

WORSHIP IN THE WORD

Toward a Liturgical Hermeneutic

• Scott W. Hahn •

St. Paul Center for Biblical Theology

Twentieth-century biblical scholarship was dominated by historical and critical theories and methodologies. This development marked the full flowering of seeds sown in Europe more than three centuries earlier, in the aftermath of the wars of religion and the rise of the Enlightenment project.¹

As a result of this movement in scholarship, today in large segments of the academy and even the Christian community, the Bible tends no longer to be read and studied as *Scripture*—a “word” spoken by God to a community that acknowledges this word as authoritative and normative for its life and worship. Instead it is read as a “text,” a literary and historical artifact bearing no more or less meaning or legitimacy than any other product of ancient civilization.

The consequences of this shift in biblical understanding and interpretation have been felt in every area of Catholic and Protestant faith and life—from doctrinal formulations and organizational structures to disciplines and worship. Much has been written in recent years on the implications of historical-critical methods and the philosophical assumptions that underwrite them. That broader conversation, which aims at reforming the use of these methods, is crucial and must be continued.

However, I want to focus in this paper on what I believe to be the most significant achievement of historical and literary scholarship—namely, the recovery of the *liturgical sense of sacred Scripture*. By this I mean the living relationship between *Scripture*, the inclusive canon of the apostolic churches, east and west, and *liturgy*, the ritual public worship of God’s covenant people, especially the eucharistic and sacramental liturgies of the Church. The recovery of this liturgical sense of Scripture is now only beginning to be recognized. I hope in this paper to make some small contribution to our appreciation of the significance of this recovery and the potential it holds for biblical scholarship in the century ahead.

¹ See generally, Hans Frei, *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative: A Study of Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermeneutics* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974); Hans Reventlow, *The Authority of the Bible and the Rise of the Modern World* (London: SCM Press, 1985); Klaus Scholder, *The Birth of Modern Critical Theology: Origins and Problems of Biblical Criticism in the Seventeenth Century* (Philadelphia: Trinity International Press, 1990); Richard John Neuhaus, ed. *Biblical Interpretation in Crisis: The Ratzinger Conference on Bible and Church* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishers, 1989); Jon D. Levenson, *The Hebrew Bible, the Old Testament and Historical Criticism* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993), especially Chapter 3: “Historical Criticism and the Fate of the Enlightenment Project”; William T. Cavanaugh, “‘A Fire Strong Enough to Consume the House’: The Wars of Religion and the Rise of the State,” *Modern Theology* 11 (1995): 397-420.

I will begin by first discussing the *liturgical content and context* of the Scriptures, which modern scholarship has helped us to see. I will discuss this in terms of what I call the material and formal unity of Scripture and liturgy. This unity, I argue, invites us to make a *liturgical reading* of the entire canonical text. The heart of this paper will outline this approach to a canonical reading, focusing on what I describe as the Bible's liturgical *trajectory* and *teleology*. Finally, I will discuss three exegetical principles that emerge from this liturgical reading of the canonical text—the notions of divine economy, typology, and mystagogy. My aim is to advance the consideration of a new, *liturgical hermeneutic*. I contend that such a hermeneutic has superior interpretive and explanatory power and is capable of integrating the contributions of historical and literary research while at the same time respecting the traditional meanings given to the Bible by the faith community from which it originates.

Scripture's Liturgical Content and Context

The recovery of Scripture's liturgical sense is the product of two critical findings of modern biblical scholarship: First, the recognition of the final canonical shape of Scripture as essential for determining the meaning and purpose of individual passages and books of Scripture; and secondly, the identification of the covenant as Scripture's keynote narrative theme. Together, these findings have helped us to see a unity between Scripture and liturgy that may be described as both formal and material. Their unity is *formal* in that Scripture was canonized for the sake of liturgy, and the canon itself derived from liturgical tradition. Their unity is *material* in that the content of Scripture is heavily liturgical.

Details about the origins of the *canon* as a definitive collection of sacred writings expressing the faith, worship, and instruction of the believing community remain elusive and are still debated among scholars.² However, there is general recognition that the motives for establishing the canon were largely liturgical and that liturgical use was an important factor in determining which Scriptures were to be included in the canon. Put simply, the canon was drawn up to establish which books would be read

² See, generally, Lee M. McDonald and James Sanders, eds., *The Canon Debate* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 2002); Brevard S. Childs, *The New Testament as Canon: An Introduction* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984); Lee M. McDonald, *The Formation of the Christian Biblical Canon*, rev. ed. (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 1995). For a review of the most recent literature and its significance, see Brevard S. Childs, "The Canon in Recent Biblical Studies: Reflections on an Era," *Pro Ecclesia* 14 (2005): 26-45.

when the community gathered for worship, and the books included in the canon were those that were already being read in the Church's liturgy.³

The scriptural canon, then, was enacted primarily as a "rule" for the liturgy (the Greek word κανών, meaning rule or measuring stick; see Gal. 6:14-16).⁴ But textual analysis and form criticism have helped us see the profound shaping influence of liturgical use on the composition and final form of individual texts. In some cases—certain psalms, for instance—this is self-evident. And we know from internal evidence that many New Testament texts, especially the epistles and the Book of Revelation, were composed for the express purpose of being read in the eucharistic liturgy (see Rev. 1:3; 1 Tim. 4:13).⁵ But close literary analysis has also enabled us now to see that the final form of the gospels reflects their use in the eucharistic worship of the early community. Some have even argued that the gospels' final form was shaped by a kind of ongoing dialogue with the Jewish texts being read in the synagogue, especially for Israel's great feasts.⁶

³ James A. Sanders has written: "That which is canon comes to us from ancient communities of faith, not just from individuals . . . the whole of the Bible, the sum as well as all its parts, comes to us out of the liturgical and instructional life of early believing communities." *From Sacred Story to Sacred Text* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 162; Everett Ferguson has observed: "Distinctive worship practices . . . served as preconditions for a canon of Scripture. The Eucharist involved the remembrance of the passion of Christ and particularly the institution narrative." "Factors Leading to the Selection and Closure of the New Testament Canon," in *The Canon Debate*, 296. The liturgical motivations for the canon are widely acknowledged. Carroll Stuhlmueller, C.P., describes the Scriptures as "the . . . liturgical documents of Old and New Testament times." *Thirsting for the Lord: Essays in Biblical Spirituality* (Staten Island, N.Y.: Alba House, 1977), 102. Gerard Sloyan has observed, "The Scripture came into existence as part of the life of a worshipping community. . . . There can be no doubt whatever that liturgical influences were strong in the formation and even the actual writing of large sections of both testaments." See "The Liturgical Proclamation of the Word of God," in *Bible, Life, and Worship: Twenty-Second North American Liturgical Week* (Washington, D.C.: The Liturgical Conference, 1961), 9.

⁴ See Paul M. Blowers, "The *Regula Fidei* and the Narrative Character of Early Christian Faith," *Pro Ecclesia* 6 (1997): 199-228.

⁵ Raymond Orlett, "An Influence of the Liturgy Upon the Emmaus Account," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 21 (1960): 212-219; Andrew Brian McGowan, "Is There a Liturgical Text in This Gospel? The Institutional Narratives and their Early Interpretive Communities," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 118 (1999): 73-87; Ugo Vanni, "Liturgical Dialogue as a Literary Form in the Book of Revelation," *New Testament Studies* 37 (1991): 348-372; Hakan Ulfsgard, *Feast and Future: Revelation 7:9-17 and the Feast of Tabernacles*, Coniectanea Biblica., New Testament Series 22 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1989); W. Hultitt Gloer, "Worship God! Liturgical Elements in the Apocalypse," *Review and Expositor* 98 (Winter 2001): 35-57; David Aune, "The Apocalypse of John and the Problem of Genre," *Semeia* 36 (1986): 89; David Barr, "The Apocalypse of John as Oral Enactment," *Interpretation* 40 (1986): 243-256.

⁶ M. D. Goulder, *The Evangelists' Calendar: A Lectionary Explanation of the Development of Scripture* (London: SPCK, 1978); Willard M. Swartley, *Israel's Scripture Traditions and the Synoptic Gospels: Story Shaping Story* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 1994); David Daube, "The Earliest Structure of the Gospels," *New Testament Studies* 5 (1958): 174-187; E.H. Van Olst, *The Bible and Liturgy*, trans. J. Vriend (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishers, 1991), 45-50.

We see then an original unity between the liturgy and the Bible. What establishes and constitutes that bond is God's new covenant made in the blood of Jesus (Luke 22:20). The canon of Scripture—Old and New Testaments—was for the early Church what the “book of the covenant” was for Israel (see Exod. 24:7; 2 Chron. 34:30). Indeed, it is instructive that *κανών* was not originally the word applied to the list of biblical books. Eusebius, writing in the early fourth century, rather spoke of the Scriptures as “encovenanted” or “contained in the covenant” (*ἐνδιαθηκος*).⁷

It is not surprising that many scholars have recognized the “covenant” as the recurrent and theologically significant theme in the canonical text. The vast literature on this topic cannot be rehearsed here.⁸ What has not been as well recognized is the crucial unity of both Scripture and liturgy in the establishment, renewal, and maintenance of God's covenant relationship with his people.⁹ It is nonetheless true that the books of the new and old covenants are heavily liturgical in content. This is what I mean in describing a *material unity* between Scripture and liturgy—the Bible in many ways is *about* liturgy.

Much of the Pentateuch is concerned with ritual and sacrificial regulations; significant portions of the wisdom, historical, and prophetic books take up questions of ritual and worship. The New Testament, too, is filled with material related to the sacramental liturgy. The Gospel of John, for instance, unfolds as a kind of “sacramentary” in the context of the Jewish lectionary calendar; the Letter to the Hebrews and the Book of Revelation contain sustained meditations on the meaning of the Christian liturgy, and the letters of Paul and Peter are animated by liturgical and cultic

⁷ See McDonald and Sanders, *The Canon Debate*, 295-320; 432.

⁸ For a review of the relevant themes and literature, see Scott W. Hahn, “Kinship by Covenant: A Biblical Theological Study of Covenant Types and Texts in the Old and New Testaments” (Ph.D. diss., Marquette University, 1995) and Scott W. Hahn, “Covenant in the Old and New Testaments: Some Current Research (1994–2004),” *Currents in Biblical Research* 3 (2005): 263-292. See also, F. M. Cross, “Kinship and Covenant in Ancient Israel,” in *From Epic to Canon: History and Literature in Ancient Israel* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998); M. G. Kline, *By Oath Consigned: A Reinterpretation of the Covenant Signs of Circumcision and Baptism* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishers, 1968). Yves Congar, O.P., summarized the constant teaching of Christ, the apostles, and the Church fathers: “The content and meaning of Scripture was God's covenant plan, finally realized in Jesus Christ (in his *transitus*) and in the Church.” *Tradition and Traditions: An Historical and a Theological Essay* (London: Burns and Oates, 1966), 68-69.

⁹ Very few commentators have recognized what Albert Vanhoye has identified as the essential relationship between liturgical cult and covenant in the Bible: “The value of a covenant depends directly on the act of worship which establishes it. A defective liturgy cannot bring about a valid covenant. . . . The reason for this is easily understood. The establishment of a covenant between two parties who are distant from each other can only be accomplished by an act of mediation and, when it is a question of mankind and God, the mediation has of necessity to be conducted through the cult.” *Old Testament Priests and the New Priest According to the New Testament* (Petersham, Mass.: St. Bede's Publications, 1986), 181-182.

concerns. From Genesis to Revelation, it can be argued, Scripture is, by and large, *about* liturgy—about the proper way to worship God and receive his blessings.¹⁰ Often it is liturgy, or the culpable neglect of liturgy, that drives the biblical drama. Also, though this topic has not been well-studied, liturgy appears at the most significant junctures of the salvation history recorded in the canonical Scriptures.

Modern biblical scholarship, then, has helped us to discover not only the *liturgical content* of the Bible but the *liturgical context* in which the Scriptures were first written, transmitted, and canonized. With the acknowledgment of this material and formal unity between Scripture and the liturgy, we are now in the position to take these advances in biblical scholarship to their next logical and even necessary conclusion—to begin to undertake a “liturgical reading” of the canon of Scripture. My contention is this: Insofar as the canon of Scripture was established for use in the liturgy, and inasmuch as its content is “about” liturgy, it follows that we must engage Scripture *liturgically* if we are to interpret these texts according to the original authors’ intentions and the life-situation of the believing community in which these texts were handed on.

In what follows I want to begin this process of engagement. Through canonical analysis, I want to offer a reading of the “meta-narrative” of Scripture focusing on liturgy—what it is and how it functions in the Bible’s grand “story.”¹¹ If I can be forgiven my use of overly long quotations in the notes, I intend here to be in dialogue with some of today’s most important biblical exegetes. I want to demonstrate how much of the best work being done in the field is leading us to see the liturgical sense of Scripture. At the same time, I hope to suggest ways in which a liturgical reading can unify and provide even greater explanatory and interpretive power to their insights and findings.

