PERICHORESIS

The theological research of Emanuel University is developed mainly by The Faculty of Theology and The Brian Griffiths School of Management. The research activity of the Faculty of Theology is carried out by the following departments: The Seminar of Theological Research, The Centre for Reformation Studies, The Centre for Missiological Studies, The Centre for Pastoral Counselling, and the Billy Graham Chair of Evangelism.

Perichoresis is published twice a year at the end of each academic semestre (March and September) by The Faculty of Theology and The Brian Griffiths School of Management in cooperation with colleagues and contributors from abroad. Thus, the ideas expressed in various articles may not represent the formal dogmatic confession of Emanuel University and they should be acknowledged as such.

For permission to reproduce information from *Perichoresis*, please write to the Board of Editors at Universitatea Emanuel din Oradea/Emanuel University of Oradea, Facultatea de Teologie/The Faculty of Theology, Str. Nufărului Nr. 87, 410597 Oradea, Bihor, România/Romania, or to the Managing Editor at perichoresis@emanuel.ro.

Any aspect of the correspondence concerning subscriptions should be addressed to Editura Universității Emanuel/Emanuel University Publishing House, Str. Nufărului Nr. 87, 410597 Oradea, Bihor, România/Romania. You can also contact us by email at perichoresis@emanuel.ro. THE PRICE OF AN ISSUE IS EUR 10, including postage and handling charges.

Contents

The Individualised Eschatology of Richard Hooker (1554-1600)

EGIL GRISLIS

The University of Manitoba

1.

The concern with eternity reverberates throughout Hooker's writings. Yet his concern with death and afterlife was mostly existential and hence individual. Although Hooker did make references to biblical texts that dealt with the Day of Judgment on a world-wide scale,[1] these were not developed into a comprehensive and all-inclusive doctrine. Moored in Scriptures and tradition as well as steadfastly reliant on right reason, Hooker was not carried away by apocalyptic speculations. His central concern remained the death of the individuals and God's judgment on them in afterlife.[2]

Hooker lived and wrote during the reign of Queen Elizabeth I when notable political and religious coherence and order had been achieved. There were, however both past and present events, that were deeply troublesome. Most notably, there was the excommunication of Elizabeth I by Pope Pius V on February 25, 1572 that carried with it the claim that her subjects had been freed from loyalty to her. In 1581 the British Parliament issued a decree: the attempt to convert anyone to Catholicism would be an act of high treason and in punishment the guilty would be "hung, drawn, and quartered", that is, hung until barely conscious, then cut down from the gallows, after that the genitals cut off, then disemboweled, and finally cut in four parts with an axe. These gruesome details are interpreted in some detail by Peter Lake.[3] As the Jesuit missionaries continued to arrive, Elizabeth I regarded them as traitors and executed them accordingly. Among them was the saintly Father Edmund Campion (1540-1581), the most renown martyr. There were also attempts on the life of Elizabeth I, most notably the Babington Plot of 1586 as well as variegated and continuous Puritan challenges. The Great Spanish Armada left Spain on July 12, 1588 but was annihilated by the British navy and several vicious storms. While Hooker did not decide which of these challenges was the very worst, he pointed to their common denominator – the attempt to destroy the present order of the Elizabethan society and the Anglican faith. Hence Hooker began his great work *Of the Lawes of Ecclesiastical Polity* with a courageous confession:

> Though for no other cause, yet for this; that posteritie may know we have not loosely through silence permitted things to passe away as in a dreame, there shall be for mens information extant thus much concerning the present state of the Church of God established amongst us, and their carefull endevour which woulde have upheld the same.[4]

2.

In this complex setting Hooker celebrated the central role of the Christian faith. This meant that as a believer, Hooker took seriously the inevitable death of each individual followed by the subsequent judgment of God. In his own pastoral ministry Hooker had become well acquainted with the complex dimensions of the reality of death. He can also be expected to have preached numerous funeral sermons. Of those only one has survived, entitled *A Remedie Against Sorrow and Feare*, delivered in a funeral Sermon, John 14:27.[5] It is a very thoughtful statement, with almost every word finding its rightful place as it elaborated key theological and pastoral insights.

One, the sermon was intensively existential. It addressed the state of mind of the grieved through carefully chosen quotations from the New Testament. These, however, were not merely recited texts, but a passionate portrayal of the great love of Jesus for His people. Through these quotations, Jesus speaks to the grieving. Initially the sermon begins as a deeply intense address to the disciples. These are "chosen sentences of sweet encouragement".[6] Almost immediately the sermon in a most intensive way turns to the grieving listeners, "Let not your hearts be troubled, nor feare".[7] Such are also the following words of Jesus, "My deare, it is for your own sakes that I leave the world". As Hooker continued to quote the words of Jesus, he briefly interpreted them. It was a remarkably intense weaving of divine love and human affection:

> I know the affections of your hearts are tender but if your love were directed with that advised and staide judgemente which should be in you, my speech of leaving the world and going unto my father would not a little augment your joie. Desolate and comfortlesse I will not leave you, in spirit I am with you to the worlds end, whether I bee present or absent nothing shall ever take you out of these hands [...] where I am, you shalbe. In the meane while My peace give, not as the world giveth, give I unto you, Let not your hearts be troubled, nor feare.[8]

Two, besides being a sensitive pastor, Hooker was also a superb theologian. He well understood that the mere proclamation of the Gospel did not automatically dispel all grief. This is only natural: "Our nature coveteth preservation from things hurtfull".[9] But where such hurt is present, the human heart is heavy and begins to fear. Jesus seeks to assuage both, and speaks to His disciples, "Let not your hearts be troubled" and "feare not".[10]

But is this realistic? In so far as grief was "naturall and therefore simplie not reprovable",[11] Hooker suggested that this depended on the situation, that is, on the cause and the extent of the grief. Thus Christ did not reprove the "naturall compassion"[12] of the women who lamented that He was brought to execution – but their error, was that they should have lamented about their own sins.[13] In addition, we err in protesting about the prosperity of the wicked. Hooker knew that the wicked were not wise and therefore could not be happy despite appearances to the contrary.[14] "They are oftner plagued then we are aware of".[15] Moreover, the judgment of God awaits them. Of course, "the judgements of God doe not alwaies follow crimes as Thunder doth Lightning, but sometimes the space of many ages comming between".[16] The believers also do not know just what future will bring. Hence both the repentant believers and the self-secure unbelievers should fear God's punishment. And what uncertainties there remain during life time there is no uncertainty at the Final Judgment. As shall be noted on several further occasions as well, Hooker did not elaborate on the Final Judgment. Yet he believed in it and regarded as necessary to give it a short but very powerful account even on the occasions of a funeral. Speaking especially of the evil doers, Hooker made the situation dreadfully clear:

> And when their punishment doth come let them make their account in the greatnesse of their sufferings to pay the interest of that respect which hath been given them. Or if they chance to escape cleerly in this world which they seldome do, in the day when the heavens shall shrivell as a scrole and the mountaines move as frighted men out of their places, what Cave shall receive them? what mountaine or rocke shall they get by intreeatie to fall upon them? What covert to hide them from that wrath which they shalbe neither able to abide nor to avoid?"[17]

Apparently there is no doubt in Hooker's mind that the just judgment will be fierce indeed. Yet he offered no detailed account of the pain of these dreadful events. Hell is not often mentioned by name. On one level it may be appropriate to note that the Elizabethan age had seen on numerous occasions how the traitors, as the Jesuit missionaries were designated, had been "hung, drawn, and quartered".[18] It knew what fier punishment be all about. Hooker never even hinted that he was aware of the public acts of such gruesome torture and execution. But Hooker could assume that everyone present at the funeral might very well imagine how horrific a divine punishment would be. Indeed, it may be noted that the power of Hooker's rhetoric lay precisely in not describing the very details of the punishment, as human imagination is far more powerful than any detailed and verbal description could offer. However, there is another level to be taken in account. C. John Sommerville has suggested that in the sixteenth century England secularisation was not merely "an erosion of religious belief." While seeing secularisation, initially, as a loss of religion's social functions, we can also see it as a "refinement or spiritualisation of faith".[19] Without subscribing to Sommerville's thesis' first part, perhaps the

"spiritualisation" in Hooker's situation may be understood on the one hand as his thorough and detailed adherence to classical Christian sources, and on the other hand as drawing on right reason in their interpretation. The primary emphasis on the most intensive love of Christ coupled with right reason, guided Hooker to acknowledge God's judgment, but to bypass the potentially cruel or even sadistic aspects of an all too human description of the Final Judgment.

Three, Hooker regarded as the most dangerous the spiritual responses to one's own suffering. Hooker asked: "The griefe which our owne sufferings doe bring, what temptations have not risen from it?"[20] Here Hooker warned that Satan was well aware of our weakness in suffering and will seek to exploit it for his own benefit. Here Hooker pointed to two distinctive situations, namely "godly griefe" and those with a "conscience of sinne".[21] Hooker counseled to seek consolation in the awareness that Jesus Himself was "consecrated by affliction". When following Him, there will not be a laid out a red carpet before us but sharp "thornes".[22] How to survive in the midst of such tribulations, Hooker pointed to patience. A visible virtue, the call to patience suggested a practical, active response, avoiding extremes: "patience I name that virtue which onely hath power to stay our soules from being over extensively troubled".[23] In this rather concrete vein, Hooker appealed to the example of angels and saints, drawing the observation that the hope of being remembered well by posterity will offer a measure of consolation.[24] Then a brief eulogy followed, consisting of an account of devotion to God and gracious dealing with other people[25]. While this section may be viewed as fully appropriate as it reflects on the life-style of the departed and her high status in community, this is the more traditional part of an Elizabethan funeral sermon Again, a specially vivid attention to Judgment and Hell fire is absent.

Four, with some repetition, Hooker turned his attention to fear, at times caused by sin, yet in life encountered in several settings. With the insight that "feare in it selfe is a thing not sinful,[26] Hooker pointed to God as the creator of nature. In fact, natural fears contribute to human survival, assisting in the avoidance of danger but also awakening from spiritual smugness. Here fear also awakens to seek the presence of God and to fulfill His demands for righteousness.

Five, while insightful, his last several observations nevertheless lacked a real existential fervor. Here we were confronted by the thoughtful scholar rather than by the fiery, arousing pastor. That Hooker was capable of the latter approach, is seen in the moving conclusion of the sermon. In reading it, it is needful to keep in mind that according to Hooker, it is the blossoming of the love of God rather than the explosion of the wrath of God that is central in Christian existence:

> It is nature which teacheth a wise man, in feare to hide himselfe, but grace and faith doth teach him where. Fools care not, where they hide their heads. But where shal a wise man hide himself when he feareth a plague comming? Where should the frighted child hide his head, but in the bosome of his loving father?

Where a Christian, but under the shadow of the wings of Christ his Saviour? Come my people, saith God, in the Prophet Enter into thy Chamber, hide thy selfe, etcetera Esay. 26. But because wee are in danger like chased birds, like Doves that seeke and cannot see the resting holes, that are right before them, therefore our Savior giveth his Disciples these encouragements before hand, that feare might never so amaze them, but that alwaies they might remember, that whatsoever evils at any time did beset them, to him they should still repaire, for comfort, councell, and succour. For their assurance whereof his Peace hee gave them, his peace he left unto them, not such peace as the world offereth, by whom his name is never so much pretended as when deepest treachery is meant, but Peace which passeth all understanding, peace that bringeth with it all happiness, peace that continueth for ever and ever with them that have it. This Peace God the Father grant, for his sonnes sake, unto whom with the holy Ghost, three persons, one eternall, and everliving God be all honor, glorie, and praise, now, and for ever; Amen.[27]

3.

A very powerful sermon on death and salvation, with a specific attention to soteriological issues, Remedie was further supported with several key statements throughout Hooker's writings. These range from discussions of major issues to merely a few marginal comments. Beginning with the latter, we may note that in the *Lawes* Hooker spoke of *life after death* rather briefly, "Our good or evell estate after death dependeth most upon the qualitie of our lives".[28] The qualification "most" is suggestive. While generally Hooker viewed the inheritance of afterlife as the result of the gift of divine grace, accepted by the free choice of the human will, Hooker may not have wanted to exclude God's freedom in ultimate judgment. In other words, in his reflections on predestination Hooker had thought to balance the gift of grace, human freedom in accepting it, and God's final judgment.

Ultimately, Hooker was aware of the impossibility to measure the reality of divine patience. Yet his continuous emphasis on the love of God allowed to hope in faith and in a way discouraged to place rigid moralism as our main standard.[29]

While Hooker acknowledged the reality of *divine judgment and condemnation*, he did not undertake a detailed discussion of it. Hooker also did not describe hell in any specific detail; he was no Dante savoring the detailed tortures of purgatory and hell. That he did not deny the existence of hell emerged only as an afterthought in Hooker's references to God's final, eschatological Judgment. At the same time, several of Hooker's specific concerns throughout his writings were above all with the power of God's love. The reality of judgment and the possibility of condemnation, always carefully acknowledged, nevertheless placed them in some subordination to the love of God.

A characteristic example was the doctrine of *infant baptism.* Following the *Thirty Nine Articles*[30] and the tradition of the Church of England, Hooker accepted infant baptism as a regenerative sacrament. Yet this did

not mean that Hooker was equally willing to accept the condemnation of unbaptized infants. As the Reformation had rejected purgatory and along with it the limbus for unbaptized infants (as a deposit of permanent happiness without, however, the vision of God in heaven), the status of unbaptized infqants became confused. Condemnation of unbaptized infants emerged in several localities, at the same time as the salvation of unbaptized infants was also viewed as a real possibility. Increasingly the latter position became the accepted view.[31] Hooker's positive position represented the actual situation. He had observed correctly that "the judgment of many hath gone hard against them".[32] For his own view that unbaptized infants are saved, he supplied the following reflective theological insights, namely, that (1) "grace is not absolutely tyed unto the sacraments".[33] (2) "Such is the lenitie of God that unto thinges altogether impossible he bindeth no man",[34] God accepts the baptism by desire of others "in stead of the deed it selfe".[35] Hooker's subsequent almost celebrative emphasis on God's grace "whereby of his owne incom- prehensible mercy he thought to save without baptisme", served him to deliver a scathing critique of the Church that through "superfluous scrupulosity" placed almost insurmountable demands in the way of infant baptism.[36]

At the root of Hooker's Erasmian gentleness[37] lay the Augustinian distinction between the *visible and invisible Church.* Now the invisible Church, a "body mysticall", "one" in reality, is partially in heaven and partially on earth.[38] Although "a reall body" that consists of a "huge multitude", it is not discernable by human sense ad truly perceived by God alone. Its position in the eyes of God is unique: "Whatsoever we reade in scripture concerning the endlesse love and the saving mercy, which God sheweth towards his Church: the onely proper subject thereof is this Church".[39] Again, Hooker's boundless celebration of divine love emerges in its full splendor.

As far as the visible Church is concerned, according to Hooker, it is also "one, continued from the first beginning of the world to the last ende".[40] Membership in the visible church is gained by confessing Jesus Christ as Lord and accepting the faith that He had proclaimed. The actual entering takes place by baptism. Although it could be assumed that Hooker had in mind the traditional infant baptism of his Church, he actually pointed to the baptism of the Egyptian eunuch (Acts 8:38) and hence to evangelical believers' baptism.[41] And the membership in the visible Church is proven by the traditional confession of "one Lord, one faith, one baptisme".[42] Those who reject such belief are "aliens and strangers", namely "Saracens, Jewes, and Infidels".[43] Consequently, according to Hooker's conviction, to this visible Church there also belonged the *Roman Catholic Church.* This pleased neither most Protestants nor Catholics. To explain his position, Hooker referred to the Roman Catholic popular and apologetic question to Protestants, formulated with scorn and humor: "they aske us where our Church did lurke, in what cave of the earth it slept for so many hundreds of

yeeres together before the birth of Martin Luther?"[44] Hooker's response was that Luther had not established any new church, but reformed the one and only Church that over the centuries had gone through greater and lesser faithfulness to Jesus Christ.[45] Similar had been the situation in the Church of England.

Such a response indicates something of basic unwillingness to pronounce judgment even on segments of the visible Church. Some of Hooker's considerations were relativistic, such as "Jerusalem is a synfull polluted citye, but Jerusalem compared with Babilon is rightuous".[46] While elaborating several key errors of the Roman Catholic Church, he was not convinced that a mere enumeration of errors served as a sufficient proof for its perdition. Rather, Hooker looked for the condition of the very center and discovered that even "infidells and heathen" cry out for God's "mercye and desire in generall to have theire synnes forgyven them".[47] In other words, not merely in comparison to people even less believing than they, Hooker saw in the quest for mercy and the forgiveness of sins an absolute standard. However small an accomplishment was registered by this standard, it was nevertheless better than the denial of the very "foundacion of faith", where salvation could not be hoped for.

Now in regard to the salvation of Roman Catholics, Hooker continued to make use of various creative arguments. While some of them can be noted, it is clear that Hooker's central hermeneutical presupposition, the guiding light that determined the direction of his argumentation, was his firm belief in the immense love of God. To God's love all things are possible – even a direct denial of the foundation of Christianity. After all, why cannot God's mercy "delyver theire soules from hell!?"[48]

Indeed, "we are apte prone and redy to forsake god but is god as redy to forsake us?"[49] And, while "no man lyveth that synneth not", it is also true that "as pefecte as any do lyve maie syn".[50] Indeed, who among us may judge – except God, who thank God! – judges in mercy, and sometimes embraces us in mercy.

