

By Arthur A. Just Jr.

**T**he ninth annual conference of The Good Shepherd Institute is somewhat of a departure for us. With the successful introduction of Lutheran Service Book into our congregations, pastors, musicians, and the people of God are now seeking ways to do the liturgy well. From the beginning, this Institute has balanced the practice of liturgy with theology—with “theological” plenaries here in Sihler Auditorium, and then more “practical” expressions of theology and theory in the sectionals, in such places as Kramer Chapel, especially for musicians. This conference will be no exception, at least when it comes to the topic of presiding at the liturgy. In this plenary, I will be more theoretical; in the sectionals, Dean of the Chapel Paul Grime will be more practical, and then he will lead this community in embodying our practice at the Eucharist on Tuesday.

The Good Shepherd Institute has never addressed the practice of the Divine Service by those who preside at liturgy, although the “doing” of the liturgy has always been lurking in the background, like a specter, and always as a qualification, that the “doing” of the liturgy matters. Not many of us, however, are willing to admit the “doing” of the liturgy affects its efficacy. Who here would really argue with this truth: Christ is present with His gifts whether the liturgy, preaching, and hymn singing is done well or done poorly.

Our liturgical worship is an invitation by Christ Himself to enter into communion with Him—the Creator and Redeemer of the cosmos. In the presence of the Holy One of God we are to receive these gifts and respond to them with the passionate confidence of saints who know who they are and where they are going, and with the welcoming hospitality of pilgrims summoned home in Christ. The story of the world is lived out in the liturgy every Sunday because the author of that story, Jesus Christ, is present bodily, telling us His story as we hear His living voice. How we allow Christ to tell His story matters. Although Christ is still present whether His story is told well or told badly, how the story is told may get in the way of how people hear and receive it. The story of a world made new in Jesus must be told with reverence and in faith, and with confidence, hospitality, and grace. For in its telling people are invited to participate in that story, as they are welcomed by Christ as Host, through the pastor, to commune with the Creator and Redeemer of all things.<sup>1</sup>

And so this conference accents how the story is told with confidence and grace, that is, how to do Lutheran liturgy and hymnody well, emphasizing the practical ways in which pastors and musicians assist the people of God to embody the story as, in their worship, they receive Christ and His gifts in faith, and then, in their lives, live out that story as they embody Christ’s mercy and love in the world.

### Confident Liturgy

First, a word on the title of my paper: “Confident Liturgy: Presiding with Hospitality and Grace.” Calvin College in Grand Rapids, Michigan seems an odd place to be the source of “confident” in the title “Confident Liturgy,” but the word “confident” in the title is the result of a month-long seminar I attended there in June and July of 2003. The seminar was entitled “Prospects of Historic Christian

Liturgy in a Postmodern Age.” Eleven of us sat around a conference table and discussed the historic liturgy and postmodernism with our able leader and guide, Bryan Spinks, esteemed professor of liturgy at Yale Divinity School, an Anglican who has studied at Durham, England, taught at Cambridge University, and is an expert on Lutheran liturgy. Some of you may know him from his marvelous study entitled *Luther’s Liturgical Criteria and His Reform of the Canon of the Mass*,<sup>2</sup> where he argues that the hermeneutic for Luther’s liturgical reforms was Christological, that is, Luther applied the doctrine of justification by grace through faith to the medieval Mass to accent Christ, His words, and His presence.

The level of conversation at our seminar was high, the tone evangelical, the spirit lively. We hailed from every mainline church—Roman Catholic, Lutheran, Episcopal, Methodist, Presbyterian—as well as from the Assembly of God. Almost all were postdoctoral fellows, experts in their fields, be it liturgy, music, biblical studies, or systematics, and all delighted in the opportunity to spend a month reading and discussing their passion—historic liturgy in its cultural context. Our discussions engaged postmodernists like Jacques Derrida, Jean-François Lyotard, and Michel Foucault; Radical Orthodoxy advocates like John Millbank, Graham Ward, and Catherine Pickstock; as well as visits to our seminar from representatives of Willow Creek Community Church outside Chicago; and trenchant sessions with reasonable and accessible scholars like Robert Webber, of blessed memory, who discussed with us his book *Ancient-Future Faith: Rethinking Evangelicalism for a Postmodern World*<sup>3</sup>. We studied ancient liturgies like Hippolytus’ “Apostolic Tradition” through the eyes of both Spinks and Paul Bradshaw, immersed ourselves in a tenth-century medieval Anglo-Saxon liturgy featured in Pickstock’s book *After Writing: On the Liturgical Consummation of Philosophy*,<sup>4</sup> and studied a contemporary Finnish Lutheran liturgy from Helsinki called the “St. Thomas Mass: Ancient, Post-Modern Worship,” one of many representative liturgies of the emerging church. We also viewed liturgies from Heartland Community Church, a liturgy they called “a different way to do church,” a liturgy from Northcoast Church outside of San Diego, and one from St. Gregory of Nyssa Episcopal Church in San Francisco.

Now why am I telling you all this about a seminar I attended five years ago on historic liturgy in a postmodern world as we open this ninth annual conference of The Good Shepherd Institute under the topic: “Lutheran Liturgy and Hymnody: Theology in Practice with Confidence and Grace”? Here’s what kept coming up at that seminar: those communities whose liturgical life was healthy and robust embodied their liturgy with confidence. Or to put it more plainly: the “doing” of the liturgy exuded confidence, from the presider’s presence, to the community’s response, to the musicians’ service. And in every case the presider was crucial: he was at home in his liturgy, natural in his movements, presiding with hospitality and grace.

Here is also what we discovered and discussed at length: substance and style must go together. The texts of the liturgy, the words on the page, the rite in the book or in the printed bulletin, the pastor’s homily, the texts of the hymns and the choral responses, that is, the substance of the Divine Service, was inseparable from the style of worship, that is, the movement, gesture, and personality of the presider, the actions of the other liturgical ministers, the way Scripture was read and preached, the music that accompanied the liturgy, how it was done, and the community’s passion in singing both the liturgy and the hymns—all these things mattered. Substance and style went together—substance

complemented by a style that fit that substance, was appropriate for that substance. The “doing” of the liturgy, therefore, mattered almost as much as what was said and what was sung.