Such a sketch must necessarily be broad brush. But by focusing on the central moments in the canonical narrative—creation, the exodus, the Davidic monarchy, and the new covenant—I believe we will see the familiar

¹⁰ For this argument and a review of the relevant literature, see Scott Hahn, *Letter and Spirit: From Written Text to Living Word in the Liturgy* (New York: Doubleday, 2005), especially Chapter 3: “The Unities of Scripture and Liturgy.”

¹¹ My method, while not explicitly spelled out or defended below, proceeds from within a confessional framework that is Catholic yet ecumenical. My method is broadly informed by certain presumptions of canonical criticism: that the final or canonical form of the text represents the primary object of study; that individual texts should be understood in light of their canonical context, as books within a bi-covenantal corpus; and that there is an underlying unity to the canon, such that all the texts of the canon are allowed to speak synchronically on a given subject. My method is also informed by speech-act theory as it has been applied to the divine “discourse of the covenant” reflected in the Old and New Testaments and in the Church’s liturgical tradition. See generally on these methodological questions: Rolf Rendtorff, “Canonical Interpretation: A New Approach to Biblical Texts,” *Pro Ecclesia* 3 (1994): 141-151; Craig G. Bartholomew and Michael W. Goheen, *The Drama of Scripture: Finding Our Place in the Biblical Story* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2004); Kevin J. Vanhoozer, *First Theology: God, Scripture, and Hermeneutics* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2002).

biblical outlines in a new light. Further, from this liturgical reading, certain hermeneutical implications will emerge. These we will consider at the conclusion of this paper.

Reading the Canon ‘Liturgically’

I must begin by anticipating my conclusion: A liturgical reading of the canonical text discloses the Bible’s *liturgical trajectory* and *liturgical teleology*. As we will see, this is the unspoken conclusion that much of today’s best exegesis points us toward. Put another way: as presented in the canonical narrative, there is a liturgical reason and purpose for the creation of the world and the human person, and there is a liturgical “destiny” for creation and the human person. Man, as presented in the canonical text, is *homo liturgicus*, liturgical man, created to glorify God through service, expressed as a sacrifice of praise.

This is seen in the Bible’s very first pages. Commentators have long observed the royal and cultic language and the liturgical rhythms in the creation narrative. It is likely that the text’s final form has been shaped by its constant use in the liturgy of ancient Israel.¹² Genesis 1, in fact, reads like a liturgical hymn. Creation unfolds in a series of sevenfold movements, beginning with the first verse which is exactly seven words long in Hebrew, and proceeding with seven clearly defined creative speech acts of God (“Let there be. . .”).

Intertextual analysis has helped us to see the linguistic and thematic parallels between the account of the primordial seven days and the later building of the tabernacle (Exod. 25-40).¹³ This in turn has helped us to understand the author’s intention in Genesis 1: to depict creation as the fashioning of a cosmic temple, a house of God which, like the later tabernacle and Temple, would be a meeting place for God and the human person made in his image and likeness.

In the second creation account in Genesis 2-3, the garden of Eden is described in highly symbolic terms as an earthly sanctuary—again with evident literary parallels to later sanctuaries, especially the inner sanctum of the Temple.¹⁴ For our liturgical reading, the most important parallels are

¹² Claus Westermann speaks of Genesis 1 as describing “. . . a heavenly liturgy. With a severe and solemn rhythm the same expressions occur again and again throughout the whole chapter like a litany.” See his *Der Schöpfungsbericht vom Anfang der Bibel* (Stuttgart, 1960), 10, quoted in Eugene H. Maly, “Israel—God’s Liturgical People,” in *Liturgy for the People: Essays in Honor of Gerhard Ellard, S.J., 1894-1963* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing, 1963), 10-20, at 13.

¹³ For background on the idea of the cosmos as temple, see Jon D. Levenson, “The Temple and the World,” *Journal of Religion* 64 (1984): 275-298; Barnabas M. Ahern, C.P., “Interpreting the Bible Typologically: The Exodus,” in *Voice Crying Out in the Desert*, ed. Carroll Stuhlmueller (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1996), 46-63; Rikki E. Watts, “On the Edge of the Millennium: Making Sense of Genesis 1,” in *Living in the Lamblight: Contemporary Challenges to the Gospel*, ed. Hans Boersma (Vancouver: Regent College Publishing, 2001), 129-151.

those that describe the terms of the relationship between God and man in the garden and in the sanctuary.

God is described “walking up and down” or “to and fro” (הלך) in the garden (Gen. 3:8). The same Hebrew verb is used to characterize God’s presence in the tabernacle (Lev. 26:12; Deut. 23:15; 2 Sam. 7:6-7). The first man is described as placed in the garden to “serve” (עבד) and to “keep” or “guard” (שמר) it. These verbs are only found together again in the Pentateuch to describe the liturgical service of the priests and Levites in the sanctuary (Num. 3:7-8; 8:26; 18:5-6).¹⁵ These literary clues suggest the biblical authors’ intent to describe creation as a royal temple building by a heavenly king. The human person in these pages is intentionally portrayed as a kind of priest-king set to rule as vice-regent over the temple-kingdom of creation.¹⁶

The Priestly King of Genesis

This reading of Genesis is confirmed intertextually in the Old Testament and throughout the intertestamental and rabbinic literature.¹⁷ Perhaps the clearest inner-biblical reflection on the nature of the primal human is found in Ezekiel’s famous lament over the King of Tyre (Ezek. 28:1-19), though its

¹⁴ See, for instance, Gordan J. Wenham, “Sanctuary Symbolism in the Garden of Eden Story,” in *Proceedings of the Ninth Congress of Jewish Studies* (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1986), 19-25; Lawrence E. Stager, “Jerusalem and the Garden of Eden,” in *Eretz-Israel: Archaeological, Historical and Geographical Studies* 26, eds. Baruch A. Levine et al. (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society/Hebrew Union College, 1999), 183-194.

¹⁵ “If Eden is seen then as an ideal sanctuary, then perhaps Adam should be described as an archetypal Levite.” Wenham, “Sanctuary Symbolism in the Garden of Eden Story,” 21.

¹⁶ The language of “image and likeness” suggests both filial relationship and a royal delegation of responsibilities. Compare Genesis 1:26; 5:1 and the kingly and filial imagery in Psalm 8. The command to rule over creation is “an important aspect of the image and likeness.” Dexter E. Callender, Jr., *Adam in Myth and History: Ancient Israelite Perspectives on the Primal Human*, Harvard Semitic Studies 48 (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2000), 29.

¹⁷ See J. Oberholzer, “What is Man...?” in *De Fructu Oris Sui: Essays in Honour of Adrianus van Selms*, eds. I. H. Eybers, F. C. Fensham, C. J. Labuschagne (Leiden: Brill, 1971), 141-151; C.J. Louis, *The Theology of Psalm 8: A Study of the Traditions of the Text and the Theological Import* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1946). The Psalter, the wisdom literature, and the prophets all give us the picture of creation as a cosmic or heavenly sanctuary and the Temple as a microcosm (Pss. 52:8; 78:69; 92:13-15; Lam. 2:6; Isa. 60:13,21). The Chronicler understands the task of the Levitical priesthood in terms of the serving, guarding, and gatekeeping imagery in Genesis (1 Chron. 9:17-27; 2 Chron. 23:19; Neh. 11:19). “The garden of Eden was the holy of holies and the dwelling of the Lord,” we read in the intertestamental *Book of Jubilees* (8:9). A midrash on Genesis describes Adam’s primordial task as that of offering priestly sacrifices (Rabbah Gen. 16:5). In a Targum, Adam is described as having been formed from dust at the precise site where the Temple sanctuary would later be built (*Targum Psuedo-Jonathon Gen. 2:7*). The Qumran community apparently saw itself as the “Temple of Adam” (4Q174 1:6). For a good review of these themes, see G. K. Beale, *The Temple and the Church’s Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2004). Also, Robin Scroggs, *The Last Adam: A Study in Pauline Anthropology* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966).

precise meaning remains the subject of scholarly debate.

Ezekiel describes the king as created in Eden, which is depicted as “the garden of God” and the “holy mountain of God,” that is, as a symbol of the site of the Temple (vv. 13,14,16). He “walks among (תָּלַל) the stones of fire” or burning coals (v. 14), which elsewhere are associated with the divine presence (Ezek. 1:3; Ps. 18:13). He is stamped with a “signet” of “perfection” or “resemblance” (v. 12)—a symbol elsewhere associated with royal likeness and authority (Gen. 41:42; Hag. 2:23; Jer. 22:24-25). And the king is clothed in the same precious stones worn on the breastplate of Israel’s high priest, the same type of stones also found in Havilah, one of the lands watered by the river flowing from Eden (compare Ezek. 28:13; Exod. 28:17-20; Gen. 2:12).

As the king’s creation is described in Adamic and priestly terms, so his sin is characterized as a form of sacrilege and profanation punished by exile and “deconsecration.” The king’s sin, like Adam’s, is grasping after divinity—wanting to be “like a god.” This becomes the refrain of Ezekiel’s indictment (compare Gen. 3:5,22; Ezek. 28:2,6,9). Driven by cherubim, he is cast from God’s presence as a “profane thing” who has desecrated God’s sanctuaries (Ezek. 28:16,18; compare Gen. 3:23-24). There may even be an allusion to the curse of Adam in the king’s being “turned . . . to ashes upon the earth” (compare Ezek. 28:18; Gen. 3:19; 18:27; Sir. 17:32).¹⁸

This passage of Ezekiel suggests that already within the Old Testament there was a traditional understanding of the human person as created in relationship with God and endowed with an identity that is at once royal and priestly, filial and liturgical.¹⁹

The terms of the human relationship with God are ordered by the covenant of the sabbath established on the seventh day.²⁰ This becomes clear further on in the Pentateuch with Moses’ building of the tabernacle

¹⁸ Callender concludes his insightful treatment of Ezekiel’s lament: “The image is suggestive of the expelled primal human as an ex-communicated priest.” *Adam in Myth and History*, 89.

¹⁹ “It is quite evident that the tradition upon which Ezekiel bases his lamentation in 28:11-19 understands the primal human in priestly terms, or, perhaps better put, in ‘intermediary’ terms. The imagery he employs is consonant with that of the sacral king, endowed for service as vice-regent of God and mediator between human and divine.” Callender, *Adam in Myth and History*, 132.

²⁰ The term “covenant,” of course, is not used in the creation account. However, that creation is ordered to the covenant is everywhere implied. See Robert Murray, *The Cosmic Covenant* (London: Sheed & Ward, 1992), 2-13. In the rabbinic and intertestamental literature, the sabbath was seen as a sign of God’s covenant oath with the first man and woman. See, for instance, the midrashic *Sifre Deuteronomy*; the *Book of Jubilees* (36:7), and 1 *Enoch* 69:15-27. See also Roland de Vaux, *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions* (New York: McGraw-Hill Co., 1961), 2:481: “Creation is the first action in this history of salvation; once it was over, God stopped work, and he was then able to make a covenant with his creature. . . . The ‘sign’ of the covenant made at the dawn of creation is the observance of the sabbath by man (Ezek. 20:12,20).” Recent Catholic magisterial documents have referred to the sabbath of creation as “the first covenant.” See Pope John Paul II, *Dies Domini*, Apostolic Letter on Keeping the Lord’s Day Holy (July 5, 1998), no. 8; see also *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, no. 288.

and God's giving of the sabbath ordinances. The literary parallels with the creation account suggest a close connection between sabbath, creation, covenant, and the dwelling that Israel is instructed to build.²¹ The plans for the dwelling are given by God immediately after the liturgical ratification of the Sinai covenant in Exodus 24. Moses' time on the mountain can be seen as a kind of "new creation"—the cloud of divine presence covers the mountain for six days and on the seventh Moses is called to enter the cloud and receive the divine blueprint for the dwelling. God's instructions consist of a series of seven commands that continue for seven chapters and conclude with the ordinances for the seventh day, the sabbath (Exod. 31:12-17).

The making of the priestly vestments and the building of the tabernacle again recall the creation narrative. In both, the work is also done in seven stages, each punctuated with the words, "as the LORD commanded Moses." As God did, Moses beholds his handiwork, and blesses it (Exod. 39:43). As God "finished his work," so Moses "finished the work" (Gen. 2:1-2; Exod. 40:34). And as God rested on the seventh day, blessing and hallowing it, when Moses finished his work, the divine presence filled the tabernacle (Exod. 40:34).