Then there is also the consideration of ancestors – all of them had been Roman Catholics! How can one believe that all of them are now among the damned? Moreover, is it not a fact that "many were there amongste our fathers who being seduced by the common errour of that church never knewe the meaninge of her heresies?"[51] And so Hooker continued. It seems to me that Hooker's greatest ecumenical insight was the recognition that even the pope could be saved. If, generally speaking, the Puritans were regarded as the greatest enemies in the *Lawes*, in the *Tractates and Sermons*, Roman Catholics were the more dangerous opponents. In the *A Learned Discourse on Justification*, Hooker delivered a beautiful statement that for his time was remarkably love-filled. Hooker wrote, rather prophetically, that

The houre maye come when we shal thincke yt a blessed thinge to heare, that yf our synnes were as the synnes of Popes and Cardinalls, the bowells of the mercye

of God are larger. I do not propose unto you a Pope with the neck of an Emperor under his foote, a Cardinall riding his horse to the bridell in the blood of sainctes: but a pope or a Cardinall, sorowfull penitent disrobed, stript not onlie of usuped power, but also delivered and recalled from error; antichrist converted and lying prostrate at the feete of Christe: And shall I think that Christ will spurne at him?[52]

The Archbishop of Canterbury, Rowan Williams, has judiciously summed up that "Richard Hooker believed (injudiciously, in terms of his reputation and career) that Roman Catholics could go to heaven".[53] The Archbishop, of course, has evaluated the situation realistically in political terms. But Hooker looked for truth and for him God's saving love was the ultimate concern, regardless of the cost.

As for *idolaters,* Hooker was outspoken in critique of their errors, and relied on their evaluation in the Book of Leviticus and the example of Moses. In essence, idolatry was "the highest degree of treason against" the Almighty God. Of course, idolatrous reason was a total failure for them that practiced it – they received no "succor", lost all "grace" and in afterlife received "confusion".[54] Yet already in this life the idolaters found themselves under a "dreadful curse".[55] Without a doubt, Hooker took the biblical statements very seriously and hence accepted the reality of the Last Judgment. But Hooker did not revel in this knowledge. Indeed, he knew that the Canaanites had not fared well. However, he understood that as an example, "a fearefull paterne" at that, of God's just displeasure and wrath against all sinfull nations". In other words, the deadly fate of the Caananites made clear that "God thought good to plague and to afflict" all idolaters. At the same time, what happened to the ancient Canaanites was a special event, an example, and "examples have not generallie the force of lawes which all men ought to keepe, but of counels onlie and persuasions".[56] God had not legislated "in what forme and manner we ought to punish the synne of idolatrie in all others".[57] And this, in Hooker's opinion, was reasonable because potentially redemptive. Hooker spoke in love and therefore in hope: "idolators maie be converted and live". Even pagan temples may be transformed into Christian sanctuaries for worship.[58]

Now the *atheists* were something else. Their situation was virtually hopeless. As Hooker saw the situation, there were two types of people who failed to apprehend the reality of God. The first were so underdeveloped "that they hardlie and scarcely seeme to holde the place of humane beinge". Consequently they have "utterlie no knowledge of God".[59] The second have become atheits by personal initiative. In order to be able to forsake all morality, they have rejected all Christian insights. Hooker lamented, "Is it not woonderfull that base desires should so extinguish in men the sense of their owne excellence, as to make them willinge that theire soules should be like to the soules of beastes, mortall and corruptible with their bodies".[60] In Hooker's experience, the conversion to faith of these atheists has been a very rare experience – "Till some admirable or unusuall accident happen (as it hath in some) to worke the beginninge of a bitter alteration in theire

mindes, disputation about the knowledge of God with such kinde of persons commonly prevaileth little".[61] In their perspective, the atheists saw religion as "a mere politique device".[62] Notably among them was Niccolo Machiavelli, the "wise malignantes".[63] And here one could see the tragedy of their lives; "they loose them selves in the very maze of their owne discourses, as if reason did even purposelie forsake them, who of purpose forsake God the author thereof".[64] Ordinarily then, there is no hope for the atheists – they have closed their minds, the ordinary route to God. Thus they steadfastly and perversely reject every divine proffer of grace. Yet even here Hooker did not elaborate the dire punishment in eternity that will await these atheists. But he does not rejoice in their perdition either. As already noted, Richard Hooker was no Dante.

The *infidels* are also outside the visible Church as they "utterlie reject the very principles of Christianity, which heretikes embrace and erre onely by misconstruction".[65] Hooker always believed that in religion error was a grave mistake. At the same time he was convinced that damnation was only for unrepentant sinners who had thoroughly misused their free will and repeatedly rejected the proffer of saving grace. Hooker thought that this dreadful and punitive insight did not need any particular elaboration and defense – except in the case of needing to oppose the Calvinist view of double predestination that had significantly underestimates human free will.[66] In other words, even though often not heeded, in the Elizabethen Age the doctrine of eternal damnation was familiar and theoretically accepted. Hooker also did not question the reality of God's wrath and Final Judgment. Yet in every situation – except in regard to the atheists and the infidels – Hooker looked for the possibility of repentance, hence for hope and salvation. And this was not a platitudinous and irrational hope. With great care, Hooker continued to ask very serious questions, as his methodology was built not only upon reliance on the inspired Word of God, but also on the God-given reason, restored by grace (and often referred to as "right reason"). Scriptures and reason evaluated tradition continuously, sifted through both Christian and pagan sources – and reflected with care. As a thinking Anglican, Hooker put aside those traditional Catholic doctrines that in his view conflicted with Scriptures and right reason. At the same time Hooker was not a rationalist from the not as yet arrived Age of Enlightenment. Therefore in his reflections on death, the afterlife and the Final Judgment, Hooker carefully integrated Scripture, tradition, and right reason, not only as a superb theologian but also as a notable evangelist. In each instance, doctrines were to serve as proffers of grace and thus invitations to salvation.

4.

For Hooker such an approach also meant reconciliation between contenders, in his *Tractates and Sermons* with greater attention to the

Roman Catholic Church and in the *Lawes* the various Puritan movements. He concluded his Preface to the *Lawes* as follows:

> But our trust in the almightie is, that with us contentions are now at their highest floate, and that the day will come (for what cause the despaire is there) when the passions of former enmitie being allaied, we shal with ten times redoubled tokens of our unfainedlie reconciled love, shewe our selves each towards other the same with Joseph and the brethren of Joseph were at the time of their enterview in Aegypt. Our comfortable expectation and most thirstie desire whereof what man soever amongst you shall anie waie helpe to satisfie (as we trulie hope there is no one amongst you but some way or other will) the blessings of the God of peace both in this world and in the world to come, be upon him moe then the stares of the firmament in number.[67]

But the expression of an ecumenical hope was, and remains, a meaningful hope only insofar as it is conjoined with repentance and forgiveness. Hooker thought that this needs to be applied to the doctrine of the Last Judgment as well: it is existentially salvific only in so far it is preceded by the personal repentance to seek mercy in God's Judgment.

In a way it can be regretted that beyond personal repentance and existential encounter with Christ here and with faithful hope for hereafter, Hooker did not spend more time on the Last Judgment. But then, Hooker did not have the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Nag Hammadi Gnostic texts. Therefore for his reading of the apocalyptic materials his resources were somewhat more limited than ours. Of course, Hooker acknowledged the reality of the Last Judgment. But when we compare him with the Luther and Calvin, we may note that while they while reflecting on the Book of Revelation, they did not write a full-length commentary on it. Apocalyptic reflections often became of greater interest for those who were even less able to handle them responsibly and academically. Luther called them the *Schwärmer*; without attention to its German root-meaning, the term has been often translated as "fanatics". Living in an atomic age with memories of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, one really does not need to be even a full fledged *Schwärmer* in order to take the end of this world somewhat seriously. Perhaps the judicious Richard Hooker might have agreed.

Notes

[1] For a broad historical overview, see Andrew Cunnigham and Ole Peter Grell, *The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse: Religion, War, Famine and Death in Reformation Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

[2] Egil Grislis, "The Role of Sin in the Theology of Richard Hooker", *Anglican Theological Review* 84/4 (2002), 881-896.

[3] Peter Lake with Michael Questier, *The Antichrist's Lewd Hat: Protestants, Papists & Players in Post-Reformation England* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2002).

[4] *The Folger Library Edition of The Works of Richard Hooker,* W. Speed Hill, General Editor, subsequently abbreviated as *Lawes and FLE* (Cambridge, MA, USA and London, England: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1977). *A Preface* I.l ; *FLE* 1.1-1:9-13.

[5] *FLE* 5.367. A general appreciation of sermons (v.xxi and v.xxii) and funeral sermons in particular (v.xxv) is recorded in the *Lawes.* A significant modern interpretation is offered by

John K. Stafford, "Sorrow and Solace: Richard Hooker's Remedy for Grief", 131-147, in W. J. Torrance Kirby (ed.), *Richard Hooker and the English Reformation* (Dordrecht, Boston, London: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2003).

[6] Hooker, *Remedie*, *FLE* 5.367.16.

[7] John 14:27.

[8] Hooker, *Remedie*, *FLE* 5.367.4-27.

[9] Hooker, *Remedie*, *FLE* 5.368.5.

[10] Hooker, *Remedie*, *FLE* 5.368.7-9.

[11] Hooker, *Remedie*, *FLE* 5.368.12-13.

[12] Hooker, *Remedie*, *FLE* 5.368.23.

[13] Hooker, *Remedie*, *FLE* 5.368. 27-29.

[14] Hooker, *Remedie*, *FLE* 5.369.22-25.

[15] Hooker, *Remedie*, *FLE* 5.370.5-6.

[16] Hooker, *Remedie*, *FLE* 5.370.18-20.

[17] Hooker, *Remedie*, *FLE* 5.370.22-30.

[18] See Peter Lake, *The Antichrist's Lewd Hat.*

[19] *The Secularization of Early Modern England: From Religious Culture to Religious Faith* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 178.

[20] Hooker, *Remedie*, *FLE* 5.371.10-11.

[21] Hooker, *Remedie*, *FLE* 5.371.12 and 14.

[22] Hooker, *Remedie*, *FLE* 5.371.22-24.

[23] Hooker, *Remedie*, *FLE* 5.372.5-6.

[24] Hooker, *Remedie*, *FLE* 5.372.23-26.

[25] Hooker, *Remedie, FLE* 5.373.7-14.

[26] Hooker, *Remedie*, *FLE* 5.375.8.

[27] Hooker, *Remedie, FLE* 5.377.3-24.

[28] Hooker, *Lawes* V.46.1, *FLE* 2.184.5-6.

[29] Egil Grislis, "Providence, Predestination, and Free Will in Richard Hooker's Theology", 79-95, in W. J. Torrance Kirby (ed.), *Richard Hooker and the English Reformation* (Dordrecht, Boston, London: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2003).

[30] Art. XXVII, *Of baptisme*: "The baptisme of young children (*baptismus paruulorum*), is in any wyse to be retained in the Churche [...]" See G. R. Evans and J. Robert Wright (eds), *The Anglican Tradition: A Handbook of Sources* (London: SPCK and Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1991), 167.

[31] Will Coster, "Tokens of Innocence: Infant Baptism, Death and Burrial in Early Modern England", 266-287, in Bruce Gordon and Peter Marshall (eds), *The Place of the Dead: Death and Remembrance in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

[32] Hooker, *Lawes* V.60.6, *FLE* 2.260.2-3.

[33] Hooker, *Lawes* V.60.6, *FLE* 2.260.3-4. Hooker did not argue that "salvation was not imparted by the sacraments" as claimed by Will Coster, "Tokens of Innocence", 271; that would have been a Zwinglian position. Here Hooker's arguments appeal to the love of God.

[34] Hooker, *Lawes* V.60.6, *FLE* 2.260.4-5.

[35] Hooker, *Lawes* V.60.6, *FLE* 2.260.6-7.

[36] Hooker, *Lawes* V.60.7, *FLE* 2.262.1-5.

[37] Timidly though kindly, covered by an almost brutal sense of humor, Erasmus had affirmed that for the first two centuries the Early Church did not practice infant baptism. See *Erasmus and the Seamless Coat of Jesus: De sarcienda Ecclesiae Concordia (On Restoring the Unity of the Church) With Selections from Letters and Ecclesiastes.* Translations with Introduction and Notes by Raymond Himelick (Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Studies, 1971), 96. Since Hooker evaluated truth by reference to judicious and wise interpreters, the Early Church precedent would not have been binding, but it may nevertheless influenced Hooker's attitude.

[38] Hooker, *Lawes* III.1.2, *FLE* 1.194.27-29.

[39] Hooker, *Lawes* III.1.2, *FLE* 1.195.3-5.

[40] Hooker, *Lawes* III.1.3, *FLE* 1.195.27-98.

[41] Hooker, *Lawes* III.1.6, *FLE* 1.197.23-29.

[42] Hooker, *Lawes* III.1.7, *FLE* 1.198.9.

[43] Hooker, *Lawes* III.1.7, *FLE* 1.198.11-12.
[44] Hooker, *Lawes* III.1.10, *FLE* 1.201.6-8.
[45] Hooker, *Lawes* III.1.10, *FLE* 1.201.8-12.
[46] Hooker, *Justification* 8, *FLE* 5.117.1-2.
[47] Hooker, *Justification* 19, *FLE* 5.126.9-11.
[48] Hooker, *Justification* 20, *FLE* 5.127.26-27.
[49] Hooker, *Justification* 26, *FLE* 5.140.2-3.
[50] Hooker, *Justification* 26, *FLE* 5.141.5-6.
[51] Hooker, *Justification* 20, *FLE* 5.127.29-31.
[52] Hooker, *Justification* 35, *FLE* 5.162.24-164.2. The reference to the emperor under pope's foot recalls the incident at Canossa in 1077 where Emperor Henry IV submitted to the humiliation by Pope Gregory VII (Hildebrand). Luther's view of the Pope as the Antichrist had gained wide but not universal following among Protestants. The reference to a Cardinal riding in the blood of the saints just might be a reference to the St. Bartholomew's massacre in Paris on August 24, 1572.
[53] Rowan Williams, *Anglican Identities* (Cambridge, MA: Cowley Publications, 2003), 24.
[54] Hooker, *Lawes* V.17.2, *FLE* 2.62. 5-12.
[55] Hooker, *Lawes* V.17.2, *FLE* 2.62.16-17.
[56] Hooker, *Lawes* V.17.5, *FLE* 2.63.6-10 and 33-64.2.
[57] Hooker, *Lawes* V.17.4, *FLE* 2.63.9-10.
[58] Hooker, *Lawes* V.17.5, *FLE* 2.64.20-22.
[59] Hooker, *Lawes* V.2.1, *FLE* 2.22.28 and 23.5-6.
[60] Hooker, *Lawes* V.2.1, *FLE* 22.19-22.
[61] Hooker, *Lawes* V.2.1, *FLE* 2.23.22-26.
[62] Hooker, *Lawes* V.2.3, *FLE* 2.25.25.
[63] Hooker, *Lawes* V.222.4, *FLE* 2.26.8.
[64] Hooker, *Lawes* V.2.4, *FLE* 2.26,23-27.
[65] Hooker, *Lawes* III.1.11, *FLE* 1.203.9-11.
[66] Egil Grislis, "Providence, Predestination, and Free Will in Richard Hooker's Theology", 79-95, in W. J. Torrance Kirby (ed.), *Richard Hooker and the English Reformation*.
[67] Hooker, *Lawes* Preface.9.4, *FLE* 1.53.5-15

John Gauden, First Biographer of Richard Hooker: an Influential Failure

DAVID NEELANDS

University of Toronto

Introduction

In publishing the first complete edition of Richard Hooker's *Of the Lawes of Ecclesiasticall Politie* in 1662, Bishop John Gauden also provided the first account of the "Life and Death of Mr. Richard Hooker". This biography was notoriously inadequate and was rapidly replaced by the venerable biography of Izaac Walton, which endured as the only available biography, largely unquestioned until the middle of the twentieth century. Now, through the work of C. J. Sisson, David Novarr, George Edelen and Philip Secor, a biography correcting Walton can be constructed. John Gauden's Life has never been republished. The purpose of this paper is to attempt to investigate the enduring importance of Gauden's biography, now that Walton is discounted.

Although Richard Hooker (1554-1600) has long been one of the most admired stylists of the English language in the sixteenth century, and the most frequently identified theologian of Anglicanism, accounts of his life have been remarkably inadequate. *The Life and Death of Mr. Richard Hooker*, the first biography of Richard Hooker, appeared with the first complete edition of his *Of the Lawes of Ecclesiasticall Politie* [*Lawes*], in 1662.[1] The biographer was John Gauden (1605-1662), newly appointed Bishop of Exeter and editor of the edition. John Gauden is well-known for another composition, *Eikon Basilike*, which purports to be an auto-biographical work of the executed King Charles I, and which is an important contribution to English literature, biography and politics. *Eikon Basilike* was a work of Royalist propaganda composed during the period of the Commonwealth and was so effective that the republican government commissioned John Milton to attack it and its monarchial positions. Gauden's biography of Hooker, however, has been totally supplanted by another commission, this time the very famous biography by Izaak Walton, and is almost unknown. The purpose of this essay is to review the assess-ment implied in this long obscurity, and to ask if it is entirely deserved.

First, it is necessary to give a brief summary of the factual details of the life of Richard Hooker and some testimonies to his importance, as John Gauden conveyed them in 1662, since they are not readily available.

Summary of Gauden's Biography of Richard Hooker

Hooker was born AD 1550, on Southgate Street, Exeter [p. 7].[2] He was the nephew of John Hooker, Chamberlain of Exeter, who contributed "both care and cost" towards his education in the Free School in Exeter [p. 7]. His parents lived contentedly and died in peace, leaving Hooker no hereditary maladies [pp. 7, 8]. By choice, Hooker had few friends [p. 9].

He was educated at the Grammar School in Exeter [p. 9]. He became a student at Oxford [p. 9]. He was, eventually, M.A. and Fellow of Corpus Christi College; he never achieved a B.D. or D.D., although well enough learned. He remained a Fellow of Corpus for seven years [pp. 9, 34, 35]. He remained in a retired mode at Corpus "for some years" before ordination and pastoral appointment, deliberately choosing obscurity [pp. 9-10]. John Jewel and John Reynolds were fellow members of Corpus, but their relationship with Hooker is not stated [pp. 10-11].