Now here is what I want to do in this plenary. I have been thinking about this topic for many years, about the “theological” perspectives that bear upon how we do the liturgy. This paper may appear to you, at first, to be eclectic, disjointed, random—and perhaps it is—but let’s call it this: a “postmodern” lecture. For what I want to share is a series of vignettes, perspectives, scenes, if you will, that I believe bear upon how the pastor sees himself at the font, in the pulpit, and at the altar as the presider over the assembly’s Divine Service. Although I have some specific thoughts about concrete ways in which liturgy is to be done, I will refrain as much as possible from engaging that topic, and leave these things for Dean Grime in his sectionals. What you have here are some theological and pastoral perspectives to consider as you think about the enormous responsibility we bear when we preside over the Lord’s liturgy.

First, I will consider how confident liturgy is possible only in communities that are confident in what they believe. Next, I will reflect on the claim that substance and style are inseparable. Third, I will discuss how confidence comes when presider and community are rhythmically engaged in liturgy as a ritual act. When ritual is done rhythmically, then hospitality is possible, as the presider is welcoming and the community is welcomed. Finally, I will offer some brief comments about how this might look, that is, what it means to preside with confidence, hospitality, and grace.

As we proceed, a very important observation, quite obvious but nonetheless important, concerns the one who presides at the Divine Service. The presider leads by serving, by placing himself in the background, and his presiding can never be separated from the community over which he presides, as well as the others who assist him in the “doing” of the liturgy, such as musicians and other liturgical attendants. The language of “presiding minister” has been around a long time, dating back in our communities to Lutheran Book of Worship and Lutheran Worship, which used the symbol P to represent those parts of the liturgy to be done by the presiding minister, and the corresponding A to represent the assisting minister. Here is Philip Pfatteicher’s definition of a presiding minister from *A Dictionary of Liturgical Terms*:

Presiding minister (Latin *praesedere*, to sit in front of). The person who presides at a liturgical service, especially the Holy Communion. In the Lutheran Book of Worship the name is reserved to those who have been received by ordination into the ministry of word and sacrament in the church; in Roman Catholic usage the term is not always limited to the ordained. The president of the eucharistic assembly, however, must be an ordained minister (PRESBYTER), for the president represents the ministry of the whole church.<sup>5</sup>

#### Confident Presiding in a Community Confident in What It Believes

Confident presiding is only possible in communities that are confident in what they believe. If we believe that the liturgy is where heaven comes to earth, where Christ is present bodily both to serve and to be praised, if we believe that the Divine Service is where we come home to be with God and He with us, then we must be confident that we are not only standing on holy ground, a stance that is reverent and faithful, but also that we are where God has called us to be, where He wants us to be, in His presence,

receiving His gifts. This confidence is always wary, believing what we know is true, that the eternal God, the Creator of the cosmos, the Redeemer of Calvary's cross, the One who triumphed over death in the empty tomb, is present bodily. Our presiding, then, is tempered by this awareness of Christ's bodily presence.

In our discussion at Calvin College on the prospects of historic liturgy in the postmodern world, we observed liturgies both ancient and contemporary. The liturgies that "worked" were in communities whose confidence was embodied in both the presider and the community of faith because they believed what they were doing. These worshiping communities embodied "a more excellent way" (1 Cor 12:31) by making the historic liturgy their own, a liturgy whose basic structure served millions of Christians for almost fourteen hundred years, perhaps even longer. This confidence was evident in how they had made the story of the Bible, the story of Christ, their story, and how that story of life in Christ was told by them through word and gesture in a natural, authentic, real, and confident way. They had confidence in the story that was told, that is, they believed it, and they had confidence in how that story was told, that is, it was told with directness and vigor.

This confident liturgy, this more excellent way, was how their grandmothers and great-grandmothers worshiped, stretching all the way back into the New Testament and even beyond that into the Old. But it was not exactly the same as their grandmothers' and great-grandmothers'. It was "contemporary," fresh and new while still embodying what had gone before. It was confident precisely because it was not old-fashioned, not a desperate attempt to hold on to some bygone, liturgical glory, nor was it idiosyncratic or out of touch with postmodern realities. It confidently honored Christ's bodily presence in worship as the community became Christ's body, His church, by receiving Christ's gifts, taking what was best from the past as it enfleshed Christ in present-day worship. As Norman Nagel wrote in that timeless introduction to *Lutheran Worship*:

We are heirs of an astonishingly rich tradition. Each generation receives from those who went before and, in making that tradition of the Divine Service its own, adds what best may serve in its own day—the living heritage and something new.<sup>6</sup>

A living heritage and something new—embodied by real people in real time, vibrant and genuine in their embrace of Christ and His gifts in faithful and confident liturgy.

Confident liturgy is possible, then, only in a community that is confident in what it believes. Or to put it graphically:

Confident church → Confident liturgy

Confident liturgy → Confident church

or

Lex credendi → Lex orandi

Lex orandi → Lex credendi

As most of you know, Prosper of Aquitaine (ca. 390–465), a lay monk and disciple of Augustine, first coined the phrase *lex orandi, lex credendi*, that is, “the law of worshiping founds the law of believing” (he was to have written this somewhere between 435 and 442 AD). This maxim maintains that ever since the time of the apostles, liturgy has been the primary way the church has handed down the faith to future generations. The liturgy and hymnody of a congregation shape the faith of the people more than anything else. A church’s belief and confession may be observed from its liturgy, hymns, preaching, and catechesis. A church’s belief and its confession is inseparable from its liturgical life.

Now, practically speaking, I believe that this maxim is true: sing Baptist hymns, use Baptist liturgies, preach like a Baptist, and your people will start believing like a Baptist. That’s just the way it works. The church growth movement understood all this, and was, in some sense, a liturgical movement that appealed to your average evangelical Protestant, turning many Lutheran churches into another bland form of Protestantism that no longer focused on things Lutheran like the theology of the cross or sacramental theology. Communities lose their identity as “Lutheran” when they worship with non-Lutheran forms and hymns.

The influx of alternative forms of worship, mostly adapted from other communities of faith, has watered down our Lutheran confession, and has led to confusion and uncertainty about what we believe, and this confusion is embodied in the way we preside at the altar. Confused belief leads to confused presiding. When we are continually trying to reinvent ourselves by attending to recent trends in American Protestantism, we adopt their way of presiding, yet this is not who we are, for we are Lutherans. So in our presiding we become tentative and uncertain, two killers of confidence.

Here’s the irony: when it comes to doing liturgy confidently, that is *lex orandi*, one must begin with a community confident in what it believes, *lex credendi*. And so the maxim must go like this: “the law of believing founds the law of worshiping.” If this is so, if our confession creates confident liturgy, then the way we worship will do what it does best—create a community Paul calls “the body of Christ,” where apostolic doctrine is embodied in saints who sing orthodox hymns, follow orthodox liturgies, listen to orthodox sermons, and are led by orthodox, confident presiders. Only with a knowledge of Scripture, a confident confession of the ecumenical creeds, and a clear head about liturgical tradition will we be able to approximate orthodoxy in the true sense of the word.