In the Israelites' work to build the tabernacle we glimpse what the royal and priestly service of the human person was meant to be about: God's sons were to rule in his name, according to his commands. Through their work they were to bring creation to its fulfillment, to complete God's work by making the world a home in which they dwell with him and live as his people.²²

All of creation is ordered to the covenant, the familial dwelling of God with his people. The sabbath, as the sign of God's "perpetual covenant" (Exod. 31:16), is meant to be a living memorial of the original perfection and intention of God's creation—his desire to "rest" in communion with creation. The sabbath orders human work to worship, labor to liturgy.²³ The royal calling to subdue the earth finds its expression in the liturgical consecration of the earth's fruits to God. Through their worship on the sabbath, God

²¹ For these parallels, see Samuel E. Balentine, *The Torah's Vision of Worship*, (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999), 136-141; Gary A. Anderson, *The Genesis of Perfection: Adam and Eve in Jewish and Christian Imagination* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 2001), 200-202.

²² See Anderson, *Genesis of Perfection*, 201-202.

²³ "On this day man must recognize the enthroned Lord of hosts who, having completed his work, awaits in the attitude of majestic repose, the liturgical response of his creature." Maly, "Israel—God's Liturgical People," 14.

bestows his blessings on his people and makes them holy (Exod. 31:13).²⁴

The Priestly People of the Exodus

These creation themes—man as made for worship in a covenant relationship as God’s royal and priestly firstborn—are made explicit in the canonical account of the Exodus. As Adam was made in God’s image and likeness, God identifies Israel as “my own people” (Exod. 3:7,10,12; 5:1; 6:5,7) and “my son, my firstborn” (Exod. 4:22-23). And as Adam was made to worship, God’s chosen people are liberated expressly for worship.

The early chapters of Exodus involve a play on the word עֲבַד, (“serve” or “work”), the word that described the primeval vocation given to man (Gen. 2:15). The word is used four times to stress the cruel slavery (“hard service”) inflicted upon the Israelites by the new Pharaoh (Exod. 1:13-14; see also 5:18; 14:5,12). But the same word is also used to describe what God wants of the Israelites (Exod. 3:12; 4:22; 7:16; 9:1,13; 10:3, 24-26). They are to serve, not as slave laborers but as a people that serves him in prayer.²⁵ They are to “offer sacrifice” (זָבַח Exod. 3:18, 5:3). Moses and Aaron are instructed to tell Pharaoh that God wants Israel to hold a religious “feast” or “festival” (חַג Exod. 5:1; compare Exod. 12:14; 23:16; 34:25).

Israel’s vocation is most clearly stated in the preamble to the covenant at Sinai. There God vows that if Israel keeps his covenant, they will be “my own treasured possession (סֵגֻלָּה) among all the nations . . . a kingdom

²⁴ “The sabbath is the sign of the covenant between God and man; it sums up the inward essence of the covenant. . . . [C]reation exists to be a place for the covenant that God wants to make with man. The goal of creation is the covenant, the love story of God and man. . . . If creation is meant to be a space for the covenant, the place where God and man meet one another, then it must be thought of as a space for worship. . . . Now if worship, rightly understood, is the soul of the covenant, then it not only saves mankind but is also meant to draw the whole of reality into communion with God.” Joseph Ratzinger, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, trans. John Saward (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2000), 26-27. See also, Jean Danielou, S.J.: “In the cosmic Temple, man is not living primarily in his own house but in the house of God. . . . But at the same time, man is part of creation and has his role to play in it. God has in some way left creation unfinished, and man’s mission is to bring it to fulfillment. . . . Man is thus the mediator through whom the visible universe is gathered together and offered up, the priest of that virginal creation over which God lovingly watches.” *The Presence of God*, trans. Walter Roberts (London: A.R. Mowbray Co., 1958), 11-12.

²⁵ Note the use of עֲבַד to describe the priestly liturgical service offered to God in the tabernacle (Num. 3:7-8; 4:23; 7:5; 16:9).

of priests (ממלכת כהנים) and a holy nation (גוי קדוש) (Exod. 19:5-6).²⁶ As God's "treasured possession," Israel is the crown jewel of humanity.²⁷ As a holy nation and a kingdom of priests, Israel is to be corporately what Adam was created to be individually—the firstborn of a new humanity, a liturgical people that will dwell with God in a relationship of filial obedience and worship.

Given a priestly purpose and identity, the Israelites are freed from their service to Pharaoh in a sort of liturgy of liberation. This liturgy begins with the celebration of the Passover ritual instituted by God and prescribed in minute detail (Exod. 12). In a ritual exit procession, the Israelites depart "company by company" led by God (Exod. 12:42, 51; 13:21-22). The event concludes with the singing of a thanksgiving hymn, accompanied by tambourines and dancing (Exod. 15:1-21).

The covenant at Sinai is ratified by liturgical actions—the reading of the book of the Law, the profession of fidelity sworn by the people, the offering of sacrifices, the sprinkling of "the blood of the covenant," and the meal eaten in the presence of God (see Exod. 24:1-9). Much of the Law, in fact, consists of regulations regarding how God is to be rightly worshipped—the design of the tabernacle and furniture, the priestly vestments, the liturgical calendar of festivals, and the ceremonial rubrics of the sacrificial system.

In their worship, the Israelites celebrated their birth as a people of God and rededicated themselves to their royal and priestly vocation (Deut. 6:4-5).²⁸ Moreover, in Israel's liturgical celebrations, God "remembered" his covenant, making it anew with each generation (Deut. 5:1-4) and extending his blessings to his people through his priests (Num. 6:22-27).

As Israel is given an "Adamic" vocation, it experiences an Adamic fall from grace. And as the primeval fall results in exile and deconsecration of the royal priestly figure, so too does Israel's worship of the golden calf.²⁹

²⁶ "In this nutshell we find a *summary* of the purpose of the covenant, presented from the mouth of Yhwh himself. Here is given the goal of Israel's future." Jo Bailey Wells, *God's Holy People: A Theme in Biblical Theology*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 305 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 34-35. See also Roland J. Fahey, *The Kingdom of Priests* (Rome: Pontifical Atheneum Angelicum, 1960).

²⁷ Following Wells, who sees סגל as connoting "treasure such as...the jewel in a crown belonging to a king." See 1 Chron. 29:3; Eccl. 2:8; Deut. 7:6; 14:2; 26:18; Ps. 135:4; Mal. 3:17. *God's Holy People*, 48.

²⁸ As Jon D. Levenson concludes, "The renewal of covenant was a central aspect of Israel's worship in biblical times." *Sinai and Zion: An Entry into the Jewish Bible* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1985), 80-81. Of the exodus, Louis Bouyer writes, "... the legislation and the religious history of Israel are all permeated with the memory of the great event, so too is its liturgy. . . ." *The Meaning of Sacred Scripture* (South Bend, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1958), 35,37.

God disowns his people, telling Moses pointedly that they are “your people, whom you brought out of the land of Egypt” (Exod. 32:7; 33:1).³⁰ God calls the people “corrupted,” using a Hebrew term (תקוּשׁ) found elsewhere to describe an animal too blemished to sacrifice or a priest unfit for service.³¹ In defiling itself through ritual rebellion, Israel, like Adam, is rendered unfit for its divine vocation. It is interesting that the royal-priestly title of Exodus 19:6 is never again used to describe Israel in the Old Testament.

According to the biblical narrative, the apostasy results in the Levitical priesthood becoming the locus of the holiness that God intended for all Israel.³² God’s presence remains among the people, but access is highly restricted and must be mediated by the Levites. A complex array of cultic laws were introduced for apparently penitential and pedagogical purposes—as mechanisms that will enable Israel to atone for its inevitable sins against the covenant and to teach them the true meaning of worship.

This turn of events gives narrative shape to the canonical presentation of the Law, especially in the sources identified as “Priestly.” The goal of the worship and Law of Israel becomes that of atonement (Lev. 16:30)—bridging the gap between God’s holiness and Israel’s sinfulness through a “substitutionary offering of blood.”³³ It is beyond the scope of

²⁹ For a detailed look at the golden-calf apostasy, see Scott W. Hahn, “Kinship by Covenant,” 226-253.

³⁰ Here too we may have an expression of an ancient biblical tradition regarding the priestly identity and vocation of the human person. John A. Davies sees this tradition behind Hosea’s later condemnation of Israel’s corrupt priesthood and covenant violations (4:4-9; 6:6-7). The passage is fraught with difficulties, but he makes a solid case that Hosea is drawing on a shared understanding of Adam as “the archetypal priest-king in the primal paradise-garden.” Davies concludes: “If Hosea has as part of his shared presupposition pool with his readers the story of Genesis 2, with Adam as the idyllic priest-king (see Ezek. 28:12-15; Jub. 4:23-26), together with the notion that Israel at Sinai was constituted as the new humanity, the true successors to Adam (see 4 Ezra 3:3-36; 6:53-59; 2 Bar. 14:17-19), then it makes sense to compare the breach of the Sinai covenant (see Hos. 4:1,2) with the rebellion in the garden (Gen. 3; compare Ezek. 28:16-17).” *A Royal Priesthood: Literary and Intertextual Perspectives on an Image of Israel in Exodus 19:6*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 395 (London: T & T Clark International, 2004), 202.

³¹ See Lev. 22:25, Mal. 1:14; 2:8. “The point to notice here is that the people of Israel as a whole now have a moral defect that separates them from God. They cannot come to the sanctuary for they have rejected God, and thus have become like a defective animal or a disqualified priest, unable to come into God’s presence.” A. M. Rodriguez, “Sanctuary Theology in Exodus,” *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 24 (1986): 127-145, at 139.

³² John M. Scholer, *Proleptic Priests: Priesthood in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 49 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 13-22.

this article to look any more closely at the priesthood or the system of ritual sacrifices. The point is that even in its fallen condition Israel is called to respond as a priestly people. Their distance from God, their desire for “at-one-ment,” is to be expressed—and effected—through the liturgical means of sacrifice.

The Priestly Kingdom of David

With the Davidic kingdom we see the fullest expression of the Bible’s liturgical anthropology and teleology. In the dynasty established by his covenant with David, God restates his divine will for the human person—to be a son of God, a priest, and a king. The formula of God’s original calling for Israel (Exod. 19:6) is conspicuously left unspoken. But there is no doubt that the kingdom established under David and later Solomon is to be a royal and priestly people.³⁴

The royal-priestly primogeniture granted to David’s seed (2 Sam. 7:14; Pss. 110:4; 89:26-27) is linked to the royal priesthood intended for Israel (Exod. 3:6-17; 4:22; 19:5-6).³⁵ David is portrayed as a “new Melchizedek”—a priest and king who serves the most high God from his capital in Salem, that is, Jerusalem (compare Gen. 14:18; Pss. 76:2; 110). Throughout the canonical narrative, David is shown taking actions that are at once cultic and political, military and liturgical. His first act after establishing Jerusalem as capital of his kingdom,³⁶ is to restore the Ark of the Covenant—the defining symbol of Israel’s election and the site of God’s living presence

³³ See the important contributions of Hartmut Gese on “The Law” and “The Atonement” in his *Essays on Biblical Theology*, (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1981), 60-116. “The goal of Torah is holiness, which can be symbolically achieved in the cult. This occurs properly through atonement. The act of dedication to God, by which the distance from what is holy is symbolically bridged by the substitutionary offering of blood, is so central for the cult of the Priestly Document, that not only is the great day of atonement the highest holy day, but also every sacrifice takes on the nature of atonement, for it is only atonement, not offering a gift, that can express the meaning of the cult” (at 74).

³⁴ See the discussion in Hahn, “Kinship by Covenant,” 359-360. For God’s original promise, see 2 Sam. 7:8-16; 1 Chron. 17:1-15. For the interpretation of this covenant, see Isa. 55:3; Jer. 33:21-22; 2 Chron. 13:5; 2 Sam. 23:5; Pss. 89; 132. Heinz Kruse, “David’s Covenant,” *Vetus Testamentum* 35 (1985): 139-164; Jon Levenson, “The Davidic Covenant and its Modern Interpreters,” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 41 (1979): 205-219.

³⁵ R. E. Clements, *Abraham and David: Genesis XV and Its Meaning for Israelite Tradition* (Naperville, Ill.: A.R. Allenson, 1967). “The Davidic covenant in Chronicles is . . . closely related to the earlier Sinaitic and Abrahamic covenants. Obedience to the law of Moses is basic to the life of the community (1 Chron. 22:13; 28:7; 2 Chron. 6:16; 7:17; 23:18; 33:8) and is implicit in its restoration to God (see 2 Chron. 17:7-9; 19:4-11; 30:15-16; 35:6,12). The Abrahamic covenant with its grant of land finds its fulfillment in the establishment of the Temple (2 Chron. 20:7-8; 1 Chron. 16:15-18).” Brian E. Kelly, “‘Retribution’ Revisited: Covenant, Grace and Restoration,” in *The Chronicler as Theologian: Essays in Honor of Ralph W. Klein*, ed. M. P. Graham, S. L. McKenzie and G. N. Knoppers, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 371 (London: T&T Clark International, 2003), 215 n. 29.

among the people during the wilderness period (Exod. 25:8-22; Josh. 3:8-11). David's great concern for the Ark is central to the early drama of his reign, and the Ark's installation in the Temple marks the culmination of the Chronicler's account.³⁷

The Ark's restoration is depicted as a grand religious pilgrimage. It is preceded by the ritual purification of the Levites (1 Chron. 15:11), who alone are permitted to transport the Ark under the Mosaic law that David reinstitutes (Deut. 10:8; 1 Chron. 15:2). The procession is a joyous religious feast, complete with liturgical dancing and song led by David and the priests (1 Chron. 15:1-16:3; 2 Sam. 6:11-19).³⁸ David wears a priest's ephod and there is a sabbatical tone to the event, highlighted by the sacrifices of the priests—seven bulls and seven rams (1 Chron. 15:25) and the joyous praise of God as creator of the world and maker of covenants (1 Chron. 16:14-18,26).