Not wishing to overstay at University, Hooker eventually fulfilled his duty of pastoral ministry and accepted, in turn, two "small obscure livings", although he was fitter for "higher and more accurate work". Hooker had no more than one living at a time, and "one or two prebendaries at most", throughout his life [pp. 11, 13, 34]. He remained in two country parishes for eight years, honing his skills there for "his great work" [p. 14]. The first parish was Boscomb, to which he was presented by Corpus Christi College [pp. 11, 12]. In 1584, he left Boscomb "in the West" to take up Drayton Beauchamp in Lincolnshire, "not much better than Boscomb", to which he was presented by a private patron [pp. 11, 12, 35].

Hooker's commitment to his major literary work began when he was alerted by "Non-conformists" pressing "parochial Presbyters and their lay-elders", and then alarmed by a *Supplication* signed by 1.000 ministers [p. 14]. It is uncertain what support Hooker had from eminent persons in writing and publishing his defence of the established polity, but probably Whitgift encouraged Hooker [p. 15] in this project. Hooker responds to "T.C.", at least in Book V of the *Lawes* [p. 23].[3]

Hooker settled at the Temple "one of the Inns of Court" through the agency of Whitgift, on the authority of Queen Elizabeth. The responsibility of the Master "or Guardian" of the Temple was to preach in the forenoon [p. 29]. Mr. Travers was elected ("popularly chosen") by the [legal] Society to be Lecturer in the afternoon [p. 29]. The lawyers were sympathetic to "the Disciplinarian Party" in part because of long-standing jealousy, as practitioners of the Common Law, for the power of the Ecclesiastical courts [p. 29]. In the contests between Hooker and Travers, Travers drew a larger but more vulgar audience. Although Travers was thought to be the better preacher, Hooker's sermons had more substance [pp. 29-30]. The dispute came to the attention of the Queen and her Council. Both Hooker and Travers were brought before the Queen and Council [pp. 30-31]. The root of

their disagreement was based on a difference of opinion with respect to the status of the Church of Rome: Hooker held that the Church of Rome was a true church, though not a pure, sound and perfect one; Travers held that the Church of Rome was no church [p. 30].

Hooker "removed to another place of less envy, and more privacy in Kent" (Bishopsbourne) in 1594, and was also made Prebend of Canterbury. Hooker and Travers respected each other and admired each other more after they were separated [pp. 31, 35]. In 1592, Hooker became Prebendary in Salisbury and Sub-dean [p. 35]. Hooker died before the last three books of the *Lawes* were published, perhaps before they were completed. Unnamed antagonists hoped he had not finished them and would have wished to suppress them, if they had known they were completed [p. 23]. The last three books are clearly of Hooker's authorship, though perhaps not polished [p. 24]. Book VII is in Hooker's handwriting; Book VIII in another hand, corrected in Hooker's hand [p. 26]. Hooker died aged 50, in 1599 [p. 35]. He was never married [p. 35]. His will was not known; a modest estate is assumed [p. 36]. Hooker's body was interred in the chancel of the church at Bishopsbourne [p. 36], and his effigy was erected there in 1634 by Sir William Cowper [p. 36].

Gauden's *Life* was to enjoy only a very brief currency, and Gauden himself was to die within a year. Almost immediately after the biography appeared, Izaac Walton (1593-1683), twelve years Gauden's senior, was recruited to compose a more appropriate and flattering biography, which was printed with Hooker's *Works* in the second edition (1666) and all subsequent editions of the *Works* until the Folger Library Edition (begun in 1977). In addition to being a much-read biography, Walton's *Life of Richard Hooker* is itself an ideological masterpiece, supporting the official viewpoint of the Restoration, as it enforced conformity to Laudian standards of church polity and practice, in exhibiting a saintly learned and "churchy" ideal pastor.

Walton's accuracy was sometimes modestly questioned, as by John Keble in his edition of Hooker's Works in 1836,[4] but no extended criticism was leveled at its details or interpretation until C. J. Sisson, working with material available in the Public Records Office and elsewhere, showed, in 1940, that Walton's biography was based on manifold untruths.[5] In 1958, David Novarr provided a comprehensive treatment of Walton's method and compositional practice, further undermining confidence in the accuracy of Walton's biography.[6] For the critical apparatus of the Folger Library Edition of Hooker's *Works*, George Edelen assembled the hard chronology of Hooker's life.[7] Finally, in 1995, the first modern biography of Hooker, written by Philip Secor, appeared.[8] Now that Walton is thoroughly replaced as a biography, whatever the literary merits of his *Life of Richard Hooker* may continue to be, the accuracy of his nearly forgotten predecessor John Gauden may be assessed. In contrast to what Gauden wrote, the following are now assumed or established as factual details.

Current Assumptions about Richard Hooker Correcting John Gauden's Account

Hooker was born about early April 1554 (not 1550), in Heavytree, just outside Exeter (not inside Exeter). He was indeed educated at Exeter Grammar School, there being no available alternative, probably with considerable support from his uncle, John Hooker. His parents were not unremarkable and ordinary, and not particularly supportive: his father had little to do with Richard Hooker and was absent in Ireland on important public business most of his life after Hooker was born; his mother is and probably was unknown; Richard Hooker was possibly illegitimate. He often experienced bad health.

Hooker did attend Oxford: in Fall 1569, he matriculated at Corpus Christi College. In October 1573, he supplicated BA, was admitted January 1574, and determined early 1574; on 24 December 1573, he was admitted disciple at Corpus Christi College; on 4 February 1577, he supplicated MA, was licensed 29 March 1577, and incorporated later in 1577; on 16 September 1577, he become a Scholar (probationary Fellow) of Corpus Christi College; by September 1578, he was a full Fellow; on 14 July 1579, he was appointed deputy Professor of Hebrew. Hooker was ordained deacon in London, 14 August 1579, that is, while he was still at Corpus Christi College.

Hooker may have had important relations with Jewel, and certainly knew Reynolds. According to Walton and Secor, Hooker visited Jewel in Summer 1571, and received financial support from him; he and Reynolds were expelled together from Corpus Christi College in October 1580.

Hooker's appointment to Boscomb came after his stay at the Temple and was not his first benefice; it was not an insignificant parish, and he was not presented by his college; in July 1591, having been Master of the Temple for six years, Hooker exchanged benefices with Nicholas Baldgay, rector of Boscomb, in Wiltshire, Diocese of Salisbury.

About Drayton Beauchamp, Gauden was more accurate. In October 1584, Hooker was presented by John Cheyne, and appointed to the parish of Drayton Beauchamp in Buckinghamshire, Diocese of Lincoln; on 12 October 1585, Hooker resigned Drayton Beauchamp (he had been Master of the Temple since March).

Hooker was indeed supported by Whitgift: he was identified by Whitgift and clearly assisted by him, as well as by a group of influential persons in and around the household of the wealthy draper John Churchman. All deserved the title "eminent persons".

Gauden's details about the appointment to the Temple are more accurate: on 17 March 1585, Hooker was appointed as Master of the Temple by Letters Patent from the Crown. Gauden's interpretation of Hooker's work and controversy at the Temple are not accurate in detail. His duties were far broader than preaching the morning sermon. Further, divisions at the Temple do not appear to have been based on jealousy between the

practitioners of the Common Law and the officials of the ecclesiastical courts, as Gauden held; this may be a recollection of difficulties in the seventeenth century leading up to the Civil War. There is every reason to accept the fact that Hooker was a less popular preacher than Travers, but it is almost certain that neither Hooker nor Travers was summoned before either Queen or Council. Gauden's story sounds much more like the commotions of the reign of King Charles I in the seventeenth century.

Hooker was indeed appointed to Bishopsbourne in January 1594/5, presented by the Queen. But it was actually to Boscomb and the other appointments in the Diocese of Salisbury (not to Bishopsbourne) that he moved on leaving the Temple in 1591. In July 1591 (not 1592), as rector of Boscomb, he was indeed appointed prebend of Netheravon attached to Salisbury Cathedral.

Richard Hooker died November 2, 1600 (not 1599), aged approximately 47, although his monument gives his age as 50 (and his year of death as 1603). Hooker was married: on 13 February 1588, he married Joan Churchman at St. Augustine's Church, London, the London parish church of the Churchman household; they had at least two sons and three daughters between 1589 and 1597.

Hooker did indeed have a will, which in its own way became the basis of famous litigation, and he left a substantial estate. The will was made 25 October 1600, and was referred to in famous suits in Chancery 1610-1624. Gauden was correct about the place of burial and the monument. In fact, he actually corrected one of his sources, Fuller, who had written that Sir Edwin Sandys, not Sir William Cowper, had erected the monument.

Gauden and his Sources

Even given the challenges Gauden faced in reconstructing Hooker's life, his performance as a factually accurate biographer is not inspiring. In part, this could be attributable to his sources. Gauden had characterized those who had previously written about Hooker as biased, brief, envious and unsympathetic persons [p. 2]. This assessment, however, is not fair to Gauden's known sources, except perhaps for the matter of brevity, whatever other sources if any Gauden may have had.

For Gauden's known sources included the second portion of the Latin *Annals of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* by the venerable William Camden (1551-1623), first published in 1625 and *The Church History of Britain* by Thomas Fuller (1608-1661), first published in 1655. Neither of these sources could be characterized as unsympathetic. Mr. Camden, indeed, praised Hooker for "modesty, temperance, meekness and other virtues" [p. 39], and almost the whole of Camden's brief notice is translated into Gauden's treatise. From Camden, Gauden took not only this praise, but also the erroneous death date of 1599. From Fuller, Gauden took the misinfor-

mation that Hooker died unmarried and the account of the quarrel between Hooker and Travers.

There may be other written sources, but they are not obvious and it might be suspected that Gauden made much of the absence of sources. In any case, neither Camden nor Fuller can be thought of as biased, envious or unsympathetic, although Camden treats only briefly of Hooker, and only in noting his death. And Fuller spends less time on Hooker than on Travers, since Travers was deemed to be of greater interest.

In specifying an erroneous place of birth within Exeter, Gauden referred to a Dr. Vilvain, "an Ancient and Learned Physician in Exeter". Dr. Vilvain was apparently still alive in 1662, which would make him fairly remote from the actual birth of Hooker 108 years earlier, but the strange reference lends an air of credibility and may even have indicated that Gauden had done some primary research in Exeter.

Further, although Gauden was seriously wrong about the timing and means of Hooker's appointment to the parish of Boscomb, Gauden does have correct information about Hooker's degrees, the length of the period Hooker was a Fellow at Corpus (seven years, 1577-1584, although Gauden may have had another period in mind), his appointment to Drayton Beauchamp, the means of his appointment to the Temple, the date and place of his appointment to Bishopsbourne and the approximate date and titles of his appointments in Salisbury. This means that he indeed had other sources not disclosed, but it is hard to identify who his predecessors unsympathetically disposed to Hooker could have been.

Gauden's Obtuseness

Gauden's perspicuity may be gauged by his use of sources known to us: even when the sources were in front of him, Gauden did not interpret them accurately. In summarizing Hooker's writings, for instance, he offers an account of twelve folio pages (over one quarter of his treatise), but the value does not match the attention given to it. Book I, the second longest of the books, is dispatched in half a page that notes the subject of laws and some other details that could be taken from the chapter summaries printed at the beginning. Book II has a much longer summary, emphasizing the appropriateness of the church's power in the details of religion. In defending the freedom of the church to make rules for itself, Hooker is declared to have struck "the right vein" of the body of Non-conformity [p. 20], a blow Gauden interprets as one of Hooker's principal and lasting contributions. Book III, Book IV and Book VIII are summarized briefly; the subject of Book IV sounds more like the subject of Book V. The summary of Book V is longer, but with few indications of knowledge of detail. In the case of Book VI, Gauden appears to summarize only the topics as originally announced, not the book as published. Book VII (which was actually set and inserted by the printers after the type of the rest of the text of the

volume had been set), now published for the first time, gets a longer treatment, but the seven points Gauden makes in his summary appear to be his own apologia for episcopacy and do not relate easily to the book printed. The smaller tractates, which Gauden includes in the edition, are not mentioned at all in Gauden's treatise, with the exception of the possible reference to Travers' *Appeal to the Council* and Hooker's response to Whitgift, which may be the source of Gauden's dubious claim that Hooker and Travers were both summoned to appear before the Queen and her Council.

Thus, whether or not Gauden had extensive sources not known to us, we may make a judgement of his ability by the way in which he introduces and summarizes the material he presents that is known to us.

Gauden's Legacy

For all his mistakes, Gauden's account was not only the stimulus for Walton's famous *Life*; it was also the source for some of Walton's most significant fictions and enhancements. Gauden's first and most important legacy stemmed from his very inadequacy: if it had been a more appropriate biography from the point of view of those now in power, Walton's biography would probably not have been. The appearance of the *Life and Death of Mr. Richard Hooker* precipitated an urgent commission for Izaac Walton, already an old man, quickly to write his *Life of Richard Hooker*. And, although it has become stylish since the work of C. J. Sisson and David Novarr to discount the accuracy of Walton, Walton's Life of Hooker (first published 1665) is a remarkable enough work, and remains well-known, not least for its convincing *apologia* for Restoration ideology.

Walton corrected several of the mistakes in Gauden's history. Indeed, Novarr has argued that it was incumbent on him to go out of his way to seek accurate sources for the details of Hooker's life precisely to discredit Gauden.[9] Walton, for instance, correctly places Hooker's appointment to Boscomb in the period after the Mastership of the Temple. Walton, apparently on the basis of records at Corpus Christi College, establishes a much more accurate account of Hooker's birth and possibly the support of Jewel. In his *History of the Worthies of the Church of England* (published posthumously in 1662), Fuller had corrected his earlier mistakes, copied by Gauden, about Hooker's marital state and the originator of the monument in Bishopsbourne parish church. Walton followed Fuller's correction, but overcorrected Gauden on the marriage: Fuller added the comment in 1662 that Hooker's wife and children "were neither to his comfort, when living, nor credit when dead". Whatever Fuller may have meant, this comment may be a principal source for Walton's fictional calumny about Hooker's spouse, Joan Churchman, exposed by C. J. Sisson – a fiction useful to Walton as casting doubt on the contents of the posthumous three books of Hooker's *Lawes*, which in their published form included views on the

episcopacy and monarchy that had been out of favour in royalist circles since William Laud.

Just possibly Walton owed a considerable debt to Gauden's observations: Gauden had presented Hooker as receiving unsympathetic treatment from previous authors, although it is difficult to find any such. Gauden had acknowledged difficulties in the texts of the last three books of the *Lawes*, although he vouched for Hooker's handwriting in Books VII and VIII [p. 26]; he also expressed the opinion that there were those who had hoped, until their appearance, that they had not been finished, and would have wished to suppress them [p. 23]. It was perhaps only a slight leap for Walton to offer us the account of those who did mutilate them, with the connivance of Hooker's spouse, whose reality had been affirmed by Fuller at the same time as her character had been sullied. As well, it may be from Gauden's reference to Jewel, as a former member of Hooker's college, that Walton developed the account of Jewel offering financial support to Hooker, which is not otherwise documented, except in Walton.

Gauden is almost certainly the author of the strange account of Hooker's blackmail [pp. 32-33]. Gauden claims to have received the "strange narrative" from Fuller, but the story is not in Fuller. In at least three different places, Fuller refers to aspersions cast at Hooker and his character (Fuller, ix, 40, 50, 58) but he does not relay the story told by Gauden, which may be summarized as follows:

Hooker was the subject of scurrilous pamphlets, whose authors also entrapped him in a blackmail plot involving a woman. Hooker paid the blackmail on the spot and later at his lodgings. His friend, Sir Edwin Sandys, shocked at the presence of the blackmailers in Hooker's chamber, eventually discovered the truth, had the blackmailers arrested and interrogated separately. They were convicted and sent to Bridewell prison [pp. 32-33].

In the first part of this story, Gauden may have been thinking of the anonymous authors of *A Christian Letter*, published at the very end of Hooker's life, but the story is, in detail, an extraordinary and an incredible one. Walton, however, did not simply drop it. He summarized it as an embarrassing story, to be told apparently since not to tell it would give it undue credibility. Walton added credibility by indicating that the plot was contrived by a dissenter, whose undisclosed name had been given to Walton; he also added that George Cranmer was involved with Sandys in delivering Hooker from his hour of trial; he added the detail that the accusers begged Hooker's pardon, thus providing a long soliloquy about forgiveness from the Christ-like Hooker; and finally, he added that Hooker sought their judicial pardon, but was unsuccessful in obtaining it (Keble, i, 82-3).

In this "strange narrative" Walton does not give all the embarrassing particulars that Gauden had; but he explicitly compares Hooker with Susannah, another innocent and holy victim of scurrilous lies. Gauden had not mentioned her name, but the source for Walton in Gauden is not far to

seek. Gauden had mentioned that the blackmailers were trapped by being interrogated separately. This is precisely what the Hebrew prophet Daniel had done with Susannah's accusers in the well-known biblical narrative (Susannah, 51-55). Thus Walton apparently saw an opportunity in what was otherwise simply fabulous in Gauden: Hooker becomes the figure of innocence accused, like Susannah (and like Athanasius too, as Walton adds for good measure). More significantly, the figure of a woman duping the innocent Hooker is possible the origin of Walton's story of Mrs. John Churchman and Joan Churchman forcing Hooker into an unwanted marriage.

Perhaps the most interesting possibility of a legacy from Gauden in Walton is a simple reference Gauden made to the attractiveness of Hooker's theological qualities beyond the Reformed household. Gauden referred to the notice of Hooker by Dr. Richard Holdsworth (1590-1649), whom he styles "a Confessor and Martyr in the late Persecution". Gauden then quotes Holdsworth: "*Hookerus magnus ille mysta, quem pro sanctissimo & modestissimo viro nostraequ, doctrine conseis habendum esse, & inter nos Pontificii liberrime fateri non aspernantur*"[10], and gives his own paraphrase: "The very Papists owned Mr. Hooker that profound Divine, to be one of the most Learned, Holy and Modest of those that have asserted the Church of England, and Reformed Religion" [p. 39].

