin on one day and the vernacular on the next, until the time comes that the whole Mass is sung in the vernacular.

At last, in 1526, three years after the *Formula Missae* was published, Luther issued his *Deutsche Messe*, which influenced the *Swedish Mass* published in the vernacular by Olavus Petri. In the *Deutsche Messe*, Luther continued his principle of reform by deletion, deleting various parts like the *Gloria in Excelsis* and the Eucharistic Nicene Creed (which he replaced with the baptismal Apostle's Creed) (Willimon 1989:65). Most importantly, unlike his previous version, it was all in vernacular (Brand 1986:346; White 1989:42; Senn 2004:69).<sup>51</sup>

Unlike Zwingli, who never allowed to use music in worship, Calvin encouraged the translation of the Psalms into French so that congregations could sing in worship (Senn 1997:368). In the worship in Geneva, all singing was congregational, biblical, and essentially from the Hebrew Bible. Soon Geneva became an international pilgrimage spot for visitors from all over Europe, and many returned home with the same musical ideals as Calvin, including the idea of the vernacular. Especially the Presbyterian Church of Scotland and the English Puritans were much influenced by Calvin (White 2001:124).

Alike sermons in vernacular, hymns in vernacular was a good method that laity could participate in worship, viz. both sermon and hymn in vernacular show God's hospitable invitation to worship. White (1989:212) says that one of the Reformers' contributions was to bring new forms of active participation by the whole congregation, such as congregational hymnody among Lutherans and sung psalmody among the Reformed.<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>51</sup> Actually, Luther (*LW* 53:63) did not object to use the Latin in worship: "[W]e would hold mass, sing, and read on successive Sundays in all four languages, German, Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. I do not at all agree with those who cling to one language and despise all others". Nevertheless, he emphasizes vernacular for the unlearned: "[The service] should be arranged for the sake of the unlearned lay folk [...]"

<sup>52</sup> Underlining that Calvin differentiated Psalms from Hymns, White (1989:66) distinguishes Calvin who insists using only Psalms in worship, from Luther.

### 3.5.3. THE PRIESTHOOD OF ALL BELIEVERS

The pope's authority was seriously doubted when the Great Schism<sup>53</sup> had occurred. The western church was led to division after the death of Gregory XI – an Italian faction by Urban VI and a French faction by Clement VII. The crucial question had arisen: Who was the real pope who has genuine authority (McGrath 1999:33)? Accordingly, in the later medieval period the crisis of authority was growing. This tendency had two dimensions: the decline of the pope's authority and the enlarged power of secular leaders (McGrath 1999:34-35). New insight of authority concerned the relationship between God and human beings: all believers are justified by faith alone and not by the church's sacraments or by their own good deeds (such as Masses and pilgrimages). In the light of this insight, Protestants clearly affirmed that all Christians are equal; the distinction between the laity and clergy is one only of function, not of rank. There was a priesthood of believers, all of whom equally belong to God and owe God their worship and praise (McKee 2003:6). According to White (1989:41), for Luther "the mankind who follows the cow is as holy as the nun in her cloister, there are no ranks of holiness. All Christians are called to minister to one another in whatever station they might find themselves placed. Far from being a leveling down of clerical dignities, this raises laity to the same dignity as clergy and those in religious orders". The theology of "the priesthood of all believers" spread the possibility of participating in worship for the laities. Thus, it was, like the vernacular, hospitable invitation for them. The hospitality can lead them into deep worship. Senn (1997:307) well formulates the motive and substance of the Luther's priesthood of all believers:

[Luther] had to break down the "three walls of the Romanists": 1) that the spiritual authority is above the temporal authority; 2) that no one can interpret the scriptures except the pope; and 3) that no one can call a council but the pope. Luther assaulted these walls with the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers. He held that all Christians are given equal authority by virtue of baptism into Christ to proclaim and live the gospel in a public and representative way. [...] Everyone is a priest and bishop by virtue of baptism; therefore the so-called spiritual rulers have no authority that is not possessed by

---

<sup>53</sup> McGrath (1999:33) sees the end of the Great Schism in 1417 when the Council of Constance elected Martin V as pope, but at that point of time, Benedict XIII, the last of the Avignon line, was still alive. Though Benedict XIII rarely had attentions from others, he continued claiming that he was the legitimate pope. Therefore, the view that the Great Schism was ended in 1423 when Benedict XIII had died without any successor is more pertinent (cf. González 1984: 228-229, 344).

the temporal rulers other than that given to them by and on behalf of the whole Christian community.

Laities were no longer simply present in worship as passive participants but played a priestly role, an essential ingredient of Luther's view on the church and the process of salvation. This necessitates that people fulfill their priesthood in worship by active participation in new ways that make worship accessible to them. As observed above, music was one of the means by which all could take part themselves in worship and exercise their "priestly ministry" (White 1989:41).

#### **3.5.4. EVALUATION**

The Reformers showed hospitality to the laity by translating the Bible; preaching the Word of God and composing hymns all in the vernacular; and providing sound theology like "the priesthood of all believers". Their hospitality was not the same as that Constantine gave. The emperor showed his own hospitality to make his empire firm, whereas the Reformers showed God's hospitality to invite people to worship of God. By doing so, the Reformers called the laity to participate in the worship service. It was a hospitable invitation. The people formerly, in the Medieval Age, took their places as passive observers in worship in the pretended fear which clergies had made. However, after the Reformation people could participate in the worship. This worship might have strengthened the dialectic relationship between fear and hospitality; because in the sermon in the vernacular they could acknowledge how God is awe and reverent; and in the Word, they could be taught how God showed His hospitality through Jesus' redemptive work.

### **3.6. AFTER THE REFORMATION: LOST AND FINDING HOSPITALITY**

It is not a range of dealing with all periods after the Reformation in this section. Thus, we select

one notable character of the post Reformation relating it to lost hospitality; and two movements relating them to finding hospitality again. The character is “the Word-focused worship”; and the movements are “the seeker service” and “the charismatic movement”.

### **3.6.1. LOST HOSPITALITY**

This section focuses on how one side of Christian worship lost the hospitality which was given by the Reformers. The hospitality was lost in too didactic worship; in lack of Communion; and in lack of participation.

#### **3.6.1.1. Too Didactic Worship**

According to Kingdon (2004:48), “the revolutionary change in public worship during the Reformation in Geneva was from a form of worship centered on the *Mass (la messe)* to a form of worship centered on the sermon (*le sermon*)”. This change was not only in Geneva, but everywhere which were affected by the Reformation. The Word of God took significant place in worship since the Reformation. Old (1992:411) specifies the characteristics of the Reformed worship after the Reformation as “kerygmatic”, “epicletic”, “prophetic”, “wisdom”, and “covenantal”. White’s depiction (1989:73-75) is not quite different from that: “intellectual”, “penitential”, “moralistic” (after the Enlightenment), and the saints are “sabbatarian”<sup>54</sup>.

Reacting against the earlier ignorance of the laity, the Reformers intended to make their church services more edifying them. Furthermore, sometimes Protestants have been accused of making worship overly intellectual. In fact, they were as much concerned with the heart as the head, but they put new emphasis on worshipping God with the understanding which was lost in the previous era

---

<sup>54</sup> Surely, White does not mean that either all Reformed church has those characters, but he stresses the one side of the Reformed worship has these dimensions.

(McKee 2003:9). Willimon (1989:68-69) evaluates Zwingli's view on the role of preaching and the Lord's Supper in worship as follows:

Somewhat inevitably, Zwingli's extreme views on the Lord's Supper led to his rejection of the Eucharist as the normal Sunday activity of Christians.<sup>55</sup> He decreed that the Lord's Supper be celebrated only four times a year and only as an addition to his primary "preaching service" [...] His services were even more pedagogical than Luther's. The congregation's duty was to listen, to be edified, and to be corrected by the preacher.

In short, according to Willimon, Zwingli regarded the sermon as the center of worship while Eucharist has a supplementary character. The preaching-centered worship has become basically to didactic worship.

Indeed, the Reformers' emphasis on edifying by the preaching was counteraction for the Medieval Church worship which did not give any instruction of the Bible to the people. It can be said that the context of the Reformers that ignored the role of the Word of God led them to emphasize the Word too much. The successors of the Reformers who are free of the context could have kept the proper balance between edifying and participating. However, the successors keep the view of the Reformers and, unfortunately, even intensified it. The invitatory hospitality that the Reformers granted through various ways – sermons and hymns in the vernacular, and sound theology like "the priesthood of all believers" – does not seem to be attractive in worship any more. Rather, the didactic sermon today has become boring to many attendees that makes participants passive observers again.

### **3.6.1.2. Lack of Communion**

As Witvliet (Maag & Witvliet 2004:3) says even in the Medieval Ages there were those who emphasized the role of sermon to the laity. However, it was the Reformers who put the sermon in the

---

<sup>55</sup> Zwingli does not look upon the bread and wine more than symbols, whereas Luther has the positive standpoint of the real presence of body of Christ, and Calvin lays his stress on the spiritual presence of the Holy Spirit. For the views on the transubstantiation of the three Reformers, see White (2001:254-256) and McGrath (1999:174-194).

core of worship.<sup>56</sup> The Reformers observed that there were too many Sacraments which Jesus did not institute; and the sermon was not delivered in the language of attendees. It is understandable why the Reformers thus emphasized the Word of God, especially in the vernacular. However, it is obvious that worship has been disfigured to some extent within the altered weight of preaching. Webber (2006:43) recalls his past attitude toward the worship service:

One Sunday morning we had a guest preacher. Just before the service was to begin he came to me and said, "Get the preliminaries over quickly. I have a lot to say today." At that time my attitude toward a worship service was similar to the of my guest: "Let's sing a few hymns, read some Scripture, have a prayer, and get to the sermon, the real reason for our being here." The order to the sermon, as such, had no meaning for me. Anything and everything leading up to the sermon was "preliminary" and unimportant in comparison to the sermon.

It is well-known fact that Calvin had failed to institute weekly Communion as he hoped, instead full Communion was celebrated only once a month at Geneva. Since then, a long preaching service was conducted in Calvinist worship which has tended toward austere intellectualism, didacticism, verbosity, and little congregational participation (Willimon 1989:70). Probably more than Luther and Calvin intended, the sermon came to be regarded as the central act of a worship service (Dobson 1941:163).

In the Medieval Church worship, "the experience of corporate worship was clearly divided between the celibate clergy and the rest of the people, who might have some complementary roles but essentially observed rather than participating actively"(McKee 2003:7-8). The laity normally did not commune but usually only the priest did, while the people watched reverently. Now, all attendees who were baptized can participate in the Communion. However, the Communion is wrongly regarded as penitential rite in some Christian worship. People share the bread and the wine, but they do not participate in the real Communion as a feast. Thus, God's hospitable invitation to worship weakens for not only the lack of the Communion but also penitential perception of the Communion.

---

<sup>56</sup> "Long before Protestants resuscitated the practice of liturgical preaching, Catholic priests – some itinerant, some monastic, some local parish pastors – devoted their lives to preaching the gospel in the language of common people" (Maag & Witvliet 2004:3).

### **3.6.1.3. Lack of Participation**

Calvin (*Inst.* 4.1.9) declares two marks of the church: “Wherever we see the Word of God purely preached and heard, and the sacraments administered according to Christ’s institution, there, it is not to be doubted, a church of God exists”. From the Calvin’s declaration, Small (2003:314) acknowledges that there are two ways to participate in the Word of God: preaching and hearing. He says that “congregations are active participants in proclamation, for hearing the Word requires discernment, response, and faithful action”. He is right in terms of the significance of hearing the gospel, as Rome 10:17 says: “So faith comes from what is heard, and what is heard comes by the preaching of Christ”. People can be active participants when they hear God’s Word in worship and act in life according to what they have heard. However, if the hearing only is continuing, the active participants would become passive observers. Thus, the Word-centered worship causes lack of participation; and the Reformers’ methods of hospitality are overlooked in the lack of participation.

## **3.6.2. NEW CHALLENGES FOR HOSPITALITY IN WORSHIP**

Many regard the lack of hospitality cannot take place in the Christian worship. The Christian worship must be familiar and accessible even to newcomers. In this section, two remedies which have offered for the lack of hospitality are deal with: the seeker service and the charismatic movement. Both of them underline familiar and accessible for everyone, though the points of stress are different.

### **3.6.2.1. The Seeker Service**

Senn (1997:676ff) points out three challenges to traditional liturgy in his book, *Christian Liturgy*: “inculturation”, “feminist critique”, and “the so-called church growth movement”. Instead of

traditional liturgy which is primary vehicle of the church's public celebrations, the church growth movement focuses onto "seeker" who is actually not a church member (Senn 1997:688). As we have seen in chapter 1, the seeker service was begun at Willow Creek Community Church in 1992. This church is unique because it avoids providing a worship service for believers on weekends. Instead of normal Sunday service, the believers must come to "new community" on Wednesday or Thursday evenings at 7:30 p.m. to receive teaching from the Bible and to worship God with songs and prayers. Saturday night and Sunday morning services are devoted to seekers, who most probably are "unchurched" or unconverted but are curious about life-changing Christianity (Burdan 1993:93). Strobel (1993:13-14) defines "unchurched" people as follows:

- who thinks that all religion is intellectually weak
- who is perfectly happy without God
- who uses Jesus' name only as a swear word
- who is too busy to think about spiritual matters
- who is afraid the Christianity might cramp his business
- a woman who has a distorted attitude toward heavenly Father for her bitter experience with her dad
- a husband who thinks that his wife's faith is a waste of time
- who believes Jesus as the Son of God but keeps putting off any kind of personal response to Him
- who goes church only religiously – e.g., on Christmas and Easter
- a parents who send their children to church to get some moral training
- who spends Sunday morning leisurely
- who has experience of faith but now thinks that the Christianity is boring and irrelevant

One of the basic assumptions of the seeker service is that the unchurched people have dropped out of church or have stayed away because of traditional liturgy and music. Thus, Willow Creek Community Church shows its hospitality to serve unchurched people making comfortable atmosphere in worship.



The church avoids traditional sermon and hymns which can be seemed boring, but offers contemporary cultural things such as drama and visual arts, but above all modern music and nontraditional preaching (Redman 2002:3). Furthermore, they yield Sunday service for the unchurched. Indeed, “Willow Creek is a church that is geared for the unchurched” (Strobel 1993:13).

However, it is not for the convenience that Christians gather in Sunday. Sunday has taken place as the day of worship from the Early Church for Jesus was risen from the dead on that day. Thus, Sunday has significance in terms of eschatology. Saliers (1994:52-53) formulates this eschatological meaning of Sunday in the Early Church with three points:

First, Sunday emerged from the witness of the women who found the empty tomb. On the first day of the week Jesus appeared to the disciples. So it is the “day of resurrection”. [...] Second, Sunday was known as the “eighth day”, a day both in time of the week, but already participating in the future age to come. [...] A third point is closely related [to the previous two]. Sunday, if conceived as the resurrection day, is readily associated in the mind of the early traditions with the final advent, the *parousia* itself.

Therefore, yielding Sunday to newcomers and worship on week day cannot be admitted in Christian worship. Add on this, many regular attendees of weekend service in Willow Creek Church are not only new members but also the existing church members. Because the believers also prefer the weekend service, they skip the midweek worship service. Thus, they miss the opportunity to participate in congregational worship (Redman 2002:18). Hospitality for the unchurched produces unexpected result that worship lost its inherent eschatological aspect and lost its attendees.

Redman (2002:15) criticizes the seeker service that “it is more focused on a target audience than on God. The service does not preserve the centrality of God in worship and the integrity of Christian truth in preaching”. Hospitality which is given in the seeker service has an opposite direct to God’s hospitality. Hospitality of the seeker service leads to contemporary church event, whereas God’s hospitality leads people to worship of God.

### 3.6.2.2. The Charismatic Movement

As Fenwick and Spinks (1995:105) says that it is difficult to identify precisely to the beginning of the modern charismatic movement. However, they argue that there are two phases of the charismatic movement to be concerned (Fenwick & Spinks 1995:106):

The first, originating in the early years of the century, led to the proliferation of Pentecostal denominations in many parts of the world. The second phase, dating from around 1950, saw the acceptance of “Pentecostalist” experience and insights into many existing Churches, though some loss of membership to newly founded groupings has also occurred.

The two phase are also found in White’s argument (1989:194-197): First, he regards that the Pentecostal tradition was appeared on New Year’s Day of 1901 when Charles Fox Parham “had advised the students to search the scriptures for evidence of a person’s baptism with the Holy Spirit. Such evidence, they found, was always signaled by speaking in tongues”. Parham began the campaign from 1905 with William J Seymour about “full gospel” and “Pentecostal” which accompanied healing. Then 1906, so-called “the explosion of the Azusa Street” began in Seymour’s service. It was the origin of the classic Pentecostal tradition. Second, as Fenwick and Spinks said above, it is the new phase of the movement that many denominations started to accept this movement into their worship around 1950’. That is one of the reasons that it is “difficult to generalize about Pentecostal worship because there are so many varieties of churches which, though they have much in common, also have their individual characteristics”.

Fenwick and Spinks (1995:110) argues characteristics of the charismatic movement as follows: “With its emphasis on the presence and reality of God, charismatic worship is in part at least a reaction against the aridity of both the personal lives of individual Christians and the dryness of the public worship of many congregations”. As we have argued thus far, after the Reformation in some Christian worship were walled by the boredom for its didactic characteristic. The charismatic movement is a reaction of this boring worship “against the aridity”. The movement emphasizes “the presence and reality of God” both has dual dimension, as discussed in chapter 2 – fear and hospitality.