#### A Comment on Liturgical Style

What this means is that Lutheran substance must be accompanied by a Lutheran liturgical style. Fifteen years ago, during my sabbatical in New Hampshire, Bishop Roger Pittelko asked me to write a paper for the English District on style and substance in the arts. Some of you may remember that “style and substance” was an issue back then, for there were those in our midst who wanted to separate style from substance,<sup>7</sup> and Roger wanted his district to know whether such a separation was even contemplated in other disciplines.

Bishop Pittelko was, and continues to be, a wise man. Although liturgy is more than simply an artistic expression, by using such arts as music, singing, gesture, and speech, the act of liturgy is never less than an artistic expression. A parallel to this idea of liturgy as art is what James Voelz always says about Holy

Scripture: the Bible is always more than literature, but it is never less than literature, and thus should be treated with principles of literary criticism. And so with liturgy, it is always more than a combination of the arts, but it is never less than the arts. Thus, we might benefit from seeing what others have said about substance and style in the arts.

Back in those days when we were fighting about style and substance, it was clear that for some, style/substance was a kind of a liturgical Nestorianism—style and substance were stuck together like two boards with little or no communication between them. However, such a position would appear curious to those who regularly engage in artistic endeavors that deal with questions of style and substance.

Those of us who grew up with *Charlotte's Web* are acquainted with E. B. White, and perhaps even know him from his many years with *The New Yorker* magazine. A standard text in high school and college freshman English classes was Strunk and White's timeless *The Elements of Style*.<sup>8</sup> At the feet of White and his mentor, English professor William Strunk from Cornell University, many of us learned the elementary rules of grammar and composition, and were introduced to White's theory of literary style. White's stylistic comments have shaped a whole generation of writers, a handy guide on many desks for those tough grammatical questions. His observations about writing bore such close resemblance to both liturgy and preaching, that it prompted Aidan Kavanagh to take White's stylistic principles and apply them to the liturgy in his *Elements of Rite*, a book about rubrics and about presiding. Later, at Kavanagh's encouragement, O. C. Edwards did the same for preaching in his *Elements of Homiletic*.<sup>9</sup> Both are reliable textbooks for teaching liturgy and preaching to seminary students, but without Strunk and White's *Elements of Style* many students would not know where to begin. White's comments on language and literary style in the final chapter of his book help orient us in our consideration of what makes for a liturgical style that leads to confident presiding with hospitality and grace:

We approach style in its broader meaning: style in the sense of what is distinguished and distinguishing. Here we leave solid ground. Who can confidently say what ignites a certain combination of words, causing them to explode in the mind? Who knows why certain notes in music are capable of stirring the listener deeply, though the same notes slightly rearranged are impotent? These are high mysteries, and this chapter is a mystery story, thinly disguised. There is no satisfactory explanation of style, no infallible guide to good writing, no assurance that a person who thinks clearly will be able to write clearly, no key that unlocks the door, no inflexible rule by which the young writer may shape his course. He will often find himself steering by stars that are disturbingly in motion.

Style is an increment in writing. When we speak of Fitzgerald's style, we don't mean his command of the relative pronoun, we mean the sound his words make on paper. Every writer, by the way he uses the language, reveals something of his spirit, his habits, his capacities, his bias. This is inevitable as well as enjoyable. All writing is communication; creative writing is communication through revelation—it is the Self escaping into the open. No writer long remains incognito.

Style takes its final shape more from attitudes of mind than from principles of composition, for, as an elderly practitioner once remarked, "Writing is an act of faith, not a trick of grammar." This moral

observation would have no place in a rule book were it not that style is the writer, and therefore what a man is, rather than what he knows, will at last determine his style. If one is to write, one must believe—in the truth and worth of the scrawl, in the ability of the reader to receive and decode the message.<sup>10</sup>

Confident writing is a matter of faith—so to paraphrase White, if one is to preside, one must believe. For White, style reveals substance. Style is an act of faith that reveals who we are. To write a book, produce a film, paint a picture, compose a symphony, or preside at a liturgy is to believe that such an act reveals something about what we believe. Style reveals substance by increment, says White. Substance reveals meaning, and style helps reveal that substance by increment, by letting substance “escape into the open.” Substance cannot exist without style. Expanding on White’s comments, Kavanagh observes:

Liturgy, style, education and social formation are increments to larger and more radical realities. But these larger and more radical realities, i.e., meaning and being human, become operational and intensified only in their incremental dimensions. An organism, for example, may be essentially human without educational or social increments, but such an organism rarely becomes operationally humane except by such incremental processes as education and social interaction with others of the same species. The potentialities inherent in the human organism are there to be actualized. The same may be said of meaning and its actualizing increment, style.<sup>11</sup>

The substance of Christ’s flesh becomes embodied in the presider at the liturgy and the community over which he presides. This substantial flesh is communicated to the world and to the community by their liturgical style—the liturgical style of both presider and community.

White’s claims for language and Kavanagh’s for liturgy can be tested if we look briefly at style and substance in the arts, particularly in film and literature, as we observe how secular culture understands the relationship between these two. And at the end of the day, we must ask if this relationship also applies to the liturgies over which pastors preside every Sunday morning.

#### Style and Substance in Film and Literature

Let’s start with the most popular art medium today—movies. Here is what John Koch said about style and substance in film in an article entitled “The Elements of Style” in the “Arts Section” of the Sunday Boston Globe:

How many times have you seen a movie’s look or style briskly kissed off in a phrase or two toward the end of a review? Surely too many to count. Whether reviews acknowledge it or not, genuine style is more than skin deep, the “look” of a movie more than a question of grooming. It can’t be affixed to a film like a decal, or applied like wax to make the action shine on screen—not, anyway, if the movie is going to amount to more than hackwork. What reviewers are inclined to mention curtly as a movie’s “look” is really a matter of the visual language with which a film expresses itself. And if it’s awkward or underdeveloped, the movie will suffer and, possibly, fail, no matter how dramatic the screenplay is or how artfully it puts words in people’s mouths. . . . We tend to discuss movies more in terms of the stories they tell than in terms of how they tell them. . . . But in most good movies, the visual textures convey as much, and often more, than the course of the action and the content of the dialogue.<sup>12</sup>

In his analysis of films, Koch comments on the interplay between the screenplay, its content, and the visual effect of the film, its style. For example, he observed that one film does not have the cinematographic style to carry the dramatic focus of the dialogue to a meaningful expression in the film itself. The screenplay has tremendous potential to produce a powerful film, but the style of the film does not realize the story's potential. Koch's critique affirms that in film, style has a profound effect on the story told or the message sent. Koch notes how a film's "visual flavor is virtually its essence." The goal of every director of a film is the wedding of style and substance together in dramatic unity, or what Koch calls "the emotive power of style."