This praise fits in well with Gauden's emphasis on the moderate Reformed Orthodoxy of Hooker, together with his appeal to the broadest range of theological opinion, an emphasis that will be considered later in this essay. But is this not as well a possible, even likely, source of another of Walton's fables? For Walton, in assembling his list of authorities for Hooker's significance, brings in the most unlikely voice, that of the Pope himself, specifically Clement VIII. Here is Walton's story:

> And I have been told more than forty years past, that either Cardinal Allen, or learned Dr. Stapleton (both Englishmen, and in Italy about the time when Hooker's four Books were first printed) meeting with this general frame of them, were desirous to read an author that both the reformed and the learned of their own Romish Church did so much magnify, and therefor caused them to be sent for to Rome; and after reading them, boasted to the Pope, which then was Clement the Eighth "That though he had lately said he never met with an English book whose writer deserved the name of an author; yet there now appeared a wonder to them, and it would be so to his Holiness, if it were in Latin; for a poor obscure English priest had writ four such Books of Laws and Church-Polity, and in a style that expressed such a grave and so humble a majesty, with such clear demonstration of reason, that in all their readings they had not met with any that exceeded them"; and this begot in the Pope an earnest desire that Dr. Stapleton should bring the said four books, and looking on the English read a part of them to him in Latin; which Dr. Stapleton did, to the end of the first book; at the conclusion of which, the Pope spake to this purpose: "There is no learning that this man hath not searcht into; nothing too hard for his understanding: this man indeed deserves the name of an author; his books will get reverence by age, for there is in them such seeds of eternity, that if the

rest be like this, they shall last till the last fire shall consume all learning" (Keble, i, 70-71).

The first four books were published in London in 1593, the fifth in 1597. Clement VIII was pope from 1592-1605. Cardinal Allen died in 1594 and Dr. Stapleton in 1598. Thus the incident could have happened only in the brief period between 1593 and 1598. Walton claims to have heard about it before about 1620. It is not, however, simply the difficulties of the timing of the incident that make it entirely improbable. It is the sheer unlikelihood that the work of a relatively unknown Richard Hooker would be so commended and so attended to.[11] Is it not probable that one of the most famous legends about Hooker, first told apparently in Walton and frequently repeated thereafter, was actually suggested by a relatively innocent remark of John Gauden? David Novarr has shown us that Walton was not above telling a good story that would serve his purpose. And this story is one of his best – one that would likely have been repeated for its effect many times before 1665, if it had been known.

Was Gauden Thoroughly Wrong about Hooker? Gauden's Independent Assessment

Aside from these possible influences on the fictional flights of the much more famous biography of Walton, there is one further note that we should take of Gauden. Gauden, in stressing the importance of Hooker in his time, made clear references to Hooker's moderate position.

For Gauden, Hooker is the enemy of faction [p. 3]; Hooker prophesied the troubles that were to come after him in the seventeenth century "by the inordinate pretensions of some mens opinions and practices" [p. 3]; after Hooker, the church which he defended became the source of its own troubles through its lawless and superficial life [p. 4]; and abandoning Hooker's view, these later churchmen were arrogant, and brought private judgements to their positions of power [p. 5]. Thus, for Gauden, the Presbyterian assault was the just dessert of the Church of England's lawless behaviour [p. 5]. (These opinions must be been particularly abhorrent to the architects of the *Act of Uniformity* of 1662). The Restoration was now about to restore the church's "true liberty" after the horror of revolution, those true liberties of its "former law" so ably defended by Richard Hooker [p. 6].

This strain of Gauden's account was certainly not consistent with the attitude towards the troubles of the previous twenty years of those who ultimately triumphed in the Restoration and the new *Act of Uniformity*, which itself could hardly be termed "true Liberty". It may seem startling for the author of *Eikon Basilike*, the most successful of the Royalist propaganda pieces during the Commonwealth, but the triumph of the Restoration would not be permanent until later in the same year in which

Gauden published his edition. Gauden's position was, however, much more consistent with the attitude previously expressed by Charles II in the *Declaration of Breda* (1660) of a tolerant and inclusive settlement.

It was much also more consonant with John Gauden's own long-term convictions before he had been an exile. Gauden had initially been sympathetic to various initiatives of the Parliamentarians; he was invited to preach before the House of Commons on 29 November 1640. In 1641, he was nominated to the deanery of Bocking in Essex. But he also procured a collation to that position from Archbishop Laud, the legitimate patron, then in the Tower. (This dangerous act hardly suggests a careful trimmer, or an unconditional parliamentary loyalist.) He was chosen as one of the Westminster Assembly of Divines in 1643, but was removed from the Assembly because he was for regulating, not abolishing, the episcopacy. He continued to use the outlawed *Book of Common Prayer* longer in his parish than in any in the neighbourhood, although eventually he acceded to the regulations and abandoned it. From 1645 on, he became progressively disillusioned by the Parliamentary agenda, and began to write critical pamphlets on behalf of the traditional institutions of the Church of England. He was totally opposed to the execution of the King. He was appointed chaplain to King Charles II on his restoration in 1660 and made Bishop of Exeter later that same year. He apparently intended the edition of Hooker's works to be a New Year's Day present for the new King on New Years' Day 1661/2.

Gauden was thus an involved moderate, attempting as long as he could to conform to the Church, opposed to exaggerated claims for its institutions, but loyal to them, and to the King. He was a loyal son of the Church of England as reformed and free to order its life as it saw fit, avoiding the extreme and exaggerated positions of the King's supporters as much as the revolution of the "lawless" Presbyterians who would end the church's liberty. He praised Hooker with feeling on account of Hooker's defence of the liberty of the church to determine its own institutions – not overly dependent on Scripture stretched beyond its purposes, or on the fashions of foreign churches – and called this an attack on the vein of Non-conformity.

This interpretation may be more historically accurate overall than that of Izaac Walton. If some in our time had tried to retrieve the "Protestant Hooker",[12] they may be in the tradition of John Gauden, who could assess Richard Hooker's significance without lifting him from the Church of England in the sixteenth century. Perhaps we can now see Richard Hooker as, indeed, first and foremost, the enemy of faction and the defender of the Church of England's true liberty, both from the constraints of a rigid Bible-based polity and from unquestioned foreign influence, or jurisdiction.

Notes

¹ *The Works of Mr. Richard Hooker* (London, 1662).

² Page references in square brackets in this summary and later in the essay are to the 1662 edition.

³ Gauden does not indicate that he knows that T.C. was the famous Puritan polemicist Thomas Cartwright.

⁴ See, for example, his comments, pages ix to xi in John Keble (ed.), *Works of Richard Hooker*, 8ᵗʰ edn. (Oxford, 1888).

⁵ C. J. Sisson, *The Judicious Marriage of Mr. Hooker and the Birth of The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* (Cambridge, 1940).

⁶ David Novarr, *The Making of Walton's Lives* (Ithaca, New York, 1958).

⁷ Georges Edelen, "A Chronology of Richard Hooker's *Life*", in *The Folger Library Edition Works of Richard Hooker*, vol. 6, part 1 (Binghamton, New York, 1993).

⁸ Philip Secor, *Richard Hooker, Prophet of Anglicanism* (Tunbridge Wells, 1999).

⁹ Novarr, *The Making of Walton's Lives*, 275.

¹⁰ [Literal trans.] "Hooker, that great mystic, whom you agree [*conseis=consentis*?] to be considered a most holy and modest man and of our doctrine, and 'whom' the papists [lit. the men of the Pontiff] do not refuse [*aspernantur*] most freely to admit 'to be' one of us [lit. among us]".

¹¹ Although thirty years later, the circle of men around Viscount Falkland at Great Tew did have a Latin translation of the *Lawes* made apparently to argue for a Christian rapprochement in Europe. See Hugh Trevor-Roper, *Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans* (Chicago, 1988), 191-7. Perhaps Walton had this episode in mind as well.

¹² See for example, Nigel Atkinson, *Richard Hooker and the Authority of Scripture, Tradition and Reason* (Carlisle, 1997) and W. J. Torrance Kirby, *Richard Hooker's Doctrine of the Royal Supremacy* (Leiden, 1990).

The Non-Verbal Illustration: Mcluhan, Postman, and the Emerging Preacher

STEVEN W. SMITH

Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

Emerging Church thinkers generally advocate the multi-sensory, non-verbal, mediated in preaching, or even in lieu of preaching as oral communication. This paper will show a multi-sensory driven preaching theory found in emerging church literature, analyzing it with the thought of communication theorist Marshal Mcluhan, and cultural critic Neil Postman.

The Emerging Church represents a movement to integrate the influence of the early church to the 20 something generation. Perhaps most notable for homilticians is that thinkers within the movement have modified, and in some cases redefined, preaching. No where is this more obvious than in the use of the non-verbal in preaching. In a recent interview with Homiletics, Sally Morgenthaler offered a prophetic summation of Emerging Church thought on the subject:

> *Homiletics*: Since we've moved into a visual culture, and the arts have become a new language, how does that impact preaching? How does preaching fit into this new emerging matrix? Is preaching losing center stage, or do we need to adapt this presentation to the new emerging reality?
> *SJM*: Preaching is definitely transitioning. It has to. It's not that preaching is moving from center stage, it's that preaching now occurs not just from the pulpit but also from and through the music and video. If the preaching role is changing, and becoming embedded in different forms, then we've got to deal with the pastor's role. The pastor's role is that of one artist in a planning community and this is an exciting move, but it is also a hard move for many pastors. (Morgenthaler, www.sacrimintis.org)

Since preaching is a theological activity, one may appropriately ask whether the change in the mode of preaching has implications on the theology that is presented by the preaching, and the theology which is driving the preaching. Thus a theological analysis of Emerging Church preaching would be warranted. However, to posit that the means of communication (in this case more non-verbal communication) is somehow affecting the content of the message communicated, it would be advantageous to instead turn to communication theorists who have thought and published widely in this area. To that end, the purpose of this paper will be to analyze the homiletic

theory of Emerging Church thinkers in light of communication theorist Marshall Mcluhan, and cultural critic Neil Postman. First, the paper will begin with a sampling of Emerging Church thought on preaching. Secondly, there will be a brief introduction to the thought of Mcluhan and Postman. Thirdly, this will be followed by rhetorical criticism of Emerging Church thinkers using the thought of the two theorists. Finally, a conclusion will offer summation and potential challenges which emerging church thinkers must address.

Toward a Homiletic Theory of the Emerging Church

In the above quote Morgenthaler notes that the preaching role is changing. The implication is that the preacher is no longer a oratorical stylist, but rather "[...] one artist in a planning community" (Morgenthaler, www.sacramentis.com). This idea seems inviting to those whose passion is to effectively communicate the Gospel to a culture whose primary means of learning is visual. After a brief look at the Emerging Church as a movement, this section will examine Emerging Church thought on preaching in general, and Emerging Church thought on non-verbal communication specifically.

Identifying Emerging Church Worship

In a recent article on and Emerging Church gathering in Nashville, *The Tennessean* described emerging Christians as

> Christians who are impatient with rigid megachurch formulas and noisy doctrinal in-fighting. They want to nurture a "vintage Christianity" that promotes the love of Christ for the emerging (non-churchgoing) generation. They're hammering out a theology that's friendly to ancient faith practices (contemplative prayer, labyrinths, hospitality) in a postmodern world of quantum physics, 24/7 media and coffee-house culture. (www.gallatinnews-examiner.com)

Perhaps the most organized and salient writers for the movement can be found at www.emergentvillage.com. They define emergent as "[...] a growing generative friendship among missional Christian leaders seeking to love our world in the Spirit of Jesus Christ" (www.emergentvillage.com). While this is about as vague as a politician on the first Monday in September, for our purposes it is enough to know emergents seek to capture an authentic faith through a worship experience that values postmodern authenticity and ancient faith.

It is interesting to note that two of the Emerging Church's seminal thinkers, Dan Kimball and Sally Morgenthaler both had negative experiences with "seeker" churches. They found the lack of religious symbol, imagery, and conversation disconcerting. Morgenthaler confessed

that she "[...] began to seriously question the whole 'church lite' paradigm" (Morgenthaler, www.sacramentis.com). This is significant in that many thinkers in the Emerging Church are wholly committed to reconnecting the church to its ancient roots. Thus while the seeker church's reaction to a disconnected mainline church was to present something inviting to seekers, the emergent reaction a perceived blandness of the seeker service is to offer something that is above all authentic. The seeker movement witnesses irrelevance in the main line denominations and decides to be relevant, while Emerging Church leaders can not find sacred in the seeker movement and decide to be overtly religious. To mix metaphors, the pendulum has swung full circle.

To accomplish the goal of reaching a visually driven postmodern culture, they fully integrate the arts into their worship. Since this paper is not interested in the movement, but the preaching in the worship of the movement, it only needs to be said that emergent worship seeks to combine the postmodern artistic sensiblities of a younger culture with the ancient roots of the faith.

Since this is a movement rooted in the idea of reaching those with a postmodern bent, it stands to reason that emerging preaching would engage the postmodern individual on their terms. Toward that end many Emerging Church thinkers feel that the sun has set on the idea of the preacher as the classical orator.

The Passing of the Pulpitier

Anyone paying attention the last twenty years witnessed a shift in the style preaching. Evangelical pulpits, especially those targeting younger seekers, have shifted away from the style of the classic orator whose words hold the audience spellbound. In some churches the pastor is more of a storyteller, a motivator, or a business presentation-maker complete with a fast moving PowerPoint presentation. Those who found this trend disconcerting will be refreshed by what some Emerging Church leaders are saying. One example is worth noting.

In the landmark book The Emerging Church, Dan Kimball begins his discussion of preaching by saying,

> Before we continue this discussion of preaching to emerging generations, let me clarify my assumptions: 1. That you will prayerfully study and exegete the Scriptures to accurately communicate their meaning. More than ever, we need to "correctly handle the word of truth" (2 Tim. 2:15), 2. That when you preach, Jesus will be the ultimate focus of your sermons, and that you will not just be giving information about him but also tell people how to relate to and experience Jesus as his disciples (John 5:39), 3. That no matter what preaching style or method you may use, your goal is to see listener's lives change so they can truly be ambassadors for Jesus (2 Cor. 5:20) and messengers of kingdom living. (Kimball, 2003, 174).

Those insisting that message be driven by an exposition of a text would find this refreshing, and find the following invigorating. In a section on message selection Kimball gives Emerging Church preachers the following admonitions:

> All preaching should somehow teach on kingdom living as a disciple of Jesus.
> Regularly preach and teach about the triune God.
> Regularly teach what it means that Jesus is the only way to God.
> Address human sexuality regularly.
> (Emphasize) redefining marriage and family to new generations.
> Teach on hell more than ever.
> Teach the trustworthiness of Scripture.
> Regularly preach and teach how our spirituality will be messy. (Kimball, 2003, 182)

As a further statement of his commitment to preaching, Kimball asserts that "Preaching is more important and holier than ever as we exercise the sacred privilege of opening the Scriptures and teaching the divine story of God to people who are hearing it for the very first time" (Kimball, 2003, 182). Morgenthaler noted that,

> Preaching in the past 20 years has focused too much on the pragmatic, so much so that we've really lost out on the narrative concerning God himself. We really thought if we gave people a list of things to do, they would become better people, not understanding that when Jesus dealt with people it was about who God is and how God works and he showed us how we fit in the story. Evangelicals too often complain about mainliner cerebral worship, but they've done the same thing: it's just that our presuppositions are from the therapeutic community and not the theological community. We've turned our services into motivational seminars: how to manage our money, how to be good parents, and so on. The goal of so much of contemporary worship has been to make us feel good about ourselves, to rid ourselves of any negative emotion after all, we are all happy here, and so we clap ourselves silly, and we sing in a major key. (Morgenthaler, www.sacramentis.com)

Thus to assert that all Emerging Church thinkers are eliminating the pulpit in worship would be a underassessment of the movement. However, it would be an equally large overstatement to say that Emerging Church thinkers are advocating preaching as it has been traditional understood as oral communication. For some indeed the pulpit is perhaps a bit passé.

The argument is that traditional preaching is driven by a modern philosophical bent toward linear thinking. However this is not how people come to belief today. Thus, a new epistemology demands another form of communication. In "Does Preaching have a Future in the Emerging Church", an unpublished research project, Jason Clark, leader of Emergent UK, gives a summary of the problem when he writes,

> Preaching needs to be radically and fundamentally re-imagined and re-purposed for a post-modern culture. If the modern church basis for preaching was to

transmit propositions to hearers for providing answers, preaching in the post-modern context becomes something very different. We must move away from the preacher as the enlightened person separate from those being spoken to. Instead, preaching becomes a connection and dialogue. Scripture is not something to be dissected by monologue, but something to be in conversation with communally. (Clark, 2005)

One of the answers Clark asserts is a post-modern hermeneutic, which among other things is more image based. The argument is that post-moderns do not embrace what they are told, rather they embrace what they experience. Thus some emergent churches have abandoned preaching all together, in favor of "shared learning experiences". Others have kept preaching marginally, being heavily supplemented with non-verbal mediated communication, and others some type of combination of the two poles.

The emergent movement is indeed reactionary (however "The Reacting Church" seems less inviting). It is a movement of post-conservatives and post-liberals, who, tired of the form of traditional and seeker churches, are looking for the roots of their faith in ancient and future expressions. In terms of preaching, there is a degree of rejection of a modern propositional homiletic, and a move toward experiencing truth. Thus for some emerging preachers, the sermon is dispensable, however the use non-verbal mediated communication is not.