Hospitality is one of the inherent natures of the charismatic movement. The nature of hospitality is found both in the first and the second phase of the movement. As White (1989:197) says, initially, those who were joined the movement were the lowest rung in the social and economic level. “They were oppressed and impecunious, and many outsiders thought that their worship provided an escape from deprivation”. Gelpi (1982:612) points out that Seymour’s preaching in 1906 at Azusa Street was focused on the poor and the uneducated by and large. Then in the second phase the role of black people and women who have not had their position and authority in church have increased significantly (White 1989:198). The hospitality in worship was given to the poor first and then black people and women, all excluded from the mainstream of the society. They were invited to participate in worship in the charismatic movement.

In charismatic worship, it is not important what people have in terms of economic or social, but what people have in the Holy Spirit. That means everyone can contribute to worship with their talents or gifts which are given by the Holy Spirit. For the charismatic movement most influences to those who are alienated from society, this feeling of value gives God’s hospitality to them. To contribute worship is the result of hospitality of the Holy Spirit. White (1989:198-199) articulates this as follows:

People are valued not for themselves but for the gifts they contribute to worship: speaking in tongues, interpretation, prophecy, testimonies, and healing. And these gifts are distributed quite regardless of sex or race. [...] Certainly the gifts create a radical equality among all present, since no one knows who will speak, interpret, or prophesy on any occasion.

In terms of showing hospitality, the charismatic movement has similarity to the Reformation. First, both of them opened worship to laity. Reformers showed God’s hospitality in sermons and hymns in the vernacular. That made the laity can participate in the worship. The charismatic movement gives hospitality of the Holy Spirit in allowing everyone does not only come to worship, but also contribute to worship with their gifts. Second, thus, the role of laity is important for both. As mentioned above, Luther gave the theology of “the priesthood of all believers” and Charismatic worship had been “predominantly lay character” (Fenwick & Spinks 1995:110). It is not important that who was ordained by church, but who has the faith in God in the Reformation; but who has the gift of the Holy

Spirit in the charismatic movement.

However, the charismatic movement has its negative features: first, in their worship the Bible is used limitedly. “Only short selections may be read in worship, often rather esoteric passages used as texts for the sermon” (White 1989:199). Second, it is vague whose gift is authentic. McDonnell (1973:618) indicates this well: “There is some uncritical acceptance of prophecy and tongues without sufficient discernment as to what comes from the Holy Spirit and what comes from the human psyche.” This ambiguity causes “dominant personalities” and “unbalanced teaching [by whom has gift] and an excessively authoritarian style” (Fenwick & Spinks 1995:111). Thus, though they want to show hospitality of the Holy Spirit, it cannot be proved whether it is the Holy Spirit’s or human beings’.

### **3.6.3. EVALUATION**

Although the Reformers invited laity to worship giving hospitality, after the Reformation boredom appeared as an obstacle which frustrates people not to be attracted to come to worship. As a reaction to the aridity or the boredom, the new movements which stress hospitality and familiarity in worship have emerged. The points of what they emphasize are different: The seeker service stresses the hospitality of worship itself. Thus, they make order of worship friendly so that newcomers feel the worship at home. But the charismatic movement stresses the hospitality of the Holy Spirit who makes people participate in and contribute to worship by giving to them gifts. However, the efforts to show hospitality in worship – such as the seeker service and charismatic worship cannot have their place in worship. The hospitality that they pursue is not the same hospitality which we have observed in chapter 2. Genuine hospitality leads people into worship by God’s redemptive work through the Son in the Holy Spirit. However, both the seeker service and the charismatic movement do not show the hospitality as the cooperative work of the Triune God. Rather, they show their own hospitality as if it is God’s.

### **3.7. CONCLUSION**

Initially, the interpretive task is to aim to answer to the question “why this going on?” By this question we can “understand and explain why these patterns and dynamics are occurring” (Osmer 2001:4). However, instead of the question this chapter asks the question “how has this been going on?” to comprehend how fear and hospitality has been stressed or ignored in the history of the church; and to interpret how different divine fear and hospitality from human beings’.

We get an objective interpretation of our argument through the study of the history that historically, fear and hospitality has been dealt with inappropriate way. Now we need a proper theology to synthesize dialectic relationship between fear and hospitality. This is offered in the next chapter.

**CHAPTER 4**

**SYNTHESIZING FEAR AND HOSPITALITY**

**DIALECTICALLY IN JESUS CHRIST:**

***THE NORMATIVE TASK***

**4.1. INTRODUCTION**

In the previous chapter, we traced shortly how fear and hospitality were manifested historically in worship. In this chapter we have to do the normative task which mainly aims to give an accountable theology to interpret episodes, situations, and contexts (Osmer 2001:131). Since our concern is the dialectic relationship between fear and hospitality in worship, this chapter should develop a theology that focuses on an agent which can unite the two terms dialectically and not just blend or balance them in quality or quantity.

To do this task, firstly, the meaning of glory (כְּבוֹד, δόξα) is observed exegetically in the Old Testament. The glory of God has the same meaning as God's presence in the Old Testament. This glory of God was revealed to people through symbolical agencies, i.e., manna, the ark, the tabernacle, and the temple. God's presence among His people was always hidden in the clouds and appeared temporarily. The term *shekinah* which is not found in the Bible, is also dealt with because it indicates that God's presence and dwelling in the Old Testament was always hidden and temporary.

Secondly, Jesus Christ as the agent of a dialectical relationship between fear of the glory and the God's hospitality is dealt. It is shown that the glory of God was too fearful to be close to people in the

Old Testament. Nobody was allowed to see or to draw near to the glory of God. When Jesus was born the fear of God's presence was changed to glorify Him because in Jesus Christ God became hospitable to human beings. As mentioned in chapter 2, God's hospitality invites sinners to glorify Him in and through their worship. Now anyone who has faith in Jesus can glorify God in a more total way, because the negative fear of God is taken away.<sup>57</sup> Therefore, doxology denotes a proper reaction to soteriology. Because of this, the Christological approach is vital for our argument concerning worship. In addition, pneumatology has a fundamental place in worship, because the work of the Holy Spirit keeps us in the faith in Jesus so that we are not separated from God's hospitality.

Lastly, the relationship between glory and worship is explained in terms of its eschatological actualization, i.e., in worship the glory of the past which Jesus obtained for our salvation is realized in the present; and the glory of the future which Jesus will give us for an eternal relationship with the Triune God is also realized in the present. In the Christological perspective, doxology and liturgy are combined. A pneumatological application also plays an important role in this matter because it is the Holy Spirit who keeps us worship God constantly.

## 4.2. THE GLORY OF GOD: AN EXEGETICAL PERSPECTIVE

The English word "glory" in the Bible is mainly a translation of the Hebrew word *קְבוֹד*, and the Greek word *δόξα*. Sometimes other words are also translated into glory; sometimes *קְבוֹד* and *δόξα* are translated into other words.<sup>58</sup> However, *קְבוֹד* and *δόξα* are the most suitable words to depict the permanent attribute or essential character of God as is shown in the manifestation of God in the Bible.

---

<sup>57</sup> This does not mean that we can worship God without any fear. There is still fear of God for us which is not a negative but positive.

<sup>58</sup> *קְבוֹד* has the customary meaning of 1)abundance, riches; 2)honour, splendour, glory of external condition and circumstances; 3)honour, dignity of position; and 4)honour, reputation of character of man etc. (*BDB* s.v. *קְבוֹד*:458-459). The term *δόξα* means 1)the condition of being bright or shining, brightness, splendor, radiance; 2)a state of being magnificent, greatness, splendor; 3)honour as enhancement or recognition of status or performance, fame, recognition, renown, prestige; and 4) a transcendence being deserving of honor, majestic being (*BDAG* s.v. *δόξα*:256-258).

Therefore, in this chapter the English word “glory”, unless otherwise mentioned, refers to קְבוֹד or δόξα .

## 4.2.1. GLORY IN THE OLD TESTAMENT: AWE AND FEAR IN THE REVELATION OF GOD

### 4.2.1.1. Glory: The Presence of God

Although קְבוֹד is a suitable word for the “glory” and “honour” of God, in Genesis it is always used to indicate “wealth” or “richness” (Gen. 31:1, 45:13); and in Exodus it refers to “heavy labour” of the Israelites (Ex. 5:9) for God made Pharaoh’s heart “hardened” (Ex. 7:14, 8:15, 9:7, 34, 10:1, 14:4, 17-18). In Ex. 16:7 we find the first usage of קְבוֹד as a symbol of God’s glory: “in the morning you [the Israelites] shall see the glory of the Lord”. The manna was the sign of the glory of the Lord that the Israelites saw the next morning. Through manna God gave us the first visible form of His glory in the Bible.<sup>59</sup>

Wainwright (1978:102) classifies glory in the Bible in two ways: 1) in its theological sense, first and foremost as a permanent attribute of God (Isa. 48:11, 59:19; John 17:5, 24); 2) in God’s dealing with human beings in the Old Testament, the symbol of His revealed presence (Ex. 16:7, 10, 24:16ff; Lev. 9:6, 23; Num. 14:10, 16:19, 20:6; 1 Kings 8:10ff; 2 Chron. 7:1-3; Ps. 145:11ff; Isa. 60:1-3; Ezek. 3:23, 8:4, 9:3, 10:18ff, 11:23, 43:2-5, 44:4). As Wainwright states above, the glory and the presence of God are closely related to each other. Though “glory” has various meanings, the revelation of God is the most significant. In this regard, Ellebracht (1965:17) remarks as follows:

Since the concept has lost some of the sharpness of its meaning through several translations, and since it tends to become trite by frequent use, a glance at the use of the Hebrew term *kebod Yahweh* may serve as a valuable aid in recapturing some of the rich and vital meaning of this key concept. [...] The biblical term *kebod Yahweh* had, for the most part, a very concrete and dynamic meaning, namely, the

---

<sup>59</sup> Manna as the symbol of the visible form of God’s presence is dealt with in more detail in subsequent discussion.



brilliant revelation of God himself.

Thus, in the Old Testament, glory almost has the same meaning as the concept of God. God's presence to His people is depicted as the descending of His glory (Ramsey 1949:10; de Silva 2003:432). Many passages (e.g., Ex. 16:10, 24:16, 17, 33:22, 40:34, 35; Lev. 9:23; Num. 16:19, 42, 20:6 etc.) depict God's descent as the appearance of His glory. When Moses asked God to show His glory God replied, "you cannot see my face, for man shall not see me and live" (Ex. 33:20). Glory in this context is almost a synonym for the face or the presence of God (Durham 1987:452). This is echoed in the observation of Saliers (1994:41): "The *shekinah*,<sup>60</sup> the glory, reflected in the shining on the face of Moses, the manifestation of God's presence, is always associated with powerful illuminating light that emanates from the uncreated life of God".

As we have observed in chapter 2, God's presence is fearful for human beings. We are not allowed to see Him. Because of this, His presence was always accompanied by clouds. The invisibility or hiddenness of God, which makes Him unpredictable, is one of the characteristics that separates the worship of God from the worship of Baal, the Canaanite fertility god (Long 2001:32). Baal was always present, always ready to provide powerful religious experiences, while "God as Spirit (John 4:24) is thus not able to be seen unless God desires to be seen" (McKim 1996:116). As Berkhof (1979:17) observed, "Baal's presence was visible and his blessings were more or less predictable; moreover, there were magical means one could use to force these blessings in case they were long in coming. The faith of Yahweh made a poor showing compared with this fertility religion".<sup>61</sup> In other words, we cannot manage or force God's presence. Rather, He works according to His own sovereignty. The mystery of God's glory is concealed until the time to come as the Bible says: "the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea" (Hab. 2:14); "The glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together" (Isa. 40:5). Accordingly, glory as a reality is not yet entirely known to human beings (Heschel 1955:84; 1966:90). We only expect the fulfillment of the glory in the messianic sense as the Psalmist prays: "let the whole

---

<sup>60</sup> The *shekinah* as the presence of God's glory is dealt with in the following section.

<sup>61</sup> Quoted from Long (2001:32).

world be filled with His glory. Amen and Amen” (Psa. 72:19).

#### **4.2.1.2. The Symbols of the Glory**

The glory of God as a reality is not unveiled, but in the Bible we can see some symbols of the divine glory. Terrien (1978:161ff) starts with to the ark of the Lord when he deals with the presence of God, the manifestation of the glory. However, we first deal with manna as the symbol of the glory of God.

In Ex. 16:7 when God heard the grumbles of the Israelites concerning their lack of any bread to eat, Moses and Aaron said to all the people of Israel that “in the morning you shall see the glory of the Lord, because he has heard your murmurings against the Lord.” From the next day, manna started to come down from heaven. Manna was a visible form of God’s glory being a representation of the visible God. The Psalmist pictures the manna as “the grain of heaven” (Ps. 78:24). In the New Testament, Jesus declares that He is the true and eternal bread of life comparing manna with Himself (John 6:32-33). When people asked Jesus “Lord, give us this bread always” (John 6:34), Jesus’ answer was: “I am the bread of life; he who comes to me shall not hunger, and he who believes in me shall never thirst” (John 6:35). He who wants to share in this eternal life must know that Jesus Himself is the bread and that he will give it to those who come to Him (Merkel 1986:250). Ultimately, at the Last Supper Table, Jesus shared the everlasting bread, the true manna, actually Himself, with His disciples. Thus, manna, the symbol of divine glory, is fully revealed in Jesus who is the fulfillment of the glory of God.

After God had sent manna to His people, He commanded Moses to build a tabernacle for His presence (Ex. 25:8). In the tabernacle He dwelt among them and traveled with them. It was God’s exact description of the ark which is to be placed in the tabernacle (Ex.25:10ff) (Donaghy 1957:279); and, manna, the symbol of the glory of God was put in the ark (Heb. 9:4). When the ark was captured

by the Philistines, Phinehas' wife said "the glory has departed from Israel, for the ark of God has been captured" (1 Sam. 4:22), which means that the ark had the same significance to them as the glory of God. Cartledge (2001:75) accentuates the significance of the ark: "the loss of thousands of Hebrews soldiers is not nearly so important as the loss of one ark, for it was Israel's most sacred symbol of Yahweh's presence". Indeed, the absence of the ark directly means the absence of the glory of God for them. After that, the ark returned to Israel and remained in David's tent until Solomon completed the temple. According to Hague (1997:504), after the return from exile and the rebuilding of the Second Temple, the ark was not replaced, because Jesus Christ, the true presence of God – will come. This means that the ark, like manna, was also a representation of Jesus Christ. Thus, Levy (1993:73) suggests two ways in which the ark was the symbol of the glory of God paralleling the ark with the incarnate Christ: "First, as the ark dwelt among mankind, so Christ was manifested to mankind during His earthly pilgrimage. Second, as the ark represented the throne of God, where He manifested His glory, so Christ is seated at the right hand of God in all of His glory" (Eph. 1:19-23).

The tabernacle, in which the ark was put, sometimes called the "tent of meeting",<sup>62</sup> is "the portable tent in which the Hebrews worshipped during the wilderness period of wandering (Ex. 25-27, 36-38)" (McKim 1996:275). When Moses finished making the tabernacle, God's divine glory came down to the tent: "So Moses finished the work. Then the cloud covered the tent of meeting, and the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle. And Moses was not able to enter the tent of meeting, because the cloud abode upon it, and the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle" (Ex. 40:33-35). This demonstrates that the tabernacle is and will be temporarily the place for the presence of the glory of God. However, as Terrien (1978:176) maintains the tent was not an expression of the permanence of divine nearness.

The tabernacle was replaced by the Jerusalem temple (McKim 1996:275). Terrien's assertion (1978:184) that the tabernacle was not transferred to Jerusalem supports this replacement. It was not

---

<sup>62</sup> Terrien (1978:177) suggests that the repeated emphasis on the word "tent" in the Bible indicates "probably" a difference from the ark, and "possibly" even from the tabernacle (cf. Terrien 1978:217n46). However, in this thesis, the "tabernacle" and the "tent of meeting" are used synonymously.

the tabernacle but the ark that was moved into the temple. The tabernacle had finished its function as the home of the ark. What was replaced was the abode of the ark, the symbol of the glory of God. The story of the building of the Jerusalem temple by Solomon culminates with the scene of the entrance of the ark into the innermost room of the edifice: “A cloud filled the house of the Lord, so that the priests could not stand to minister because of the cloud; for the glory of the Lord filled the house of the Lord” (1 Kings 8:10-11). However, the temple was also not the permanent place for God’s presence. Terrien (1978:195) describes this temporary dwelling of God using the word עֲרָפֶל, “deep darkness”, “thick darkness” or “heavy cloud”.<sup>63</sup> It also refers most often to this darkness and clouds associated with a theophany of God in the Bible (Price 1997:542). Although עֲרָפֶל is related to the theophany of God, the function of the deep darkness is not to reveal God but to hide His presence from the people so that they cannot see His glory directly (Ex. 20:21; Deut. 5:22; 1 Kings 8:12; 2 Chron. 6:1).

Furthermore, עֲרָפֶל refers figuratively to deep gloom brought on by God’s judgment (Jer. 13:16); to the gloom associated with Israel’s captivity (Ezek. 34:12); to the day of the Lord (Joel 2:2; Zeph 1:15) (Price 1997:543). All this gloom and fear ultimately refers to the day of the Messiah. However, this hiddenness and gloom of God in the עֲרָפֶל will not be permanent. According to Terrien (1978:195), “the promise of Yahweh to sojourn in the “*araphel*” [עֲרָפֶל] is not to be construed as a commitment to dwell forever in a holy place [the temple]”. The presence of God through the cloud, elsewhere associated with that of the thick darkness, was applied to the Son of God (Terrien 1978:416) that the temporary presence of God in the temple was accomplished permanently in Jesus. In John 2:21, Jesus identifies Himself with the temple. As Elowsky (2006:105) remarks, “[h]e Himself was the true temple of God”.

Biblical exegesis seems to stress that the glory of God in the Old Testament was an eschatological movement towards one point: Jesus Christ. The hiddenness of glory is revealed in Jesus. He replaces all symbolical agencies of hiddenness.