But why all this talk about movies and style? Film and television are the most popular media in our culture. Most people know something about the latest films and may have even read or heard a review about them. As popular media, film and television contribute significantly to the popular culture and influence people's perception of the liturgy, that is, we who do liturgy are measured by the standards people come to expect from their popular viewing. Today's culture is visually conditioned. Film and television begin with a script, screenplay, or text. They move towards the embodiment of that text in a visual act, whether recorded or live. Every script or screenplay has stage directions, lighting instructions, sound suggestions, etc. To bring a text to life, one need pay attention to the screenwriter's directions to be faithful to the intent of the text. These directions help create style. Built into the script, the substance of the movie, are signals on how the script might take shape in action. But as most of us know, a director has freedom to interpret the script and the stage directions, so that we might have, for example, a traditional King Lear portrayed by Laurence Olivier or an avant-garde Lear as a crazed homosexual as portrayed by Richard Dreyfuss. Same text, same stage directions, but completely different interpretation. Much of what we call "style" is in the interpretation, for style reflects everything that goes into making a film a film. Here is Koch's description of style:

Perhaps it's not surprising that we often don't talk about a movie's style. It's complex, for one thing: Just consider what goes into the composition of even a single shot; then add the interplay of light and darkness throughout a film; and factor in the tensions and rhythms created in the process of editing. Perhaps we instinctively know how basic all such elements are to the experience of a movie. Yet in our heated conversations about favorite new films, as in the discourse of most daily reviewing, the question of how they are used tends to be scanted.<sup>13</sup>

The look of a film will first either attract or repel or bore us; then, if it holds our attention, it will draw us into its message and reveal its meaning. The style of a film cannot be separated from the film. The relationship of style to substance in film is complex, but it is significant to the overall impact of the film upon the viewer.

The same holds true for liturgy, where its "look" will draw our attention, hold it, and assist the proclamation of God's revelation. Liturgy has its liturgical text and its rubrics, but that is not liturgy. Liturgy is the text enlivened on Sunday as it is done by God, His priest, and His people. Although liturgy is not divine drama, it contains elements of drama as everyone contributes to the process of bringing a text to life. Liturgical action is the text in motion, to rephrase Kavanagh's definition of liturgy as the

people's faith in motion. Liturgical style will note the text, the rubrics, the worship space, the arrangement of the ecclesiastical furniture, the assembly's seating, the pastor and other assisting ministers, and any other aspects of the context that might affect the liturgy's action. Like the making of the film, the liturgy's final act on Sunday morning is complex. For better or for worse, the style of the liturgy, the way it is done, will affect the proclamation of the Gospel.

Style in film is much different than style in literature. Film is much more complex and explicit than literature. The reason is obvious. Film's context is visual and literature's is not. Film must consider a larger environment—location, lighting, sound, staging, props, etc., whereas literature has only the printed word and format of the page. Literary style is dependent on the selection of words, the juxtaposition of words, the structure of sentences, paragraphs, chapters, etc.

During the twentieth century, much was said about literary style, since each new decade produces a new style of writing. John Updike, in his anthology entitled *Odd Jobs: Essays and Criticism*, offers stylistic observations about the most significant authors of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Updike's most poignant remarks about literary style are reserved for his own writing. In his discussion of the creative imagination, he begins with Herman Melville but ends with one of his earliest short stories for *The New Yorker* called "The Happiest I've Been." Concerning the process of writing this story, Updike observed:

The artist who works in words and anecdotes, images and facts wants to share with us nothing less than his digested life as he conceives it, in the memories and fantasies most precious, however obscurely, to him. . . . For the creative imagination, as I conceive it, is wholly parasitic upon the real world—what used to be called Creation. Creative excitement, and a sense of useful work, has invariably and only come to me when I felt I was transferring, with a lively accuracy, some piece of experienced reality to the printed page. . . . The wish to do justice to the real world compels language into those semi-transparent layers that make a style. No style of form exists in the abstract; whatever may be true in painting or music, there is no such thing as abstract writing. Words even when shattered into nonsense struggle to communicate meanings to us; and behind the most extreme modernist experiments with the language of fiction—Joyce's *Finnegans Wake*; the late writing of Gertrude Stein; the automatic writing of Dada—some perception about the nature of reality seeks embodiment.<sup>14</sup>

Reality seeking embodiment is Updike's way of speaking of the manner in which reality's substance takes life through the shape of an author's narrative style.

An example of this embodiment is evident in F. Scott Fitzgerald's *The Great Gatsby* and his quest for the American dream, a semi-autobiographical tale that captures the spirit of the hedonistic<sup>1920</sup>s. It portrays one man's pursuit of his dream with zeal and abandon, and the tragedy that comes when he confronts careless people—careless with money, careless with things, and most of all, careless with people's lives. The story is really quite simple—nothing abstract or philosophical about *Gatsby*. High school students understand it. And the reason Fitzgerald's novel about the pursuit of the American dream has endured and become an American classic is because it takes this simple story and tells it in language whose style fits the text and stands as a monument to the beauty of English prose, accessible even to the high school

student. His style captures a whole generation's struggle and preserves it for future generations to ponder. Remember White's words: "When we speak of Fitzgerald's style, we don't mean his command of the relative pronoun, we mean the sound his words make on paper." As Updike would say, Fitzgerald's prose shares with us his "digested life as he conceives it." He does it through words that express meaning and, by increment, through a style that gives that meaning life.

Liturgy is the church's "digested life," its biblical substance—the presence of Christ—life itself—given expression by increment through a liturgical style that embodies a church's life as it has been lived out by generations of Christians. Liturgy tells the story of a world made new in Jesus Christ; liturgical style is how the story is told with hospitality and grace.

### Confident Liturgy Is Rhythmic, That Is, Repetitious Ritual

The sound of the words on a page—why one song makes you want to get up and dance and another doesn't—why some days on the golf course your swing is so sweet you can do no wrong—is because of rhythm. Since liturgy is a ritual act it must be rhythmic, for rhythm helps form community, and communities bound together by rhythmic ritual are by nature hospitable.