As the Ark is installed, David leads the priests in offering holocausts and peace offerings. Then he blesses the people in the name of the Lord and shares bread, meat, and a cake with every Israelite. What we witness here is Israel's king performing high-priestly acts—leading worship, offering sacrifices, imparting the Lord's blessings.³⁹ David's actions reestablish the presence of God among the people (1 Chron. 23:25). To ensure the purity of Israel's worship he organizes Aaron's descendants to be "officers of the sanctuary and officers of God" (1 Chron. 24:3,5,19), and installs the Levitical priests "to minister before the Ark of the LORD, to invoke, to thank, and to praise the LORD" every morning and evening and also on feast days (1 Chron. 16:4; 23:25-32).

Restoration of the Ark and the reassertion of the priestly hierarchy (Deut. 10:8) are among the signs that the Chronicler sees David as a new Moses figure, possibly the "prophet like me" that Moses himself had promised (Deut. 18:15).⁴⁰ Like Moses, David glories in God's presence in the Ark (Exod. 25:21-22; 30:6,36; Num. 7:89; 17:19). He restores Moses' cultic and worship prescriptions (1 Chron. 15; 21:29; 22:13) and advises Solomon that this liturgical order is crucial to the monarchy's character and success (1 Chron. 22:12-13). Why should the king be so concerned about worship? Because the Chronicler believed that God's blessings flowed to the people

³⁶ 1 Chron. 28:5; 29:23; 2 Chron. 6:5-6; 13:8; 2 Sam. 5:7,9; 6:10,11.

³⁷ See Christopher Begg, "The Ark in Chronicles," in *The Chronicler as Theologian*, 133-145.

³⁸ Endres, "Theology of Worship in Chronicles," 168.

³⁹ See Hahn, "Kinship By Covenant," 347-349.

⁴⁰ On David as heir of Moses' liturgical leadership and restorer of the "divinely ordained" liturgical life of Israel, see William Riley, *King and Cultus in Chronicles: Worship and the Reinterpretation of History*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 160 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 163.

through the proper celebration of the sacrifices and other liturgies.⁴¹

The Liturgy of the Temple

The exodus was ordered to the establishment of Israel as a priestly nation. The Sinai covenant was expressed architecturally in the tabernacle. Similarly, the conquest of the land was ordered to the establishment of Israel as a kingdom of priests. The architectural expression of the Davidic Kingdom was not a royal palace, but the Temple.

David, like Moses, is given a divine “pattern” or “plan” (תבנית) for the Temple that will house the Ark permanently (1 Chron. 28:19; Exod. 25:9), and in which God will dwell for all time with his people.⁴² The building of the Temple is presented as a new creation. As creation takes seven days, the Temple takes seven years to build (1 Kings 6:38; Gen. 2:2). It is dedicated during the seven-day Feast of Tabernacles (1 Kings 8:2) by a solemn prayer of Solomon structured around seven petitions (1 Kings 8:31-53). God capped creation by “resting” on the seventh day. Built by a “man of rest” (יש מנוחה) 1 Chron. 22 :9), the Temple was to be the “house of rest” (בית מנוחה) 1 Chron. 28:2) or “resting place” for the Ark and for the LORD (2 Chron. 6:41; Ps. 132:8, 13-14; Isa. 66:1).⁴³

In the Temple worship, the precise sacrificial system of the Mosaic cult continues, but there are new elements and accents. The most apparent

⁴¹ “The reason for this interest in the divine institution of the sacrificial cult is clear. Worship was effective and beneficial only as long as it was performed in accordance with divine law. *In fact, its divine institution empowered it, so that, by its enactment, the Lord himself received his people, like a king his petitioners, and acted in their favor.*” John W. Kleinig, *The Lord’s Song: The Basis, Function, and Significance of Choral Music in Chronicles*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 156 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 31, emphasis supplied. Reward and retribution, a theme identified so often among scholars of Chronicles, when looked at closely is very often a function of right cultic performance. The Lord is with those who worship him as he wants to be worshipped (2 Chron. 13:10-12). Those who do this will be blessed (1 Chron. 22:13; 28:8; 2 Chron. 13:21; 33:8). Wrong worship will lead God to the destruction of the Temple (2 Chron. 7:19-22). This pattern can be seen too in the story of the Ark. The wrath of the Lord blazes when the Ark is not handled as Moses prescribed—with deadly consequences for Uzzah (1 Chron. 15:13; 2 Samuel 6:6-10).

⁴² Levenson, *Sinai and Zion*, 141.

⁴³ On “rest” and Solomon’s election to build the Temple, see Sara Japhet, *I and II Chronicles: A Commentary* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993), 221; Gerhard von Rad, “There Remains Still a Rest for the People of God,” in *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966), 94-102; Steven L. McKenzie, “Why Didn’t David Build the Temple?: The History of a Biblical Tradition,” in *Worship and the Hebrew Bible: Essays in Honour of John T. Willis*, eds. M. P. Graham, R. R. Marrs and S. L. McKenzie, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 284 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 204-224, at 220-221; Levenson, *Sinai and Zion*, 144-145.

innovations are the development of liturgical music and sacred song, both of which are traditionally attributed to David, the divinely inspired, “sweet psalmist of Israel” (2 Sam. 23:1). The kingdom’s corporate worship takes the form of praise and thanksgiving.

Many commentators have identified the centrality of songs of praise (תהלה) and songs of thanksgiving (תודה) in the Temple liturgy. Many of the psalms of praise appear to have been written to accompany the offering of sacrifices in the Temple (Pss. 27:6; 54:6,8 141:2). This is true also for the psalms of thanksgiving. In the post-exilic works, we see examples of the Levites organizing “the thanksgiving songs” of the Temple liturgy (Neh. 11:17; 12:8,31).

David’s own thanksgiving hymn (1 Chron. 16:7-36) is presented as a kind of paradigm for Israel’s prayer. It is, in essence, a celebration of God’s covenant in liturgical form. It begins and ends with exhortations to give thanks to God. It glorifies God’s holy name and his majesty as the creator of heaven and earth. The focus of praise and remembrance is Israel’s status as God’s elect. The exodus and Israel’s wandering among the nations is remembered. There is, too, a missionary quality about the prayer, as Israel is enjoined to declare God’s salvation to all the nations.⁴⁴

Scholars have pointed out that David’s hymn includes portions of Psalms 96, 105, and 106. And this hymn sets the tone and provides the content for the acts of worship and the theology of worship we find in the Psalter. God is praised and thanked in remembrance of his mighty works in creation and for his saving words and deeds in the life of Israel—the defining experience being that of the exodus and the covenant. Praise and thanksgiving, accompanied by sacrifice, is understood to be the only appropriate response to the God who has created Israel to be his own and rescued them from death.⁴⁵ In calling on the name of the Lord—an injunction heard in David’s hymn and throughout the Psalter—the Israelites believed themselves to be truly in God’s presence as heirs of the blessings of the covenant wrought by his saving deeds.⁴⁶

⁴⁴ Note the similarities between David’s hymn and the prayer Solomon delivers during the Temple dedication liturgy (2 Chron. 6:12-21). “Both divine addresses are concerned with the meaning of the Davidic covenant as the foundation of God’s relationship with Israel. In the Chronicler’s understanding, this covenant does nothing less than constitute Israel as the earthly manifestation of Yahweh’s kingdom, a reality with a twofold expression in the interrelated institutions of the Davidic dynasty and the Solomonic temple.” Endres, “Theology of Worship in Chronicles,” 175.

⁴⁵ See J. Kenneth Kuntz, “Grounds for Praise: The Nature and Function of the Motive Clause in the Hymns of the Hebrew Psalter,” in *Worship and the Hebrew Bible*, 149-183, especially 182-183.

The Sacrifice of Praise

Prayer in the Psalter moves inexorably in the direction of sacrifice. This is seen most evocatively in the *todah* (תודה) or thanksgiving psalms (for example, Pss. 18; 30; 32; 41; 66; 116; 118; 138). Composed to accompany the offering of a sacrificial meal of bread and meat in the Temple (Lev. 7:1-21), these are some of the highest expressions of the Old Testament's liturgical anthropology.⁴⁷

In the *todah* psalms the experience of the individual believer is almost typologically compared to that of Israel's captivity and exodus experience. Typically these psalms begin with a confession of faith and a vow of praise and self-offering. There follows a lament concerning some life-threatening distress that had befallen the believer. Then the believer describes how God delivered him from death or Sheol (the netherworld) and brought him to sing God's praises in the Temple.⁴⁸ In these psalms, "life" is equated with worship and sacrifice in the presence of God in his Temple; "death" is seen as a sort of exile or captivity, to be cut off from God's presence, outside of his Temple.⁴⁹

We see in these psalms and in the prophetic literature a new and deepening understanding of the liturgical vocation of man. In the

⁴⁶ See 1 Chron. 16:10. See also Kleinig, *The Lord's Song*, 146-147: "This proclamation of the Lord's name was a performative enactment. It did not merely impart information about the Lord but actually effected his presence, for wherever his name was proclaimed, he was present with his people, as he had promised in Exod. 20:24. Through their performance of praise, the singers introduced the Lord to his people and announced his presence among them. The people could therefore seek him, since he was present with them there (1 Chron. 16:10-11)." On the presence of God in the ritual remembrance of Israel, see D.P. Niles, "The Name of God in Israel's Worship: The Theological Importance of the Name 'Yahweh'" (Ph.D. diss., Princeton University, 1974), 193-196; T. N. D. Mettinger, *In Search of God: The Meaning and Message of the Everlasting Names*, trans. F. H. Cryer (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), 8-9; R. J. Tournay, *Seeing and Hearing God with the Psalms: The Prophetic Liturgy of the Second Temple in Jerusalem*, trans. J. E. Crowley, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 118 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991).

⁴⁷ "It can be said that the thank offering constituted the cultic basis for the main bulk of the psalms. It not only represents the high point of human life, but in it life itself can be seen as overcoming the basic issue of death by God's deliverance into life." Gese, *Essays on Biblical Theology*, 131.

⁴⁸ See Hermann Gunkel, *An Introduction to the Psalms* (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1988), 199-221.

⁴⁹ See the fine treatment of Gary A. Anderson, "The Praise of God as a Cultic Event," in *Priesthood and Cult in Ancient Israel*, ed. G. A. Anderson and S. M. Olyan, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 125 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 15-33, at 28: "[J]ust as 'life' was experienced in the cult as being before the presence of God in the (heavenly) Temple, so 'death' was experienced in the cult as being cut off from that presence outside the Temple. Both descent to Sheol and ascent to the Temple had ritual accouterments."

prophets, this recognition of the inner truth of sacrifice often takes the form of denouncing the corruption of Israel's cult and worship (for example, Isa. 1:10-13; 66:2-4; Jer. 7:21-24; Amos 4:4-5,6b; Mic. 6:6-8; Hos. 6:6; Mal. 1:10,13-14). Positively, worship comes to be seen as a sacrificial offering in thanksgiving for redemption, for deliverance from death. Praise is revealed as the sacrifice by which men and women are to glorify God (Pss. 50:14,33; 141:2). God is portrayed as desiring that Israel serve him, not with the blood of animals but with their whole hearts, aligning their will with his, making their whole lives a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving (Pss. 40:6-8; 51:16-17).

With this profound understanding that they are called to a pure worship of the heart comes the recognition that no amount of ethical striving or moral reform can make them holy enough to serve their God. The psalmist's cry, "Create in me a clean heart, O God . . ." (Ps. 51:7,10-12), finds its answer in the promises of the prophets. A new covenant is promised as a new exodus and a new creation in which there will be a forgiveness of sins and a divine transformation of the heart—God himself will inscribe his law on the heart (Jer. 31:31-34; 32:40; Ezek. 36:24-28).

Ezekiel foretells the new coming of God's royal and priestly servant David, who will shepherd God's people and establish God's Temple sanctuary and dwelling among his people forever (Ezek. 34:23-25; 37:24-28). In this restoration, the prophet says, all the nations will know that God is the one who makes Israel holy. What is being promised is a new sabbath rest, a new dwelling of God with his people. But what was once given to Israel as a sign of its election will now be a sign to all nations (compare Exod. 31:12; Ezek. 37:28).