The Medium is the Massage

Marshal Mcluhan

When Marshall Mcluhan wrote his landmark Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man he was predicting a wired world. A virtual world transposed over a rotting physical world. In a restated popular version of that work, *The Medium is the Massage*, Mcluhan asserted that,

> The circuited city of the future will not be the huge hunk of concentrated real estate created by the railway. It will take on a totally new meaning under conditions of very rapid movement. It will be an information megalopolis. (Mcluhan, 1967, 72)

Replace the word "city" for the word "church" and one has the sense of the emergent church. Mcluhan was the prophet of a coming global village whose streets were the wired communication that would come. A virtual city (no walls) would replace the geographical city. In the same way the emerging church, at least as a movement, has attempted to be a movement that exists in space and time but not place. There is almost a value in being a non-movement. It is in this embracing of the need for a present reality that Mcluhan and the emerging church leaders share common ground.

Mcluhan's most popular assertion was that the media itself has more impact on culture than the content which it is mediating. Thus the media should be the object of study, and thus "The medium is the message". The idea is that the medium in which a message is presented is itself a message. Intuitively one understands this. A novel is a different thing all together when told on a stage in the form of a play. A play is all together different in the form of a big screen movie, and a movie all together different than a television drama. Mcluhan would argue that not only did the medium change, but so did the content. This is not an example of a drama told four different ways, rather it is four different stories all together. The medium "spoke" so loudly that it became a part of the story. Over time, the medium of communication actually effects cognition.

The immediate application is to the Gospel presentation itself. If Mcluhan is right, then the Gospel is itself different when presented in different mediums. Or at least the medium of presentation causes the recipient to think differently about the Gospel. It is at this point that Neil Postman is insightful.

Neil Postman

Postman was a cultural critic who took the academic thought of Mcluhan and deftly applied it to American culture in Amusing Ourselves to Death. Postman bemoans the passing of the age of expositional thought in America which has been replaced with the age of entertainment. In other words to show how "[...] under the governance of the printing press, discourse in America was different from what it is now – generally coherent, serious and rational; and then how, under the governance of television, it has become shriveled and absurd" (Postman, 1985, 16). The purpose of bringing Postman into the conversation is his insightful look television as a medium for Christianity.

In an effort to understand televised Christianity Postman, watches forty-two hours of religious programming, after which he reaches two conclusions: 1. Televised religion, like all things televised is presented as entertainment, and 2. "[...] This fact has more to do with the bias of television than with the deficiencies of these electronic preachers". (Postman, 1985, 117).

He concludes that televised Christianity is not like real Christianity at all. "I believe I am not mistaken in saying that Christianity is a demanding and serious religion, When it is delivered as easy and amusing, it is another kind of religion all together" (Postman, 1985 117). Borrowing a page from Mcluhan he again observes that this reality does not have to do directly with the preachers themselves, but rather the medium in which they work. In this sense, Postman extends the work of Mcluhan to Christianity and asserts that it is naïve to assume that one can change the medium of the Gospel message without altering its message.

Summary

In sumb Mcluhan broadly believes that media effects cognition. Postman, applying this thought to television, would argue that the cognitive behavior of a generation has already been shaped by television viewing. Thus, both Mcluhan and Postman are media determinist in that they believe that the media, not just the message, can determine thinking and behavior. Thus, the media itself can have a negative effect on the way Christianity is practiced and understood. What remains is to let this thought speak to the emerging church.

The Question for the Emerging Merger

In a sense Emerging Church thinkers have merged media determinists who say the medium of communication effects cognition, with the historic roots of the Christian faith. One can not help but applaud the desire for a faith that is more serious, more sobering, more like faith itself. Yet, as will be developed below, there seems to be an unanswered question in this merger.

In Emerging Church preaching there is a heavy dependence on the non-verbal. This use of the multi-sensory in worship moves beyond using the non-verbal to illustrate a point. Rather, the non-verbal is the message. In other words, the emphasis is not on hearing the truth, but on experiencing the truth.

The New Testament gives a small record of what early church worship was like; church history, a still smaller picture of early church worship. And, it seems important to distinguish between what worship activities were limited to one time, i. e. the Day of Pentecost; those things for which there is a precedent but are not necessarily normative (earthquakes in jail, the appearance of angels); and those things which are normative for Christian worship: singing, prayer, apostle's doctrine, communion, fellowship. So there are some worship activities, some practices which are clear. Among these very clear practices was the teaching of Christian doctrine. This mandate to pass on doctrine seems especially clear from the Pastoral Epistles. There are multiple examples but three will suffice here,

> For the overseer must be [...] holding fast the faithful word which is in accordance with the teaching, so that he will be able both to exhort in sound doctrine and to refute those who contradict (Titus 1:7, 9), "Give attention to the public reading of Scripture, to exhortation and teaching" (1 Timothy 4:13), "All Scripture is inspired by God and profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for training in righteousness; so that the man of God may be adequate for every good work. I solemnly charge you in the presence of God and of Christ Jesus, who is to judge the living and the dead, and by His appearing and His kingdom: preach the word; be ready in season and out of season; rebuke, exhort, with great patience and instruction (2 Timothy 3:16).

So, it is easy to argue that the preacher has a primary task of preserving revealed truth. Also, whatever sermons are preached must be explicitly faithful to the revealed truth. Broadly speaking, every preacher is expositional in that he is "ex-ing" out the posit of truth in the text. Therefore, any communication, verbal or non-verbal, must expose people to revealed truth, and in itself be a faithful exposition of Scripture. So the question all preachers, especially those in the emerging church must answer is, "Is my non-verbal communication a faithful explanation of revealed truth?"

Emerging church discussions about the way congregants receive messages generally revolve around their understanding of the truth based upon how they receive information, i. e. epistemology. Homileticians often assume that knowing comes through the reception of proclamation, whereas some Emerging Church thinkers would say that the postmodern individual's epistemology demands that knowing come through experiencing.

Mcluhan, I believe, would say the discussion is slightly off. Yes, the medium is important, but not because of a foundationalist/postfoundationalist, or modern/post-modern epistemology. Rather the mediums are important in what they themselves say about the message, in this case the Gospel message. The message is the medium. Therefore if the preacher accepts that his responsibility is to expose people to revealed truth, then he must ask whether his method itself is expositional. Interestingly, this seems to be the thrust of the entire book of Titus – the message of the preacher's life must run congruent with the message. At least, therefore, the manner of preaching, experiencing, storying, or facilitating should itself be a theologically informed exposition of the text.

The same question posed another way would be, "Is my sermon, non-verbal or verbal saying about God what God says about God, the way God says it?" One example will suffice. An emerging church pastor allowed his congregation to sit in individual circles, each with a colored ball of yarn. As they discussed the topic they would hold one place in the yarn, and then throw the yarn to another participant with whom they connected. At the end of the discussion, the congregants saw a multicolored circle before them. The preacher then noted that this was like unity in that all of the variant opinions and thoughts connected with each other. To some, this would seem like a wonderful visual for unity. However this seems to be different from what Paul is saying about unity in Ephesians 4, namely that because of God's nature we are to do the hard work of rallying ourselves around revealed truth as presented from pastor-teachers. That concept however is very possibly impossible to explain using primarily non-verbal communication. For that matter, aren't most theological concepts? There is yet to be a non-verbal illustration that could clearly posit the nuances of the atonement, or regeneration, or the incarnation, or the trinity, or the host of other theological/biblical concepts unless they are buttressed with some plain verbal explanation.

Summary and Conclusion

In this paper it has been noted that emergent church thinkers/practitioners assert that individuals in a postmodern hermeneutic must experience the truth as much, if not at more than hear the truth. To facilitate this experience, some opt for no sermon, others call for a non-verbal mediated driven sermon. With a brief look at Mcluhan and Postman, it was noted that these thinkers, in the vein of media determinism, believe that the media can actually affect cognition. Thus, on one level it seems that Emerging Church thinkers have embraced a media that best adapts to the proposed cognitive processes of a postmodern epistemology in a techno-logical age. What remains at question is whether the media itself is a faithful exposition of revealed truth, a question that must be answered affirmatively if the Emerging Church thinker is to be consistent in claiming that their future faith is indeed ancient. The following conclusion will first illustrate how certain church traditions have adapted to the changing culture.

The culture has indeed changed. There is a decrease in morality and interest in biblical Christianity, while there is an exponential increase in the use of non-verbal media to communicate in out culture. While homileticians may tire of hearing it is still true that "The arts have become the language of the culture – we now live in a visually stimulated culture." Evangelicals who want to use non-verbal communication often look at the non-verbal in preaching like a calf looking at a new gate. Others have looked at the arts as a gate to let in the more visually driven calves. Postman speaks to all of the traditions when he writes,

> Most Americans, including preachers, have difficulty accepting the truth, if they think about it at all, that not all forms of discourse can be converted from one medium to another. It is naïve to suppose that something that has been expressed in one form can be expressed in another without significantly changing its meaning, texture or value. (Postman, 1985, 117)

In fact the naïve, undiscerning calf becomes veal, unable to lead others with discernment. It is to this naivety to which these final thoughts are addressed.

The Traditional Evangelical Response

In some traditional evangelical churches there has been reticence to change anything in worship, especially the use of mediated communication. The methodology itself is sacrosanct, learning styles are ignored completely. This manifests itself in the refusal to project words on screens, or acknowledge any other forms of communication in worship. It would seem that this radical approach is somewhat naïve of the culture.

The Seeker Approach Response

Some churches billed as seeker friendly have uncritically embraced all forms of technology. The service may appear professional and technologically adept. The idea is that if we change the method, but keep the message, we can show the relevance of the Gospel message. However, if the media cannot be separated from the content of the message, this approach is also naïve in that it underestimates the power of the method to become the message. It is possible in this scenario for the message of the Gospel to only barely be heard over the mediums in which it is presented.

The Emergent Church Response

Emergent Church leaders, acknowledging the above implications, strive for authenticity in communication which acknowledges the culture. Simultaneously they strive for some ancient forms which acknowledge Christian roots. Thus, they tend to be highly multi-sensory (what the postmodern culture demands), but will mediate the faith in an ancient way (what the ancient narrative of the faith demands).

In this way, they are perhaps naïve about the power of the spoken word. It is granted that there is not a specific formulaic methodology in the New Testament regarding preaching. The author would argue for a model of exposition book by book , but would concede, as any honest homiltician would, that this is a theologically-driven methodology more than an explicit command from the Pastoral Epistles. On the other hand, some go so far to say that the form of propositional exposition of Scripture is not valid because this is more a reflection of Greco-Roman rhetoric than it is the form of the early church. However, this makes two assumptions. First, this assumes that the Greco-Roman form of rhetoric is ineffective. Could not one effectively argue that, considering the timing of its development, the reason God allowed the Greeks to develop rhetoric was for the propagation of the Gospel?

Second there is the assumption that the non-verbal is more effective at communicating than the verbal. Some Emerging Church thinkers use "non-verbal" synonymously with "experiential". Their emphasis follows their epistemology. However, listening is also an experience. And, since the verbal is clearly what Paul had in mind in the pastorals quoted above, there needs to be a strong rationale for moving away from it totally. It is hard to argue that truly ancient/future worship would not include the proclamation of Scripture.

In other words, Emerging Church thinkers seem to be media determinists in that they believe that the content of the message must be shaped by its medium. Yet in this practice, the medium of the communication has become a strong message itself, and perhaps at times the volume of the medium is louder than the message. One could then ask if preachers have the freedom to change the medium so radically from that of

the New Testament church. Of course this is essentially the argument Emerging Church thinkers use to be critical of expositional, propositional, foundationalist preaching. Still, it is difficult to argue that a non-verbal emphasis in worship is the heart of the New Testament church. In that way the Emerging Church thinkers have changed the medium significantly from that of the New Testament church. The question is, has the message changed as well.

Appendix

The use of Non-Verbal Mediated Communication in Worship

All those who use non-verbal mediated communication in preaching should consider the implications of their use. The following list is influenced by a discussion of the emerging Church, however these are thoughts for the use of media in worship.

1. If we want to be a Christocentric church, we must be biblical.

2. If we are biblical, we must be honest about what the text says.

3. If we are honest about the text, then all we do should reflect the text. Thus, all non-verbal communication must say what the text says, the way the text says it.

4. Any non-verbal must pass the Titus test. Does this support truth that will protect sheep?
   (a) Entertainment does not do this. Some use mediated arts in the worship as a form of entertainment alone with no relationship to a revealed truth to be communicated;
   (b) Connecting with them alone does not do this. Some want to use mediated communication as a way to connect with the audience. This however is never a stated goal of preaching Scripture. Connecting with people is a worthy goal in so much as it accomplishes the larger goal of drawing people into the text.

5. Any form of communication that distracts from the text does not meet the mandate of exalting the revealed truth, and thus knowing the God of the Scripture.

This paper was presented to the Evangelical Homiletics Society, St. Louis, Missouri, Fall 2005.

Orthodox Ecclesiology:
The Temple of the Spirit

PAUL NEGRUȚ

Emanuel University of Oradea

Introduction

Speaking about the Holy Spirit, Bobrinskoy contends that "throughout the two thousand years of its tradition, the Orthodox Church has been deeply conscious of the fact that the coming of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost inaugurates a new time for the whole humanity and cosmic history. From Pentecost on, the church, and with it the whole creation, has been experiencing the pains of childbirth until Christ is formed in each one of us, the single humanity is restored and the universe becomes, in Him, by a Christological cosmology, the Body of Christ".[1]

Orthodox theologians argue that their theology has been more "Spirit-sensitive" than Western theologies. In fact, Orthodoxy believes that the Holy Spirit is the life of the Church[2].

Historical Background

The mystical theology of the Orthodox Church is not primarily concerned with positive theological definition, but with the mystical experience of union with God. Eastern Orthodoxy understands salvation in terms of deliverance from mortality and corruption for life everlasting.

Therefore, the doctrine of salvation is not focused on sin and guilt, but focuses rather on progressive appropriation of the divine energies, culminating in deification (*theosis*)[3]. Deification means participation in the life of the triune God. It is the work of the Holy Spirit, however, to impart the divine energies to humans and to the whole creation through the Church. When it comes to ecclesiology, Orthodoxy speaks about their church as being founded on a twofold divine economy: the work of Christ and the work of the Holy Spirit. Thus, the cristological ecclesiology if Ignatius[4] and the pneumatological ecclesiology of Irenaeus[5] are being brought together. The Church is both the Body of Christ and the Temple of the Spirit. Ware argues that the Orthodox Church, "is not only hierarchical, it is Charismatic and Pentecostal. The Holy Spirit is poured out upon all God's people. In the Apostolic Church, besides the institutional ministry conferred by the laying

on of hands, there were other charismata or gifts conferred directly by the Spirit".[6]

The Spirit and the Institution

The view that the Church as communion is instituted by Christ and constituted by the Spirit has, according to Zizioulas, significant consequences for ecclesiology:

> The *institution* is something presented to us as a fact, more or less a *fait accompli*. As such, it is a provocation to our freedom. The "con-situation" is something that involves us in its very being, something that we accept freely, because we take part in its very emergence. Authority in the first case is something imposed on us, whereas in the latter it is something that springs from amongst us. If pneumatology is assigned a constitutive role in ecclesiology, the entire issue of *Amt und Geist*, or of "institutionalism", is affected. The notion of communion must be made to apply to the very ontology of the ecclesial institutions, not to their dynamism and efficacy alone.[7]

However, Zizioulas affirms that the actual situation in Orthodoxy, "both theologically and canonically no longer does full justice to the tradition of which [his] exposé has been a reflection".[8] Consequently, we turn now to examine the actual relation between the Spirit and the institution in contemporary Orthodoxy.

Charismatic Institution

Patterned after the monarchical model of the Trinity,[9] the Orthodox Church is a hierarchical Church.[10] As Hopko puts it: "the church is rather a monarchical, patriarchal and hierarchical community in imitation of the Trinity".[11] However, since this hierarchical structure of the Church is pneumatically constituted, Ware argues that it is not a dead institution but a charismatic body.[12] The bishop is not only appointed by God to be the monarch of his own diocese, but he also receives a special charisma from the Holy Spirit to be the teacher of the faith and the president of the eucharistic assembly.[13] Moreover, since the Spirit is poured out on all God's people in baptism and chrismation the lay state should be considered charismatic: "a royal priesthood" which could be understood as ordination, although, only in a limited sense of the word.[14]

It follows, then, that within Orthodoxy the institutional and charismatic spheres are not in opposition, but actually coincide. However, this raises the question concerning both the origin and the modus operandi of this model of "two-tier priesthood": the sacramental (bishop, priest, deacon) and the universal (laity).[15]

"Two-Tier" Priesthood

Stăniloae argues that the origin of this model is not socio-historical, but theological, that is, from the very beginning of the Church the sacramental priesthood was necessary in order both to mediate in a visible way Christ's invisible ministry as king, prophet and priest, and to point toward the otherness of Christ in His relationship with the believers.[16] Similarly, the official teaching of Romanian Orthodoxy affirms that the christological and pneumatological origin of hierarchy is clearly recorded in Scripture.[17] The biblical "proof-texts" put forward are: the Holy Orders were instituted by Christ after His resurrection when he gave His Spirit (John 20:21-23) to the Apostles and sent them to proclaim the Gospel to the whole world (Matt. 28:18-20; Mark 16:15-16; Luke 24:47-48); the institution of hierarchy was constituted by the Holy Spirit at Pentecost (Acts 2:1-4, 37-42); the hierarchy (bishop, priest and deacon) were endowed with the power of the Holy Spirit for the authoritative preaching of the Word (Matt. 28:19; Mark 16:15; 2 Tim. 2:15), the administration of the holy sacraments (Matt 28:19; Mark 16:16), and for leadership (Matt. 28:20; Acts 20:28; 1 Tim. 4:16). Thus the threefold ministry (prophetic, priestly, and kingly) of the invisible High Priest continues in the Church with the same authority through the visible ministry of the hierarchy. Further, the apostles continued the practice of the sacramental priesthood in its threefold structure (John 20:21-23; Acts 6:3, 5-6; 20:28; Phil. 1:1; 1 Tim. 3:1-7, 8-12; 4:14; 5:17-22; 2 Tim. 1:6; Tit. 1:5, 7; 1 Pet. 5:1-2,5; James 5:14).