Rituals are complex, especially in a Christian community that embraces the historic liturgy with its rich tradition and history. In *Elements of Rite*, Kavanagh notes that ritual and rhythm are important to the "how" of the liturgy, that is, to "how" the story is told:

One cannot, however, think in a ritual context of the living and the dead (that is, historically) without soon realizing that human rituals are rarely short, clear, and without repetition. They are more often long, richly ambiguous, and vastly repetitive. This is so because many people participate in them simultaneously. This takes time, requires repetition, and embraces many different facets of meaning the participants bring with them to the act. A liturgy without this time-consuming repetition is one without rhythm; one without rhythm allows little or no active participation; one without participation will communicate little or no crucial meaning.

Repetition and rhythm in the liturgy are to be fostered. No rule is more frequently violated by the highly educated and well-meaning, who seem to think that never having to repeat anything is a mark of effective communication. Yet rhythm, which organizes repetition, makes things memorable, as in music, poetry, rhetoric, architecture, and the plastic arts no less than in liturgical worship. Rhythm constantly insinuates, as propagandists know. It constantly reasserts, as good teachers know. It constantly forms individuals into units, as demagogues and cheerleaders know. It both shrouds and bares meaning which escapes mere words, as poets know. It fuses people to their values and forges them to a common purpose, as orators such as Cato, Churchill, and Martin Luther King knew. It frees from sound and offers vision for those who yearn for it, as the preacher of the Sermon on the Mount knew. Liturgical ministers who are irreparably arrhythmic should be restrained from ministering in the liturgy.<sup>15</sup>

How to rescue a presider from arrhythmia? By immersing him in the structure of the historic liturgy as ritual. In some circles today, the word "ritual" has negative connotations, but this is unfortunate. What

we must always remember is that the historic liturgy is always more than ritual, but it is never less than ritual.

Ritual is a pattern of formal, repetitive behavior that communicates meaning symbolically both verbally and non-verbally, which is necessary for group relationships to operate in order that the group may stick together and thus survive.<sup>16</sup>

Rituals cause communities to cohere as a group, and, in many cases, that cohesion is the means by which the group is able to survive with its identity intact. Liturgical communities depend on ritual not merely to establish identity but also to hand down faith to new hearers and succeeding generations. Common ritual action creates community, and communities formed by common ritual action are bound together in love and charity, and such communities are by definition hospitable.

Our historic liturgy, which we call the Divine Service, is a pattern of formal, repetitive behavior. Some who think that our historic liturgy is an impediment to missions and evangelism will point to this aspect of our liturgy and describe it as a “dead ritual.” But rituals themselves are neither dead nor alive. Those who participate in them make them appear as either living, vital rituals or as dead ones. Said plainly, it is not the ritual that is dead; it is we who are dead. Ritual, when it comes alive in living people, is the means by which others are welcomed into our communities.

People who have not been born from above (Jn 3:3) are not able to receive gifts because they have no life in them. Those who understand the historic liturgy and see it as the means through which Christ’s bodily presence comes among us with the gifts of forgiveness, life, and salvation would never describe the historic liturgy as dead. This is why it is so important for pastors and the communities over which they preside to know the tradition and to teach it to their children. Most Christians who know why they worship as they do would never think of their worship as dead, nor consider departing from it. They know, like any good teacher does, that repetition is the key to learning something deeply. And as any good athletic coach knows, to be able to perform in the game, practice is necessary. In our worship we repeat the same things Sunday in and Sunday out to learn the posture of forgiveness in daily life. This posture is formed in us through hearing His Word read, preached, and celebrated in a Sacrament of His body and blood, where God has bound Himself to be present with His gifts. This may happen when the presiding minister is arrhythmic, but how much more when he himself embodies the ritual by the rhythm of his words and gestures.

What is true of God’s people is also true of the presider who, through repetition of his actions, comes to feel at home in the liturgy. That’s why the pastor turns to the right when he turns at the altar, not because he doesn’t want to turn his back on the deacon, which is the tradition, but because he wants to build in a pattern of ritual behavior, a pattern of movement that frees him to forget himself and his movements so that he too may worship.

For most of us in Western Christianity, our symbolic communication is restricted to language and does not take advantage of action, ceremony, and image. Non-verbal communication can communicate in ways as powerful as verbal communication, especially for those who are challenged in their language abilities. To enter a church with a baptismal font in the narthex with water flowing makes a statement

about the identity of this community as one that is constituted by its union with Christ at the font. Looking down the aisle to the altar, one sees that the goal of the community's journey is communion with this same Christ at a table prepared for a feast, a feast where heaven itself is present among us in bread and wine.

These powerful, stable images communicate that Baptism and the Lord's Supper are the initiating and sustaining events in the life of the church. Without these marks of the church and the profound, mysterious realities they communicate by their presence in the church as the stable cornerstones of our life, the church could not be what Christ called it to be. The historic liturgy is a pattern of formal, repetitive behavior that moves the community from font to altar as it journeys from entrance hymn to benediction, stopping to confess sins, sing hymns, hear the Word of God read and preached, confess faith, pray, and then sup at His Table on heavenly food. By this simple ritual of Word and Sacrament, with its surrounding structures of movement, communities are bound together as the body of Christ, His church. These three places—font, pulpit, and altar—are the places where the presiding minister presides. He must feel at home here. He must know these spaces intimately, know where to move and when, and embrace the ceremonies associated with these spaces with a reverence for the presence of Christ in this sacramental space.

This weekly ritual of patterned, repetitive behavior is the means God has given to make us His people, His coherent body. By looking at the historic liturgy through a functional definition of ritual, there are certain characteristics of ritual that help us understand how the ritual is to be done. As you listen to these characteristics of ritual, picture the liturgy you experience every Sunday morning, as your pastor presides over the Divine Service, the musicians assist in the people's song, and the community participates in the heavenly banquet by their communion with Christ.

Rituals do not analyze, they assume.<sup>17</sup> Rituals do not hand out instruction manuals or books to guide one through the ritual. When one engages in ritual, there should be very little explanation by the one who presides over the ritual, for those who engage in the ritual know the ritual, and those who do not know it are taught the meaning of the ritual before engaging in it. When we tend to talk our rituals to death instead of simply doing them, we become untouched spectators instead of receivers of the Lord's actions. Once the Divine Service begins, we should have very few announcements or explanations, letting the Divine Service instead take us into its rhythms. This symphony of movement flows towards Jesus' clear voice in the Gospel and in the Words of Institution, the two climaxes of the liturgy.