Indeed, in the vision of the prophets, the new exodus will mark a renewal of Israel's vocation as the firstborn and teacher of the nations. Isaiah sees Israel fulfilling its ancient vocation as "priests of the LORD" (Isa. 61:6), and the instrument of God's blessings for the nations (Isa. 19:24). In the Servant of the Lord, the prophet Isaiah imagines an ideal "new man" whose life has a paschal or sacrificial dimension—who is able to give his life like a sacrificial lamb, as an offering for the sins of his people (Isa. 53). This servant is to be a "covenant to the people . . . a light to the nations." He will make God's salvation known, not only to Israel but to all nations. And the result will be a glorious new liturgical song of praise that will be heard from the ends of the earth (Isa. 42:1-10; 49:1-6; 60:6).

Isaiah foresees nations streaming to Zion to worship the Lord (Isa. 2; see also Jer. 3:16-17). But he also foresees Egypt, the archetypal oppressor of Israel, serving (עבד) God, offering sacrifices and burnt offerings on altars erected within its own borders. The dreaded Assyria is also seen joining Egypt in the worship (עבד) of Israel's God. These foreign nations will be made heirs to God's covenant with Israel. He will call them what he once called only Israel: "my people" and the "work of my hands" (Isa. 19:16-

25 compare Isa. 60:21; 64:7-8; Exod. 5:1; 6:7). In his final vision, Isaiah sees foreigners being made priests, and envisions a new sabbath in which “all flesh shall come to worship” before God (Isa. 66:21-23).⁵⁰

We see then, on the threshold of the New Testament, the promise that man’s primal vocation will be renewed, that Israel will be gathered together with all nations at Zion to offer acceptable sacrifice to the God of Israel.

The New Genesis and the New Adam

As more than a generation of scholarship has helped us see, in the New Testament Jesus and his Church are presented as the fulfillment of the promises and institutions of the old covenant. Our understanding has been particularly enhanced by the many fine studies of the use and interpretation of Old Testament texts in the New Testament writings.⁵¹ I cannot hope here to do justice to the findings and insights of these studies. But I would like to illustrate how a liturgical reading of the canonical text can help us to see a unified and integrated pattern to the use of Old Testament types and themes in the New.

The story of the incarnation is told as a new creation. The first words of the New Testament canon—βίβλος γενέσεως—can stand as a kind of title for the whole, “the book of the new genesis.” Christ’s coming into the world is nothing less than a recapitulation of God’s intentions “in the beginning.” In Jesus there is a new beginning for the human race. He is explicitly called the new Adam (Rom. 5:12-20; 1 Cor. 15:45-49). And in the early chapters of the Letter to the Hebrews—especially in the opening catena of seven Old Testament quotations—Jesus is described in terms of Adam’s original royal, filial, and priestly vocation.⁵² Here and throughout the Pauline corpus, it is understood that the human vocation was frustrated at the

⁵⁰ Christopher T. Begg, “The Peoples and the Worship of Yahweh in the Book of Isaiah,” *Worship and the Hebrew Bible*, 35-55; G. I. Davies, “The Destiny of the Nations in the Book of Isaiah,” in *The Book of Isaiah/Le Livre d’Isaïe*, ed. J. Vermeylen, (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989), 93-120; R. E. Clements, “A Light to the Nations: A Central Theme of the book of Isaiah,” in *Forming Prophetic Literature: Essays on Isaiah and the Twelve in Honor of John D.W. Watts*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, 235, eds. J. W. Watts and P. R. House, (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 58-69. See also, Robert Martin-Achard, *A Light to the Nations: A Study of the Old Testament Conception of Israel’s Mission to the World*, trans. J. P. Smith, (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1962). See also Walter Vogels, *God’s Universal Covenant: A Biblical Study* (Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1986).

⁵¹ See generally, R. B. Hays, *The Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989); D. Juel, *Messianic Exegesis: Christological Interpretation of the Old Testament in Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988). For extensive bibliographies, see Steve Moyise, *The Old Testament in the New* (New York: Continuum, 2001).

outset by Adam's sin.

It is impossible to put forward here a biblical-theological argument concerning the specific nature of Adam's sin.⁵³ However, I would suggest that Adam's disobedience was understood inner-biblically as having something to do with a failure to offer himself—what we might call a failure of worship. The fall appears to be more than the transgression of God's legislative commands concerning a fruit tree. That transgression betrays a broader abdication of Adam's task of priestly service in the temple of creation.⁵⁴

In this sense, the story of the fall is truly the first chapter of the Bible, preparing the reader for Israel's history. That history unfolds according to the pattern of Eden—divine benediction is offered and accepted only to be followed quite immediately by human profanation, resulting in punishment by exile from the land of God's presence.⁵⁵ In fact, from the unacceptable offering of Cain to the golden calf affair and the strange fire of Nadab and Abihu (Lev. 10:1-3), human sin and disobedience frequently

⁵² For a close reading of the text, see William L. Lane, *Hebrews 1-8*, Word Biblical Commentary 47a (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1991), 46-50: "In Jesus we see exhibited humanity's true vocation. In an extraordinary way he fulfills God's design for all creation and displays what had always been intended for all humankind, according to Psalm 8. He is the one in whom primal glory and sovereignty are restored." Also, James D. Dunn, *Christology in the Making* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1980), 109-111: "[I]t is *Jesus* who fulfills God's original intention for man—Jesus exalted after death. The risen Jesus is crowned with the glory that Adam failed to reach by virtue of his sin."

⁵³ For recent entries on the subject, see James Barr, *The Garden of Eden and the Hope of Immortality* (Minneapolis: Augsburg-Fortress Press, 1992), 1-20; S. Towner, "Interpretations and Reinterpretations of the Fall," in *Modern Biblical Scholarship: Its Impact on Theology and Proclamation*, ed. F. Eigo (Villanova, Penn.: Villanova University, 1984), 53-85; R. W. L. Moberly, "Did the Serpent Get it Right?" *Journal of Theological Studies* 39 (1988), 1-27; Robert A. DiVito, "The Demarcation of Divine and Human Realms in Gen. 2-11," in *Creation in the Biblical Traditions*, ed. R. Clifford and J. Collins (Washington: Catholic Biblical Association, 1992), 39-56.

⁵⁴ Beale finds in the ancient interpretive literature an understanding of Adam's sin as a failure to guard the garden sanctuary and protect it from defilement and profanation by the serpent. *The Temple and the Church's Mission*, 69-70.

⁵⁵ See the important work of Gary A. Anderson, who has shown that "the story of Adam and Eve in the J [Yahwist] source shows a striking parallel to Israel's larger national story. We might say that the entire narrative of the Torah is in tersely summarized form . . . Adam and Eve fall at the first and only command given to them. And like the nation Israel, the consequences of their disobedience is exile from a land of blessing." *The Genesis of Perfection*, 207-208. See also, Anderson, "Necessarium Adae Peccatum: An Essay on Original Sin," *Pro Ecclesia* 8 (1999): 319-337; Joel Kaminsky, "Paradise Regained: Rabbinic Reflections on Israel at Sinai," in *Jews, Christians and the Theology of the Hebrew Scriptures*, eds. A. Bellis and J. Kaminsky (Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000), 15-44. Although much work needs to be done in this area, I would argue that the same pattern that Anderson and the rabbis see in the Eden narrative and in the Pentateuch—"the theme of Israel sinning immediately upon reception of a benediction" (Anderson)—can be traced into the period of the judges and on through the divided monarchy. Indeed, Anderson seems to be moving in this direction when he suggests that "this pattern defines not only the narrative of Israel's election but also other founding moments in the Hebrew Scriptures." *Genesis of Perfection*, 206.

manifests itself as false worship or idolatry. Even the social injustices decried by the prophets often go hand-in-hand with a refusal to offer right worship (Amos 8:4-6).

Again, my purpose here is not to propose any exhaustive explanation of what later tradition came to call "original sin." Nor do I want to reduce the history of sin in the Bible to a story of cultic failure. I do want to suggest that a liturgical reading of Scripture enables us to better understand why Christ's "obedience" is so often cast in cultic, sacrificial, and priestly terms. As animals' blood was used in the liturgical worship of Israel, the New Testament writers describe Christ's blood, offered in sacrifice on the cross, as the agent of atonement for the sin of Adam and Israel. This identification of Christ's redemptive work with cultic sacrifice is especially strong in those passages that most scholars agree represent christological hymns used in early Christian worship.⁵⁶

The hymn in Paul's letter to the Philippians (2:6-11),⁵⁷ according to many, underscores the dramatic reversal of Adam's sin. Unlike Adam, who was made in the image of God, Christ did not grasp at equality with God, but instead offered his life in humility and obedience to God. Thus in Hebrews, this obedience is compared to the liturgical act of high priestly sacrifice (Heb. 9:11-28). Whereas Israel's high priests would enter the sanctuary once a year to offer animal blood in atonement for the people's sins, Jesus is described typologically as entering the "true" sanctuary—"heaven itself" (Heb. 9:24)—to offer his own blood in sacrifice "to take away the sins of many" (Heb. 9:28).

By this priestly act, this blood-offering, Jesus atones for sin and at the same time reveals the true nature of sacrifice as intended by God from the beginning—man's offering of himself in filial obedience to the divine will. Hebrews explains this through a christological reading of Psalm 40, finding in it a prophecy of Christ's offering of his body on the cross (Heb. 10:5-10).

Christ's self-offering is shown to be the worship that had been

⁵⁶ For example, see the redemptive "blood" imagery in Rom. 3:24-25; Eph. 1:3-14; 2:13; Col. 1:15-20; Heb. 1:3; 1 Pet. 1:18-21. On these hymns, generally, see Martin Hengel, "Hymns and Christology," in *Studia Biblica* 1978, ed. E. A. Livingstone, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 3 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1980), 173-197; Jack T. Sanders, *The New Testament Christological Hymns: Their Historical Religious Background*, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series, 15 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971).

⁵⁷ Ralph P. Martin, *Carmen Christi: Philippians 2:5-11 in Recent Interpretations and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship*, Society for Biblical Literature Monograph Series 4 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967; reprint Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1983). See also, N. T. Wright, "Harpagmos and the Meaning of Philippians 2:5-11," *Journal of Theological Studies* 37 (1986): 321-52.

expected originally of Adam and again of Israel as God's firstborn, royal and priestly people. His sacrifice marked the fulfillment of all that Israel's sacrificial system was intended to prepare and instruct Israel for—that through Israel all the nations of the world might learn to make a perfect offering of heart and will to God. Christ makes possible the human vocation of offering priestly service to God.⁵⁸

The New Exodus

As the New Testament presents it, Jesus' sacrificial death brought about a new exodus—liberating God's people from slavery to sin and subjection to death, ending their exile from God, gathering them and all peoples and leading them into the promised land of the heavenly kingdom and the new Jerusalem.

This “new exodus” theme, found in its most developed Old Testament form in the final section of Isaiah, is now widely recognized as a decisive and shaping factor in the New Testament.⁵⁹ It is now widely accepted that Jesus is presented as a “new Moses” in the gospels. His passion and death are

⁵⁸ I have in mind here what Yves Congar, O.P., has called the “. . . theology of sacrifice as consisting in *man's offering of himself* (in other words, his loving obedience to God's will) . . .” Referring specifically to Hebrews 10:4-9, he writes: “We are at the heart of the whole work of Jesus, in a word, the work which his Father had given him to do. *It is to this that all God's plan leads*, it is here that all its strands are gathered together, it is from this point that it moves forward to its full implementation. We have seen that after asking for a series of sacrifices consisting in the offering of animals, God had made it known through the prophets that he expected a better, truer sacrifice, man's offering of himself, that is, the loving obedience of his heart.” *The Mystery of the Temple: The Manner of God's Presence to His Creatures from Genesis to the Apocalypse* (Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1962), 126, 141. See also, Lane, *Hebrews 9-13*, Word Biblical Commentary 47b (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1991), 266: “In the sacrifice of his body on the cross, Christ freely and fully made the will of God his own . . . and eradicated the disparity between sacrifice and obedience presupposed by Psalm 40:6-8. Christ's self-sacrifice fulfilled the human vocation enunciated in the psalm. By virtue of the fact that he did so under the conditions of authentic human, bodily existence and in solidarity with the human family, the new people of God have been radically transformed and consecrated to his service.”