---

<sup>63</sup> *BDB* (s.v. עֲרָפֶל:791) lists the meaning of this word as “cloud, heavy cloud”, but Price (1997:542) prefers “deep darkness, thick darkness, heavy cloud” as Terrien suggests.

As noted above, all the symbols of the glory of God are symbolical eschatological prefigurations of Jesus. When God said to Moses “put off your shoes from your feet, for the place on which you are standing is holy ground” (Ex. 3:5), it does not mean that the place is holy, but the presence of God is holy. That is why God commanded Moses “do not come near”. As a sinner, Moses cannot come close to the holy God. Terrien (1978:186) says that “both the ark and the tent [the tabernacle] pointed to an intermittent and elusive presence of the Godhead”. Moreover, he adds that “of the manifold aspects of the irrational in religion, that of the holy place is one of the most enigmatic” (Terrien 1978:186). To resolve this enigmatic mystery of the holy place in which God reveals and dwells Himself, we should focus on the “intermittent and elusive” presence of God.

#### **4.2.2. SHEKINAH: THE PROMISE OF THE IMMANUEL GOD IN THE OLD & NEW TESTAMENT**

Israel experienced the “intermittent and elusive” presence of God through manna, the ark, the tabernacle, and the temple. However, now God’s presence is experienced the “constantly revealed and hospitable” presence with the meaning of Immanuel. Here the concept of *shekinah* (שְׁכִינָה) can help us. It is etymologically derived from שָׁכַן, meaning to “settle” or “dwell” (BDB s.v. שָׁכַן:1014), and theologically one of the representative signs of God’s glory. According to McKim (1996:258), *shekinah* can be defined as:

A term (Heb. “dwelling”) that in the writings of the rabbis came to mean the presence of God. It occurs as a manifestation (revelation) of God. Though not found in the Old Testament, the term may be used in reference to God’s glory filling the Temple (1 Kings 8:11; 2 Chron. 7:1) or God’s presence in the cloud (Ex. 14:19).

We can deduce three significant aspects of *shekinah*: 1) *Shekinah* is not a biblical term; 2) etymologically it means “dwelling” or “presence”, and theologically “God’s dwelling in us” or “God’s self revelation”; and 3) it refers to God’s glory.

#### 4.2.2.1. The glory of God and *Shekinah*

The term *shekinah* was introduced in Jewish-Babylonian circles in the first century by the Targum writers. It was used by these writers as a periphrasis when they wished to speak of God as dwelling among His people (Donaghy 1957:277). Thus, the word *shekinah* is used in the Targums to denote God's dwelling-place, the abiding or tabernacling of God in a certain spot (Munk 1992:3). More specifically this term points to the special presence of His power in a given time and place.

Kravitz (1996:22) distinguishes between *shekinah* as the presence of God and as God Himself:

Though *Shekinah* comes from the root *sh-k-n* "dwell", it is clear that the Aramaic translator found a difference between God's dwelling in a physical locality and God's causing something else to be there. The *Shekinah* was God's Presence and yet not God. [...] In general, it might be said that *Shekinah* was the metaphor for God's relation to the world and to the Jewish People.

However, he (Kravitz 1996:22) agrees that it is difficult to discern between the two: "At times, however, it is difficult to distinguish between metaphor and personification". Thus, Thayer's (2000:156) identification of *shekinah* with the glory (ἡ δόξα) is more useful in order to clarify the meaning of the *shekinah*. He defines the *shekinah* as "the glory of the Lord, and simply ἡ δόξα, a bright cloud by which God manifests His presence to men on earth".

#### 4.2.2.2. Intermittent and elusive dwelling of the *shekinah*: the Old Testament compared to the New Testament

God promised that He would dwell among the people of Israel, and be their God (Ex. 29:45). It was God's intention to bring them out of the land of Egypt in order to dwell (לְשִׁכְנֵנִי) among them (Ex. 29:46). The verb שָׁכַן, from which *shekinah* is derived, and which means to "settle down", "abide", or "dwell" (BDB s.v. שָׁכַן:1014), is used to verbalize the descent of God's glory. Many times in the Old Testament, however, God's glory settled down (שָׁכַן) as being covered by clouds (cf. e.g., Ex. 16:10,

24:16, 40:34, 35; Num. 16:42; 1 Kings 8:11; 2 Chron. 5:14; Isa. 4:5; Ezek. 1:28, 10:4). We cannot be sure whether the clouds were the ordinary visible ones or the metaphorical expression of the majestic and mystic ambience of that moment. In any case, the people could not see the glory for it was hidden. God's glory appeared in the clouds so that the people could not see God in the clouds which covered the mountain (Ex. 24:16) or the tabernacle (Ex. 40:34-35; Num. 16:42). God's dwelling was hidden in the clouds. Additionally, God's glory dwelled only temporarily with His people; it moved; and even went or disappeared from the people's eyes (Ezek. 10:4, 18, 11:23). However, "intermittent and elusive" is not the true character of the *shekinah*. Rather it is to be understood that the authentic meaning of *shekinah* was not yet revealed; it had limited meaning in the Old Testament period. The intermittent and elusive presence caused a feeling of fear, i.e., the *shekinah* in the Old Testament did not have the hospitable aspect yet.

#### **4.2.2.3. Permanent or Intermittent Dwelling of the *shekinah* in the Incarnation: A Christological Interpretation**

God is not always hidden. It is the nature of God to "show forth" or to manifest His glory (Duba 1990:366). In the Old Testament God's promise that He would dwell among His people was not intended to be transient, but it was realized fully in the New Testament in Jesus who is the ontological mode of *shekinah* and the way of revelation of God's permanent glory (Ramsey 1949:59-60). The most significant passage in the Bible on this matter is the prologue of John's Gospel, especially 1:14: "the Word became flesh and dwelt among us". John uses the Greek word "ἐσκήνωσεν" (dwelt) which has "σκηνώ" for its root. Σκηνώ is defined as to "live, settle, take up residence" (*BADG* s.v. σκηνώ:929). Compared to the meaning of שָׁכַן, from which *shekinah* is derived, it is acknowledged that the two words have similar etymological roots: the meaning of שָׁכַן is also to "settle down, abide, dwell" (*BDB* s.v. שָׁכַן:1014). Donaghy (1957:282) pays attention to the fact that the two words, σκηνώ (*skeno*) and שְׁכִינָה (*shekinah*), are similar in writing and in sound. Newbigin (1982:8) also

points to the spelling of the words: “The word [σκηνώ] used [in John 1:14] had profound reverberations in the Old Testament. The consonants of the Greek word are those of the Hebrew word (*shekinah*) which denotes the presence and glory of God”. Thus, it is not accidental that, as Donaghy (1957:276) says, that “dwells among us” in John 1:14 is reminiscent of *shekinah*. God who settled down (יָרַד) within the clouds now dwells (σκηνώ) incarnately among His people within the Son. It is very clear that the invisible *shekinah* becomes visible flesh now. That means the fear of the invisibility of the glory or God’s presence was consummated in Jesus Christ being now the visible glory of God. The remaining problem is whether it is a temporary or permanent dwelling. The two conditions of the dwelling are two facets of incarnation. It can be differently emphasized depending on whether we focus on the physical or on the spiritual dimension of the incarnation.

Terrien (1978:418) argues that John 1:14 can mean that “he pitched his tent among us” or “he encamped among us”. It unmistakably suggests a temporary stay. Calvin (1847a:47) also emphasizes the temporary dimension of the incarnation. He refers to the verb σκηνώ, the tabernacle as follows:

Those who explain that *the flesh* served, as it were, for an abode to Christ, do not perceive the meaning of the Evangelist [John]; for he does not ascribe to Christ a permanent residence amongst us, but says that he remained in it as a guest, for a short time. For the word which he employs (ἐσκήνωσεν) is taken from *tabernacles*. He means nothing else than that Christ discharged on the earth the office which had been appointed to him; or, that he did not merely appear for a single moment, but that he conversed among men until he completed the course of his office.

Σκηνή, the noun form of σκηνώ implies a temporary dwelling: “a place of shelter, frequently temporary quarters in contrast to fixed abodes of solid construction, *tent, hut*” (*BDAG* s.v. σκηνή:928). In *BDAG* (s.v. σκηνώ:929) σκηνώ is simply defined as “live, settle, take up residence”, but Michaelis (1995:385) says that it more specifically refers to the tabernacle: i.e., “to live or camp in a tent”. Michaelis intends to emphasize, via this definition, that the Incarnation with flesh was the temporary dwelling. Σκηνώ is clearly linked to the tabernacle, being a temporary abode for God’s presence in the Old Testament.



However, in Rev. 7:15 σκηνώ is used as God's permanent dwelling (Michaelis 1995:385). Morris (1995:91) also criticizes the concept of a temporal incarnation in terms of time in John 1:14:

The Word "lived for a while among us". Properly the verb signifies "to pitch one's tent"; it may thus denote a temporary visit.<sup>64</sup> But this cannot be insisted upon, and any exegesis that deduces a limited incarnation from the fact that the Word "tabernacle" among us is in error. The term had come to be used in a conventional fashion of settling down permanently in a place (e.g., Rev. 12:12; there can be no more permanent dwelling than in heaven!).

In addition to the above commentary on John 1:14, Terrien (1978:416) suggests that Luke 1:35 linked to the word  $\text{שָׁכַן}$ <sup>65</sup> points to the eternal dwelling of God in the incarnation:

The verb "overshadow" (*episkiazein*)<sup>66</sup> [in Luke 1:35] has been used by the Septuagint to translate the "sojourning (*shaken*) of the cloud" over the tent of meeting, in the Sinai desert: "Moses was not able to enter the tent of meeting, for the cloud sojourned over it and the glory of Yahweh filled the tabernacle" (Ex. 40:35).<sup>67</sup> The procreation of Jesus was symbolically described as the descent of Yahweh over the desert sanctuary. The theologoumenon of presence through the cloud, elsewhere associated with that of the thick darkness, was now applied to the "Son of God". It carried with it the quality of the holy, the *mysterium tremendum* of divine nearness. It is significant that the Lukan story of the annunciation did not lay stress on the motif of the glory, although such a motif was associated with the tabernacle. The cloud created a shadow from which Moses himself was expelled. Divine presence in the humanity of Jesus belonged to the mask of the holy.<sup>68</sup>

In Jesus God Himself has become man and "pitched his tent" among us. The glory of God tabernacling among men is permanently revealed in this way (Newbiggin 1982:8). Troxel (1997:476) articulates how John Owen explains the matter of the permanent indwelling of Jesus Christ by comparing the old and new temple. He explains the argument of Owen in the following way:

Commenting on Hebrews 3:3-6, Owen admits that the temple of old had its beauty, but it was not

<sup>64</sup> Morris referring to James Moffatt, *The New Testament: A New Translation* (New York: Doubleday/Doran & Company: 1929), says that Moffatt translated "a temporary visit" into "tarried among us".

<sup>65</sup> "inhabitant" or "neighbour" (*BDB* s.v.  $\text{שָׁכַן}$ :1014).

<sup>66</sup> The verb ἐπισκιάζω means "1) to cause a darkened effect by interposing something between a source of light and an object, overshadow, cast a shadow; and 2) to cause a darkening, cover". Luke 1:35 takes the second meaning (*BDAG* s.v. ἐπισκιάζω:378).

<sup>67</sup> It is uncertain which Bible translation he used.

<sup>68</sup> Also noteworthy is his parallelism between the Lukan story of the annunciation and the account of the ark in 2 Sam. (cf. Terrien 1978:441n13).

meant to be a dwelling place for God. He describes how it was when Solomon was building the temple that he told Hiram, king of Tyre, that the house that he built was very great, for “great is our God above all gods” (2 Chron. 2:5) [KJV], yet Solomon adds, “but who is able to build him an house, seeing the heaven, and the heavens of heavens cannot contain him; who am I then that I should build him an house, save only to burn sacrifice before him” [2 Chron. 2:6, KJV]. Thus, Owen concludes that “the use of this house is not for God to dwell in, but for us to worship him in”. This, he points out, stands in stark contrast to the new-covenant temple, which is composed of the people of God themselves (Eph. 2:21), that is, a “living temple”. And God says that he dwells in this temple, whereas he did not dwell in the house of old (Eph. 2:22). Furthermore, this holy temple is built of “living stones” (1 Peter 2:4), and has Christ Jesus himself as the chief cornerstone (Eph. 2:20). Finally, Owen argues that the major thematic thrust of Hebrews 3:4 is that this temple (house), is built by Christ himself and is therefore more glorious than the temple of old.

As explained above, some scholars point out the temporary aspect of the incarnation stressing the physical dimension of it, whereas others formulate the permanent incarnation accentuating the spiritual dimension of the incarnation. We have to recognize the significance of the work of the Holy Spirit who lives and works in and through us. When we look at the incarnation focusing only on becoming flesh, it would be regarded as a temporal dwelling of God, in the same way as in the period of the Old Testament. However, in the light of pneumatology, it can be clear how God’s promise of the Immanuel has been accomplished permanently through His presence in the Spirit (John 1:14-16).

To sum up, the word σκηνώ which has the same meaning as שָׁכַן, can be interpreted as both the intermittent and permanent dwelling of the *shekinah* in the incarnation. However, it has a fuller meaning within the work of the Holy Spirit. Thus, in the next section we discuss the permanent dwelling of the *shekinah* in the pneumatological perspective.

#### **4.2.2.4. Permanent dwelling of the *Shekinah* in and through the Holy Spirit: A Pneumatological Interpretation**

The incarnation of Jesus was the perfect dwelling of the presence and glory of *shekinah*: it did not need any supplement. However, in John 12:28 Jesus asks “Father, glorify thy name”. Then a voice

came from heaven, “I have glorified it, and I will glorify it again”. This means that the Father glorified Himself (ἐδόξασα: aorist active) before, and He will glorify Himself (δοξάσω: future active) soon again. However, why must the Father be glorified again? When Father glorified Himself, was it imperfect? Furthermore, Jesus was already glorified: “Now is the Son of man glorified (ἐδοξάσθη: aorist passive)” (John 13:31); however, v.32 says “God will also glorify (δοξάσει: future active) Him [Jesus] in Himself”. The same question is: Was the first glorification imperfect? John 17:5 says the glory has been with the Father and the Son before eternity: “Father, glorify me in your own presence with the glory that I had with you before the world existed” (*ESV*). It cannot be true that the glory which has been with the Father and the Son before the creation of the world is deficient. Then, what is meant by the double glorification in the passages? It can be regarded as the gradual progress of revelation, which has the same dimension of *Heilgeschichte* (salvation history). According to McKim (1996:126) *Heilgeschichte* has a progressive sequence in human history as “a term used by some biblical scholars to mark the history of Israel and the subsequent Christian church as ‘holy history’ being worked out as God’s plan in the midst of human history as a whole”. Thus, we discuss the gradual progress of the double glorification relating with God’s permanent dwelling.

As regards John 13:31, Calvin (1847b:73) comments that Jesus shows in what manner He would bring glory to Himself. It was through His death whereby He would redeem all the creatures He has made. Through the redemptive work Jesus would gain glory and be perfectly glorious. That does not mean that Jesus lacked glory before, rather, the glory that Jesus has obtained through His work of salvation can be verbalized as “glory upon glory” (cf. John 1:16). Bruce (1983:330) speaks of this “glory upon glory” before and after the Crucifixion as follows: “he [Jesus] had glorified his Father on earth by obediently carrying out his will. One act of obedience remained to be performed – one, moreover, in which the Father would be supremely glorified”. This cannot mean that Jesus’ glorification of the Father before the Crucifixion was insufficient. It is difficult to understand exactly what the notion that Jesus who was perfectly glorious will be glorified by saving us means. Nevertheless, it is not strange to say that the already glorified Jesus entered His glory after He had

saved all from their sin. Jesus' glory was, is and will be perfect. It was perfect before the beginning of the world and will be after He has finished all His work on the earth. He is perfect now that He is at the right side of God the Father; and will be perfect when He will come again on the clouds with power and great glory (Matt. 24:30, 26:63).

However, our salvation has not been finished when Jesus had done all His work and ascended into heaven. The work of the Holy Spirit was to start after Jesus' ascent into heaven, as Aalen (1986:48) says: "the glorification of Jesus is not accomplished merely by His entry into heaven; it becomes a reality by His suffering, death, resurrection (John 12:23-28), and finally by the witness of the Spirit (John 14:16)". The incarnation was perfect; the promise of the Immanuel God was accomplished in His becoming flesh. However, the permanent dwelling of God among us is to be sealed by the abode of the Holy Spirit who Jesus has given us (1 John 3:24). Wainwright (1980:89) says that the Holy Spirit was "released" when all of Jesus' work had been finished. That does not mean the Holy Spirit did not exist or did not work before, but indicates that the function of the Holy Spirit in God's redemptive history had started as Jesus had ascended in essence. Then the Holy Spirit came into us to live within us and to help us overcome our sinfulness and weakness. By this, God invites us to Jesus' glorification in His salvation history. Luther (*LW* 20:200-201) declares how glorious it is being God's dwelling place, despite the fact that we are so sinful and weak:

But these are all spiritual and exalted words, which require faith, that I, a poor man, am to believe that God dwells with me when outwardly, after all, I am subject to the devil and all the world and besides am a sinful man, who falls often and is weak. This matter of being God's dwelling place here, then, is a most incredible thing.

Both our sinfulness and weakness as well as the indwelling of the Holy Spirit will continue until Jesus' Second Coming. Jesus' dwelling in us initiated in the incarnation, being temporal at least in appearance, becomes permanent by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. By the work of the Holy Spirit our salvation is completed (Phil. 2:12). Sachs (1990:535-536) relates salvation to the glorification of God by indicating the progressive and consecutive work of Jesus and the Holy Spirit:

The Spirit carries out the divine work of God's saving glory, established in Christ, to its completion. That is why glory is particularly associated with the Spirit's ministry (2 Cor. 3:8), which will be to bear witness to Christ (John 15:26), and to lead men and women into the fullness of the truth revealed in Christ (John 16:13).