Rituals do not discourse, they assert and proclaim. When we gather for worship, we do not talk about the Gospel and the mystery of Christ's bodily presence. We proclaim the Gospel and participate in Christ's bodily presence by hearing His Word and eating and drinking His body and blood. The Divine Service is not a lecture about Christ, the Gospel, justification, but rather, a series of actions that get Christ, the Gospel, and justification all the way into the hearer. Again, rituals do not explain in a didactic way, even though much may be learned during the ritual. The purpose of ritual is not to teach but to engage the participant in a ritual process. In rituals you do not explain, you just do; you experience rituals. You do not think about it, or even reflect on how you feel about it or how the ritual is affecting

you. In the Divine Service you commune with Christ's bodily presence, your sins are forgiven, you are joined to His life that has no end, you are saved from your enemies.

Rituals do not conceive, they perceive. Certainly "faith comes from hearing, and hearing through the word of Christ" (Rom 10:17), and yet we are more than our ears, and the liturgy is more than simple words, even though words and hearing are the most important aspects of ritual. Our other senses give us access to meaning, deepening and broadening our ritual experience. The sense of smell is a good example of how, without words, we may be transported to a different place or time. Music does this as well. Both access memory in a way that words do not. Perception does bring ambiguity, but the kind of delicious ambiguity that makes life worth living. Unfortunately, since the Enlightenment, our church buildings and their liturgies have become temples to the rational mind, and we have spurned the sensuousness of the ancient liturgies. When one enters the sacred space of the church, it should smell different, look different, and the sounds one hears should be unlike any other in the culture. You have entered into a foretaste of heaven, a space that has its own unique culture and its own distinctive story to tell. Your eyes, ears, nose, and mouth testify that you are able to see, hear, smell, and taste that the Lord is good. You have entered into the presence of Jesus.

Rituals do not reflect reality, they enact reality. The Divine Service does not simply reflect what Christ is like, it enacts us in His flesh as His Word is broken open through preaching that reveals Christ to us as Christ was revealed to the Emmaus disciples in the breaking of the bread. To break open God's Word is to see Christ at its center, for as Jesus Himself tells the Emmaus disciples concerning the testimony of the Old Testament: "Was it not necessary that the Christ should suffer these things and enter into his glory?" (Lk 24:26). God's Word is first broken open for us in the liturgy of the Word so that we might be prepared in the Holy Supper to eat His body broken in death and His blood poured out for the remission of sins. In the liturgy of Word and Sacrament you leave the world behind, with all its cultural baggage, and only then do you begin to perceive through your rational mind and your senses that Christ is present bodily to give you the gifts of heaven. Rituals are not a mirror that show us what reality might look like; they are reality, and by our participation in those rituals we enact reality.

At the center of the liturgy of the Lord's Supper is the cross where we feast on the body and blood of our Host. Think of the ambiguity of this act of participating in a banquet of joy in which the food is the One who sacrificed Himself in a humiliating, shameful, and scandalous death. It is hard to comprehend that through Christ's bodily presence, heaven itself is present with angels and archangels and all the company of heaven when we eat His body and drink His blood. What is it that we perceive here through our eyes, our ears, our nose, our mouths? Joy at our salvation at the heavenly feast? Horror that the violence of Calvary is in, with, and under what we consume into our bodies? Sadness that participating with us in Christ are all the saints who are no longer with us, including our closest relatives and friends? These are thoughts that ritual can evoke, and they are too big to be analyzed, discussed, categorized, and pared down to size. <sup>18</sup>

These are the realities that the pastor presides over at the liturgy. And so he must be confident and competent as he helps his people negotiate these heavenly things. His presiding will be more confident, then, if it is rhythmic, grasping the enormous reality that the "ritual" of liturgy is how he and his people

negotiate this boundary between heaven and earth. Communities constituted by rhythmic ritual are formed into the person of Christ, who, in His incarnation, showed us what it means to be hospitable to a world that crucified Him.<sup>19</sup>

### Confident Liturgy Is Hospitable, That Is, Welcoming

So, then, what do we mean by “hospitality”? It begins with Jesus who truly showed God’s hospitality by coming into our world as one of us, sitting down at our tables to eat with us, healing our sick, teaching us about the kingdom, absorbing into His flesh our brokenness, restoring it in His resurrection, and then revealing His true identity in the breaking of the bread with the Emmaus disciples. Throughout the Gospels,<sup>20</sup> Jesus shows the hospitality of God to the world’s rejected outcasts by the intimate act of eating and drinking with them. Jesus eats with sinners and publicans, the disenfranchised, with all of us, even though we are not worthy. Jesus, one who comes from afar, shows God’s gracious hospitality toward His fallen creation by His divinely ordained suffering and death. Then, after He rose from the dead, Jesus opens up the Scriptures (Lk 24:27, 32, 45) to show the disciples the divine hospitality that has come to full expression in Him, in the kingdom He now brings in liturgy of Word and Meal.

The breaking of the bread—the Meal—is the intimate celebration of this divine hospitality. What is at stake for the disciples and all Israel is the manner in which they receive or reject this stranger, who comes and is known in the breaking of the bread. Will they receive Him with the same open hospitality as Jesus showed to strangers during His earthly life? Or will they meet Him with hostility and rejection?

<sup>21</sup>

The table is still the common ground where the divine Son meets humankind and humankind meets the divine Host. In table fellowship God offers His gracious hospitality, and in His supreme form of table fellowship—the Lord’s Supper—He extends His forgiveness to sinners in the true, real presence of Jesus in bread and wine. Fellow creatures of “flesh and bones” (cf. Lk 24:39) have the opportunity to reciprocate hospitality by receiving in this Meal the divine mystery of God’s redemptive action in Jesus Christ. Fellowship around God’s Table—the Sacrament of the Altar—is therefore a confession of unity in faith in Jesus, of common understanding and doctrinal agreement. This hospitality at the fellowship of the Table is also eschatological, pointing to and proleptically participating in the heavenly table fellowship at the eternal messianic banquet, where God’s hospitality reaches its final fulfillment.<sup>22</sup>

“The ultimate hospitality is, then, an entertainment of divine mystery in human life. Table hospitality is but a sign.”<sup>23</sup> Presiding at the Table of the Lord with hospitality is to welcome the community gathered around the living voice of Jesus and His holy Meal of body and blood, to see Jesus and be welcomed by Him. For Jesus is our true Host welcoming us into a communion that knows no end, and the pastor who stands in the stead and by the command of Christ, represents Christ as host at the Table, inviting all who believe, are baptized, and confess the catholic faith to come to the feast.