⁵⁹ See for instance, Carroll Stuhlmueller, *Creative Redemption in Deutero-Isaiah*, *Analecta Biblica* 43 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1970); F. Ninow, *Indicators of Typology within the Old Testament: The Exodus Motif* (New York: Peter Lang, 2001); Dale C. Allison, Jr., *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology* (Minneapolis: Augsburg-Fortress Press, 1993); Rikki E. Watts, *Isaiah's New Exodus in Mark* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000); J. Manek, “The New Exodus in the Books of Luke,” *Novum Testamentum* 2 (1958): 8-23; T. F. Glasson, *Moses in the Fourth Gospel* (Naperville, Ill.: A. R. Allenson, 1963); Stan Harstine, *Moses as a Character in the Fourth Gospel: A Study of Ancient Reading Techniques*, *Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series* 229 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002); Andrew C. Brunson, *Psalm 118 in the Gospel of John: An Intertextual Study on the New Exodus Pattern in the Theology of John* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003); David W. Pao, *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000); Sylvia C. Keesmaat, *Paul and His Story: (Re-)interpreting the Exodus Tradition*, *Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series* 181 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press 1999); Mary Rose D'Angelo, *Moses in the Letter to the Hebrews*, *Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series* 42 (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1979). See also the seminal work of Jean Danielou, S.J., *From Shadows to Reality: Studies in the Biblical Typology of the Fathers* (Westminster: The Newman Press, 1960), 153-228.

described as an “exodus” (ἐξοδὸν Luke 9:31) in a transfiguration scene filled with allusions to the theophanies of the wilderness period. And his death on the cross is described as a paschal sacrifice—that is, in terms of the liturgical sacrifice commanded by God to be offered on the night before Israel’s exodus. What the letters of Peter (1 Pet. 1:19) and Paul (1 Cor. 5:7) state explicitly—that Christ was the spotless, unblemished passover lamb—the Gospel of John details typologically.

Announced early in John’s gospel as the lamb of God (John 1:29,36), Jesus at the end is condemned to death as “King of the Jews” near the hour when the passover lambs were traditionally slaughtered by the priests in the Temple (19:14). He dies as paschal lamb and king as well as high priest in John’s typological account; this latter fact is stressed by the odd detail of Jesus’ seamless tunic, similar to that worn by Israel’s high priest (19:23; Exod. 28:4; 39:27; Lev. 16:4). Before the first exodus, Moses sprinkled the blood of the paschal lamb on the door posts of the Israelites’ homes using a hyssop branch. And in the final moments before the new exodus, a hyssop branch is offered to Jesus on the cross (19:29; Exod. 12:22; see also, Heb. 9:18-20). Finally, the soldiers do not break Jesus’ legs because, as John states directly, the paschal lamb was to remain unblemished (19:33, 36; Exod. 2:46).

The effect of John’s typology, reflected too in the letters of Paul, Peter and Hebrews and in John’s Apocalypse (Rev. 5:6,9; 7:17; 12:1; 15:3), is to present the crucifixion as a liturgical sacrifice. As the first exodus is preceded by the institution of a liturgical memorial, by which Israelites would annually celebrate their establishment as a people of God, so too Christ institutes a memorial of his exodus in the Eucharist.

This typological reading of a new exodus and a new passover is hardly contested. It is also generally accepted that the New Testament writers present the sacraments of baptism and the Eucharist as means by which Christian believers are joined to the new exodus. Baptism is prefigured by the Israelites’ passage through the Red Sea, the Eucharist prefigured by the manna and the water from the rock in the desert (1 Cor. 10:1-4; John 6). But a critical aspect of the typology is largely unnoticed in the literature—how the New Testament writers appropriate the Old Testament understanding of the *purpose* for the exodus. As we saw, God’s liberation of Israel was ordered to a very specific end—namely, the establishment of Israel as God’s royal and priestly people destined to glorify him among the nations.

Echoes of that exodus purpose are clearly heard in Zechariah’s canticle at the outset of Luke’s Gospel (1:67-79): Mindful of his covenant (Luke 1:73; Exod. 2:24), God has raised up a “horn,” the royal son promised to David (Luke 1:69; Ps. 132:17), who will be a new Moses to deliver Israel from the “hand of” its enemies (Luke 1:73; Exod. 3:8) so that it may “serve” God (Luke 1:74; Exod. 3:12; 7:16). The canticle resounds with images and language drawn from the exodus account and from the prophets’ and

psalmists' hopes for a new deliverance.⁶⁰ The goal of this new liberation, as Zechariah sings it, is precisely that of the first exodus—to establish Israel as children of the covenant made with their fathers, as a holy and righteous people that worships in God's presence. Luke even employs here the specific term for the covenant "service" (λατρεύω Luke 1:74) that God intended for Israel.⁶¹

In 1 Peter, we encounter a rich passage (1 Pet. 1:13-20; 2:1-10) in which the exodus themes are applied to the newly baptized.⁶² They are told to "gird up the loins," as the Israelites did on the night of their flight (Exod. 12:11). Peter says they have been "ransomed" (λυτρόω 1 Pet. 1:18), using the same word used to describe Israel's deliverance (Exod. 15:13), by the blood of a spotless unblemished lamb (Exod. 12:5). Their lives are described as a sojourning like that of Israel in the wilderness; they too are fed with spiritual food as the Israelites drank living water from the rock in the desert.

Finally, this passage of 1 Peter culminates with the explicit declaration that the Church is the new Israel—"a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation." This direct quotation from the Septuagint translation of Exodus 19:6 is joined to a quote from an Isaianic new exodus text that foresees the world-missionary dimension of Israel's royal and priestly vocation as "the people whom I formed for myself, *that they might announce my praise*" (1 Pet. 2:9-10; Isa. 43:21).

The New Priestly Kingdom

Christ's new exodus is ordered to the establishment of the priestly kingdom that God intended in the first exodus. This is the clear literary sense of the New Testament read canonically. It can be traced in the gospels, the epistles, Acts and Revelation. This understanding is enriched by another type found

⁶⁰ See the review of "scriptural metaphors derived from the exodus" in Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1997), 110-120.

⁶¹ See Deut. 11:13. In the Septuagint, λατρεύω routinely translates עָבַד, which, as discussed above, means "to serve or worship [God] cultically, especially by sacrifice." David Mathewson, *A New Heaven and a New Earth: The Meaning and Function of the Old Testament in Revelation* 21:1-22:5, *Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series* 238 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003), 205-206. See also Fitzmyer's conclusion: "The infinitive latreuein, 'to worship' expresses the consequence of the deliverance brought about by Yahweh for his people, expected to result in a way of life that is really a cultic service of him. Though it denotes acts of worship, it is used analogously of the entire way in which the chosen people was to conduct itself." *The Gospel According to Luke*, 1:385. Green, too, sees Zechariah prophesying a new exodus for the same reasons as the first exodus: "This is precisely the purpose of the Exodus. . . . 'To serve' or 'to worship' is used to clarify the nature of the redeemed people, a community whose practices were to be formed in their worship of the Lord God. Thus, the freedom to worship without fear refers to much more than spiritual or cultic practices. Worship or service embraces the whole way of communal life of those who have been delivered." *The Gospel of Luke*, 117.

⁶² On this passage, see Danielou, *From Shadows to Reality*, 162-164.

in the New Testament writings—that of the Church as the restored kingdom or house of David. Jesus is portrayed throughout the New Testament as the son of David anticipated in the Old Testament, a priest-king according to the order of Melchizedek.⁶³ The Church, heir of the royal priestly sonship of Israel, is said to participate in the heavenly high priesthood and royal sonship of Christ.

The redemptive work of Christ is described as priestly. It brings about “purification from sins,” Hebrews tells us in language drawn from the Old Testament purification rites (καθαρισμός Heb. 1:3).⁶⁴ Through his priestly work, Christ “consecrated” believers (ἀγιάζω Heb. 2:10; 10:10), as previously God consecrated the Israelites (Exod. 31:13; Lev. 20:8; 21:15; Ezek. 20:12; 37:28). The Christian life is depicted as a living out of this priestly consecration. The believer, Hebrews says, has been consecrated and purified “in order to serve (λατρεύειν) the living God” (Heb. 9:14; 12:28).

The Christian life is seen as a priestly self-sacrificial offering, a worship in the Spirit in which each believer, beginning in baptism, participates personally in Christ’s paschal sacrifice (Rom. 6:3; Gal. 3:27). As envisioned in the New Testament, the service to be rendered by the “holy priesthood” of all the faithful is one of offering “spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ” (1 Pet. 2:5). Believers are to “present [their] bodies as a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God” (Rom. 12:1). In other words, they are to dedicate their whole selves to God, to surrender their wills totally to the will of God.⁶⁵ Speaking in the sacrificial vocabulary of the Temple, Paul urges the Philippians to live as “children of God without

⁶³ See Scott W. Hahn, “Kingdom and Church: From Davidic Christology to Kingdom Ecclesiology in Luke-Acts,” in *Reading Luke*, eds. Craig Bartholomew, et al. (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 2005); also Hahn, *Kinship by Covenant*, 592-593; Brian M. Nolan, *The Royal Son of God: The Christology of Matthew 1-2 in the Setting of the Gospel*, Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 23 (Fribourg: University of Fribourg, 1979); Mark L. Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and Its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology*, Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 110 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995).

⁶⁴ Compare Exod. 29:37; 30:10; Lev. 16:19; 2 Pet. 1:9. See the discussion in Lane, *Hebrews* 1-8, 15.

⁶⁵ On this theme in the letters of Paul, see the excellent analysis of Raymond Corriveau, C.Ss.R., *The Liturgy of Life: A Study in the Thought of St. Paul in His Letters to the Early Christian Communities*, Studia Travaux de Recherche 25 (Brussels: Desclée De Brouwer, 1970). See also, Ernest Best, “Spiritual Sacrifice: General Priesthood in the New Testament,” *Interpretation* 14 (1960): 273-299. Charles C. Eastwood, *The Royal Priesthood of the Faithful: An Investigation of the Doctrine from Biblical Times to the Reformation* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1963); John H. Elliott, *The Elect and the Holy: An Exegetical Examination of 1 Peter 2:4-10 and the Phrase ‘Basileion ierateuma’* Novum Testamentum Supplement Series 12 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1966); D. Hill, “To Offer Spiritual Sacrifices... (1 Pet. 2:5): Liturgical Formulations and Christian Paraneis in 1 Peter,” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 16 (1982): 45-63; Eduard Schweizer, “The Priesthood of All Believers: 1 Peter 2:1-10,” in *Worship, Theology and Ministry in the Early Church: Essays in Honor of Ralph P. Martin*, eds. M. Wilkins and T. Paige, Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 87 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992), 285-293; Thomas F. Torrance, *Royal Priesthood* (Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1955).

blemish" (ἄμωμα Phil. 2:15) and exhorts them in the "sacrifice and liturgy of [their] faith" (τῇ θυσίᾳ καὶ λειτουργίᾳ τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν Phil. 2:17). Life itself is here seen as liturgy (λειτουργία), with Paul adopting the Septuagint word for the ritual worship of God—λατρεύειν—to define the Christian way of life.⁶⁶

The highest expression of this liturgy of life is seen in believers' participation in the cosmic liturgy, the worship in heaven mediated by the high priest Christ. The Eucharist was the "heavenly gift" tasted by those who have "once been enlightened" in baptism (Heb. 6:4). Hebrews describes the Eucharist as a "festal gathering" celebrated by the "church of the firstborn" (ἐκκλησίᾳ πρωτοτόκων) with the angels on "Mount Zion . . . the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem." In this liturgy in the heavenly sanctuary, the true celebrant is "Jesus, the mediator a new covenant" made in his "sprinkled blood" on the cross (Heb. 12:18-24). The language here again is thick with references to the Old Testament, most pointedly to the covenant theophanies of God at Sinai.⁶⁷

The liturgy of the new covenant, the Eucharist, forms the pattern of life for the firstborn of the new family of God. Like the liberated Israelites, they no longer serve as slaves but as sons. By joining themselves sacramentally to the sacrifice of Christ, the sons and daughters were to offer themselves "through him" as a continual "sacrifice of praise" (Heb. 13:15).⁶⁸ The offering of spiritual sacrifices is not only something that Christians *do*—it is of the very substance of their being; it is *who* they are. Nowhere is this more evident than in the frequent descriptions of the Church as a spiritual house or temple and of believers as living temples (1 Cor. 3:16-17; 6:19-20; Eph. 2:21-22; 1 Pet. 2:4-6). The symbolism expressed here marks an unexpected fulfillment of the old covenant's liturgical anthropology—where once God dwelt in a tent, an ark, and a temple, now he has made his dwelling place in the hearts of all who serve him in the liturgy of their lives.

⁶⁶ See, for example, Acts 24:14; 27:23; Rom. 1:9; 2 Tim. 1:3. See Corriveau, *The Liturgy of Life*, 141-142.

⁶⁷ Of course, many recent commentators reject the earliest interpreters of Hebrews and deny that there are Eucharistic references either here or elsewhere in the letter. I am persuaded otherwise. See Hahn, *Kinship by Covenant*, 624-629.

⁶⁸ The expression "sacrifice of praise" in Hebrews 13:15 quotes the promise of Psalm 49:14. The phrase δι' αὐτοῦ "through him" was apparently used in the ancient Christian liturgy much as it is used in the Roman liturgy today. Lane, *Hebrews 9-13*, 549.