The indwelling of the Holy Spirit is also found in Ezekiel when the prophet proposes a new principle for the correlation of the divine presence with human volition. The prophet juxtaposes his prediction of God's tabernacle in the midst of men and the doctrine of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit (Terrien 1978:210).

We can conclude: God's "intermittent and elusive" glory, manifested in various symbols, was manifested within the *shekinah*. The *shekinah* as a manifestation and indwelling of God and presence are fulfilled in Jesus Christ who became flesh. It is fully accomplished by His will constantly in and through the Holy Spirit who works in us. We can now pay attention to Jesus Christ in order to synthesize dialectically fear and hospitality of presence in worship and to the Holy Spirit who keeps the synthesized relationship between them.

### **4.3. JESUS CHRIST, THE RADIANCE OF THE GLORY OF GOD: A CHRISTOLOGICAL AND PNEUMATOLOGICAL APPROACH TO THE GLORY**

We have discussed that the manna, the ark, the tabernacle, and the temple point to Jesus Christ. The *shekinah*, which is related to clouds, shows that God's glory and His dwelling in us was hidden and temporary in the Old Testament. However, it has been revealed and became permanent in and through Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit whom Jesus has sent to us.

God's glory had been revealed in the face of Jesus, i.e., when we see Jesus, we also see God's glory (2 Cor. 4:6) (Hoekema 1988:21). Jesus is the perfect reflection of the glory of God (Heb. 1:3);

He is the radiance of the glory of God (Heb. 1:3, *ESV*). The hidden glory is revealed in Him; the fear of God is replaced by the expression of God's hospitality in Him. All that was closed is opened to God's people in Jesus Christ. Furthermore, the Holy Spirit witnesses to the permanent dwelling of God in us.

### **4.3.1. FROM FEAR TO HOSPITABLE GLORY: A CHRISTOLOGICAL REVOLUTION**

#### **4.3.1.1. The Glory without the Soteriology**

Van den Brom (1993:21) links glory to worship as the experience of encountering God:

[T]he divine Glory has already been mentioned as one of the reasons why YHWH is worthy of worship. For example: Moses asked God to see His Glory. The Seraphim even tell us in Isaiah 6 that the divine Glory fills the whole of the earth. Whilst the Prophet Ezekiel falls prostrate upon the ground when he beholds it. As was also the case with the divine Holiness, it is also possible to discern a definite pattern in those Biblical passages which deal with revelation of the Glory of YHWH. This helps us to understand the relationship between the divine Glory and God's worthiness of worship.

In other words, in faith it is possible to worship or to glorify God as creatures who encounter God's divine glory. Having analyzed Heschel's theological terms of "sublime, grandeur and mystery", Merkle (1975:591) regards worship as the ultimate goal of Heschel's theology:

Grandeur and mystery are not the ultimate. Rather they allude to the ultimate; they signal the divine. The sublime and the mysterious form the setting for worship and faith inasmuch as they echo the glory of God. Wonder and awe are antecedents of worship and faith insofar as they are experiences in which the glory is discerned.

Thus, worship is the proper response to God and His glory.<sup>69</sup> The problem is that it is impossible for sinners to worship God when they see God and His glory. Human beings have lost their ability to

---

<sup>69</sup> However, we cannot agree with Heschel's assertions that "praise precedes faith" and "prayer is a way to faith". Faith is originated in the knowledge of God, and without faith, it is impossible to praise or pray to God. see, Calvin (*Inst.* 3.2.2.; 3.2.14). Barth (*CD* II/1, 39) also says that "Knowledge of God can always proceed only from the knowledge of His existence in the two-fold sense that we always already have this knowledge and that we must have it from God Himself, in order consequently to know Him".

enjoy and praise God and His glory because of sin. Therefore, the glory of God was seemed to be fear to be close, even though the proper response to God's glory must be doxology (Duba 1990:366).

Initially, participation in the divine glory is granted to human beings (Rom. 1:21; 1 Cor. 11:7). However, as human beings have been unfaithful to their appointed place and so participation in the divine glory has been lost (Rom 1:24, 3:23), glory takes on a central meaning in soteriology (Hegermann 1994:345). In other words, it is impossible to glorify God before being saved by Him. Without changing this state, a creature cannot be close to the glory of God or glorify God. Therefore God's divine glory has been hidden from human beings so that sinful nature must not be allowed to see God's divine glory and not be put to death.

As we have observed in chapter 2, the awe or fear of God has two dimensions – *mysterium tremendum et fascinans*. Thus, as Cilliers (2009b:3) says, “in our approach to God we normally undergo both these experiences”, i.e., both of them are proper responses to God's glory. However, at times people wrongly regard the dimension of *mysterium tremendum* as something negative. Because the invisibility of God's glory in the Old Testament deepens this *mysterium tremendum* of God, people wanted to avoid it. People did not know the reality of the glory hidden in the clouds that they made the glory into a figure that can be seen. The Bible indicates this: “They exchanged the glory of God for the image of an ox that eats grass” (Ps. 106:20); “my people have changed their glory for that which does not profit” (Jer. 2:11); “[they] exchanged the glory of the immortal God for images resembling mortal man or birds or animals or reptiles” (Rom. 1:23). These passages say that people exchanged the invisible glory of God for visible images, and worship them. However, the invisibility of God's glory is no excuse for their rebellious behaviour, because people did not accept the glory even when it became visible flesh (John 1:11). Fearing the invisible divine glory and worshipping visible idols has become part of the nature of human beings after the Fall.

Thus, it is not accidental that Jesus will come with visible glory so that the whole world sees Him and His glory. As we have observed, in the Old Testament, the glory of God is practically identified

with his presence among his people in the tabernacle and in the temple: “For the glory of the Lord filled the whole temple” (2 Kings 8:11). This presence was destined to spread as wide as the earth: “All the earth is filled with the glory” (Is 6:3) (Ellebracht 1965:18). The fullest accomplishment of the glory is unified with the knowledge of Jesus Christ in His second coming. In the New Testament, Jesus’ second coming is depicted that it would be “with the clouds (μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν)” (Mark 14:62; Rev. 1:7) or “on the clouds (ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν)” (Matt. 24:30, 26:64), which are contrasted with the Old Testament expression, “in the cloud (בְּעָנָן)” (Ex. 16:10). Everyone will see Jesus and His glory so that nobody will be excused of ignoring Him visibly incarnated. To unbelievers the fear of the glory will still remain, but to believers the fear will be altered to God’s hospitable invitation to heaven.

#### 4.3.1.2. The Glory with Doxology

As mentioned above, people in the Old Testament fear the glory hidden in the clouds. Likewise, the shepherds in Luke 2 were in fear of the glory at first: “the glory of the Lord shone around them, and they were filled with fear” (Luke 2:9).<sup>70</sup> According to Marshall (1978:109) it was the “inevitable effect of such a heavenly visitation is fear”. Not only for the shepherds but also for all human beings, “fear is standard reaction to divine manifestations” (Nolland 1987:106).<sup>71</sup> Zechariah was also in fear when he saw the angel of the Lord (Luke 1:12).<sup>72</sup>

However, the angel of the Lord said to Zechariah “do not be afraid” (Luke 1:13), and to the shepherds “be not afraid” (Luke 2:10), since the angel brought good news about the Messiah (Marshall 1978:109). Because human beings cannot do anything but feel fear when experiencing God’s glory, the gospel must always begin with “fear not” (Lenski 1946:129). After the shepherds met

<sup>70</sup> Bock (1994:214) regards δόξα, קְבוֹד, and *shekinah* as the same terms indicating that all of them manifest God’s majestic presence.

<sup>71</sup> Johnson (1991:50) accentuates that the Greek word δόξα in these passages is the translated form of the Hebrew word קְבוֹד, saying that as Isaiah felt fear when he encountered קְבוֹד (Isa. 6:1-5), feeling fear is “a not unnatural response”.

<sup>72</sup> Lenski (1946:129) observes that the shepherds, Zacharias and Mary met the same angel, thus, it is no wonder that the shepherds were in fear as Zacharias and Mary were.



Jesus lying in a manger (Luke 2:12), their fear was changed into the glory and worship: “the shepherds returned, glorifying and praising God for all they had heard and seen” (Luke 2:20). The coherence of what they had heard from the angels with what they had seen led the shepherds to praise (Marshall 1978:114). What brought about this change? What had they seen and heard? Jesus Christ is the answer. All fear and awe is replaced with worship in Jesus Christ. The shepherds show how believers are converted from the fear of the glory of God to glorifying Him; from sinners to be cast into the outer darkness (Matt. 22:13) to guests to be invited to God’s feast (Luke 14:21); and ultimately from the Old Testament to the New Testament. What the shepherds saw in Bethlehem was in agreement with what they had heard from the angels. They saw what God has done for human beings, and they gave the honor to God for His acts (Bock 1994:224).

Plummer (1896:60) suggests that  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ <sup>73</sup> is used in various relationships in the Bible – man to man (1 Sam. 15:30); man to God (Ex. 15:2); and God to man (Ps. 91:15). In these passages, it was man giving honour to God. The Son of God gained His glory from the angels and the shepherds having glorified Him (Nolland 1987:110; Bock 1994:224). Having no fear but glorifying Jesus after having met Him, the shepherds became the most decisive representatives of a transitional people from the Old Testament to the New Testament.

#### **4.3.1.3. Glorifying God through Jesus Christ: Synthesizing Soteriology and Doxology in Christology**

As we have argued in chapter 2, Abraham Heschel and Rudolf Otto agree that *numen* or awe has a dual nature – fear and fascination. However, they differ on whether or not fear leads us to faith or holiness. Heschel (1955:77) says: “awe precedes faith; it is at the root of faith. We must grow in awe in order to reach faith. We must be guided by awe to be worthy of faith”. He is right that awe is a

---

<sup>73</sup> Because Plummer argues this when he comments on the Gospel of Luke, he uses the New Testament term  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ .

pathway to faith, as noted in the account of the shepherds in Luke 2:8-21. However, he never mentions how. He just explains awe as “the beginning and gateway of faith, the first percept of all, and upon it the whole world is established”. It is acceptable to say awe precedes faith. Fear of God was our condition before knowing Jesus, but what lacks in Heschel’s argument is an explanation of how awe leads us into the faith. On the contrary, as in the conclusion of his book *The Idea of the Holy*, Otto ([1923]2010:181-182) graded 3 levels of cognition of the holy: 1) high level is found in the art which demonstrate fear and awe; 2) a higher level can be found in the prophet with whom the Holy Spirit is; 3) but the highest level of the Holy is the recognition of the Son. The fear, which remains in high level, i.e., the first level above, is changed in the knowledge of the Son, the highest level; in the Holy Spirit, the higher level. This refers to Prov. 1:7: “the fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge” and John 17:3 (*ESV*): “And this is eternal life, that they know you the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom you have sent”. The function of the Holy Spirit is to lead human beings to the knowledge of Jesus (John 14:26). It is worth looking at how Otto ([1923]2010:182) explains the Son:

We can look, beyond the prophet, to one in whom is found the Spirit in all its plenitude, and who at the same time in his person and in his performance is become most completely the object of divination, in whom Holiness is recognized apparent. Such a one is more than Prophet. He is the Son.

As explained above, the ark in which the manna was placed and that once was in the tabernacle and moved to the temple, prefigures God’s dwelling, the presence, God’s glory – ultimately revealed Jesus Christ. We draw near to God through Christ (Heb. 7:25, 13:15) and ascribe glory to Christ as God (Heb. 13:21) (Duba 1990:367).

Troxel (1997:469) accurately indicates this when he argues that the glory of worship under the new covenant is rooted in the truth that Christ brought a “twofold reconciliation”, in that He broke down the barriers that had previously stood between Jew and Gentile and also between God and all humankind (Eph. 2:11ff). Thus, worshippers have access to God solely on the basis of the sacrificial blood of Jesus (Troxel 1997:470). According to Troxel (1997:471), John Owen rightly asserts that the blood of Christ is the sole means by which the Christian is able to approach God in worship. In Jesus

Christ, God transforms worship from an event of fatal separation between humanity and God into an event of saving reconciliation between them (Boulton 2008:5-6).<sup>74</sup> However, without true knowledge of the fact that Jesus saved us by grace and the faith in Him, human beings also fear the Son. Sometimes Jesus' disciples feared Him for they lacked the true knowledge of Him. The account of Jesus' walking on the water (Matt. 14:22-33) exemplifies this. The disciples were terrified when they thought they saw a ghost, but Jesus said to them "it is I; have no fear" (14:27). After they realized he was Jesus, they worshipped Him saying "truly you are the Son of God" (14:33). The disciples were redeemed from fear then worshipped Jesus. Fear was replaced with worship when they believed He was the Saviour. True knowledge of Jesus Christ led them to prostrate themselves before Him. Thus, it could be argued that Christology connects soteriology and doxology (Sachs 1990:535).

Navone (1968:48) encapsulates the account of God's glory in the New Testament within the salvation history as follows:

- 1) In the beginning man was subject to God and could see his glory (Rom. 1:21, 23); 2) as soon as man became subject to sin, this glory became foreign to him and an object of terror (Rom. 3:23; 2 Thess. 1:9); 3) after the death and the resurrection of Jesus Christ, man is saved from the domination of sin, although he must still die. He sees the glory in the face of Christ, the glory of God (2 Cor. 3:18; 4:6); 4) after the work of redemption is perfected with the return of Christ, man will neither sin nor die anymore; not only will he see the glory, but he himself will become a glorious body, a being in glory (1 Cor. 15:43; 2 Cor. 3:18; Phil. 3:21), subject to the active and radiant power of God.

One significant point that can be inferred from Navone's statement is that God's redemptive work is not finished yet. God is working in us to maintain us in the glory in and through the Holy Spirit. In the

---

<sup>74</sup> This thesis does not deal with reconciliation as a sacrament. Lang (1989:495) defines the "rite of reconciliation" or the "rite of penance" as a "Sacrament instituted by Christ". He, then continues that we need to confess our sin even after baptism. However, we do not need any rite to confess our sin or for penance. According to White (2001:267), Luther objected to the laity making an artificial catalog of one's sins and priests giving one the peace of reconciliation, saying "how one should teach common folk to shrive themselves?" For the Reformers, penitential prayer was an only appendix to their public Sunday service. God accepts us not because of the rite of confession or penance, but because of His love and grace. Therefore, the only thing we need to do is to believe in Christ. Calvin (*Inst.* 2.16.3) emphasizes our despairing conditions and how Jesus' work altered that state: "[T]o take away all cause for enmity and to reconcile us utterly to himself, he wipes out all evil in us by the expiation set forth in the death of Christ; that we, who were previously unclean and impure, may show ourselves righteous and holy in his sight. Therefore, by his love God the Father goes before and anticipates our reconciliation in Christ. Indeed, 'because he first loved us' (1 John 4:19), he afterward reconciles us to himself".

next section, we will discuss doxology and soteriology from a pneumatological perspective.

#### 4.3.2. TOWARDS AN ESCHATOLOGICAL GLORY MANIFESTED IN PNEUMATOLOGY

##### 4.3.2.1. Participation in the Glory – Already but Not Yet

God's glory can be granted or transmitted. God shares the glory with us so that we can participate in His divine glory. The transmissive aspect of the glory makes it possible. In John 17 the divine share and spread of the glory is presented. God the Father and the Son share the glory and the Son shares the glory with His disciples. John 17 can be divided into three parts: 1) Prayer for Jesus Himself (17:1-5); 2) Prayer for the disciples (17:6-19); and 3) Prayer for those who will believe (17:20:26). However, as Morris (1995:634) rightly indicates, it is difficult to subdivide these passages, for Jesus' prayer in John 17 is essentially speaking of unity between God and us in the participation of the glory, not of separation. God the Father, the Son, the disciples, and the later believers are united in the glory. The divine unity in the glory from God to the world unfolds as follows:

- 1) God does not give His glory to another (Isa. 48:11), but to Jesus (John 8:54, 11:4, 12:28);
- 2) Jesus glorified God through His work: "I have brought you glory on earth by completing the work you gave me to do" (John 17:4, *NIV*). This glorification had been Jesus' aim throughout His earthly dwelling (Bernard 1928:563);
- 3) The disciples glorified Jesus (John 17:10). But Jesus is already thoroughly glorious, thus, this glorification is the occasion for the disciples to participate in the divine glory, not for Jesus Himself (cf. Bernard 1928:567);
- 4) Jesus gave the glory to believers (John 17:22);
- 5) Jesus wanted them to participate in the divine relationship with God the Trinity seeing<sup>75</sup> eternal glory (John 17:24). This glory believers will see is different from the glory that Jesus

---

<sup>75</sup> *ESV* and *NIV* translate "ἵνα θεωρῶσιν τὴν δόξαν τὴν ἐμήν" (John 17:24) to "to see my glory", while *RSV* and

gave them in v.22, for that glory which was the same as we now have been given is not complete and eternal (Bernard 1928:578);<sup>76</sup>

6) the believers' unity is important to their mission that the world knows and participates in the glory (Köstenberger 2004:494).