### Toward a Lutheran Liturgical Style: How to Preside at the Liturgy with Confidence, Hospitality, and Grace

Now for some comments about what a Lutheran liturgical style looks like, about the “doing” of the Lutheran liturgy. Any confident liturgical style takes practice, practice, practice. There are some

wonderful resources available to those presiding at the liturgy. Of course, the greatest resource is to live in a community where presiding is done well, and to experience the hospitality and grace of a pastor who presides confidently.

As for resources, here are a few examples. The now ancient but still valuable publication by Paul H. D. Lang, *Ceremony and Celebration*,<sup>24</sup> offers sane advice about Lutheran presiding, as does Arthur Carl Piepkorn in *The Conduct of the Service*.<sup>25</sup> For another Lutheran perspective, there is Philip Pfatteicher and Carlos Messerli's, *Manual on the Liturgy: Lutheran Book of Worship*, which offers general guidelines on all matters liturgical.<sup>26</sup> For a deeply theological and philosophical treatment there is Richard D. McCall's *Do This: Liturgy as Performance*.<sup>27</sup> Although he has very little to say about practical matters, his chapter on "The Performance of Ordo Romanus Primus," the medieval Roman Mass, gets you inside the meaning of this liturgy in its historical context, and then offers, in appendix form, a description of how the rite was done. For a Roman Catholic point of view, the standard text was Robert Hovda's *Strong, Loving, and Wise: Presiding in Liturgy*, which still has much to say about presiding, especially his chapter on liturgical style.<sup>28</sup>

The book that has been a standard for my liturgics classes ever since it was published is the aforementioned *Elements of Rite* by Aidan Kavanagh. In it you see a man who lives deeply in his own tradition, knows that tradition well, and is not afraid to comment on how that tradition is best embodied in the presider and the community over which he presides. As he himself says, his book "is not about rubrics. It is about what gives rubrics their reason and value."<sup>29</sup> Like Strunk and White in *Elements of Style*, Kavanagh begins his book with some pointed observations about the doing of the liturgy under such topics as "Elementary Rules of Liturgical Usage," "Some General Laws of Liturgy," "Principles for Putting Liturgy Together," "Some Matters of Form," and "Some Common Mistakes." It is in his last chapter, following Strunk and White, where he gets to the heart of the matter in "An Approach to Liturgical Style." His thirteen principles are worth placing before you:

1. Place yourself in the background.
2. Do things naturally.
3. Know the assembly's liturgical tradition thoroughly.
4. Do the liturgy with directness and vigor.
5. Beware of particularizing the liturgy.
6. Beware of liturgical fundamentalism.
7. Do not over-ceremonialize.
8. Do not affect a loose informality.
9. Do not explain too much.
10. Strive for simplicity.

11. Do not get too relevant.
12. Learn to live with symbol.
13. Adapt culture to the liturgy rather than liturgy to culture.<sup>30</sup>

In teaching liturgics over the years, these thirteen principles have endured and served to help students recognize that style, how they preside in their movements and words, and substance, what they say, are inseparable.

To be confident at the altar makes hospitality possible, and hospitality is only possible if the pastor presides there with grace. Here, then, are some concrete ways in which we may preside with confidence, hospitality, and grace.

#### Presiding with Confidence

To preside at the Lord's Table with confidence is only possible if the presider is:

- Confident in what he believes and teaches
- Knowledgeable of the liturgical tradition of his church
- Aware of the liturgical limitations of the space in which he presides
- Understanding of the community he serves as they embody the liturgy

To be consumed with worry over making a liturgical mistake is the greatest mistake of all. Reverence is a virtue, not a neurosis, and God can take care of himself.<sup>31</sup>

#### Presiding with Hospitality

To preside at the Lord's Table with hospitality is only possible if the presider is:

- Welcoming in allowing Christ and His gifts to be the center of the Divine Service
- Genuine, authentic, natural, that is, if the presider is himself
- Welcoming with his voice and relaxed in his body
- o Confident in movement and gesture—presiding with directness and vigor
- o Reverent but at ease with himself
- o Happy and smiling

The "atmosphere of hospitality" . . . means that everything possible must be done to help people feel "relaxed," "at home," physically comfortable and comfortable with each other, so that the assembly's celebration, its common prayer and praise and ritual action is uninhibited by feelings of isolation, alienation, estrangement, fear, suspicion.<sup>32</sup>

## Presiding with Grace

To preside at the Lord's Table with grace is only possible if the presider:

- Prepares the liturgy beforehand
  - Reads all texts ahead of time out loud and understands them
  - Walks through the entire liturgy, noting his every movement and the movement of others
  - Consults with musicians for cues and other places where music coincides with his presiding
  - Moves the congregation to the Gospel and Verba climaxes, the very words of Jesus
  - Seeks simplicity
  - Aspires towards solemnity
- Presides with natural rhythm and a pace that is reverent and solemn
  - Uses the rubrics to free the congregation, not to enslave them
  - Creates a gentle flow of the liturgy by his movement
  - Reads naturally at a pace for hearing and understanding
  - Employs gestures that are natural, meaningful, and fit the space in which he serves
  - Offers few announcements during the liturgy

The approach to liturgy, as to literary style, is by way of plainness, simplicity, orderliness, and sincerity. . . . Simplicity is noble. It is not the same as barren brevity. Rhythm requires repetition and time. Solemnity, on the other hand, does not require slowness, ponderousness, or weight. Solemnity should skip rather than trundle, dance rather than lumber. Solemnity and simplicity are close to being the same thing, and each is native to a liturgy which is divine service.<sup>33</sup>

To preside with confidence at the liturgy in a Lutheran liturgical style is to be passionate in what one believes, welcoming to all, and natural in voice and gesture. The presiding pastor is reverent to Christ's bodily presence, and serves the people of God by leading them to hear Christ's voice at the two great moments where He speaks His authoritative Word: in the holy Gospel and in the instituting Word. The presider is aware of the community and the individuals in it, knows how each part of the liturgy functions and why, does not hurry in his readings or his movements, but is aware that the liturgy must be done with directness and vigor. He is never tentative, is sometimes bold, and understands that silence is a great virtue. He uses his natural speaking voice, with something extra so as to be heard, and his gestures are smooth, even relaxed, but never informal or loose. He enters the pulpit with reverence, attends the altar with great care for the mystery it holds, and is lavish with water at the font, for in this Word and in these Sacraments Christ's great gifts of grace are offered and received, events that create great joy and celebration.

From beginning to end, he who presides is Christ's—Christ's host, Christ's bridegroom, Christ's servant—so that with his entire being he welcomes home the pilgrim people of God to be with Christ in His Father's house—heaven on earth, Jerusalem the golden, the place of peace and rest, our sweet and blessed country, the home of God's wandering saints.