The Liturgical Consummation of the Canon

The New Testament also depicts the Church fulfilling the mission of Israel—to gather all nations to Zion to offer spiritual sacrifices of praise to God.⁶⁹ This is the vision we see in the Bible’s last book. John’s Apocalypse is a liturgical book. The literary evidence clearly indicates that the book was intended to be read in the liturgy, most likely in the celebration of the Eucharist “on the Lord’s day,” (Rev. 1:10).⁷⁰ The Apocalypse is also a book “about” liturgy. What is unveiled is nothing less than the liturgical reality of creation and the liturgical consummation of human history in Christ. The vision John sees is that of a Eucharistic kingdom, in which angels and holy men and women worship ceaselessly around the altar and throne of God. The vision even unfolds in liturgical fashion, in a series of hymns, exhortations, antiphons and other cultic forms.⁷¹

Jesus, described throughout the book as “the Lamb,” with obvious reference to the lamb of the Passover,⁷² brings about a new exodus.⁷³ Many commentators have noted this, even pointing out the correspondences between the “plagues” inflicted on Pharaoh and the chalices or vials poured out in Revelation. I want to focus on the “end” toward which this new exodus is ordered. In this final book of the canon, we see the fulfillment of the canon’s first book: in the new heaven and new earth, the new Jerusalem of Revelation, the brethren of the new Adam worship as priests and

⁶⁹ Wells, *God’s Holy People*, 243.

⁷⁰ On the liturgical structure of the book, see Vanni, “Liturgical Dialogue as a Literary Form in the Book of Revelation,” and Ulfsgard, *Feast and Future*.

⁷¹ Gloer, “Worship God! Liturgical Elements in the Apocalypse,” at 38-40.

⁷² Rev. 5:6,12,13; 6:1,16; 7:9,10,14; 7:17; 12:11;13:8,11; 14:1,4,10; 15:3; 17:14; 19:7,9; 21:9,14,22,23,27; 22:1,3.

⁷³ On the new exodus typology in Revelation, see Mathews, *A New Heaven and a New Earth*, 62-64. See B. Anderson, “Exodus Typology in Second Isaiah,” in *Israel’s Prophetic Heritage: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg*, ed. B. Anderson and W. Harrelson (London: SCM Press, 1962), 177-195; J.S. Casey, “Exodus Typology in the Book of Revelation” (Ph.D. thesis, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1981).

rule as kings, and the entire universe is revealed to have become a vast divine temple.⁷⁴

This cosmic temple, this new Jerusalem, is revealed to be the body of Christ, the Lamb that was slain (Rev. 21:22). This theme is found throughout the New Testament: Christ's body—destroyed by crucifixion and restored three days later in the resurrection—is the new temple (John 2:18-22; 4:21,23). John's Gospel depicts Jesus' body as the new tabernacle, the new locus of divine presence on earth.⁷⁵ Jesus has "pitched a tent" or "tabernacled" (σκηνώ John 1:14) among us, John writes, choosing a word associated in the Septuagint with God's presence dwelling in the tabernacle (Exod. 25:8-9; Zech. 2:10; Joel 3:17; Ezek. 43:7). This theme too has been widely studied. But reading the canonical text liturgically we can see the deeper meaning of this imagery—what God desired in the beginning he has finally brought about at the end of the ages. The divine presence now fills the temple of creation, and God dwells with his people in a covenant relationship that is described in Revelation (21:3)—as in Genesis—in both sabbatical (21:25; 22:5) and nuptial (19:9) terms.⁷⁶

Gathered together into this new paradise, those redeemed by the blood of the Lamb make up a priestly kingdom, as John sees it, quoting God's commission to Israel in Exodus 19:6 (Rev. 1:6; 5:10). But in this new kingdom, the children of Abraham reign with people from every tribe, tongue, and nation (Rev. 5:9; 7:9). Jesus is the "firstborn" of this new family of God, the prophesied root and offspring of David (Rev. 22:16; 3:7) in whom all are made divine sons and daughters of God (Rev. 21:7)—royal sons and priests who will rule with him until the end of ages (Rev. 20:6).

In the final pages of the Apocalypse, then, the human vocation given in the first pages of Genesis is fulfilled. Before the throne of God

⁷⁴ For the themes of the new Jerusalem, the new Temple, the new covenant, the new Israel and the new creation in Revelation, see William J. Dumbrell, *The End of the Beginning: Revelation 21-22 and the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House, 1985).

⁷⁵ See most recently, Alan R. Kerr, *The Temple of Jesus's Body: The Temple Theme in the Gospel of John*, Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series, 220. (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002); Mary L. Coloe, *God Dwells with Us: Temple Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel* (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2001); Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, 2 vols. (Garden City: Doubleday, 1966), 2:32-34.

⁷⁶ "The Temple, as symbol of access to the divine presence, is replaced by the Presence itself." C. Deutsch, "Transformation of Symbols: The New Jerusalem in Rev. 21:1-22:5," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 78 (1987): 106-126. "The dwelling of God with humanity is part of a fuller evocation and transformation, in Rev. 21:3, of the covenant relationship between God and Israel in which God affirms that he is their God and they are his people. Stretching back to the promise to Abraham (Gen. 17:6), affirmed in the context of the exodus (Exod. 6:7; 29:45; Lev. 26:12,45), and again as part of the hope of post-exilic restoration (Ezek. 37:27), this relationship has been implicit in the worship of the people of God recorded in Rev. 7:10,12; 19:1; and is here made explicit." Stephen Pattemore, *The People of God in the Apocalypse: Discourse, Structure and Exegesis* Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 128 (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2004), 201.

and the Lamb, the royal sons of God are shown worshipping him, gazing upon his face with his name written upon their foreheads, and reigning forever (Rev. 22:1-5). John chooses his words carefully here to evoke the Old Testament promises of God's intimate presence to those who serve him. The word rendered "worship" in most translations of Revelation 22:3 is λατρεύουσιν. This, as we have seen, is the word used in the Septuagint to translate עבד—the Hebrew word that describes Adam's original vocation as well as the purpose of the exodus and conquest.⁷⁷

Likewise, to "see God's face" has priestly and cultic overtones and may even be a technical term for liturgical worship. The expression is often used in cultic settings to describe the experience of worship in Israel's festivals, including the offering of sacrifice.⁷⁸ The name of God written on their foreheads appears to be a reference to the diadem worn by Aaron and succeeding high priests as they entered the Lord's presence in the sanctuary (Exod. 28:36-39; 39:30; Lev. 8:9). The diadem was inscribed with the words "Holy to the Lord" (קדש ליהוה).⁷⁹ In the final vision of God's face shedding light upon the people (Rev. 22:5), some scholars hear an allusion to the priestly blessing bestowed by the high priest at the end of the Temple liturgies (see Num. 6:24; Sir. 50:19-20; Ps. 118:27).⁸⁰

At the conclusion of our liturgical reading of the canon, we hear the purpose and meaning of the entire Bible summed up in the refrain of the Apocalypse: "Worship God!" (Rev. 14:7; 19:10; 22:9). The human person has been shown from the first pages of Genesis to the last of Revelation to

⁷⁷ For the "purpose" of the exodus, see Exod. 3:12; 4:23; 7:16; 9:1,13; 10:3,7,8,24,26; 23:25. Mathews notes that λατρεύω is also used in Rev. 7:15-16 to denote the service of those who stand before the throne in the temple of God. "Thus, the cultic service, which was to be rendered by God's people, and which was the goal of the first exodus, is now fulfilled and carried out in the new Jerusalem where God's people approach the throne and render him worship." *A New Heaven and a New Earth*, 205-206.

⁷⁸ Mathews cites Exod. 23:15,17; 34:24; Deut. 16:16; 31:11; Isa. 1:12; Ps. 42:3: "The references from Exodus and Deuteronomy occur in the context of the celebration of Israel's festivals. In Isa. 1:12 the context is specifically the offering of sacrifices (v. 11) and 'beholding the face of God' in Psalm 42:2 is realized in connection with the temple (v. 4). According to Psalm 24:6, those who enter the sanctuary do so to 'seek the face of the God of Jacob.' Moreover, a similar phrase occurred in rabbinic literature (שכ"ן פני) with reference to the presence of God in the Temple or synagogue. . . . Thus, the goal of cultic worship in the Old Testament is ultimately reached here with the saints serving God before his face." *A New Heaven and a New Earth*, 206-207.

⁷⁹ See the discussion in Mathews, *A New Heaven and a New Earth*, 208, n. 98. See also Rev. 7:3; 9:4.

⁸⁰ Mathews, *A New Heaven and a New Earth*, 211, notes that God's face shining on his people is "a common metaphor in the Old Testament for divine blessing and salvation (Pss. 4:6; 31:16; 44:3; 67:1; 80:3,7,19; 89:15; 119:135)."

be liturgical by nature, created and destined to live in the spiritual house of creation, as children of a royal and priestly family that offers sacrifices of praise to their Father-Creator with whom they dwell in a covenant of peace and love.⁸¹

The Bible's Liturgical Trajectory and Teleology

Our liturgical reading of the canonical text reveals a clear liturgical *trajectory* and *teleology*. The story of the Bible is the story of humankind's journey to true worship in spirit and truth in the presence of God. That is the trajectory, the direction toward which narrative leads. This true worship is revealed to be the very purpose of God's creation in the beginning. That is the *teleology* revealed in the canonical text.

The trajectory of Scripture does not terminate with the closing of the final canonical book. The teleology of Scripture includes the proclamation of Scripture in the liturgy. For the believing community that composed, preserved, and continues to meditate upon the Scripture, its "story" continues in the liturgy. The liturgical worship of the new covenant, the Eucharist established by Christ, is at once a remembrance of the story told in Scripture and a gateway into that story.

The formal unity of Scripture and liturgy and the recovery of the canonical text's liturgical teleology and trajectory has important methodological implications for biblical scholarship. Indeed, I would argue that three interpretive imperatives arise from our liturgical reading. These imperatives, which I will consider under the headings *economy*, *typology*, and *mystagogy*, undergird the assumptions of the biblical authors and present themselves as crucial dimensions that must be understood for any authentic interpretation of the text.

The Unity of Scripture: The Divine Economy

Our liturgical reading highlights the importance of what ancient Church writers called "the divine economy"—that is, the divine order of history as presented in the canonical text. The biblical writers everywhere evince a belief in this economy. They see it unfolding in the sequence of covenants that God makes with his people—in creation, after the flood, with Abraham, at Sinai, with David, and finally with Christ.

Throughout, the divine economy is presented as the motive for God's words and deeds in sacred Scripture.⁸² The biblical writers

⁸¹ While Congar did not advance a liturgical reading of Scripture *per se*, this reading is anticipated throughout his *The Mystery of the Temple*, see especially, pp. 192; 245-248.

understood the economy as part of “the mystery of his will, according to his purpose . . . a plan (οἰκονομίαν) for the fulness of time” (Eph. 1:9-10). In this the apostolic witness is faithful to the teaching of Christ, who is shown teaching them to see biblical history fulfilled in his life, death and resurrection (Luke 24:26-27, 44:47).

As we have seen, the liturgy of both the old and new covenants is founded on remembrance and celebration of God’s saving words and deeds. Liturgy, then, as presented in the Scripture, is an expression of faith in the divine economy and a means by which believers gain participation in that economy.⁸³ The Scriptures themselves are regarded by the biblical authors as the divinely inspired testament to the divine economy as it has unfolded throughout history, culminating in the saving event of the cross.

It follows that if our interpretations are to be true to the integrity of the texts, we must pay close attention to this notion of God’s economy. The economy gives the Bible its content and unity. The very term “economy” is richly suggestive for the exegete. It translates the Greek οἰκονομία which etymologically derives from οἶκος and νόμος—*household* and *law*. The divine economy is a kind of family law, the law of God’s cosmic “household.”

The image of God fathering his people runs throughout the Old Testament,⁸⁴ a tradition beautifully recapitulated in the teachings of Christ and the early Church.⁸⁵ Indeed, the New Testament describes the fatherhood of God and the adoption of all peoples through baptism as the “end” of God’s salvific economy.⁸⁶ Again we see Scripture ordered to a liturgical consummation—the divine economy culminates “in the fulness of time” with the sending of God’s Son and his Spirit, that all may be made adopted children in the sacramental liturgy of baptism.⁸⁷

This further suggests that the exegete be sensitive to the economy’s unfolding according to a divine “fatherly” plan. In this, the interpreter will do well to pay particular attention to what rabbinic and early Church authors

⁸² For explanations of God’s words and deeds in light of a divine covenant plan, see Exod. 2:24; 6:5; 33:1; Num. 32:11; Deut. 1:8; 9:5; 30:20; 2 Sam. 7:8,10,11, 22-25; 1 Chron. 16:14-18; Jer. 31:31-37; 33:14-26; Luke 1:46-55, 68-79; Acts 2:14-36; 3:12-26; 7:1-51; 11:34-43; 13:16-41.

⁸³ The purpose of Christian liturgy, says I. H. Dalmais, O.P. is “to express man’s *faith* in the divine economy and perpetuate the living effects of the incarnation.” *Introduction to the Liturgy*, trans. Roger Capel (Baltimore: Helicon, 1961), 27. See also Jean Danielou, S.J., “The Sacraments and the History of Salvation,” in *Liturgy and the Word of God*, Papers given at the Third National Congress of the *Centre de Pastorale Liturgique* (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1959), 21-32, at 29: “The object of faith is the existence of a divine plan.”