In experiencing the glory, human beings can be one with the Father and the Son as God is one. Furthermore, in the glory human beings can be one with the Triune God, i.e., the Holy Spirit is also united with us in the glory. Though there is no mention of the Holy Spirit in John 17<sup>77</sup>, the Holy Spirit also shares this unity with the Father and the Son (see John 16:14-15) (Köstenberger 2004:492). According to Bruce (1983:36), the unity through the Son with the Father is maintained and attested by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. In this sharing of the glory among the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, we can be united with the Triune God and participate in God's glory. Now we are already participating in His Kingdom, but until we enter the eternal Kingdom our glory will not be completed yet. Therefore, Jesus prayed to God to keep the disciples one, as God is one (John 17:11). In the sharing of the divine glory, creatures can abide in God as the Father and the Son abide in each other (John 15:4) (Sloyan 1973:197). In this fellowship with God, they are safe from that which threatens them in the world (Ridderbos 1997:553). Morris (1995:643) notices that "keep (protect, *NIV*) them" probably means keep them from evil. God must keep our faith, i.e., our glory, because it is not perfect yet. According to Ridderbos (1997:553), the weakness and imperfection of the disciples motivated Jesus' intercession. Thus, the unity can be kept not only in the faith in Jesus but also in the work of the Holy Spirit (Calvin 1847b:175). Therefore, it is clear that the indwelling Holy Spirit has significance as far as the participation in the glory of the Triune God is concerned.

---

*KJV* translate it to "to behold my glory".

<sup>76</sup> Calvin (1847b:187) also agrees with the distinction between the glory of v.22 and v.24 in the eschatological perspective when he comments on v.24 as follows: "I think that Christ speaks of the perfect happiness of believers, as if he had said, that his desire will not be satisfied till they have been received into heaven. In the same manner I explain the BEHOLDING of *the glory*. At that time they saw the *glory* of Christ, just as a man shut up in the dark obtains, through small chinks, a feeble and glimmering light. Christ now wishes that they shall make such progress as to enjoy the full brightness of heaven. In short, he asks that the Father will conduct them, by uninterrupted progress, to the full vision of his *glory*".

<sup>77</sup> Sloyan (1973:196) explains this absence of the Holy Spirit from the perspective of the salvation history: "This may be owing to the confinement of that figure of consolation to the last days".

We have observed the double-glorification of Jesus in the gradual progress of the salvation history. Now we discuss the double glorification of the saints in the idea of “already but not yet”. Because God is holy and glorious, His people must be holy and glorious too (Lev. 11:45, 19:2, 20:7; 1 Pet. 1:15-16). The glory is, on the one hand, the riches that the nations will bring into the house of God (Rev. 21:24), on the other hand, to be glorious in the Holy Spirit is our obligation, viz. we have a right and duty to the glory. This right and duty is not completed yet; it must be kept and be perfect. God already gave the glory through the Son, but our glory is not perfect yet; Jesus has already completed His redemptive work, but we have not reached complete salvation. As noted in chapter 3, the Aramaic utterance *Maranatha* has the meaning of the urgent imperative: “Our Lord, come!” However, at the same time, it is to be understood as an invocation as well: “The Lord has come and is present” (Saliers 1994:50). Eschatology is not merely about the doctrine of the last things, but is also the principle of thought and act for those who live now and here. Though it has been differently accentuated in the history of the church within their given circumstances, the dual meaning of eschatology must always be underlined. This duality is included in the locution of “already but not yet”. As Saliers (1994:51) remarks “[i]n some way eschaton has already occurred, but its final actualization among human beings is yet to take place. From this line of thinking comes the paradox of the ‘already’ and the ‘not yet’ of the kingdom of God”.

#### **4.3.2.2. Becoming Glorious through the Holy Spirit: Synthesizing of Soteriology and Doxology in Pneumatology**

Wainwright (1979c:495) argues that “worship is a human glorification of God and a divine glorification of man in and through which we give glory to God”. Thus, he accentuates the communication between God and human beings in the glory. The Bible teaches us that we can enter the Holy of Holies through faith in Jesus Christ. However, we should remember one thing, namely that our faith is feeble. Thus, without the work of the Holy Spirit who helps us to keep faith in Jesus

Christ, we are still in fear of the glory of God. It is impossible to worship and glorifying God without the Holy Spirit.

Jesus has already obtained our salvation, but we must complete our salvation through the work of the Holy Spirit with fear and trembling as Phil. 2:12 says “work out your own salvation with fear and trembling”. This does not mean we can complete our salvation by our effort. As the next verse indicates, it is God who works in us with “His good pleasure” (Phil 2:13). Stressing God’s “willing” and “doing”, Calvin (1851:67) argues that to obtain salvation is not “the reward of merit”, but from God’s “unmerited goodness”. In the *Inst.* (2.5.11) he also interprets Phil. 2:12 observing that it is not our work:

He [Paul] assigns tasks to them to do so that they may not indulge the sluggishness of the flesh. But enjoining fear and carefulness, he so humbles them that they remember what they are bidden to do is God’s own work. By it he clearly intimates that believers act passively, so to speak, seeing that the capacity is supplied from heaven, that they may claim nothing at all for themselves.

Because in v.13 the Holy Spirit is not manifested directly, Calvin links the verse to 1 Thess. 5:19 for the pneumatological perspective: “Paul’s statement, ‘Do not quench the Spirit’ (1 Thess. 5:19), means the same thing, because sloth continually steals upon believers unless it be corrected”. God has already redeemed us, but for our imperfection He is still working in the Holy Spirit to complete our salvation. Fear and trembling in God’s redemptive work does not lead us into despair or death, but help to sanctify us in and through the Holy Spirit. In Jesus this matter of fear is resolved; now fear means only a positive attitude before God. It is a glorious thing for us that He accepts our worship in spite of it being imperfect. Luther (*LW* 20:271) links God’s dwelling, ultimately indwelling of the Holy Spirit, to a fruitful life<sup>78</sup> when he comments on Zechariah 8:1-3:

There are to appear there the fruit and the good of this dwelling and grace; that is, spiritually everything is to be splendid for [...] the people will be believing and pious, they will avoid men’s teaching and idolatry, they will cling to God’s Word alone, and through that they will become holy and

---

<sup>78</sup> This “fruitful life” is associated with the fruit of the Holy Spirit in Gal. 5:22-23: “But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, self-control; against such there is no law”.

faithful, that is, righteous and pious without any hypocrisy at all. For wherever God dwells, there God's Word and Spirit are, as we have said often; and where God's Word and Spirit are, there it produces holy and righteous people, both through teaching and living, and as a result these blessing burst forth also among many others, and the city becomes famous as an example for many others.

The *shekinah* has come home to its people in Christ. It does not need to settle down or dwell temporarily any longer, rather, it dwells among God's people and within them eternally. Now the tabernacle takes its place in us. The Bible says our body is a temple of the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. 6:19), thus we are not our own but Christ's who lives in us (Gal. 2:20). Furthermore, Christ's special presence in us can be constantly increased through the works of the Holy Spirit (Donaghy 1957:284). The Holy Spirit glorifies Jesus by enabling believers to see His life, death and resurrection as the revelation of the glory (Sachs 1990:536) and by keeping their way in His Word. Thus, in the pneumatological perspective, eschatology can be properly understood, not merely as a future event related to Jesus' Second Coming. As Regan (1977:332) argues "the Holy Spirit is as much a part of eschatology as Christ is".

#### **4.4. WORSHIP: ACTUALIZATION OF THE GLORY IN AND THROUGH JESUS CHRISIT**

We have argued that Jesus is the radiance of the glory of God. He wants to share His glory with us, and wants us to participate in His glory which the Father has given Him and which He has obtained for us. This participation is happened in the Holy Spirit. The glory Jesus obtained must be actualized here and now. The glory is not only signifying a past event, but is also improving a present occurrence. The crucifixion is not finished but an everlasting event for believers. Christ has come, comes and will come to us in the Holy Spirit. Moreover, because eschatology does not merely speak about future things, the glory that will be accomplished in the future also should be actualized here and now. This actualization of the future glory prevents us from regarding this world as worthless. Rather, we are always to live in the light of the Holy Spirit who dwells in us. Thus the glory of the past and the future



must be actualized. As Müller (2007:450) says “liturgy is an exercise in memory and also an exercise in eschatological hope”. Webber (1994:67) also echoes this actualization of the glory to the present. He articulates worship as follows:

Worship is not a mere memory or a matter of looking back to a historic event (that is an Enlightenment notion). Rather, worship is the action that brings the Christ event into the experience of the community gathered in the name of Jesus. Three implications to this understanding of worship are: 1) worship recapitulates the Christ event, 2) worship actualizes the church, and 3) worship anticipates the kingdom.

“Recapitulating the Christ event” also means the actualization of the past glory which Jesus had obtained for us through His redemptive work, into the present; and “anticipating the kingdom”. It refers to actualizing the hope of the future that we will obtain the eternal glory in his Kingdom, into the present. Thus, when we practice worship centered in Christ, we can actualize the glory of the past and the future into the present. In Jesus Christ glory and worship meet.

Actualizing the glory of God in worship cannot be done without the decisive work of the Holy Spirit. As Sachs (1990:529) remarks “Christian worship is not something in which the Spirit occasionally has a function, but rather something which from the beginning to end is the proper work of the Holy Spirit”. The Holy Spirit was, is and will keep the hospitality which has been changed from fear by Jesus, dwelling in us. Worship is the place for keeping the hospitality and actualizing the glory of the Triune God in our lives.

## **4.5. CONCLUSION**

The aim of this chapter is to describe fear and hospitality dialectically. Describing fear and hospitality in worship is neither a matter of balance or blending, nor ignoring or excluding. Fear of God must not be altered or replaced by God’s hospitality. It is not true that the fear in the Old Testament only contains negative side whereas the hospitality in the New Testament has bright side.

Both point Jesus Christ, but they come to a fuller fruition in the New Testament in Christ and the Holy Spirit. Fear and hospitality in worship must be synthesized dialectically. Then, what can be the foundation of worship in which fear and hospitality can be synthesized dialectically? Only by worshipping Jesus Christ through the Holy Spirit can we answer this question. In Him, fear and awe of the glory is fully revealed with joyful worship; the fear of God is changed to God's hospitality. Jesus is the norm and the center of worship giving meaning to the glory of God. Through Christ and in the Holy Spirit, we have access to the Father. When we behold Jesus Christ it is by the Holy Spirit that we are changed from glory into glory (2 Cor. 3:12-18, esp. v.18) (Duba 1990:367). As Cilliers (2009a:38) states, "we are attracted to God because He approaches us". We call it grace. This grace is revealed in Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour. Even though we live in this grace, we still have to deal with the temptation of sin. That is why we need the indwelling of the Holy Spirit.

Thus, only those who believe in Jesus can worship in the Holy Spirit through God's hospitable invitation. Faith in Jesus is the foundation of God's hospitality; and we show His hospitality to neighbours in worship. Wainwright (1979c:495) says that precisely because we are being conformed to Jesus Christ who is our glory, our worship takes its origin and fundamental pattern from Jesus. Jesus was full of God's glory from His birth (Luke 2:9, 14, 32; John 1:14); was glorified by His death and resurrection (Luke 24:26; John 7:39; 12:16); and will come in His glory (Matt. 19:28, 25:31).<sup>79</sup> Thus, it needs mainly the Christological approach, but the pneumatological application must also be considered for without the indwelling of the Holy Spirit the glory Jesus has given to us cannot be preserved.

---

<sup>79</sup> "His glory" is also depicted as "the glory of His Father" (Matt. 16:27; Mark 8:38; Luke 9:26), "great glory" (Matt. 24:30; Mark 13:26; Luke 21:27), and "His glory and the glory of the Father and of the holy angels" (Luke 9:26). This shows the unity of the Triune God in the glory. Ramsey (1949:148) confirms that the glory of the Son and the glory of the Father cannot be separated.

**CHAPTER 5**

**A WAY OF SYNTHESIZING**

**FEAR AND HOSPITALITY IN WORSHIP:**

***THE PRAGMATIC TASK***

**5.1. INTRODUCTION**

Acting and speaking cannot be separated otherwise they would be in contradiction. The Greek word λόγος and the Hebrew word דְּבַר mean “word” and, at the same time, “deed”.<sup>80</sup> Thus, one’s actions must coincide with one’s words. Theology also should be consistent regarding its theory and practice. That is why theology must not end at the desk, but be concerned with the ministry in the field. Theology must be practical (Browning 1996:7-8).<sup>81</sup>

In the previous chapter we have dealt with “what/who must be the agent who synthesizes fear and hospitality in worship?” as the normative task, and the answer was “Jesus Christ”. We have applied a Christological approach as well as the pneumatological implications to find the answer. In this chapter, the method we use is what Osmer (2001:4, 175ff) calls the “pragmatic task”, which is concerned with the practical field and its application. Osmer poses the question “how might we respond?” to do the task. However, first we pose another question before dealing with Osmer’s question, viz. “how might

---

<sup>80</sup> *BDAG* (s.v. λόγος:598) lists the meaning of λόγος as word; computation, reckoning – “a formal accounting, esp. of one’s actions”; and the Logos, and *BDB* (s.v. דְּבַר:180) defines דְּבַר as word, things, matter.

<sup>81</sup> Browning (1996:8) calls it “fundamental practical theology”.

we not respond?” to criticize contemporary evangelism which seeks to exclude fear and awe from worship or to blend fear and hospitality just in terms of quantity. Secondly, we answer Osmer’s question by suggesting a model for synthesizing fear and hospitality.

Contemporary evangelistic church services support hospitable greetings at the door and the foyer by ushers, contemporary music and a sermon delivered through a communicative method. These are all the results of effort to convey familiarity and hospitality, but meanwhile we might forget the fact that fear of God and awe are vital aspects of Christian worship. Although we should be intimate with newcomers, the focus of worship should be God’s glory, not the convenience of people. We can find this perspective in the Early Church’s training course, “the catechumenate”. In the catechumenate, unbaptized people were banned from staying in the place of worship when the Communion was served. It must have been an unpleasant request to put to those who wanted to be church members. However, the Early Church maintained the perception of sacredness and reverence in this way.

This is neither a question of choosing between “contemporary” or “traditional ways”, nor about whether one is good and the other is bad. We accept both the enthusiasm of contemporary worship, which seeks to reach out to persons around us, and the traditional heritage that tries to maintain the divinity of worship. Dawn (1995:93) declares that “[only] in a dialectical tension of traditional and reformation<sup>82</sup> can we ask better questions to insure that worship is consistent with the nature of God as revealed in the Scripture and in the person of Jesus Christ”. Moreover, as we explored in the previous chapter, “fear” and “hospitality” are not something good or bad in themselves. Dawn (1995:95-96) gives a good account of this:

[M]ost of weaknesses of worship arise when we forget the constant dialectic of God’s character. Holiness without love incites terror; love without holiness invites liberalism. Worship that focuses on God’s transcendence without God’s immanence becomes austere and inaccessible; worship that stresses God’s immanence without God’s transcendence leads to irreverent coziness.

In this chapter, we do not criticize contemporary evangelistic seeker-friendly worship as if

---

<sup>82</sup> By this term she means reformation from the previous era, not “the Reformation”.

traditional liturgical awe-inspiring worship is the only good form of worship, or vice versa. Our concern is about synthesizing the two opposing aspects within a dialectical relationship and how they can be synthesized in worship with Jesus as the agent.

## **5.2. EXCLUDING AND BLENDING: A MATTER OF EVANGELISM**

### **5.2.1. CONTEMPORARY WORSHIP MUST BE DISTINGUISHED FROM VERNACULAR**

Wright (1997a:23) defines “contemporary worship” as follows: “Worship marked by characteristics of the present period”. That means “contemporary worship” is intrinsically influenced by current popularity or fashion. He further describes contemporary worship as follows: “By its nature, contemporary worship does and should change”. According to this definition, we cannot speak of “contemporary worship” if there is no difference between the service of this Sunday and that of last Sunday.

In this regard, “contemporary worship” is in some ways similar to the term “vernacular” which was explained in chapter 3: In both cases changes occur because for people’s sake. Reynolds (1997:51) says that “[elements of traditional worship] make many people feel like they are in a foreign country. People then begin to feel that God is foreign and inaccessible”. He seems to think that the vernacular is needed for people who are not adapted to Christian worship. However, it cannot be regarded as the same meaning that newcomers “feel like they are in a foreign country” and that sixteenth century worshippers did “listen to a foreign language in worship”. The Bible and the hymns had to be in the vernacular, for the “believers” who had Christian faith and were eager to worship God sincerely. However, “being contemporary” means to be changed owing to the fact that newcomers are not familiar with the Bible, hymns, church buildings, bulletins, choirs, and the rituals of worship. Adaptations for newcomers must include avoiding fear and awe in worship, for those dimensions are awkward for them. Thus, sometimes contemporary worship changes its form and elements of worship

in order that newcomers should not feel uncomfortable during worship, whereas the Reformers translated the Bible and the hymns for the believers so that they could understand God's Word and praise God. Therefore, "contemporary" and "vernacular" are different.

### **5.2.2. EXCLUDING FEAR IN WORSHIP**

Dawn (1995:97) regrets that the "sense of God's greatness, fullness, and mystery is often missing in modern worship". This trend of excluding the mysterious aspect in worship is one of the characteristics of contemporary worship. According to Wright (1997a:26), the "churched people" expect "awe" in worship while the "unchurched<sup>83</sup> guests" expect "intimacy". Thus, following this distinction, worship must be awe-inspiring but not hospitable in order to satisfy believers; furthermore, to satisfy newcomers, worship must stress intimacy, familiarity, and hospitality while excluding the dimensions of awe and fear. However, the desires of those coming to worship cannot be described so simply. "Churched" people do not just expect fear and awe; they also anticipate the perception of God's hospitality and familiarity which comes through Jesus' redemptive work for us. Likewise, "unchurched guests" also have a religious sentiment and curiosity about divinity. They do not merely expect intimacy and a warm welcome when they attend a service. As mentioned in chapter 2, people come to church with two needs: a hunger for communion with God and the hunger for human community. Both believers and newcomers draw near to fear God as well as to receive God's hospitality when they enter the place of worship. Both needs should be satisfied simultaneously. Only God can satisfy people's hunger for Him; God's divine ethos cannot be replaced with human pathos.