Theologically, the mystery of the Holy Orders, particularly that of the bishop is the condition and the source of the other sacraments (mysteries) although it cannot be separated from them.[18] Therefore, concludes Radu, since laity cannot administer the sacraments, it follows that the Church as a sacramental community cannot exist without hierarchy (bishop, priest and deacon).[19] However, the Romanian approach is in striking contradiction with Bulgakov's view, who argues that,

> It is impossible to state, historically, the place, the time and the manner of the institution by the Apostles of the hierarchy in its present form, that is in the three orders: bishops presbyters, deacons. The documents of the beginning of the first century are silent on this point. Or indeed, if we find suggestions about the hieratic dignities it is evident that the orders there have another meaning than that of day, or that the distinction and the correlation between the three degrees, very clear today, at that time lacked precision (Acts 20:17, 28; Titus 1:5-7; 1 Tim. 2:5, 7; 1 Peter 5:1-5).[20]

Yet, Bulgakov does not question the Orthodox presupposition concerning the apostolicity of the Church's hierarchy, but affirms that it developed gradually during the second century as a result of the interplay between the Old Testament priesthood and the apostolic succession.[21]

The difference between Bulgakov who argues that the early church had only a "germ" of hierarchical structure and the Romanian view which asserts

that from the very beginning the Church had a fully developed hierarchy (bishop, priest, deacon) demonstrates not only the disagreements within Orthodoxy concerning this issue, but also the constant appeal by Romanian Orthodoxy to the authority of Scripture as a result of its encounter with the evangelical movement which emerged from the work of the three Romanian Orthodox priests: D. Cornilescu, T. Popescu, and I. Trifa.[22]

However, once the idea of divinely appointed hierarchy is accommodated, the next problem the Church faces is to reconcile the charismatic constitution of the Church to its hierarchical institution.[23]

Sobornost – The "One" and the "Many"

One attempt to resolve the tension between the Spirit and the institution is the ecclesiology of sobornost.[24] Whilst rejecting both Catholic "overinstitutionalized" and Protestant "overdemocratized" ecclesiologies, Khomiakov, who coined the concept,[25] developed a conciliar model, which, in his understanding, is a synthesis between the two.[26] Sobornost affirms that both clergy and laity are constitutive of the Church. In other words, neither can exist without the other, and consequently both clergy and laity are in the Church and not outside or above it.[27] This clarification was intended to correct the Catholic influence which stressed the right of the bishops to exercise episcopal authority even if they were not titular bishops.[28] Alternatively, in the Orthodox tradition, the bishop cannot exist without a local church and neither can a local church exist without the bishop.[29] In this way the "one" and the "many" are in a dynamic unity. Moreover, charisma and institution do not exclude each other and actually coincide due to the fact that sacramental priesthood is both divinely ordained and empowered:

> The clergy is not above the people but in them and with them: it is not a judicial absolutism but a divinely-given authority. Yet, for the faithful, this authority is a spiritual power, based upon the mystical energy imparted in ordination to the priesthood for the fulfilment of its sacramental task. The sacrament which this energy of the priesthood brings into operation is a divine, not a human activity: not an idea, a doctrine, an institution, but an immediate divine Fact. The priesthood has the power to link the divine with the human, to bring heaven down to earth, and it is in this sacramental ministration that the efficacy and basis of the Holy Orders consists.[30]

This divine power is not conferred to the clergy as a result of human election for office, but is transmitted by apostolic succession.[31] Consequently the presence in the Church of this charismatic priesthood in apostolic succession is vital for the being of the Church. *Sine episcopo nulla ecclesia.*[32]

However, Bulgakov argues that amongst the three offices of Christ (priest, prophet and king) entrusted to the Church, only that of priesthood is by divine right and power (*de jure divino*) entrusted to hierarchy, whilst the ruling ministry is an expression of the unity of the whole body and the prophetic ministry belong to the whole Church (clergy and laity). Hence

Bulgakov concluded that laity has the right to participate both in the teaching and ruling ministry of the Church.[33] However, whilst affirming that all believers are charismatic due to the fact that the Holy Spirit is poured out upon all God's people, Ware points out that lay charismatic ministries have been less emphasized in the Orthodox Church.[34] Bulgakov attempted to overcome this problem by creating space for laity in Orthodox ecclesiology. He argues that despite the fact that this ordo of laymen is subordinate to the priesthood, it has certain independence.

> Baptism even without confirmation, imparts some charismatic gifts; and because of this, baptism in the Name of the Holy Trinity is valid even when performed by a layman, so that baptism is valid even among those Christian confessions which do not recognize Holy Orders and have lost apostolic succession.[35]

In sobornost, however, this freedom represents the grounds for cooperation between clergy and laity, or in other words, between the "one" and the "many".

Firstly, the laymen co-operate with the clergy both in the administration of sacraments, and in the eucharistic liturgy through singing, responses and prayer.[36] In this way the unity between the "one" and the "many" is clearly illustrated during the eucharistic liturgy, when the bishop as the image of Christ presides and the many are around him and participate at the Eucharist.[37] Therefore, the eucharistic assembly can have only a single person as its head, the bishop.[38] At the same time, the bishop who is the source of all the other ministries (priests and deacons) in the Church is consecrated within the Church during the eucharistic assembly and subsequently he can exercise his episcopal prerogatives only in his church, as long as he is in office.[39] In this sense the Orthodox Church follows Cyprian: "The bishop is in the church and the church is in the bishop".[40]

Secondly, the "one" and the "many" work together in the election of the clergy, in all its degrees from that of the deacon to that of the patriarch.[41] The laity present at the ordination of a clergyman signify their approval by acclaiming him as axios (worthy) immediately after the impositions of hands. Without this approval, affirms Bulgakov, ordination cannot take place.[42]

Thirdly, administration is conducted by the bishop ("one") in "concert with representatives ("many") of clergy and laity organised in episcopal, diocesan or presbyterial councils, or in special gatherings such as local or ecumenical councils".[43]

Fourthly, the "one" and the "many" work together in preaching and teaching. Bulgakov asserts that the authority to preach the Gospel and even the power to baptise are compatible with the status of the laymen.[44]

> Strictly speaking, the succession of gifts of the Holy Spirit, given to the Church at the time of Pentecost and descending by the Apostles and their followers, extends to the whole Church. The "apostolic succession", special and restricted, exists only for the sacramental ministry, for the priesthood and not for teaching and dogmatic consciousness.[45]

Moreover Bulgakov asserts that the commandment, "Go into all the world and preach the Gospel to the whole creation" (Mark 16:15) was given to all believers and subsequently "we find in the Scriptures instances when not only the apostles but all believers were involved in preaching and teaching (Acts 6:5; 8:5, 12, 14, 26-36)".[46] However, a certain limitation of the right of the laity ("many") to preach was introduced, asserts Bulgakov, not because of charismatic inferiority, or of the incompatibility of the right of preaching with the status of laity but because of practical and disciplinary reasons.[47] As a matter of fact, "only one ministry is withheld entirely from the laity, that of the mysteries-the celebration of the holy Eucharist and other sacraments".[48]

Fifthly, the *pleroma* of the Church (clergy and laity) is considered to be the deposit and the guardian of truth, the only organ of infallibility. Even the definitions of the Ecumenical Councils become normative[49] only after they have been accepted by the whole Church.[50] In all these ministries, argues Bulgakov, by acting in unity and co-operation, and not one group against the other, the Church reveals the very essence of Sobornost.[51]

> The Church is Christ's body, in which there are many members, differing from each other and yet indispensable to the body, and in that sense each has the same value. They are many: the body is one [...] the Church has a hierarchy and its constitution is hierarchical, and yet it is an organism rather than a juridical institution.[52]

Whilst this approach attempts to resolve the problem of clericalism as a separate class from laity by emphasizing the unity between the "one" and the "many",[53] Orthodox theologians do not always agree over the practicality of this model. Some emphasize the primacy of the community ("many") over the bishop ("one") whilst others stress the primacy of the bishop over community. Thus Meyendorff argues that,

> The documents of our disposal do not give us any certainty about the existence of a "monarchical episcopate" in all churches from the first century [...] On the other hand, we can assert that there never was a Christian Church when the Lord's Supper was not celebrated.[54]

Alternatively, Florovsky asserts that,

> [...] the order of bishop is so necessary for the Church that without it the Church is not a Church and the Christian is not a Christian, and they cannot even be so called.[55]

Whilst attempting to overcome this contradiction between the "one" and the "many", Zizioulas proposes a eucharistic ecclesiology which reflects "the proper synthesis between Christology and Pneumatology. This principle is that the "one", the bishop, cannot exist without the "many", the community, and the "many" cannot exist without the "one".[56]

Observations

Methodological

The Orthodox approach to the relation between the Spirit and the institution represents a significant attempt to realize a synthesis between both christology and pneumatology, and the "one" and the "many". However, from a methodological point of view the whole construct has weak exegetical foundations. Thus, in addition to the disagreements between the Orthodox theologians concerning the origin of the monarchic episcopate, the validity of the biblical evidence put forward by the Romanian Church is severely questioned by the conclusions of recent studies in New Testament and post-apostolic writings.[57] Schillebeeckx, for instance, argues that the relation between the Spirit and the institution in the early church took the form of a charismatic type of leadership based upon the "solidarity and equality of all Christians 'in the Spirit' (Acts 2:17-18)".[58] Due to their charisma, those leaders, or "teachers of faith" who could be ordained or non-ordained, had undoubtedly "great prestige in the Church".[59] Faivre is of the opinion that the process of clericalization began in the middle of the third century when the bishop took all the authority in the Church.[60] Similarly, Stockmeier argues that,

> The conspicuous absence from the New Testament writings of the office of bishop as is materialized in the course of the second century is sufficient proof of the variety which characterised the developing outward structure of the Church.[61]

Whilst this view has been, to a certain degree, accepted in recent years by some Orthodox scholars, there is no evidence, yet, of significant implications for ecclesiology.[62] However, Bria points out that the development of the institution in the imperial church had been achieved at the expense of its charismatic dimension.

> A particular understanding of the apostolic succession of the bishops appeared which conceded to them the right to make pronouncements of faith. Their doctrinal authority was based on their consecration in the apostolic succession, leaving little room for consideration of their spiritual capacity to discern the truth on the basis of the experience of the Pentecost. In some periods of church history, this led to crisis situations in which ecclesiastical authorities did not speak the word of God clearly or defend gospel values.[63]

Second, in the absence of a critical hermeneutic, the typological approach which underlines the model of unity between the "one" and the "many" can be misleading. For example, Ignatius wrote:

> You must all follow the lead of the bishop, as Jesus Christ followed that of the Father. Where the bishop appears, there let the people be, just as where Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholic Church.[64]

In the first sentence the bishop is the image of the Father and the people are the image of Jesus, whilst in the second the bishop is the image of Jesus and the people the image of the Catholic Church. Elsewhere Ignatius argues:

> Everyone must show the deacons respect. They represent Jesus Christ, just as the bishop has the role of the Father and the presbyters are like God's council and an apostolic band. You cannot have a church without these.[65]

Here the deacons represent Jesus, the bishops represent God and the presbyters represent the apostolic band. Comparing the two passages from Ignatius' writings it becomes clear that a theology of hierarchy construed upon his hermeneutical approach faces difficulties in harmonising the overlapping senses of the images. Even if one accepts Zizioulas' attempt to reconcile the historical and eschatological aspects of the ministry,[66] that is, the ministry is not an *interim* period between *Ascension* and *Parousia* but an expression of the eschatological nature of the Church, one still faces the problem of reconciling Ignatian overlapping typological roles, both historically and eschatologically. Additionally, commenting on the emergence of a rich literature concerning the "reality and the symbolism of the episcopate", Bria asserts:

> The episcopate is a visible structure exercising a power that gives certainty to the life and mission of the church. It is a structure which gives the church a status of certainty, but such a church cannot take risks in its affirmations and acts.[67]

Theological

One important point of trinitarian theology, as C. E. Gunton argues, "is that enables us to develop an ontology of the personal", that is, of being in relations of mutual constitution with other persons.[68] However, an uncritical emphasis of the monarchy of the Father has not only trinitarian implications,[69] but also ecclesiological, that is, it leads to a strongly episcopal ecclesiology that tends to see the bishop as the image of the Father.[70] For example, as a result of the emergence of the monoepiscopate, with Ignatius of Antioch, the bishop acquired special ecclesiastical and soteriological prerogatives. Thus, the bishop is the locus of unity and "without him the lifegiving sacraments could not be administered".[71] The bishop is not only "a living image of God upon earth" but actually the "fountain of all Mysteries (sacraments) of the Catholic Church, through which we obtain salvation".[72] And further, "what God is in the heavenly Church of the first born, and the sun in the world, that every High Priest [bishop] is in his own particular Church".[73] Similarly, Bulgakov affirms that the bishop "has the power to link the divine with human, to bring heaven down to earth, and it is in this

sacramental ministration that the efficacy and basis of Holy Orders consists".[74] Consequently, the bishop is not "one among equals" but, as Chadwick points out, this approach gave "vertical justification by claiming that the bishop is God's representative on earth, an earthly counterpart corresponding to the heavenly Monarch, so that 'we ought to regard the bishop as the Lord himself'."[75]

Additionally, a hierarchical ecclesiology reflects strong tendency to reduce the relation between the Spirit and institution to the relation between the Spirit and the hierarchical structure of the Church. Consequently, the sobornost attempt to create space for lay ministries is, to a large degree, rejected by other theologians. For instance, the relative lay independence illustrated by the idea that baptism administered by lay people is valid, is strongly rejected by Zizioulas who affirms that "there is no baptism, which is the constitutive act of the community, i.e. the ontological basis of the laity, without the bishop".[76]

Further, concerning the teaching ministry of the Church, Ware argues that "the bishop is the divinely appointed teacher of the faith, whilst the guardian of the faith is not the episcopate alone, but the whole people of God, bishop, clergy, and laity together".[77] Thus to teach and to possess the truth are two distinct functions: the former belongs to the bishop, the latter to the entire people of God.[78] However, whilst the role of laity is being reduced to that of the guardian of faith, the Orthodox theologians do not agree as to the significance of this role. Drawing from the belief that the whole Church, not simply the clergy, is the guardian of truth,[79] Kotsone argues that a lay person is obligated to oppose even a bishop who is not holding the truth.[80] Alternatively, Lossky contends that except in the case of schism the will of a bishop is binding for the faithful regardless if the bishop is right or wrong.[81] Whilst attempting to reconcile these two trends, Ware fails to offer a synthesis which would create space both for relatedness and freedom between both clergy and laity, and the Spirit and institution.

> More than once in Orthodox history the "charismatics" have come into conflict with the hierarchy, but in the end there is no conflict between the two elements in the Church's life: it is the same Spirit who is active in both.[82]

However, Ware offers a lengthy description of the charismatic hierarchy, whilst the charismatic laity is considered to be a silent guardian of faith. This approach leads to the conclusion that when the space between the Spirit and the institution (hierarchy) diminishes, the space between hierarchy and laity increases, as it happened, for instance, in the imperial church.[83]

Sociological

Whilst the Orthodox Church dismisses the charge that its model of Spirit-institution downgrades the laity by arguing that the latter participates both in the election of the hierarchy and in the life of the Church, a careful analysis of

Orthodox ecclesiology proves beyond any doubt that lay ministries are not encouraged.[84] Being aware of this aspect, Bulgakov attempted to create space for lay participation in Church governing, teaching and prophecy.[85] Thus, compared with the imperial church in which the "People of God" (*laos*) were considered to be a "mob" (*ochlos*), and thus totally excluded from episcopal election,[86] sobornost represents a significant step towards a more corporate ecclesiology. However, whilst affirming that lay people are necessary in episcopal election, sobornost ecclesiology limits their participation to the right to acclaim (*axios*) the newly elected bishop. Consequently, Bulgakov's assertion that "ordination cannot take place without this approval" is without object if one observes that the acclamation takes place after the "imposition of hands" which represents both the divine endowment and apostolic succession.[87] Thus, compared with the early church model in which the community was actively involved in the election of its leaders[88] due to their belief in "horizontal unity",[89] sobornost ecclesiology believes in "vertical unity"[90] which "operates through the levels of being reflected in lower levels and representational levels, all held together in a synthesis of divine Word made human flesh".[91]

Another sociological aspect concerns the ecclesial relation between the "one" and the "many" by analogy to the Trinity. Thus, whilst within the Godhead each divine hypostasis has His specific office as Father, Son, and Spirit, a hierarchical ecclesiology which fails to provide space for each member of the community to have his/her particular office runs the risk to perceive the "many" in non-personal terms such as "crowd" or "public". Although Orthodoxy acknowledges that the gifts (*charisma*) of the Holy Spirit are intended to safeguard the absorbtion of the person into an impersonal being,[92] in practice the "many" who respond to the "one" during the liturgy have no space for the development of "charismatic" ministries. As Fitzgerald puts it:

> Orthodox theologians are challenged by the critical need to reaffirm the important place in the Church which the laity is meant to have. Simply put, can the Orthodox continue to advance the valuable features of eucharistic ecclesiology without, at the same time, calling for a genuine renewal of community worship and church life, in which the laity are enabled and encouraged to take their rightful place? In many places, the Eucharist appears to be very much an action of the clergy and their "assistants", in which the laity are but passive spectators. Such a situation is certainly contrary to the best expression of Orthodox liturgical theology.[93]

However, one has to acknowledge that there have been periods in the history of Orthodoxy when lay persons played an important role in the life of the Church, such as St. Seraphim of Sorov, Father John Kronstadt, or the *startsi* (elders) of the monastery of Optina,[94] but such examples are exceptions rather than the rule of the Orthodox Church.

Consequently, it can be argued that, so far, Orthodox ecclesiology in general and sobornost in particular, have failed to offer a satisfactory answer to the question concerning the tension between institution and the Spirit.