⁸⁴ See, for example, Exod. 4:22; Deut. 1:31; 32:6; Pss. 89:26; 103:13; Isa. 63:14; 64:8; Hos. 11:1, etc.

⁸⁵ For example, Matt. 5:44-45, 48; 7:11.

⁸⁶ Rom. 4:11-18; 8:14-23; 2 Cor. 6:2, 161-8; Gal. 3:7-9; 26-29.

⁸⁷ Gal. 4:4-6.

described as patterns of divine “condescension” and “accommodation”—God “stooping down” to communicate with his children through words and actions they can readily understand.⁸⁸

The Typological Pattern

The divine economy is comprehended and explained in Scripture through a distinct way of reading and writing that originates in the canonical text and is carried over into the living tradition of the faith community that gives us these texts. We characterize this way of reading and writing broadly as *typology*.

The literature on biblical typology (from the Greek τύπος; see Rom. 5:14; 1 Pet. 3:21) is extensive.⁸⁹ What is important for our purposes is to acknowledge the pervasiveness of typological patterns of exegesis in both the Old and New Testaments.⁹⁰ We saw this in our overview of the canonical text. To recall but a few examples: The world’s creation was portrayed in light of the later building of the tabernacle. The tabernacle in turn was described as a “new creation.” Jesus’ death and resurrection are seen as a new passover and a new exodus. The Christian sacramental life is illuminated by the exodus event.

These are not mere literary tropes for the biblical authors. The extensive use of typology reflects a profound biblical “worldview.” If the economy gives narrative unity to the canonical Scriptures, fashioning them into a single story, typology helps us to understand the full meaning of that story. It does this by a pattern of analogy or correspondences. What God will do in the future is expected to resemble or follow the pattern of what he has done in the past. What began in the Old Testament is fulfilled partially even within the Old Testament, but definitively in the New, in a way that is both

⁸⁸ See, generally, Stephen D. Benin, *The Footprints of God: Divine Accommodation in Jewish and Christian Thought* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993); Second Vatican Council, Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation, *Dei Verbum* (1965), no. 13; Among the Church fathers, see Origen, *Homilies on Jeremiah*, 18.4; St. John Chrysostom, *Homilies on Genesis*, 17.1.

⁸⁹ See J. D. Dawson, *Christian Figural Reading and the Fashioning of Identity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002); Christopher R. Seitz, *Figured Out: Typology and Providence in Christian Scripture* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 2001); G. W. Buchanan, *Typology and the Gospel* (New York: University Press of America, 1984); Leonhard Goppelt, *Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New*, trans. Donald H. Madvig (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1982).

⁹⁰ See, for example, Benjamin D. Sommer, *A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40-66* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1998); J. Enz, “The Book of Exodus as Literary Type for the Gospel of John,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 76 (1957), 208-215; Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation In Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985). “The New Testament . . . did not invent typology, but simply showed that it was fulfilled in the person of Jesus of Nazareth.” Jean Danielou, S.J., *The Bible and the Liturgy* (Notre Dame, Ind.: Notre Dame University Press, 1956), 5; see also Danielou, *The Lord of History*, trans. Nigel Abercrombie (New York: Meridian, 1968), 140.

transformative and restorative.

Recognition of this biblical worldview has important hermeneutical implications. The interpreter of the Bible enters into a dialogue with a book that is itself an exegetical dialogue—a complex and highly cohesive interpretive web in which the meaning of earlier texts is discerned in the later texts and in which later texts can only be understood in relation to ones that came earlier. In order to read the texts as they are written the exegete needs to acknowledge the authors' deep-seated belief in both the divine economy and in the typological expression of that economy. This is the teaching that the Scriptures themselves attribute to Christ. Words and deeds found in the Law, the prophets, and the Psalms, are signs that find fulfillment in him (Luke 24:44).

From our liturgical reading, we see that three moments in the economy of salvation stand out as having decisive typological significance for the entire canonical text—creation, the exodus, and the Davidic kingdom.⁹¹ These in turn should have special significance for the exegete. The first Adam is not only a living being but a type of the new Adam, the life-giving Spirit who is to come (Rom. 5:14; 1 Cor. 15:45). The exodus is more than an event in the life of Israel. It is a sign of the future liberation of all peoples by the cross of Jesus. Solomon is not only a historical leader of Israel, the son of David. He is a sign of a “greater than Solomon”—the Son of David who is to come.

We must remain mindful that the foundation of all authentic biblical typology is the historical and literary sense of the text. Typology is not an arbitrary eisegesis. For the biblical authors, God uses historical events, persons, and places as material and temporal symbols or signs of future events and divine realities. The prophets can speak of a “new exodus” only because they presuppose the historical importance of the original exodus. The exegete must see the literal and historical sense as fundamental to his or her approach to Scripture.

Mystagogy: Living the Scripture's Mysteries

The final hermeneutical imperative that emerges from our liturgical reading is *mystagogy*. From the Greek, *mystagogy* means “doctrine of the mysteries.” *Mystagogy* recognizes that the same typological patterns by which the divine economy is comprehended in Scripture continue in the Church's sacramental liturgy.

As we noted at the start of this paper, the canon was a liturgical enactment—the Scriptures come to us as the authoritative texts to be used in Christian teaching and worship. But as it was written and passed on to us, Scripture has more than an instructional or exhortative function. When

⁹¹ For just a few of the citations, see the prophets' announcement of a new creation (Isa. 4:5; 65:17; 66:22; Jer. 31:35-36; Ezek. 36:8-11), a *new exodus* (Isa. 51:9-11; Jer. 16:14-15; Ezek. 29:3-5), and a *new kingdom* (Isa. 9:2-7; Jer. 23:5-6; Ezek. 34:23-24).

proclaimed in the Church's liturgy, Scripture is intended to "actualize" what is proclaimed—to bring the believer into living contact with the *mirabilia Dei*, the mighty saving works of God in the Old and New Testament.

Mystagogy focuses our attention on the deep connection between the written "Word of God"—the Scripture itself—and the creative Word of God described in the pages of the Old and New Testaments. From the first pages to the last, we see expressed the biblical authors' faith that God's Word is living and active and possesses the power to bring into being what it commands. Creation, as seen in Scripture, is the work of the Word.⁹² The early Christians identified this Word as Jesus.⁹³ The apostolic preaching was depicted as a "ministry of the Word" (Acts 6:4). The divine Word, experienced in the apostolic Church, had such efficacy that it could literally raise the dead (Acts 9:36-41).

The Church's traditional understanding of the sacramental liturgy is built on this belief in the performative power of the Word of God as a "divine speech act."⁹⁴ Proclaimed sacramentally and accompanied by the ritual washing of water, the Word brings the Spirit upon people, making them sons and daughters of God through a real sharing in his life, death and resurrection (Rom. 6:3; Gal. 4:6; 1 Pet. 1:23). Proclaimed as commanded in the Eucharistic liturgy, the Word brings about true participation in the one body and blood of Christ (1 Cor. 10:16-17). The Word in the sacramental liturgy continues the work of the Word in Scripture. This pattern, too, is shown originating in the pages of Scripture.

⁹² See, for instance, Pss. 32:9; 148:5; Isa. 55:10-11; 2 Pet. 3:5; Louis Bouyer, "The Word of God in Israel," in *The Meaning of Sacred Scripture* (South Bend, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1958), 1-14; "The Word of God and the Berakah," in *Eucharist: Theology and Spirituality of the Eucharistic Prayer* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame, 1968), 29-49. Lucien Deiss, C.S.Sp., *God's Word and God's People* (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1974), xvii: "The word of God is all-powerful and possesses a sovereign efficacy. God speaks and the universe exists; he commands and all things come into being. Wherever he sends his word, it acts as a messenger empowered by him and everywhere accomplishes its mission in an irresistible way."

⁹³ John 1:1-3; Rev. 19:13. For the efficacy of "the Word" in the New Testament, see Craig A. Evans, *Word and Glory: On the Exegetical and Theological Background of John's Prologue* (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 305 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993)); "The Agent of the New Exodus: The Word of God," in Pao, *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus*, 147-180; Yun Lak Chung, "'The Word of God' in Luke-Acts: A Study in Lukan Theology" (Ph.D. diss., Emory University, 1995); Leo O' Reilly, *Word and Sign in the Acts of the Apostles: A Study in Lukan Theology* (Analecta Gregoriana, 243 (Rome: Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 1987)); Jerome Kodell, "'The Word of God Grew: The Ecclesial Tendency of Λόγος in Acts 6:7; 12:24; 19:20,'" *Biblica* 55 (1974): 505-519.

⁹⁴ On divine speech acts, see T. Ward, *Word and Supplement: Speech Acts, Biblical Texts and the Sufficiency of Scripture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002); R. S. Briggs, *Words in Action: Speech Act Theory and Biblical Interpretation* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2001); Kevin Vanhoozer, "From Speech Acts to Scripture Acts: The Covenant Discourse and the Discourse of the Covenant," in Craig Bartholomew, et. al., *After Pentecost: Language and Biblical Interpretation* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan Press, 2001), 1-49.

The interpretation of Scripture is ordered to the celebration of baptism (Acts 8:29-38) and the Eucharist (Luke 24:27-31). The New Testament also gives us numerous passages in which the sacraments are explained “typologically” that is, according to events and figures in the Old Testament (1 Cor. 10; 1 Pet. 3:20-21). This paschal catechesis is at the heart of what early Church writers called *mystagogy*.⁹⁵

At a minimum, then, our interpretations of Scripture must respect the mystagogic content of the New Testament. In this exegetes will do well to recall that the sacramental liturgy afforded the first interpretive framework for the Scriptures. But on a deeper level, the exegete must appreciate the *mystagogic intent* of the Bible. The exegete must always be conscious that the Word he or she interprets is written and preserved for the purpose of leading believers to the sacramental liturgy where they are brought into a covenant relationship with God.⁹⁶

Toward a Liturgical Hermeneutic

I believe that, as a natural outgrowth of the past century’s scientific exegesis of the Bible, we are prepared for the development of a new hermeneutic. It is a hermeneutic that will reflect the last century’s fundamental rediscovery of Scripture’s liturgical sense as expressed in the formal and material unity of Scripture and liturgy. This formal and material unity—Scripture being both *for* and *about* liturgy—necessitates a new biblical-theological reading of the canonical text, a reading that I have tried to sketch in this paper. As we have seen, this reading has the potential to offer extraordinary unitive, explanatory, and interpretive power. Further, it suggests certain exegetical imperatives—concern for the principles of economy, typology, and mystagogy—that arise integrally from a liturgical reading of Scripture.

These principles, along with a biblical-theological reading of the canonical text that illuminates Scripture’s liturgical trajectory and

⁹⁵ See, generally, Enrico Mazza, *Mystagogy: A Theology of Liturgy in the Patristic Age* (New York: Pueblo Publishing Co., 1989).

⁹⁶ “The sacraments are simply the continuation in the era of the Church of God’s acts in the Old Testament and the New. This is the proper significance of the relationship between the Bible and the liturgy. The Bible is a sacred history; the liturgy is a sacred history. . . . [The sacraments] are the divine acts corresponding to this particular era in the history of salvation, the era of the Church. . . . The sacramental acts are, therefore, only saving actualizations of the passion and resurrection of Christ.” Jean Danielou, “The Sacraments and the History of Salvation,” 28,31. See also J.A. DiNoia, O.P. and Bernard Mulcahy, O.P., “The Authority of Scripture in Sacramental Theology: Some Methodological Observations,” *Pro Ecclesia* 10 (2001), 329-345, at 330: “The sacramental economy is a divine arrangement . . . by which grace is given by God in virtue of the passion, death, and resurrection of Christ. It is a divine provision which . . . employs or deploys the natural signification of things, actions and words to the divine end of bringing us progressively closer to the triune God and closer to one another in the triune God.”

teleology, are the foundations for a hermeneutic that is at once literary and historical, liturgical and sacramental. As I hope this paper has suggested, this hermeneutic is capable of integrating the contributions of historical and literary research while at the same time respecting the traditional meanings given to the Bible by the believing community in which the Bible continues to serve as the source and wellspring of faith and worship.

What is emerging is a *liturgical hermeneutic*. It is an interpretive method that recognizes the liturgical content and “mission” of the Bible—its mystagogic purpose in bringing about, through the sacramental liturgy, the communion of believers with the God who has chosen to reveal himself in Scripture. It is, then, a hermeneutic that grasps the profound union of the divine Word incarnate in Christ, inspired in Scripture, and proclaimed in the Church’s sacramental liturgy.

Much work remains to be done. But, I believe this understanding of Scripture has great potential to renew the study of the Bible from the heart of the Church. Reading Scripture liturgically, we will find no tension between letter and spirit, between the literary and historical analysis of Scripture and the faithful contemplation of its religious and spiritual meaning.