Malloy (2010:444) quotes Kimball, one of the representative contemporary megachurch youth pastors, as follows:

Little by little, I began to recognize that non-Christian students, who had once been impressed by all

---

<sup>83</sup> The term "unchurched" is also a contemporary word, as used in chapter 3.

of our programming, dramas, media clips, and topical messages, were showing less and less interest. With technology now so accessible to teenagers that they could easily create their own flashy video clips, seeing it in church was no big deal (Kimball 2003:32-33).

The endeavour which uses contemporary media to make newcomers feel comfortable, seems to have failed to attract them any longer. Church is to be a Church, not a theatre. An attempt to draw newcomers into church should be encouraged, but the means should be appropriate. Without fear and awe Christian worship cannot stand. Thus, fear and hospitality are to be ascribed the same weight. Dawn (1995:78) criticizes the change of the liturgical invocation which says that the Triune God calls us to worship, to a “casual greeting” to make worshipers feel comfortable. As we discussed in chapter 4, negative fear and awe had been changed to a hospitable welcome in Jesus Christ, the agent. Thus, we do not have to try to take fear away from worship; rather, we must try to show how Jesus changed fear to grace in worship.

### **5.2.3. BLENDING FEAR AND HOSPITALITY**

As mentioned above, ignoring or excluding fear is one of the trends of contemporary worship, though it is not the main characteristic. However, there are some people who criticize that tendency, loudly remonstrating “do not throw out the baby with the bath water!” They want to blend old and new; traditional and contemporary; fear and hospitality. Central to this assertion, is Robert Webber who in his book, *Blended Worship*, focuses on blending traditional and contemporary worship. In this regard, Webber (1996:13) remarks as follows: “in the future, Christian worship will be characterized by the blending of the traditional and the contemporary into a vital experience of worship and praise”. He (1996:53ff) offers various examples of the contemporary convergence worship style, i.e., the contemporary elements in liturgical denominations, e.g., praise and worship style in Orthodox worship, dancing in Episcopal worship; and the traditional elements in contemporary evangelistic churches, emphasizing the Eucharist in worship in Willow Creek Community Church, and historic traditional worship in charismatic worship. It seems, in his opinion, that this generation requires

blended worship. Wright (1997a:25) agrees with Webber that he distinguishes “Believer-Oriented Worship” and “Seeker-Oriented Worship”, and he puts “Believer-Oriented, Seeker-Friendly Worship” which is very typical blended worship, between them. He then defines the “Believer-Oriented, Seeker-Friendly Worship” as follows:

While the worship and messages focus on believers, great care is taken to help visitors feel welcome. Perhaps the service is printed out in its entirety in the bulletin, making it easy to follow. Maybe a team of greeters is trained to welcome people at the door of the sanctuary. Perhaps extra care is taken in choosing hymns that are easier to sing. Both traditional and contemporary believer services can be made seeker-friendly, though it admittedly takes a great deal of work to do so with traditional, liturgical forms of worship. This service assumes that visitors may be present, though the overwhelming majority of worshipers will be believers.

Criticizing the contemporary “emerging churches”<sup>84</sup>, Malloy (2010:446) states: “They [emerging churches] embrace art, conversation, shared contemplative silence, the classic spiritual disciplines, and liturgical worship as reliable ways to encounter God”.<sup>85</sup> According to him, they embrace traditional liturgical aspects including weekly Eucharist for church growth and to be seen as being spiritually. They do not have any healthy theology for the purpose of blending, but just use contemporary devices for convenience and tradition for spirituality. Lueking (2006:10) also noticed the absence of theology in blended worship, when he went to a Lutheran church in Finland which was introduced as a creative venture in liturgical evangelism:<sup>86</sup>

A choir of 25 men and women had taken their places just off center at the head of the nave, behind a group of a half-dozen instrumentalists. A woman stepped to the microphone, welcomed all, and briefly explained what would follow: prayer and confession, the word and the Eucharist.

I then faced my own first doubts: Would Lutherans actually get up, go forward, kneel down and confess to another person their sins and whatever else was eating them on the inside?

Although thousands of people gathered that night, drawing many people is not the reason that we should blend fear and hospitality in worship.

---

<sup>84</sup> For details about the “emerging church”, see Kimball (2003).

<sup>85</sup> Naming the section in which the sentence above appears, “Warren meets Dix?”, Malloy shows his negative stance to the blended worship.

<sup>86</sup> However, he gradually became impressed by the so-called “Thomas Mass” and finally insisted that it gives a good example of how liturgy-based churches adopt contemporary things – how they blend them in worship.



As Long (2001:12) observes, “Webber has a fluid and sophisticated understanding of ‘blended’ worship”. However, Long criticizes this, saying that in many congregations, the blended worship has lost its Christ-centered character, and has been compromised by mixing the two dimensions of worship. Compare the following remark in this regard: “we’ll do a traditional hymn, then we’ll do a praise song. We’ll have the classic structure, but we’ll spice it up with skits. A little of this and a little of that, and everyone will be happy” (Long 2001:12). Webber points to the three points which are crucial to worship: event-orientation, the Word and the Table, and four movements – gathering, the Word, the Table, and dismissal. All these aspects represent Jesus Christ. However, when Webber’s theory is applied to the practise, the theology is missing, and all that remains is “blended”, which is looked upon as a kind of panacea. Even though blended worship looks like a good alternative for our current issue, it cannot be the best answer to this question: “How can fear and hospitality stand dialectically in worship?” Blended worship just mixed the elements of both in quality and quantity.

We notice that one of the characteristics of blended worship, is that it is concerned with “seekers”, or the “unchurched”. Therefore, all the reasons for changing worship, excluding fear from worship, and blending fear and hospitality are the same: not wanting newcomers to feel like strangers. It seems that many churches assume that worship is the same as evangelism.

#### **5.2.4. WORSHIP AND EVANGELISM**

The Frontier worship, by which worship-evangelism such as the “seeker service” has been influenced (Senn 1997:688), was related to pragmatism. White (1989:177) evaluates Charles Finney and worship in his era – the Frontier worship, as follows: “Finney discarded traditions when they did not prove as effective as newer methods. The essential test, then, is a pragmatic one: Does it work? If so, keep it; if not, discard it. Finney and his associates represent a liturgical revolution based on pure pragmatism”. The aim of the Frontier worship was not to educate or sanctify people, but to convert and justify them. With this aim, the Sunday service had predominantly three parts: a song, a sermon,

and an invitation. Contemporary “growth-oriented” churches follow this order in worship for reasons of worship-evangelism (cf. White 1989:178; Senn 1997:688). Worship-evangelism is also linked to “revivalism” which inevitably focuses on conversion to save the lost one (Bolt 1992:99).<sup>87</sup> Wright (1997b:127) answers the question “why do we want to offer this [evangelistic] service?” as follows: “if the congregation believes it can more effectively reach new, unchurched people through this kind of worship, then the church has no choice but to go where God has called them to go.” What he assumes in this answer is that worship must focus on unchurched people first, viz. worship should be evangelistic. Morgenthaler (1999:77ff) says that worship-evangelism is already happening. He mainly quotes from the experiences of worship leaders and pastors.<sup>88</sup> However, practical theology is not and must not be subordinated to what is happening in the ministry, though an accurate observation of it is important. Rather, practical theology creates a sound theology from the Bible and history, where God has worked for His people, and provides the theology to the field to help ministers.

Keifert (1992:60) is right when he states that: “As God is host to Israel, so Israel is called to be host to the strangers”.<sup>89</sup> Moreover, he maintains that “[s]ince Israel was the recipient of the Lord’s hospitality, so Israel’s worship was to be hospitable to strangers” which probably means worship should be open to strangers. Nevertheless, the rite of Israel’s worship was not familiar to the strangers. Rather, Israel’s worship was odd to strangers as today’s worship can seem strange to newcomers. Divine worship is innately unnatural to unbelievers. As we explored in chapter 4, hospitality without a Christological-pneumatological application merely provides human intimacy.

---

<sup>87</sup> Worship can be called as “evangelical” in this regard. Hoon (1971:182) says “[i]n a deep sense worship is always a call to conversion”. Müller (2007:449) also remarks that worship needs to be evangelical: “Although the liturgy is focused primarily on the baptismal community of faith, there is a need for a more comprehensive, inviting liturgy that does not limit and confine God’s blessing solely to this faith community. The horizon of the Gospel is never confined to the church, but looks beyond it to the larger horizon of the Kingdom, giving the nations access to the blessing of God. It must focus simultaneously on outsiders to help them find God-given foundations for life in all its complexities”. However, there is a great difference between the statements that “worship is evangelical” and “worship is evangelistic”. To stress evangelistic worship the dimension of fear must be taken away in the worship. However, in evangelical worship fear can stand firmly, because it is the inherent nature of the Gospel. Worship is evangelical but not evangelistic (Hoon 1971:182).

<sup>88</sup> Morgenthaler (1999:81) also gives examples from Bible passages (cf. Isa. 66:19; Ps. 96:3, 10; 2 Sam. 22:50; and Ps. 18:49), but these passages do not uphold worship evangelism as she insists. These passages declare how God is glorious and that the whole world, which has been created by Him, should know that He is glorious. They do not indicate that worship is evangelistic.

<sup>89</sup> We discussed the fact that God is the initiator of hospitality in chapter 2.

It must be remembered that there was enormous growth in the Early Church without “evangelistic service”, “revivalism”, or “advertisements showing hospitality”. The way of the “growth” was an ardent enthusiasm for the mission given by Jesus (González 1984:78). The Early Church grew because they were simply eager to proclaim Jesus’ Gospel. As mentioned in chapter 2, newcomers can be taught what worship is when they see believers worshipping in a proper way. “When believers praise God with all their hearts, and souls, and minds, and strength, nonbelievers who are present will be moved” (Dawn 1999:272). We do not have to change worship to evangelism to accommodate newcomers. Bolt (1992:101) stresses the sufficiency of Christian worship itself: “There is no reason, in my judgment, why intentionally Christian worship cannot be powerfully attractive to “seekers”... I conclude, therefore, that Christian worship must be scandalously *particular*, unabashedly focused on Jesus, unashamed of the demand of the Cross”. Thus, the church must proclaim the Gospel to the world and lead people into the church; moreover, the church must be open and sometimes needs to create a more comfortable atmosphere for newcomers. However, this does not mean worship must be changed for the sake of the unchurched. Worship is to keep its divinity. Webber (1996:90-91) formulates this matter well:

[E]vangelism is not worship because the thrust of the service is directed toward the people, particularly the sinner, with the intention of bringing the sinner to a personal relationship with God through Christ. Unfortunately, many churches have brought this evangelistic model into the Sunday morning service and called it worship. It is not worship; it is evangelism. The church must be about evangelism, but it must also be about worship – and worship is not primarily directed toward the people. Rather, worship is the people’s celebration of the living, dying, and rising of Christ, a celebration which is offered to God’s glory.

The observation of Dawn (1995:80-81) is also worth mentioning:

Many people advocate turning worship into “seekers’ services” or “entertainment evangelism”. These attempts to reach out to persons who do not know God are certainly laudable – one would hope that we all look for ways to share our faith – but it is a misnomer to call services “worship” if their purpose is to attract people rather than to adore God. Plans for specific efforts to draw nonbelievers to the Church must be accompanied by definite preparations to move those attracted by such evangelistic rallies into services that actually worship God. The key is providing education for new believers to come to know God and what it means to worship.

Dawn (1999:271) stresses that the different focus between worship and evangelism. Thus, according to her, when we talk to others about God – His characteristics, attributes, and about His Word – “the focus is on those to whom we speak”, whereas in worship our focus is God. However, in worship we focus on God and the attendees as well. We worship God and, at the same time, instruct newcomers to worship God.

Cilliers (2009b:2) formulates four tensions in worship: “between being and becoming, between time and space, between awe and expression, and between laughter and lament”. As mentioned above, there are many opposing aspects in worship, and they create such tensions. What we would like to do is to synthesize the tensions so that they can stand in a dialectical relationship. This study does not want to ignore or exclude these tensions, but rather, want to admit that they do exist in worship.

## **5.4. AN EARLY MODEL FOR SYNTHESIZING FEAR AND HOSPITALITY IN WORSHIP: THE CATECHUMENATE**

The church must be hospitable to newcomers and neighbours; the church must be open to them so that they draw near easily. However, opening and changing must be dealt with cautiously. Church, as well as worship, cannot be changed just to attract newcomers. They should remain holy. Although worship is not closed to people, some think that worship is difficult to approach. However, ignoring fear or blending fear and hospitality cannot be the answer; the two aspects must be synthesized dialectically in Jesus Christ. In this section, we introduce “the catechumenate” in the Early Church as a model of how the elements of fear and hospitality can be synthesized in a proper way and how the Early Church kept its reverence by separating opening the church and worship from changing them.

### **5.4.1. THE CATECHUMENATE AND THE CHURCH**

The catechumenate is the Early Church practice of training new believers, which is “derived from the Greek word *katechein*, meaning ‘to teach’ or ‘instruct’” (Arnold 2004:40). According to the *Apostolic Tradition*, the catechumenate was divided into two parts: “the long-term preparation, lasting up to three years, when the candidates were trained in Christian doctrine and morals, and the final intensive preparation, when those accepted for baptism were exercised daily, fasted on the two days before Easter, kept an all-night vigil consisting in the reading of scripture and instruction, and were finally baptized on Easter morning” (Crichton & Fisher 1986:150).<sup>90</sup> This training system for new believers is quite different from the contemporary system. Arnold (2004:42) regrets the short period of the contemporary evangelistic training course, comparing it with the catechumenate, not only in the length, but also in rigidity. The final intensive preparation of the catechumenate included strict scrutinizing tests: “The preparation for baptism consisted of a series of instructions and exercises during the season of Lent, called ‘scrutinies’. They were designed as periodic tests of the progress of the candidates to be baptized” (Folkemer 1946:291). Compared to contemporary evangelism, the Early Church seems to have been very careful about allowing newcomers as members. They were not hasty to increase church membership, rather, what they considered significant, was that catechumens should be prepared well for baptism.

Becoming a member of the Christian community does not merely imply a decision to follow the rules and teachings of the church, but also means changing one’s lifestyle. While they were in the catechumenate, catechumens could adapt the Christian way of life. It was a time for discernment and prayer (Piil 1990:173), and through this period their lives could be converted. This converted life is “a

---

<sup>90</sup> The length of the long-term preparation is debatable. Piil (1990:173) remarks that normally it lasted from several months to years. According to Folkemer (1946:289), there was no fixed period of time for the catechumenate. Generally, it seemed to have lasted long enough to test thoroughly the sincerity and character of the candidate. Folkemer quotes the *Apostolic Tradition* in this matter: “Let him who is to be a catechumen be a catechumen, for three years... ..but if any one be diligent, and has a good will to his business, let him be admitted: for it is not the length of time, but the course of life that is judged.” However, the length of the training was shortened after Constantine’s conversion, for after that too many inquiries were requested (Crichton & Fisher 1986:150). Weiss (1998:58), moreover, indicates that “[a]fter the conversion of the emperor Constantine, large numbers of people wanted to join the Church, and not always for entirely laudable reasons”. In length and sincerity, the catechumenate declined after the peace of the church. In chapter 2, we have already dealt with the relationship between the emperor Constantine and the distortion of Christian worship.

life lived in relationship with Christ". The catechumenate was the first step into the Christian life<sup>91</sup>; catechumens had just started toward being faithful to Christ. It was "not simply education but conversion, and conversion takes time" (Piil 1990:174). Through this long period, the church could enable the catechumens to live as Christians, for the church's purpose is not simply to pass on correct doctrines, but above all to initiate the newcomers into a living faith (Martimort et al 1987:276). Three indispensable things were required of the catechumens when they had finished the various processes of the catechumenate: 1) they made their sincere, formal, and solemn renunciation of the devil; 2) they promised to live in obedience to Christ and the laws and rules of the Christian faith; and 3) they confessed their faith in the Creed that had been taught to them by the catechist shortly before the day of baptism (Folkemer 1946:298-300). It should be noted that there is difference between entering a place of worship and worshipping God. As mentioned above, only those who believed what Jesus had done for them could worship; thus, catechumens were just regarded as potential worshippers until they had received enough instruction to be Christians.

The condition of catechumens was somewhat vague. Although catechumens were in the training course of the catechumenate, they were not believers yet. Calvin (*Inst.* 4.4.1) quotes from Jerome's five church orders: bishops, presbyters, deacons, believers, and catechumens, when he stresses that there is no distinction between clergy and laity. We can see from Calvin's statement that catechumens were not treated as believers. Folkemer (1946:287) also says they did not belong to the believers' group: "As the Church became organized, there evolved three orders of members; the clergy, the believers, and the catechumens. Some divided the clergy into bishops, presbyters, and deacons. The believers were strictly the laity who had been baptized". However, they were also regarded as Christians at the same time (Folkemer 1946:287):

In addition to the clergy and believers was the group of catechumens. Though they were not strictly members, they were in some measure considered within the pale of the Church and reckoned as one of the orders. They were part of the Christian community and were regarded as Christians. With the

---

<sup>91</sup> Although there were many classes of catechumens, it is obvious that the whole process of the catechumenate is the first step to the Christian life. For detailed study of the classes of the catechumens, see Folkemer (1946:288).

insufflation, exorcism, the signing of the cross, and the administering of salt, they became catechumens.

The catechumens were called Christians and were instructed to live the Christ-centered life, but still did not have membership. Only when they had completed all the processes of the catechumenate, could they become official members of the church. Privileges were given to them at that time, and “[o]f course, the greatest privilege was that of receiving the sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ for the remission of sins and the strengthening of faith”<sup>92</sup> (Folkemer 1946:300). Participating in the Eucharist is a significant distinction between catechumens and believers; moreover, because the Eucharist is the “heart of worship” (Brunner 1968:86), worship is still not open to the catechumens, though they have already entered the place of worship. However, it does not mean that worship is something conditional. Being baptized is not like a ticket by which one can enter the place of worship, it is the privilege given to all so that they can come into the deep sense of worship.