Moreover, even the attempt made by sobornost to address this issue faces a growing opposition from within both Russian and Greek Orthodox fold. The main charge brought against Khomiakov and his school, for instance, is that it has endangered the prerogatives of the episcopate and "democratized" the idea of the Church.[95] Consequently, by failing to create space for laity to participate in the life of the community, a hierarchical Church runs the risk of losing the very communities which its bishops are supposed to represent. In fact Zizioulas draws attention to this phenomenon when he affirms that, "the community has almost disappeared and the number of titular bishops is increasing rapidly".[96] Further, whilst acknowledging that the Orthodox Church a "pyramidal" structure, Zizioulas argues that this "clericalization" can be corrected only if christology and ecclesiology are pneumatically constituted.[97]

Conclusions

Commenting on the situation of contemporary Orthodoxy, Gvosdev affirms that "the Orthodox Church has been described as a rigidly hierarchical, authoritarian body. At various points in its history, particularly in the nineteenth and twentieth century, the national Orthodox churches in Eastern Europe 'remained static, lacking a horizontal cohesiveness and local dynamism' because of a system of 'bureaucratized, pyramidal subordination' to a state dominated hierarchy."[98]

This hierarchical model which has characterized the Orthodox "school-theology"[99] has its roots in the unbalanced translation of both Chalcedonian christology and monarchical trinitarianism into ecclesiology. Thus, whilst an ecclesiology construed around the image of the Body of Christ provides a frame of thought for the relation between Christ and the Church, it does not allow for enough space between the "Head" and the "Body". Consequently, emphasis has been made on the invisible Church which shares the same authority with Christ. Further, since the Holy Spirit is the life of the Church there is no space between the Spirit and the institution: hence the latter claims the same authority as the former. Theologically, this approach paved the way for an ecclesiology in which Christ, the Spirit and the Church are so inextricably knit together as to run the risk of merging into one another, or to extend the principle of communicatio idiomatum from christology to ecclesiology. Historically, however, the Orthodox Church faces the danger of incoherence between symbolism and reality. In other words, whilst Orthodoxy took the magisterial route of idealizing the institution, it lost the community.[100] The hierarchical ecclesiology provides space for the "one" (the bishop) whilst failing to create space for the "many" (the laity).

However, the twentieth century has revealed not only the crisis of the Orthodox Church, but also its significant potential for renewal. The most significant change appears to be the shift from a hierarchical institutionalism to a hierarchical community. The underlying principle for this change is the

belief that the universal church exists only in and through local communities.[101] There are two main trends within this shift from institution to community. First, the eucharistic vision emphasizes the fact that since truth exists ontologically as communion,

> Only in the Eucharist does the Church acquire a vision of the truth as both historical and free from the laws of history; as social and yet transcending all societies; as love which although experienced in and through human relations remains ultimately only a matter of sharing the trinitarian love of God, of theosis. The Eucharist is the only historical experience that the Church possesses in which all this becomes real.[102]

This view adopted by Melia, Florovsky, Meyendorff, Schmemann and Afanasieff,[103] and particularly emphasized by Zizioulas attempts to develop a neo-patristic synthesis in order to recover both the symbolic-hierarchical and corporate-existential aspects of the Greek Fathers.[104]

Secondly, there is the pastoral vision which is primarily concerned with the present situation of the Orthodox pleroma living in different cultures and facing different challenges than those of the Byzantine period. This approach argues that contemporary Orthodoxy has to re-writes its theology in such a way as whilst being faithful to the Holy Tradition, it has to be also relevant for the present realities. In other words, Orthodoxy has to re-discover the theology of community which allow space for all the faithful to participate in the truth of faith according to their charisma.

> Pentecost continues to enable the people of God to hold the Tradition in ways the Spirit wills. The Eastern Church understands this continuity as ensured by an episcopal ministry consecrated in the apostolic succession. But the church is built on the foundations of the apostles and prophets, with Christ Jesus himself as its main cornerstone (Ephesians 2:20). This view of the church does not prevent the participation of all in building up the body. The wholeness-koinonia-of the body implies that all categories of the people of God share fully in "all truth". This is the charismatic ministry of the people of God, who are transformed by the power of the Holy Spirit into the "living stones" of the church.[105]

This pastoral view illustrates clearly the shift from the institutionalism of the past through the contemporary crisis towards a new ecclesial community. Consequently authority is no longer a predicate of the office but a quality of truth; and truth is Christ in communion and community.

Notes

[1] B. Bobrinskoy, "The Holy Spirit in the Bible and the Church", in *The Ecumenical Review* 42-43 (1990), 357-362 (here 361).
[2] See C. N. Tsirpanlis, *Introduction to Eastern Patristic Thought and Orthodox Theology* (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1991).
[3] See J. Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology,* 1974, ch. 11.
[4] "Wherever Jesus Christ is, there is the universal church". Ignatius, *Letter to the Smyrneans*, 8.2.

[5] "Wherever the Spirit of God is, there is the church, and all grace". Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses*, 3.24.1.

[6] K. Ware, *The Orthodox Church,* rev. edn. (Penguin, London, 1993), 240.

[7] J. Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 140.

[8] J. Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 141.

[9] Hopko argues that the interpersonal communion of the persons of the Holy Trinity is both ontologically and "economically" ordered according to the *monarchy* of the Father. The communion of the three Persons of the Godhead is rooted not only in the consubstantiality of the three hypostases, but basically in the Person of the one God and Father, the divine "source" and "cause" of the Word and the Spirit. However, the *headship* of God the Father does not imply heterosubstantiality or metaphysical subordination among the three hypostases. T. Hopko, "God and Gender", 166.

[10] T. Ware, *The Orthodox Church*, 252.

[11] T. Hopko, "God and Gender", 173.

[12] See T. Ware, *The Orthodox Church*, 253.

[13] In virtue of the special *charisma* which the bishop receives as his consecration, he is endowed with the threefold power of ruling, teaching and celebrating the sacraments. See T. Ware, *The Orthodox Church*, 253.

[14] S. Bulgakov, *The Orthodox Church*, 48.

[15] N. Chițescu și C. Corniţescu, "Sfîntul Duh Sfinţitorul: lucrarea Lui în biserică şi în lume", in D. Radu (ed.), *Îndrumări misionare*, 398-399.

[16] D. Stăniloae, "Isus Hristos, Arhiereu în Veac", in *Ortodoxia*, XXXI/2 (1979), 223.

[17] I will present here the biblical texts indicated by D. Radu in "Învăţătura despre biserică" in D. Radu (ed.), *Îndrumări misionare*, 399-400; S. Cosma, *Cuvinte*, 244-250; Patriarch Teoctist, *Învăţătura*, 279-280; Metropolitan Nicolae, *Catehism Orthodox* (Editura Mitropoliei Banatului, Timişoara, 1990), 78-79.

[18] *The Confession of Dositheus,* X; T. Ware, *The Orthodox Church*, 253.

[19] D. Radu, "Învăţătura despre Biserică", 400-401.

[20] S. Bulgakov, *The Orthodox Church*, 40.

[21] S. Bulgakov, *The Orthodox Church*, 41. "We cannot affirm that the Apostles instituted this succession immediately, but the fact of such institution cannot be denied. After some fluctuation the hierarchy was formed in the second century after the type of the priesthood of the Old Testament, yet always with a difference. For the Church, which lives in the unity of tradition, the institution of the apostolic succession of the hierarchy is axiomatic. Tradition remains the same, always possessed of the same power, whether a certain form or institution appears in the first or the second or the twentieth century, if only the new form contains, not a denial, but a completion of what has previously been contained in the substance of tradition". See S. Bulgakov, *The Orthodox Church*, 43.

[22] D. Cornilescu translated the Bible into vernacular and underwent a similar experience of faith as Martin Luther. T. Popescu was converted by D. Cornilescu and subsequently challenged the apostolicity of the Orthodox tradition. I. Trifa underwent a dramatic experience of conversion to biblical faith and founded the evangelical movment called "The Lord's Army" within the Romanian Orthodox Church.

[23] Bulgakov presents his view on the role of the clergy and laity within the Church in "The Church's Ministry", in C. Patelos (ed.), *The Orthodox Church in the Ecumenical Movment,* 166-171. In the following I will present Bulgakov's view on ministry because he makes an attempt to create space for laity that is very unusual within the Orthodox tradition.

[24] S. Bulgakov, "The Church's Ministry", 166.

[25] During the nineteenth century there were three major theological tendencies in Russia. The first one known as "Latinophilism" was led by Chaadaev who favoured an openness to Western ideas, especially Roman Catholic. Chaadaev thought that Roman Catholicism and socialism are not irreconcilable as they would be adapted in Russia. Consequently he turn to the ideas of the French writers such as: De Maitre, Lamennais, Saint-Simon and Prospere Enfantin. The second tendency represented the "Occidentalists" or "Westernizers". They were primarily interested in providing an instrument of revolution against the oppressive regime of Nikolai I. Russian thinkers such as Herzen, Bakunin, Belinskii and Stankevich adopted from Hegel the historical dialectic method and subsequently they associate the Church and its theology with

the past that necessarily had to be ploughed under in order that a new age might begin. The third tendency was known as "Slavophilism". This saw the future of Russia not in French socialism or German idealism but in Muskovite traditionalism. Therefore it supported the Orthodox Church as synonymous with Russian native culture in opposition with Western Catholicism or Protestantism. The leaders of this movement such as K. S. Aksakov, I. V. Kireevskii, M. P. Pogodin, F. I. Tiutchev, I. Samarin and A. S. Khomiakov fought for a spiritual and political isolationism from the contagious and decadent philosophies of the West and a turn instead to the Muscovite Russia and Slavic culture for the inspiration for all that would make Russia of the 19th century truly great. Thus, the ecclesiology of *sobornost* has its roots on one side in the Orthodox reaction to the so-called "Western captivity" which followed after the fall of Constantinople in 1453 and on the other in the Russian Orthodox quest for identity. Thus Khomiakov considered that the Roman Church is founded on external authority but has no liberty whilst Protestant ecclesiology strives for internal liberty but loses any unity. See G. A. Maloney, *A History of Orthodox Theology*, 56-59.

[26] According to this approach the tension between clergy and laity, institution and the Spirit that characterise both the Catholic and Protestant churches has been overcome. S. Bulgakov, *The Orthodox Church*, 61.

[27] S. Bulgakov, *The Orthodox Church*, 54-60. See also J. Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 137.

[28] See K. McDonnell, "Infallibility as Charism at Vatican I", in P. C. Empie, (eds), *Teaching Authority and Infallibility* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1980), 270-286. For an analysis of the difference in the Catholic tradition between a titular bishop and a bishop without diocese see G. Feliciany, "The Process of Codification", in *Concilium* 167/7 (1983), 37-40. In the Orthodox tradition the mention of the name of the community takes place during the prayer of ordination of a bishop meaning that the community forms part of the ontology of the bishop. See J. Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 137.

[29] S. Bulgakov, "The Church's Ministry", 169-170.

[30] S. Bulgakov, "The Church's Ministry", 168.

[31] S. Bulgakov, "The Church's Ministry", 169.

[32] S. Bulgakov, "The Church's Ministry", 169-170.

[33] "He [the bishop] does not impose his personal opinion upon his church but gives authoritative expression to the voice of the whole Church". S. Bulgakov, "The Church's Ministry", 168.

[34] T. Ware, *The Orthodox Church*, 254.

[35] S. Bulgakov, "The Church's Ministry", 167.

[36] S. Bulgakov, "The Church's Ministry", 167.

[37] "This 'catholicity' of the eucharistic community was also reflected in its structure. As far as we can reconstruct this structure from pieces of evidence that we possess, we can see that in the centre of the *synaxis* of the 'whole' Church and behind the one altar, there was the throne of 'one bishop' seated 'in the place of God' or understood as the living image of Christ.' Around his throne were seated the presbyters, whilst by him stood the deacons helping him in celebration, and in front of him the 'people of God' that *order* of the Church which was constituted by virtue of the rite of initiation (baptism-chrismation) and considered the *sine qua non* condition for the eucharistic community to exist and express the Church's unity". See J. Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 152-153.

[38] See J. Meyendorff, *Catholicity and the Church*, 53-54.

[39] S. Bulgakov, *The Orthodox Church*, 46-48.

[40] Cyprian, *Epist.,* 66 in *ANCL*, vol. VIII, 231-235.

[41] Bulgakov illustrates his point referring to the lay participation at the election of the Patriarch Tikhon of all the Russians. See Bulgakov, "The Church's Ministry", 167.

[42] S. Bulgakov, "The Church's Ministry", 167.

[43] S. Bulgakov, "The Church's Ministry", 168.

[44] S. Bulgakov, "The Church's Ministry", 168.

[45] S. Bulgakov, *The Orthodox Church*, 60.

[46] S. Bulgakov, *The Orthodox Church*, 52.

[47] S. Bulgakov, *The Orthodox Church*, 53.

[48] S. Bulgakov, "The Church's Ministry", 169.

[49] J. Madey, "Ecumenical Council and Pan-Orthodox Synod: A Comparison", in *Concilium* (1983), 64-65.

[50] S. Bulgakov, *The Orthodox Church*, 64-75

[51] S. Bulgakov, "The Church's Ministry", 167.

[52] S. Bulgakov, "The Church's Ministry", 166.

[53] "But the Church of Christ is not a community of equals in which all the faithful have the same rights. It is a society of unequal, not only because among the faithful some are clerics and some are laymen, but particularly because there is in the Church the power of God whereby to some is given to sanctify, teach, and govern, and to others not". See J. Neuner and H. Roos, (eds), *The Teaching of the Catholic Church* (Staten Island: Alba House, 1967), No. 669.

[54] J. Meyendorff, *Orthodoxy and Catholicity*, 5.

[55] G. Florovsky, *Collected Works*, vol. 3, *Creation and Redemption* (Nordland, Belmont, Mass., 1976), 191.

[56] J. Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 136-137.

[57] The unity of the believers with Christ and among themselves in John 17:21-23 is not mediated by men (bishop) but it is a direct relationship: "the believer is in Jesus as Jesus is in the Father". Further the New Testament records do not suggest that unity in Christ is replaced by unity around a person (bishop) who replaces Christ, or is the image of Christ. G. M. Burge, *The Anointed Community: The Holy Spirit in the Johanine Tradition* (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1987), 6o. The same approach to unity of faith is followed in the Shepherd of Hermas, where the Church gathers its members from the whole world, forming them into one body, which is united in understanding, mind, faith, and love. Shepherd of Hermas, *Similitudes*, 9.17 in *ANCL*, vol. I, 402-403. Similarly, Justin Martyr spoke of all who believe in Christ as united in "one soul, one synagogue, one Church, which is brought into being through His name and shares in His name; for we are all call Christians". See Justin Martyr, *Dial*, 63.5 in *ANCL*, vol. II, 173-174. Chadwick asserts that the unity of the Church "depended on two things: on a common faith and on a common way of ordering their life and worship". See H. Chadwick, *The Early Church* (London: Penguin Books, 1967, reprinted, 1990), 32. See also J. Ash, "The Decline of Ecstatic Prophecy in the Early Church", in *Theological Studies* 37 (1976), 227-252; M. E. Boring, *Sayings of the Risen Jesus. Christian Prophecy in the Synoptic Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982); D. Wallace-Hadrill, *Christian Antioch. A Study of Early Christian Thought in the East* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982).

[58] E. Schillebeeckx, "The Teaching Authority of All. A Reflection about the Structure of the New Testament", in *Concilium* 180/4 (1985), 16.

[59] E. Schillebeeckx, "The Teaching Authority", 18.

[60] See A. Faivre, *Naisssance d'une hiérarchie. Les premières etapes du cursus clerical* (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1977), 153-170.

[61] P. Stockmeier, "The Election of Bishops by Clergy and People in the Early Church", in *Concilium*, 137, 7 (1980), 4.

[62] See J. Meyendorff, *Imperial Unity,* 40-41; T. Ware, *The Orthodox Church*, 254.

[63] I. Bria, *The Sense of Ecumenical Tradition,* 43.

[64] Ignatius, *Smyr.* 8,10 in *ANCL*, vol. I, 249.

[65] Ignatius, *Trall.* 3,1 in *ANCL*, vol. I, 191-192.

[66] See J. Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 209-246.

[67] I. Bria, *The Sense of Ecumenical Tradition*, 42.

[68] C. E. Gunton, *The Promise of Trinitarian Theology*, 164.

[69] An uncritical over-emphasis of the Father as the source of communion in the Trinity runs the risk of undermining the mutual constitution of the Father, Son, and Sprit as communion. Alternatively, an uncritical over-emphasis of the "social" analogy of the Trinity may suggest a form of tritheism. Further, C. E. Gunton proposes a model in which communion is "a function, a way of characterising the relation of all three". He writes: "Whatever the priority of the Father, it must not be conceived in such a way as to detract from the fact that all three persons are together the cause of the communion in which they exist in relation of mutual and reciprocal constitution". See C. E. Gunton, *The Promise of Trinitarian Theology*, 165.

[70] See C. E. Gunton, *The Promise of Trinitarian Theology,* 167.

[71] H. Chadwick, *The Early Church*, 41.

[72] *The Confession of Dositheus*, X, in J. H. Leith (ed.), *Creeds of the Churches*, 491-495.

[73] *The Confession of Dositheus*, X.

[74] S. Bulgakov, "The Church's Ministry", 168.

[75] H. Chadwick, *The Early Church*, 41.

[76] J. Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 137.

[77] T. Ware, *The Orthodox Church*, 255.

[78] T. Ware, *The Orthodox Church*, 255.

[79] See P. E. Bratsiotis, "The Fundamental Principles and Main Characteristics of the Orthodox Church", in A. J. Philipou (ed.), *The Orthodox Ethos* (Oxford: Holywell Press, 1964), 28-29; J. Stamoolis, *Eastern Orthodox Mission Theology Today*, 107.

[80] See I. Kotsone, *The Place of the Laity* (Athens, 1956). Cf. J. Stamoolis, *Eastern Orthodox Mission Theology Today,* 107; H. Kraemer, *A Theology of the Laity* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1958), 96-98.

