

For Discussion on 10-19-2008

2B. A diagram of the components of old temple worship

Here is schematic summary of the Calvin-Girardeau-Williamson view applied in a rough and ready way to 2 Chronicles 29-30 (any thoughts on improving this chart are welcome).

OT Components Shadows	NT Antitypes Reality
Temple: the building	Temple: the people of God
Bowing to the ground	Bowing the head; reverence in prayer
Burnt Offerings	Sacrifices of prayer and thanksgiving
Sin offering & Passover Lamb	Christ our Passover
Levite singers (29.30; 30.21)	All believers as priests singing in worship
Singing with IA (29.25-30)	Singing with joy

3B. Some evaluative Qs

1) For emphasis: what task of OT priests that was *restricted to them only* is now a task of all believers and what does this teach us about NT/new temple worship?

2) From Q 1, how does this pertain to each of us in a practical way as we gather for worship on the Lord's Day?

3) As we move from the OT to the NT, why should we look for not only discontinuity but also for continuity?

4) Regarding IA, and considering the chart above, does the Calvin-Girardeau-Williamson view do justice to both discontinuity and continuity?

5) If not (to Q4), if the Calvin view fails to due full justice to continuity, what basic fact here seems to prevent a wholesale use of IA in new temple worship? In other words, what prevents an "anything goes" extreme (at least, seems to prevent)?

Conclusion

Of course, warrant for IA may be discernible by good and necessary consequence; it need not be explicit. It may be that some accompaniment of the voice has a place in NT worship. This leads to the next point put in a question. By good and necessary consequence from Scripture as our sole authority for worship, can we find warrant (God's regulation) for the use of some new but residual form of IA? In doing so, how do we avoid what K. Stewart calls "a worship free for all where anything and everything goes on, except what should"?

Before taking up this argument, we should comment on the church history argument against IA.

4B. For perspective, we should reply to the argument from church history against IA.

1) We need church history for perspective and challenge.

2) Church history is not an infallible guide to the truth.

3) Examples of church history show us the problems that arise from polarization.

4) We need to find the thinking, basis, and arguments for historical views; church history opens the door to help us avoid polarization and find the lines of arguments for competing views.

5) Still, it should strike us as a weighty point that the testimony of church history tells more against than for IA in corporate worship. This has to exert a restraining influence on all attempts to defend IA.