#### **5.4.2. THE CATECHUMENATE AND WORSHIP**

Hahn (1973:36) finds one of the unique characters of the Early Christian worship to be the “*synerchesthai*” (to come together) or “*synagesthai*” (to gather together). What is important is not the gathering itself, but what they do when they assembled. According to Hahn (1973:36), where the Christian community comes together, “God is praised, his mighty acts are proclaimed, prayers are said, and the Lord’s Supper is celebrated”. All these actions were to be taken by attendees, but of these actions the Lord’s Supper was not allowed to all who gathered as Weiss (1998:57-58) describes:

During this preparatory period the catechumens received regular instruction in the faith but were not permitted to attend the celebration of the Eucharist, or even to pray together with those who were already baptized or to exchange the kiss of peace with them, since they were regarded as not yet holy.

---

<sup>92</sup> The other privileges were: the use of the Lord’s Prayer and “the administration of Church matters and full participation in all the affairs of the Church” (Folkemer 1946:301); the exchange of the kiss of peace (Weiss 1998:58). Cf. also White (2001:155)

By accepting the system of the catechumenate the church already drew the catechumens into the circle of worship. They received and accepted God's word, experienced acts of worship performed on themselves, and participate in the worship of the church. "In addition to participation in the weekly gatherings for the celebration of the word, various liturgical rituals are suggested during the period of the catechumenate": 'various minor exorcism', 'blessings and rites of anointing', 'prayer' (Pill 1990:174). However, they could not sit at the Lord's Supper (Johnson 2009a:209).

There were two parts of worship in the Early Church: The "Mass of the Catechumens" and the "Mass of the Faithful" (Cobb 1979:181-182, cf. *Inst.* 4.18.8n13). Certainly completing all the processes of the catechumenate cannot guarantee that the catechumen has become "faithful", but by this the Early Church tried to avoid tainted worship. Catechumens could join the "Mass of the Catechumens", but after the Bible reading, the chants, and the sermon, the non-baptized had to leave the Christian assembly before the Communion, viz. "Mass of the Faithful" (Cobb 1979:187).<sup>93</sup> Therefore, although catechumens attended worship, they could not join to the deep sense of worship before being baptized. Only those who are bound to Jesus and incorporated into the body of Christ by baptism can memorialize Him through the Eucharist which He instituted. They know what Jesus has done for them and, in this knowledge fear and the mystery of worship are revealed by God's hospitable invitation to the Lord's Table. Brunner (1968:86) emphasizes that the Eucharist is the heart of worship: "The heart of worship, the celebration of the Lord's Supper, is still closed to [catechumens]. Only the baptized may enter this precinct, only the baptized is qualified to worship and is a fully authorized sponsor of worship". Therefore, the catechumens were not allowed to enter worship, because they could not receive the bread and the wine.

By the process of the catechumenate, the Early Church wanted the catechumen to be adopted into the Christian faith, worship, and ultimately, to Christ Himself. The catechumen had to learn the Word of God and the Creed, and had to decide to live a life following the instruction. That is quite different

---

<sup>93</sup> "With the disappearance of the catechumenate the formal dismissal of the catechumens was naturally omitted or at least contracted. It was dropped from the Roman rite but continued in Milan, Gaul, Spain, and north Africa and survives in the Byzantine rite to the present day" (Cobb 1979:188).



from changing worship for the newcomers' convenience. It can be wrongly concluded by newcomers that the church is ready to change everything, including worship, for their sake. Contemporary worship seems to pay too much attention to newcomers. As mentioned in chapter 2, Jesus did not refuse or change God's will to be intimate with people, but He inspired people to resemble God's holiness. We must open the church, but at the same time, must not change worship. We need to heed Bolt's assertion (1992:98):

Since Christian worship is a response to God's action in Jesus Christ, a response that involves remembering and rehearsing specific divine acts (Exodus, Incarnation, Crucifixion, Resurrection) it cannot be performed by those who lack such memories, who do not share the story. The Lord's Supper is closed to participation by non-believers. This approach begins with the church and its worship and moves from there *to* the world.

## **5.5. CONCLUSION**

Some people may argue that fear is overemphasized in traditional worship while hospitality is overstressed in a contemporary evangelistic worship. However, the issue is not about "traditional" or "contemporary" styles. Both can be idolatrous (Dawn 1995:93). Our concern is how the elements of fear and hospitality in worship can be synthesized dialectically. This cannot be done by accentuating one and ignoring the other, or blending them, but by putting Jesus in the center of worship. The catechumenate is a good model for Jesus-centered worship: It allowed only those baptized in Jesus' name; who had decided to follow Jesus; who had been taught Jesus' instructions; who had given an appropriate length of time in preparation for this, to share in Jesus' flesh and blood – the heart of worship.

The privilege of taking the bread and the wine is not given for our good morality, rather, taking Jesus' body and blood encourages us to live morally as God wants us to do. The reason to ban the unbaptized from taking the bread and the wine is not that they were less moral than the baptized, but that they have not been baptized in Jesus' name. Only those who have been grafted in Jesus can

glorify God through the Holy Spirit. They are in fear of God but, at the same time, God accepts them with His hospitality because of their faith in His only Son Jesus Christ. Thus, worship becomes a celebration of Jesus for them. Traditional and contemporary, old and new, mystery and celebration, and fear and hospitality are integrated in Jesus Christ.

## CHAPTER 6

# CONCLUSION

### 6.1. THEOLOGICAL EVALUATION: WORSHIP, THE PLACE OF DOXOLOGY

We have explored how the tension between fear and hospitality; traditional and contemporary worship; divine ethos and human pathos; and old and new in worship can be synthesized: When Jesus is the center of worship, all the tensions co-exist in a dialectic relationship. The two aspects of worship are not supplementary to each other, but need to be supplemented by Jesus, i.e., fear of God does not mean we must be frightened by Him, but implies that we are to adore Him with awe. In Jesus we are enabled to worship God with perfect fear. God's hospitality does not just mean to be intimate with others, but signifies His merciful favour, the fact that He accepts ungodly sinners like us. This perfect hospitality is given to us in Jesus' redemptive work. Since the two aspects themselves do not have a negative or positive effect on worship, we should not ignore or stress either one of them. Rather, they must stand in a dialectic relationship in Jesus.

This dialectical relationship between the two aspects in worship has the same effects as a doxology because in Jesus the tension of the glory is also relieved. As discussed in chapter 4, initially, the glory of God is shown to be fearful to human beings. However, when Jesus came to us with a human body, the glory was revealed to us fully, and accompanied by God's hospitable invitation through which we can glorify God. Therefore, we are able to practice doxology in worship, for the

tension of the glory is resolved in Jesus. As such, worship and doxology become possible only in Jesus; they meet in Jesus. Worship is the place of doxology in Jesus.

## **6.2. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: THE MATTER OF OPEN AND CLOSED**

The main title of this thesis is intentionally formulated as a question “Open Church and Closed Worship?” One would expect a negative answer. The relationship between doxology and worship is related to the fact that unbelievers cannot glorify God in worship. However, that does not mean that worship is closed to unbelievers. Rather, God opens His arms and embraces all people, inviting them into worship to praise Him (Isa. 43:21). Everyone can and must come to the place of worship. However, the deep sense of worship is not to be changed.

We mainly dealt with two opposing aspects of Christian worship – fear and hospitality. They are not to be changed or altered by anything; otherwise, Christian worship would lose its genuine characteristic. On the one hand, there are those who regard the dimension of fear as an unnecessary part of worship. They think it is an obstacle when inviting neighbours to worship. For them worship is something “contemporary” that is and should be changed. Thus, fear should be taken away from worship for the sake of newcomers who are unfamiliar with Christian worship. On the other hand, there are those who feel that the dimension of hospitality should not be over-stressed in worship. They think worship should be serious and awe-inspiring. If there are any humorous or entertaining aspects, worship will lose its reverence. Thus, for them, worship is something closed to some people.

However, it is Jesus who can open and close worship (cf. Rev. 3:7). He commends us to open the church and invite all nations to worship so that they listen to God’s Word, but at the same time, he warns us that “whoever, therefore, eats the bread or drinks the cup of the Lord in an unworthy manner

will be guilty of profaning the body and blood of the Lord (1 Cor. 11:27)”. Open the church and open worship for God’s glory, but do not change for the people’s sake.

### **6.3. FOR SUBSEQUENT STUDY: TOWARDS TRINITARIAN WORSHIP**

It is impossible to deal with the relationship between fear and hospitality in worship without Christ, because He is the one who relieves the tension between them and leads us to the genuine glory beyond the tension. Thus, we mainly used a Christological approach and with some pneumatological elements. However, this is a limitation of this thesis. Worship must be Trinitarian for God is Trinity and the Triune God comes to our worship. In theme and structure, Christian worship is characteristically Trinitarian – in worship we are to glorify God through Jesus Christ in the Holy Spirit (Wainwright 1979b:501; 1986:505; Bolt 1992:96). We glorify God the Trinity in worship, participating in the life of the Triune (Vanhoozer 2002:15).

The tension between fear and hospitality is resolved in the Triune God only. Fear and hospitality are the work of the Triune God: fear of the Father in worship can be altered to God’s hospitable invitation in the redemptive work of the Son in whom we can believe through the work of the Holy Spirit. Fear and hospitality can stand dialectically only in the cooperative work of the Triune God, though the Son must be at the center. As the renowned assertion of Gregory of Nazianzus shows us, it is an appropriate conclusion that worship is Trinitarian, not Christological alone:

No sooner do I conceive of the One than I am illumined by the Splendour of the Three; no sooner do I distinguish Them than I am carried back to the One. When I think of any One of the Three I think of Him as the Whole, and my eyes are filled, and the greater part of what I am thinking of escapes me. I cannot grasp the greatness of That One so as to attribute a greater greatness to the Rest. When I contemplate the Three together, I see but one torch, and cannot divide or measure out the Undivided Light (*NPNF 2nd VII: 375*).

We end this thesis with the declaration of the eternal communication of the Triune God. LaCugna (1990:1293) formulates the correlation of the Triune God to everything as follows: “[E]verything comes from God (Father), through Christ, in the Spirit, and everything returns to God (Father), through Christ, in the Spirit (Eph. 1:3-14)”. God the Trinity invites us to the eternal communication through worship. In the center of the communication stands the Son: “For from Him and through Him and to Him are all things. To Him be glory for ever. Amen” (Rom. 11:36).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aalen, S 1986. "δόξα", in Brown, C (ed), *The International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*, vol.2. 44-48. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House.
- Allen, C A 1911. "Reverence as the Heart of Christianity". *Harvard Theological Review* 4/2:253-266.
- Arnold, C E 2004. "Early Church Catechesis and New Christians' Classes in Contemporary Evangelicalism". *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 47/1:39-54.
- Arterbury, A E 2002. "The Ancient Custom of Hospitality, the Greek Novels, and Acts 10:1-11:18". *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 29/1:53-72.
- Baker, F 1986. "Love Feast", in Davies, J G (ed), *The New Westminster Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship*. 341-345. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.
- Barnard, M 2001. "Secular Feast and Christian Feast in Schleiermacher's *Practical Theology and Aesthetics*: A Theological Contribution to the Study of Liturgy and the Arts", in Post, P *et al* (eds), *Christian Feast and Festival: The Dynamics of Western Liturgy and Culture*. 185-203. Lueven/Paris/Sterling: Peeters.
- Barth, K 1956-1975. *Church Dogmatics*, 4 vols. tr by Parker, T H L et al. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Berkhof, H 1979. *Christian Faith: An Introduction to the Study of the Faith*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Bernard, J H 1928. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John*. ed by Driver, S R, Plummer, A & Briggs, C A. *The International Critical commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament*. vol.22. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Bock, D L 1994. *Luke Volume 1: 1:1-9:50*. ed by Sliva, M. *Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament*. vol.3A. Grand Rapids: Baker Books.
- Bolt, J 1992. "Some Reflections on Church and World: Worship and Evangelism". *Calvin Theological Journal* 27/1:96-101.

- Boulton, M M 2008. *God Against Religion: Rethinking Christian Theology Through Worship*. Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans.
- Bradshaw, P 1996. *Early Christian Worship: A Basic Introduction to Ideas and Practice*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press.
- Bradshaw, P 2002. *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship: Sources and Methods for the Study of Early Liturgy*. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Brand, E 1986. "Lutheran Worship", in Davies, J G (ed), *The New Westminster Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship*. 345-347. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.
- Bretherton, L 2006. *Hospitality as Holiness: Christian Witness amid Moral Diversity*. Hampshire/Burlington: Ashgate.
- Brown, C (ed) 1986. *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*, 4 Vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House.
- Browning, D E 1996. *A Fundamental Practical Theology: Descriptive and Strategic Proposals*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Bruce, F F 1983. *The Gospel of John: Introduction, Exposition, and Notes*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Brueggemann, W 1990. *First and Second Samuel*. ed by Mays, J L. *Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching*. Louisville: John Knox Press.
- Brüki, B 2006. "The Reformation Tradition in Continental Europe: Switzerland, France, and Germany", in Wainwright, G & Tucker, K B W (eds), *The Oxford History of Christian Worship*. 436-462. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Brunner, P 1968. *Worship in the Name of Jesus: English Edition of a Definitive Work on Christian Worship in the Congregation*. tr by Bertran, M H. Saint Louis/London: Concordia Publishing House.
- Burdan, S 1993. "The Seekers' Service/Believers' Worship Churches", in Webber, R E (ed) *The Complete Library of Christian Worship: vol.3. The Renewal of Sunday Worship*. 93-94. Nashville: Star Song Publishing Group.
- Buttrick, D G 1992. "Reformed Liturgy", in McKim, D K & Wright, D F (eds), *Encyclopedia of the*



- Reformed Faith*. 220-223. Louisville/Edinburgh: Westminster John Knox Press/Saint Andrew Press.
- Calvin, J 1847a. *Commentary on the Gospel According to John*, vol.1. Edinburgh: The Calvin Transration Society.
- Calvin, J 1847b. *Commentary on the Gospel According to John*, vol.2. Edinburgh: The Calvin Transration Society.
- Calvin, J 1851. *Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Phillippians, Colossians, and Thessalonians*. tr by Pringle, J. Edinburgh: The Calvin Transration Society.
- Calvin, J 2006. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, 2 Vols. reissued. tr by Battles, F L. ed by McNeill, J T. *The Library of Christian Classics*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Cartledge, T W 2001. *1&2 Samuel*. ed by Nash, R S. *Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary*. Macon: Smyth & Helwys.
- Chandlee, H E 1986. "The Liturgical Movement", in Davies, J G (ed), *The New Westminster Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship*. 307-314. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.
- Cilliers, J 2009a. "Mysterium Tremendum et Fascinans: Liturgical Perspectives on the Approach to God". *In die Skriflig* 43/1:31-44.
- Cilliers, J 2009b "Why Worship: Revisiting a Fundamental Liturgical Question". *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 65/1, Art. #126, 6 pages. DOI: 10.4102/hts.v65i1.126.
- Cobb, P G 1979. "The Liturgy of the Word in the Early Church", in Jones, C, Wainwright, G & Yarnold, E (eds), *The Study of Liturgy*. 179-188. London: SPCK.
- Creasey, M A 1986. "Quaker Worship", in Davies, J G (ed), *The New Westminster Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship*. 454-456. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.
- Crichton, J D 1986. "Low Mass", in Davies, J G (ed), *The New Westminster Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship*. 365-366. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.
- Crichton, J D & Fisher, J D C 1986. "Catechumen, Catechumenate", in Davies, J G (ed), *The New Westminster Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship*. 150-151. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.

- Cullmann, O 1954. *Early Christian Worship*. tr by Todd, A & Torrance, J. London: SCM Press Ltd.
- Davies, J G 1986. "Architectural Setting", in Davies, J G (ed), *The New Westminster Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship*. 26-36. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.
- Davies, J G (ed) 1986. *A New Westminster Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.
- Dawn, M 1995. *Reaching Out without Dumbing Down: A Theology of Worship for the Turn-of-the-Century Culture*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Dawn, M 1999. "Reaching Out without Dumbing Down: A Theology of Worship for the church in Postmodern Times", in Gelder, C V (ed), *Confident Witness - Changing World: Rediscovering the Gospel in North America*. 270-282. Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans.
- De Silva, D A 2003. "Honor and Shame", in Alexander, T D & Baker, D W (eds), *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Pentateuch*. 431-436. Downers Grove: IVP.
- Dobson, J O 1941. *Worship*. London: Student Christian Movement Press.
- Donaghy, H 1957. "God with Us". *Worship* 31/5:276-284.
- Duba, A D 1990. "Doxology", in Fink, P E (ed), *The New Dictionary of Sacramental Worship*. 365-369. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press.
- Dunn, J D G 2010. *Did the First Christians Worship Jesus?: The New Testament Evidence*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Durham, J I 1987. *Exodus*. ed by Hubbard, D A & Barker, G W. *Word Biblical Commentary*. vol.3. waco: Word Books Publisher.
- Ellebracht, M P 1965. "Glory, a dynamic concept". *Worship* 39/1:16-20.
- Elowsky, J C (ed) 2006. *John 1-10*. ed by Oden, T C. *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture*, NT-IVA. Downers Grove: IVP.
- Fenwick, J R K & Spinks, B D 1995. *Worship in Transition: The Twentieth Century Liturgical Movement*. T&T Clark: Edinburgh.
- Fink, P E (ed) 1990. *The New Dictionary of Sacramental Worship*. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press.