---

## Notes

1. Note the use of the passive voice in telling the story, to accent that it's not we who tell the story, for the story is told by Christ.
2. Bryan Spinks, *Luther's Liturgical Criteria and His Reform of the Canon of the Mass* (Bramcote, Notts: Grove Books, 1982).
3. Robert Webber, *Ancient-Future Faith: Rethinking Evangelicalism for a Postmodern World* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Books, 1999).
4. Catherine Pickstock, *After Writing: On the Liturgical Consummation of Philosophy* (Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 1998).
5. Philip H. Pfatteicher, *A Dictionary of Liturgical Terms* (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1991), 101. The new Altar Book of Lutheran Service Book notes on p. x that the presiding minister is ordained.
6. *Lutheran Worship* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1982), 6.
7. David Luecke placed the issue of style into the liturgical discussion with his book *Evangelical Style and Lutheran Substance* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1988). In his introduction he separates style from substance by writing: "'Style' will be a key word in this discussion. It is used to identify the dimensions of a church's life and ministry that can be changed. . . . the contrast is 'substance,' understood as the ingredients of a church's identity that are not open to change" (Luecke, 9–10). He then brings liturgy into the discussion in his chapter "Concentrating on the Adiaphora of Style": "For some Lutherans there may be a question whether liturgical worship belongs to their substance. They would resist treating it as style, as implied earlier. But in fact Lutheran worship practice has considerable variance and has had that over the centuries. For Lutherans, substance revolves around beliefs, which are readily identified in the Confessions that define Lutheranism. The Confessions recognize considerable latitude in matters of practice and thereby in style. The conceptual term for what is at issue here is 'adiaphora'—things which God neither commands nor forbids and which therefore are subject to human judgment. Planning is a process of applying such judgment to adiaphora. It can and should facilitate changes in style" (Luecke, 22).
8. William Strunk and E. B. White, *The Elements of Style* (New York: Macmillan, 1979).
9. Aidan Kavanagh, *Elements of Rite* (New York: Pueblo Publishing, 1982), and O. C. Edwards, *Elements of Homiletic* (New York: Pueblo Publishing, 1982).
10. Strunk and White, 66–67, 84 (emphasis mine).
11. Kavanagh, 87–88.
12. John Koch, "The Elements of Style," *Sunday Boston Globe*, 1992, A7, A10.

13. *Ibid.*, A10.

14. John Updike, *Odd Jobs: Essays and Criticism* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1991), 133–34.

15. Kavanagh, 5, 28.

16. This definition comes from class notes on 27 September 1983 at Yale Divinity School in Aidan Kavanagh's seminar on "An Anthropology of Ritual Behavior."

17. This section comes from class notes on 4 October 1983 at Yale Divinity School in Aidan Kavanagh's seminar on "An Anthropology of Ritual Behavior."

18. This ambiguity is captured in the words of Stevie Wonder: "there is joy inside my tears," or, more piously, in the words of Luke in describing the reaction of the disciples when Jesus appeared to them in the upper room: "they still disbelieved for joy" (Lk 24:41). It is too good to be true—Christ comes to us with the gift of Himself in the flesh.

19. This section on ritual is adapted from Arthur A. Just Jr., *Heaven on Earth: The Gifts of Christ in the Divine Service* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 2008), 32–39.

20. Cf. Demetrius R. Dumm, "Luke 24:44–49 and Hospitality," in *Sin, Salvation, and the Spirit: Commemorating the Fiftieth Year of the Liturgical Press*, ed. Daniel Durken (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1979), 231–39, whose insights concerning this theme in Luke were instrumental in the formulation of this argument. Cf. also John Koenig, *New Testament Hospitality: Partnership with Strangers as Promise and Mission* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985).

21. Cf. Heb 13:1–2 and the many other New Testament exhortations for Christian hospitality. Dumm, 236, comments: "At Emmaus, it was only after the disciples had offered hospitality to the stranger that he was revealed to them" (Lk 24:29–31).

22. During the journey to Emmaus, Cleopas asks Jesus, "Are you alone a stranger in Jerusalem and you do not know the things that have happened in her in these days?" (Lk 24:18). The Emmaus disciples perceive Jesus as a Passover pilgrim to Jerusalem (not a permanent resident) who somehow missed the news of the crucifixion. As the Son of the Most High (Lk 1:32) without a human father, Jesus truly is a sojourner on earth, not a native son at home on earth or even in Jerusalem. Ironically, Cleopas' question of Him is, in some ways, a confession of His true identity. Jesus is a visitor in Jerusalem, sojourns with His people wherever they may go—even to the ends of the earth. Jesus came from a far country to secure for Himself a kingdom (cf. Lk 19:12), to bring Israel out from bondage and lead her to her true and permanent home.

Jesus as sojourner and alien who needs hospitality highlights Jesus' visitation and identification with Israel. Old Testament Israel sojourned in Egypt; Abraham sojourned in the Promised Land, living in tents—temporary dwellings; Moses was temporarily a sojourner in Midian before returning to Egypt to deliver Israel. 1 Peter 1:17 and 2:11 speak of the Christian life as a temporary sojourn here on earth, where Christians are strangers in this world. Ephesians 2:19 tells how those in Christ are no longer

strangers or temporary sojourners in relation to God but are permanent members of God's household and fellow citizens with God's saints.

If the people of Israel were "sojourners," then Jesus, the Son of Man, embraces in His very person the same tension that Israel experienced and churches now experience. As Son of God and Son of Man, He is both a stranger in the hostile, fallen world and the Redeemer of the world (cf. Lk 24:21). Crucial for the Gospels is the manner in which Jesus receives sinners in the world and the way in which sinners in the world receive Him. When Jesus sent the twelve and the seventy(-two), respectively, He told them that those who received them received Jesus Himself, and those will be received by Him on Judgment Day.

23. Dumm, 236 (emphasis Dumm).

24. Paul H. D. Lang, *Ceremony and Celebration* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1965).

25. Arthur Carl Piepkorn, *The Conduct of the Service* (St. Louis: Concordia Seminary Print Shop, 1965).

26. Philip H. Pfatteicher and Carlos R. Messerli, *Manual on the Liturgy: Lutheran Book of Worship* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1979).

27. Richard D. McCall, *Do This: Liturgy as Performance* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2007).

28. Robert W. Hovda, *Strong, Loving, and Wise: Presiding in Liturgy* (Washington, D.C.: Liturgical Conference, 1976).

29. Kavanagh, 3.

30. Kavanagh, 94–104.

31. Kavanagh, 31.

32. Hovda, 74.

33. Kavanagh, 93, 102.