- Folkemer, L 1946. "A Study of the Catechumenate". *Church History* 15/4:286-307.
- Freedman, D N (ed) 1992. *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, 6 Vols. New York: Doubleday.
- Friedman, M S 1976. "Divine Need and Human Wonder: the Philosophy of Abraham J Heschel". *Judaism* 25/1:65-78.
- Fuller, J D 2009. "Dreaded monoliths: Rudolf Otto's *Das Heilige* and 2001: A Space Odyssey". *Teaching Theology & Religion* 12/1:58-59.
- Fuller, R H 1986. "Sermon", in Davies, J G (ed), *The New Westminster Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship*. 484-485. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.
- Funk, V C 1990. "The Liturgical Movement (1830-1969)", in Fink, P E (ed), *The New Dictionary of Sacramental Worship*. 695-715. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press.
- Gelpi, D L 1982. "Conversion: The Challenge of Contemporary Charismatic Piety". *Theological Studies* 43/4:606-628.
- González, J L 1984. *The Story of Christianity: The Early Church to the Dawn of the Reformation*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Grenz, S J & Olson, R E 1992. *20th Century Theology: God & the World in a Transitional Age*. Downers Grove: IVP.
- Guder, D L (ed) 1998. *Missional Church: A Vision for the Sending of the Church in North America*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Hague, S T 1997. "אֵרֶוֹן", in Van Gemeren, W A (ed), *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*, vol.1. 500-510. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House.
- Hahn, F 1973. *The Worship of the Early Church*. tr by Green, D. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Hegermann, H 1994. "δόξα", in Balz, H & Schneider, G (eds), *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*, vol.1. 344-348. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Heitink, G 1999. *Practical Theology -History, Theory, Action Domains: Manual for Practical Theology*. tr by Bruinsma, R. Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans.

- Heschel, A J 1955. *God in Search of Man: A Philosophy of Judaism*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Cudahy.
- Heschel, A J 1966. *Who is Man?* London: Oxford University Press.
- Hitchcock, R D & Brown, F (eds) 1885. *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles: Recently discovered and published by Philtheos Bryennios, Metropolitan of Nicomedia*. London: John C Nimmo.
- Hoekema, A A 1988. *Created in God's Image*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Holman, J 2001. "An Approach from Biblical Theology of the Passover: A Critical Appraisal of Its Old Testament Aspects", in Post, P *et al* (eds), *Christian Feast and Festival: The Dynamics of Western Liturgy and Culture*. 167-184. Lueven/Paris/Sterling: Peeters.
- Hood, A 2004. "Faith and Fear". *Expository Times* 115/5:145-149.
- Hoon, P W 1971. *The Integrity of Worship: Ecumenical and Pastoral Studies in Liturgical Theology*. Nashville/New York: Abingdon Press.
- Johnson, L J (ed) 2009a. *Worship in the Early Church: An Anthology of Historical Sources*, vol.1. Collegeville: Liturgical Press.
- Johnson, L J (ed) 2009b. *Worship in the Early Church: An Anthology of Historical Sources*, vol.2. Collegeville: Liturgical Press.
- Johnson, L J (ed) 2009c. *Worship in the Early Church: An Anthology of Historical Sources*, vol.3. Collegeville: Liturgical Press.
- Johnson, L T 1991. *The Gospel of Luke*. ed by Harrington, D J. *Sacra Pagina Series*. vol.3. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press.
- Jones, C, Wainwright, G & Yarnold, E (eds) 1979. *The Study of Liturgy*. London: SPCK.
- Jones, D L 1979. "Christianity and Emperor Worship from Hadrian to Constantine". *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 6/1:34-44.
- Jungman, J A 1966. *The Early Liturgy: To the Time of Gregory the Great*. tr by Brunner, F. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Keifert, P R 1992. *Welcoming the Stranger: A Public Theology of Worship and Evangelism*.

- Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Kimball, D 2003. *The Emerging Church: Vintage Christianity for New Generations*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Kingdon, R 2004. "Worship in Geneva Before and After the Reformation", in Maag, K & Witvliet, J D (eds), *Worship in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Change and Continuity in Religious Practice*. 48-60. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Kittel, G & Friedrich, G (ed) 1995. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 Vols. tr by Bromiley, G. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Klauser, T 1979. *A Short History of the Western Liturgy: An Account and Some Reflections*. 2nd ed. tr by Halliburton, J. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Koenig, J 1992. "Hospitality", in Freedman, D N (ed), *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, vol.3. 299-301. New York/London/Toronto/Sydney/Auckland: Doubleday.
- Köstenberger, A J 2004. *John*. ed by Yarbrough, R & Stein, R H. *Baker Exegetical commentary on the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Kravitz, L S 1996. "Shekinah as God's Spirit and Presence". *Living Pulpit* 5/1:22-23.
- LaCugna, C M 1990. "Trinity and Liturgy", in Fink, P E (ed), *The New Dictionary of Sacramental Worship*. 1293-1296. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press.
- Lang, J P 1989. *Dictionary of the Liturgy*. New York: Catholic Book Publishing Co.
- Lathrop, G 1993. *Holy Things: A Liturgical Theology*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Lattke, M 1985. "Rudolf Bultmann on Rudolf Otto". *Harvard Theological Review* 78/3-4:353-360.
- Leaver, R A 2004. "Sequences and Responsories: Continuity of Forms in Luther's Liturgical Provisions", in Maag, K & Witvliet, J D (eds), *Worship in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Change and Continuity in Religious Practice*. 300-328. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Leithart, P J 2010. *Defending Constantine: The Twilight of an Empire and the Dawn of Christendom*. Downers Grove: IVP.

- Lenski, R C H 1946. *The Interpretation of St. Luke's Gospel*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House.
- Leonard, R C 1993. "The Numinous Aspect of Biblical Worship", in Webber, R E (ed) *The Complete Library of Christian Worship: vol.1. The Biblical Foundations of Christian Worship*. 71-79. Nashville: Star Song Publishing Group.
- Levy, D M 1993. *The Tabernacle : Shadows of the Messiah : Its Sacrifices, Services, and Priesthood*. Bellmawr: Friends of Israel Gospel Ministry.
- Lienhard, J T (ed) 2001. *Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy*. ed by Oden, T C. *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture, OT-III*. Downers Grove: IVP.
- Long, T G 2001. *Beyond the Worship Wars: Building Vital and Faithful Worship*. Herndon: Alban Institution.
- Lueking, F D 2006. "Liturgical evangelism". *Christian Century* 123/12:10-11.
- Luther, M 1960-1974. *Luther's Works*, 55 Vols. Palikan, J (for vols 1-30) & Lehmann H T (for vols 31-55) (ed). Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Maag, K & Witvliet, J D (eds) 2004. *Worship in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Change and Continuity in Religious Practice*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Mackey, J A 2003. "The Awesome and our Awe". *Living Pulpit* 12/3:26.
- Malloy, P L 2010. "Rick Warren Meets Gregory Dix: The Liturgical Movement Comes Knocking at the Megachurch Door". *Anglican Theological Review* 92/3:439-453.
- Marshall, I H 1978. *The Gospel of Luke: Commentary on the Greek Text*. ed by Marshall, I H & Gasque, W W. *The New International Greek Testament Commentary*. Exeter: The Paternoster Press.
- Martimort, A G et al 1987. *Principles of the Liturgy*. tr by O'Connell, M J. ed by Martimort, A G et al. *The Church at Prayer: An Introduction to the Liturgy*. Vol.1. London: Geoffrey Chapman.
- Martin, R P 1976. *Worship in the Early Church*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Maxwell, W D 1960. *An Outline of Christian Worship: Its Developments and Forms*. 8th ed, revised.

- London: Oxford University Press.
- McDermott, B O 1990b. "Feast of Christ", in Fink, P E (ed), *The New Dictionary of Sacramental Worship*. 200-204. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press.
- McDonnell, K 1967. *John Calvin, the Church, and the Eucharist*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- McDonnell, K 1973. "Statement of the Theological Basis of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal". *Worship* 47/10:610-620.
- McGrath, A 1999. *Reformation Thought: An Introduction*. 3rd ed. Malden/Oxford/Carlton: Blackwell Publishing.
- McKee, E A 2003. "Reformed Worship in the Sixteenth Century", in Vischer, L (ed), *Christian Worship in Reformed Churches Past and Present*. 3-31. Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans.
- McKim, D K & Wright, D F (eds) 1992. *Encyclopedia of the Reformed Faith*. Louisville/Edinburgh: Westminster John Knox Press/Saint Andrew Press.
- McKim, D K 1996. *Westminster Dictionary of Theological Terms*. Louisville: Westminster Kohn Knox Press.
- Merkel, F 1986. "ἄρτος", in Brown, C (ed), *The International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*, vol.1. 249-251. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House.
- Merkle, J C 1975. "Worship, Insight and Faith in the Theology of Abraham Joshua Heschel". *Worship* 49/10:583-596.
- Michaelis, W 1995. "σκηνώ", in Kittel, G F, G (ed), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, vol.7. 385-386. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Morgenthaler, S 1999. *Worship Evangelism: Inviting Unbelievers into Presence of God*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Morris, L 1995. *The Gospel according to John*. rev. ed by Stonehouse, N B, Bruce, F F & Fee, G D. *The New International Commentary on the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Müller, B A 2007. "Liturgy at the Edges: Between Doxology and Domestication". *Scriptura* 96:441-

452.

- Muller, R A 1985. *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms: Drawn Principally from Protestant Scholastic Theology*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Munk, L 1992. "His Dazzling Absence: The Shekinah in Jonathan Edwards". *Early American Literature* 27/1:1-30.
- Navone, J 1968. "'Glory' in Pauline and Johannine Thought". *Worship* 42/1:48-52.
- Newbigin, L 1982. *The Light Has Come: An Exposition of the Fourth Gospel*. Grand Rapids/Edinburgh: Eerdmans/Hansel Press Ltd.
- Newlands, G & Smith, A 2010. *Hospitable God: The Transformative Dream*. Farnham/Burlington: Ashgate.
- Nolland, J 1987. *Luke 1-9:20*. ed by Hubbard, D A & Barker, G W. *Word Biblical Commentary*. vol.35A. Waco: Word Books Publisher.
- Oden, T C (ed) 1999-. *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture*, 29 Vols. Downers Grove: IVP.
- Oden, A G (ed) 2001. *And You Welcomed Me: A Sourcebook on Hospitality in Early Christianity*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Old, H O 1992. "Worship", in McKim, D K & Wright, D F (eds), *Encyclopedia of the Reformed Faith*. 409-411. Louisville/Edinburgh: Westminster John Knox Press/Saint Andrew Press.
- Osmer, R R 2001. *Practical Theology: An Introduction*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Otto, R [1923]2010. *The Idea of the Holy: An Inquiry into the Non-Relational Factor in the Idea of the Divine and Its Relation to the Rational*. tr by Harvey, J W. Mansfield Centre: Martino Publishing.
- Piil, M A 1990. "Catechumenate", in Fink, P E (ed), *The New Dictionary of Sacramental Worship*. 172-175. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press.
- Plummer, A 1896. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke*. ed by Driver, S R, Plummer, A & Briggs, C A. *The International Critical commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament*. vol.20. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.



- Pohl, C D 1999. *Making Room: Recovering Hospitality as a Christian Tradition*. Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans.
- Price, J D 1997. "עֵרְפָּל", in Van Gemeren, W A (ed), *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*, vol.3. 542-543. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House.
- Ramsey, A M 1949. *The Glory of God and the Transfiguration of Christ*. London: Longmans.
- Redman, R 2002. *The Great Worship Awakening: Singing a New Song in the Postmodern Church*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Regan, P 1977. "Pneumatological and Eschatological Aspects of Liturgical Celebration". *Worship* 51/4:332-350.
- Reynolds, K 1997. "How to Blend Contemporary and Traditional Elements without Offending Everyone", in Wright, T & Wright, J (eds), *Contemporary Worship: A Sourcebook for Spirited-Traditional, Praise and Seeker Services*. 51-53. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Ridderbos, H N 1997. *The Gospel of John: A Theological Commentary*. tr by Vriend, J. Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans.
- Root, A 2009. "Practical Theology: What Is It and How Does It Work". *Journal of Youth Ministry* 7/2:55-72.
- Rordorf, W 1968. *Sunday: The History of the Day of Rest and Worship in the Earliest Centuries of the Christian Church*. tr by Graham, A. London: SCM Press Ltd.
- Sachs, J R 1990. "Holy Spirit in Christian Worship", in Fink, P E (ed), *The New Dictionary of Sacramental Worship*. 529-539. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press.
- Saliers, D E 1994. *Worship as Theology: Foretaste of Glory Divine*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Saliers, D E 1996. *Worship Come to Its Senses*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Schaff, P & Wace, H (eds) 1999. *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers Second Series*, 14 Vols. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers.
- Schmemmann, A [1966]2009. *Introduction to Liturgical Theology*. tr by Moorehouse, A E. New York: St Vladimir's Seminary Press.

- Senn, F C 1997. *Christian Liturgy: Catholic and Evangelical*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Senn, F C 2004. "The Mass in Sweden", in Maag, K & Witvliet, J D (eds), *Worship in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Change and Continuity in Religious Practice*. 48-60. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Sloyan, G S 1973. *John*. ed by Mays, J L. *Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching*. Atlanta: John Kknox Press.
- Small, J D 2003. "A Church of the Word and Sacrament", in Vischer, L (ed), *Christian Worship in Reformed Churches Past and Present* Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans.
- Smart, N 1972. *The Concept of Worship*. London: The Macmillan Press.
- Streetman, R F 1980. "Some Later Thoughts of Otto on the Holy". *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 48/3:365-384.
- Strobel, L 1993. *Inside the Mind of Unchurched Harry & Mary: How to Reach Friends and Family Who Avoid God and the Church*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House.
- Sutherland, A M 2006. *I was a Stranger: A Christian Theology of Hospitality*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Talley, T J 1973. "History and eschatology in the primitive Pascha". *Worship* 47/4:212-221.
- Terrien, S 1978. *The Elusive Presence: Towards a New Biblical Theology*. ed by Anshen, R N. *Religious Perspectives*. 26. San Francisco: Harper&Row Publishers.
- Thayer, J H 2000. *Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers.
- Troxel, A C 1997. "Cleansed Once for All - John Owen on the Glory of Gospel Worship in Hebrews". *Calvin Theological Journal* 32/2:468-479.
- Van den Brom, L J 1993. *Divine Presence in the World: A Critical Analysis of the Notion of Divine Omnipresence*. Kampen: Kok Pharos Publishing House.
- Van Gemeren, W (ed) 1997. *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*, 5 Vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House.

- Vanhoozer, K J 2002. "Worship at the Well: From Dogmatics to Doxology (and Back again)". *Trinity Journal* 23/1:3-16.
- Vischer, L (ed) 2003. *Christian Worship in Reformed Churches Past and Present*. Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans.
- Volf, M & Bass, D C (eds) 2002. *Practical Theology: Beliefs and Practices in Christian Life*. Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans.
- Wainwright, G 1978. *Eucharist and Eschatology*. 2nd ed. London: Epworth Press.
- Wainwright, G 1979a. "The Language of Worship", in Jones, C, Wainwright, G & Yarnold, E (eds), *The Study of Liturgy*. 465-473. London: SPCK.
- Wainwright, G 1979b. "In praise of God". *Worship* 53/6:496-511.
- Wainwright, G 1979c. "The Understanding of Liturgy in the Light of Its History", in Jones, C, Wainwright, G & Yarnold, E (eds), *The Study of Liturgy*. 495-509. London: SPCK.
- Wainwright, G 1980. *Doxology: The Praise of God in Worship, Doctrine, and Life*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wainwright, G 1986. "Theology of Worship", in Davies, J G (ed), *The New Westminster Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship*. 505-507. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.
- Wainwright, G 2006. "Christian Worship: Scriptural Basis and Theological Frame", in Wainwright, G & Tucker, K (eds), *The Oxford History of Christian Worship*. 3-31. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wainwright, G & Tucker, K (eds) 2006. *The Oxford History of Christian Worship*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Webber, R E (ed) 1993-94. *The Complete Library of Christian Worship*, 7 Vols. Nashville: Star Song Publishing Group.
- Webber, R E 1994. *Worship Old and New: A Biblical, Historical, and Practical Introduction*. revised and expanded ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House.
- Webber, R E 1996. *Blended Worship: Achieving Substance and Relevance in Worship*. Peabody:

Hendrickson Publishers.

Webber, R E 2006. *Worship is a Verb: Eight Principles for Transforming Worship*. 2nd ed. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers.

Weiss, J E 1998. "Liturgy and Catechesis". *Liturgical Ministry* 7/Spr:57-66.

Wenderoth, C 1982. "Otto's View on Language: The Evidence of Das Heilige". *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 9/1:39-48.

Wenham, G J 1994. *Genesis 16-50*. ed by Hubbard, D A & Barker, G W. *Word Biblical Commentary*. vol.2. Waco: Word Books Publisher.

Wettstein, H 1997. "Awe and the Religious Life". *Judaism* 46/4:387-407.

White, J F 1989. *Protestant Worship: Traditions in Transition*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

White, J F 2001. *Introduction to Christian Worship*. 3rd ed, revised and expanded. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Williams, B 1989. "Tolerating the Intolerable", in Mendus, S (ed), *Toleration and the Limits of Liberalism* London: Macmillan.

Williams, R 2005. *Why Study the Past?: The Quest for the Historical Church*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Willimon, W H 1989. *Word, Water, Wine and Bread: How Worship Has Changed over the Years*. Valley Forge: Judson Press.

Wright, T 1994. *A Community of Joy: How to Create Contemporary Worship*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Wright, T 1997a. "Defining Contemporary Worship", in Wright, T & Wright, J (eds), *Contemporary Worship: A Sourcebook for Spirited-Traditional, Praise and Seeker Services*. 23-26. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Wright, T 1997b. "The Six W's of Contemporary Worship", in Wright, T & Wright, J (eds), *Contemporary Worship: A Sourcebook for Spirited-Traditional, Praise and Seeker Services*.

127-129. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Wright, T & Wright, J (eds) 1997. *Contemporary Worship: A Sourcebook for Spirited-Traditional, Praise and Seeker Services*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.