[81] "The acts which emanate from episcopal power have a binding authority: in submitting to the will of the bishop one is submitting to the will of God [...] the bishop, if he has not himself acquired grace, and if his understanding is not enlightened by the Holy Spirit, can act according to his human motives, he can err in the exercise of the divine power which is conferred upon him. He will be assuredly be responsible for his actions before God; they will have, nevertheless, an objective and binding character, save only in case of a bishop who acts contrary to the canons – in other words, at variance with the common will of the Church. In such a case he becomes the promoter of schism and places himself outside the unity of the Church". See V. Lossky, *The Mystical Theology*, 188.

[82] T. Ware, *The Orthodox Church*, 254.

[83] J. Meyendorff, *The Orthodox Church*, 25.

[84] T. Ware, *The Orthodox Church*, 253-254.

[85] "In the Church there is no place for speechlessness and for blind obedience... In our time the terms "prophet" and "prophecy" have become rather literary epithets... But the spirit blows where it wills; the gift of prophecy by the Holy Spirit is not connected with the hieratic ministry, though it may be united with it". See S. Bulgakov, *The Orthodox Church*, 53.

[86] With the recognition of Christianity by the State under Constantine, the episcopal office was caught in a public conflict of interests and subsequently "the original structure [of the Church] was challenged not by charismatic sectarians, as in the early period, but by temptation to identify church functions with the legal administrative patterns of Roman society". For details, see J. Meyendorff, *Imperial Unity*, 41. Among the consequences of the rapprochement between the Church and State, the association of the office of the bishop with the large cities, political importance of the office and the exclusion of the laity from the election of the bishop are only some which have significant importance for ecclesiology. For a presentation of the transition from pre-Constantinian to post-Constantinian period of the Church see J. Meyendorff, *Imperial Unity*, 41-49; The Council of Laodicaea, canon 13; P. Stockmeier, "The Election of the Bishops", 7.

[87] See S. Bulgakov, "The Church' Ministry", 167.

[88] Stockmeier asserts that "The relevant texts more than once specify the congregation as being actively involved in the choice of its ministers". Cf. P. Stockmeier, "The Election of the Bishops", 4. Similarly in *I Clement* 44, 3 (*ANCL*, vol. I, 38-39), the author states that the Apostles appointed presbyters "with the consent of the whole Church". Didache is more specific about the procedure of a appointment: "You must, then, elect for yourselves bishops and deacons who are a credit to the Lord, men who are gentle, generous, faithful, and well tried. For their ministry to you is identical with that of the prophets and teachers". See *Didache*, 15, in C. Richardson (ed.), *Early Christian Fathers*, 178. Hippolytus (A.D. 215) expressly emphasizes the election of bishops by the whole people: "Let the bishop be ordained after he has been chosen by all the people". See Hippolytus, *Apostolic Tradition*, 2, in T. Halton, *The Church*, 104. Cyprian of Carthage (d. 258) is an early example of the emergence of a pronounced episcopal and hierarchical self-consciousness, but nevertheless this tendency did not lead him to play down the responsibility of the laity to appointment Church leaders. Thus the account given in his biography points out that Cyprian withdrew in humility when the whole people rose up in love and honour for him under the inspiration of the Lord. See Pontius, *Vita Cypriani*, 5, in *CSEL*, III, III, XCV, lines 15-16. There is no doubt that Cyprian believed in an active participation of the lay people in the election of the bishop and not simply in their presence to acclaim the successful candidate. In a letter sent to the Numidian bishop Antonianus, Cyprian describes the election of Pope Cornelius (251-253): "But Cornelius was made bishop by the judgement of God and of his Christ, by the testimony of almost all the clergy, by the vote

(*suffragium*) of the people then present, and with the approbation of long-serving priest and of upright men". See Cyprian, *Ep.* 55, 8, in *ANCL*, vol. VIII, 186-187. Elsewhere, Cyprian gives an account of the election of the Spanish bishop Sabinus "in virtue of the vote of the whole brotherhood and the judgement of the bishops". See Cyprian, *Ep.* 67, 5, in *CSEL*, III, II, 739, lines, 15-16. Likewise the *Apostolic Constitution* (c. 360) insists that "a man who is to be consecrated bishop should be blameless in every respect and elected by the people". Cf. *Apostolic Constitution*, VIII, 2-4, in *ANCL*, vol. XVIII, 210-213. It is clear from these patristic records that in the pre-Constantinian period "the bishops were undoubtedly elected by clergy and people". See P. Stockmeier, "The Election of the Bishops", 8. See also T. Halton, *The Church* (Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1985), 105-106.

[89] In the early Church, the Christians called each other "brother" and "sister" and whatever differences there might be of race, class or education, in the Church they were all equals "in the Spirit". E. Schillebeeckx, "The Teaching Authority", 16-17; H. Chadwick, *The Early Church*, 32.

[90] For a critique of the sacramental, vertical model of ecclesiology see: B. Depuy, "Is There a Dogmatic Distinction between the Function of Priest and the Function of Bishop?", in *Concilium* 34 (1968), 74-86; Y. Congar, "My Pathfinding in the Theology and Laity and Ministries", in *The Jurist* 32 (1972), 169-188; H. Küng, *Why Priest?* (Doubleday: Garden City, 1972); O. Semmelroth, "The Priestly People of God and Its Official Ministers", in *Concilium* 31 (1967), 100; K. Barth, *The Word of God and the Word of Men* (Harper Torchbooks, 1957); K. Rahner, "What Is the Theological Starting Point for a Definition of the Priestly Ministry?", in *Concilium* 43 (1969), 85.

[91] T. Bradshaw, *The Olive Branch: An Evangelical Anglican Doctrine of the Church* (Paternoster, Oxford, 1992), 77.

[92] T. Ware, *The Orthodox Church*, 253-254.

[93] T. Fitzgerald, "Conciliarity, Primacy, and the Episcopacy", in *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 38/1 (1994), 17-44 (here page 30).

[94] S. Bulgakov, *The Orthodox Church*, 51. C. N. Tsirpanlis, *Introduction to Eastern Patristic Thought and Orthodox Theology* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1991), 151.

[95] T. Ware, *The Orthodox Church*, 257.

[96] J. Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 141.

[97] J. Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 139.

[98] N. K. Gvosdev, "Rendering unto Caesar", 81. See also D. Pospielovsky, *The Russian Church*, vol. 1, 241ff.

[99] See E. Melia, "Point de vue Orthodoxe sur la problème de l'Authorité dans l'Eglise", in *Problème de l'Authorité* (Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1962), 29.

[100] I. Bria, *The Sense of Ecumenical Tradition*, 44.

[101] See N. Afanasieff, "The Church which Presides in Love", in J. Meyendorff (ed.), *The Primacy of Peter* (Leighton: The Faith Press, 1973), 74-81.

[102] J. Zizioulas, "Communal Spirit and Conciliarity: 1st Comment", in S. Agourides (ed.), *Procès-Verbaux du Deuxième Congrès de Théologie Orthodoxe* (Athens, 1978), 140-146.

[103] See Bishop Maximos Agiorgousis, "East Meets West", 12-13.

[104] McPartlan presents a well-documented view on the positive and negative aspects of eucharistic ecclesiology. See P. McPartlan, *The Eucharist Makes the Church* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993).

[105] I. Bria, *The Sense of Ecumenical Tradition*, 39.

A Study of the Concepts of *Intention* and *Inward Disposition* in Cases where the Intent, not the Action, Establishes Blame or Praise

AURELIAN BOTICA

Emanuel University of Oradea

Introduction

When the Bible talks about the inward dispositions and intentions it usually does so by using one or more of following terms: as bl¢, hb v x|m, rcy, brq¢ hy lK, and hm zm. To understand better the meaning of the individual passages in which this terminology appears, one must first establish the general semantic background of the terms. Now, these words represent physical organs, physiological and mental/spiritual operations. That is why it is important to classify all our terms in a hierarchical order, from the most physical to the least. We will see that even terms denoting physical organs may function as "markers" or "vessels" of intent. This classification will offer us a better picture of the terminology the Bible uses to express intent. To begin our review of terminology, we want to introduce a list of verbs of "divine examination". The verbs themselves do not connote the idea of intent, nor do they belong to the group of "organs" and "spiritual operations". What connects them to the wider category of terms for intent is the fact that they take objects such as bl¢ hy lki, x|lr, hb v x|m; – in other words, the very same terms that function as "markers" of intent.

General Semantic Background of Key Terms for Expressing the Notion of *Intent*

Idioms for Divine Examination of Heart, Mind, Thoughts, etc.

1. Background of the Concept of *Testing*

The passages describing the act of "divine examination/testing" of the heart (thoughts, mind, etc.) seem to form a recurring pattern in the Bible. What makes them essential to our investigation is the fact that the object of the verbs of "testing/examining" are the inward thoughts and intentions. This

motif, however, has been analyzed from several perspectives, some of which may not fit the purpose of this investigation.

First, the motif was understood as a religious/theological theme underlying the divine attributes of knowledge, perception, and omni-science. Thus scholars have pointed out parallels between this motif in the Bible and in the ancient Near Eastern texts; in particular, texts depicting the solar deities and the "weighing of the heart" in Egyptian religion.[1]

Second, as we have indicated, the motif of "divine testing" has also been interpreted from a moral/cultic standpoint, as a prayer-formula to be recited before entering the Temple gate.[2]

Third, another avenue of interpretation has emerged from the area of the "cultic ordeal". Specifically, scholars have argued that the element of "divine examination" was part of the larger process of establishing a verdict through the sacral ordeal administered by priests in the temple.[3] Gerstenberger, Krauss, and others characterize the motif of divine examination as an element of the "doxology of judgment", in which "'a person unconditionally submits to the procedure of the deity, namely, by confessing the unsearchable omnipotence of God in a doxological hymn'."[4] Schmidt specifically restricted this to the prayer of the person who was accused falsely and who now calls for a "legal resolution on his innocence".[5] We believe that, although some maintain the probability of this scenario, disagreements still remain.[6]

Fourth, the motif of "divine examination" appears in texts that presuppose not strictly a judicial setting, but rather a religious and ethical one. This appears to be the case both in narrative texts like 1 Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles, as well as in prophetic and wisdom passages from Jeremiah, Job, and Proverbs.[7] Arguably one may still detect here some juridical notions inherent in the motif of "divine searching". In the current setting, however, they reflect the preoccupations of the authors with religious/theological and ethical issues outside the cult.[8]

2. Idioms for "divine examination" of intentions, thoughts, mind, and heart:
!xb, dqp, !kt, vrd, asn, rqx, @rc, !yb, [dy, har, hzx, vpx

The Bible expresses the notion of "divine examination" of the thoughts through certain verbs. One group of terms that falls under this category includes the verbs [dy, har, and !yb, that is, verbs of knowing and perceiving. In the Bible, the objects of the divine perception may be physical entities, events, hidden mysteries, as well as human thoughts and inner attitudes. Our focus is on the seeing, knowing, and understanding of intention.

har [9]
Man looks at the appearance, but the Lord [...] at the heart: bb [d; ha, ry]l hw hym: ~yh: y[d; ha, ry]l ~d a h ((**1 Sam 16:7**)
God tests the righteous, sees the inwards and the heart (bl w tAy l k. ha, ro qyDl c; !xtB) **— Jer 20:12; cf. 12:3**

The Lord saw that every inclination of the thoughts [...] was evil: [r;AB li tbovxm; rcyE-lk yKi hw hy>arY�: w: **(Gen 6:5)**

!yb i[10]

God discerns every intent of the thoughts: !ybime tAb v xm; rcyE-lk w> **(1 Chr 28:9)**
You discern my thoughts from afar: qAxr mey[ird. hT nB: ymllqu>yTi b.vi T [dy hT a; **(Ps 139:2; Ps 24:12)**

[dy [11]

(Render justice [...]) acc. to Your knowledge of his heart: Abb l-ta, [d; Terv<a] **(1 Ki 8:39; 2 Chr 6:30; cf. Ps 139:23)**
Test him to know everything that was in his heart: Abb lBi-lK t[d; l At ASm: l. **(2 Chr 32:31)**
God knows the secrets of the heart: blE tAm lu[]T; [dey0alUh -yKi **(Ps 44:22)**
God knows the thoughts of man: ~d a tAb vxm; [dy0hw hy> **(Ps 94:11; cf. Job 21:27)**
I know the inclination he is forming before [...]: ~rj, B. ~AY h; hf[oalUh rv, a] Ar cyl-ta, yTi[dy yKi **(Dt 31:21)**

A second, more prevalent, group of verbs are those that describe the literal act of testing/searching; in particular, !xb, @rc, rqx, dqp, fpx and !kt. We have already alluded to this aspect in the analysis of the cultic ordeal, where God is shown to test the human heart to determine guilt or innocence. As with the verbs of perception, the acts of testing/searching do not always have the "heart" or "mind" as objects, but they frequently function in this type of relationship.

!xb [12]

The Lord [...] tests the inwards and the heart: blw tAy l K. !xEBo qdc, jpevo tAab c. hw hyw: **(Jer 11:20; 12:3; 17:9)**
Test my heart: yBi li T nx: B **(Ps 17:3; Jer 12:3; Prov 17:3)**
Test me: hw hy>ynhEx B. **(Ps 26:2; 11:4-5; 139:23-24)**

Rqx [13]

The Lord searches the heart: blE rqExo hw hy> **(Jer 17:10)**
God knows the secrets [...], will examine [...]: blE tAm lu[]T; [dey0alUh -yK(taz0rq x]) ~yhil{a/al{h] **(Ps 44:21)**
Lord, examine me: ynlT; rqx] hw hy> **(Ps 139:1; cf. 139:23; Job 13:9)**
Great searchings of the heart among the people of Reuben: blE yrqxi ~yli AdG> **(Jdg 5:16)**

@rc [14]

The smelting is for silver [...] but the Lord tests the hearts: hw hy> tAB li !xEbU bh Z l; r\lk w>@sKl; @rEcm; **(Prov 17:3)**
You tested me and found nothing: ac mTi-l b; ynlT: prc. **(Ps 17:3)**

The Lord tests the inwards and the heart: yBﬂi⊳yt; Ayl ki hp rε **(Ps 26:2)**

Dqp [15]

You tested my heart, visited me at night: ac m.Ti-lb; ynﬂT: prc. hl yŁ;T dq: P yBi li T nx: B **(Ps 17:3)**

That you should visit him in the morning, test him every moment: Wﬂﬁx b.Ti ~y[i g r‡i ~yrﬁq b.li Wﬂd, qp.Tﬂr: **(Job 7:18)**

Fpx [16]

And I searched my spirit: yxﬂﬁr fPexyﬂ **(Ps 77:6)**

We have accomplished a diligent search: qmﬂ[blⅇ⊳vyai brq⊲ﬂ⊳fP xm. fpxⅇWﬂm.T; **(Ps 64:7)**

The lamp of the Lord [...] searches all the innermost chambers: jb {yrⅆx;-lK fpexo [...] hⅉ hy⊳rﬁE **(Prov 20:27)**

I will search Jerusalem with lamps: tArﬁB; ~ ﬂ; v Wry⊳ta, fPexa] **(Zeph 1:12)**

!kt [17]

The Lord probes (weighs) the spirit: hⅉ hy⊳tﬂx Wr !kEtⅉ **(Prov 16:2; cf. Is 40:13)**

The Lord probes the heart: hⅉ hy⊳tﬂB li !kEtⅉ **(Prov 21:2; cf. 24:12)**

Who has probed (measured) the spirit of the Lord?: hⅉ hy⊳xﬂWr -ta, !KE ti-ymi **(Isa 40:13)**

Hsn [18]

To test you to know what was in your heart: ^ bb lB(rv⊲a‡ta, t[ⅆ l ^ tShﬂ. **(Deut 8:2; 2 Chr 32:31)**

Test me [...] and try me; examine my heart [...]: yBﬂi⊳yt; Ayl ki hp rε ynﬂﬁﬂ⊳hⅉ hy⊳ ynﬂﬁEx B. **(Ps 26:2)**

They tested God in their heart by demanding food: ~v ﬂﬁl. lkao-la v.l(~b b lBi l ae-Wﬁﬁﬂﬂ **(Ps 78:18)**

A Classification of Terms Related to Actual Physical Organs and Physio-logical Functions with Mental/Emotive Characteristics

1. Terms related to actual physical organs

A. ble

One may, from the outset, point out the difficulty of capturing the exact meaning of this term. The word ble appears to describe spiritual, mental, emotive, as well as physical functions of the body, both in the Bible and in other ancient Near Eastern texts.[19] The general semantic range of ble is extensive, but we must focus here on those semantic aspects which may be shown to relate to concepts of "intention", "predisposition", "inner attitude", etc.[20] The word ble appears with this sense most often in Poetic, Prophetic, and Wisdom literature, but one may find similar nuances in

Legal and Narrative texts. Altogether ble **can take on the following meanings:**

a. The heart as the medium of intending, devising, and conceiving evil

Also in the heart (and hands) you work out injustice: !MW [p.Ti tl{A[blB.-@a; **(Ps 58:2)**
Words of peace to their friends, but malice in their heart: ~b 0 lBi h[r w> ~hy[r¢~[i ~Alv yrebDo **(Ps 28:3)**
Eat and drink (he says to you) but his heart is not with you: %M)[i-lB; AB li>%l + rmay0htw\W lkoa/ **(Prov 23:7)**
An abomination of heart (inward deceit masked by outward pretension: AB1B. tAb [AT **(Prov 26:25)**
Their heart is far from Me (in spite of display of public worship): yNMmi qx;rl AB li> **(Is 29:13)**
If I had thought evil in my heart, the Lord would not listen to my prayer: yBil b. ytiyai r -~ai !ma **(Ps 66:18)**
The intention of the thoughts of the heart is only evil: [r; qr; AB li tbovxm; rcyE **(Gen 6:5; 8:21)**

b. The heart as the medium of positive intention

It was good that you intended to build a House: [ymi.vli tyB: tAn b.li] ^b]o l.-~[i hy h yKi t boyjih/ **(1 Ki 8:17-18)**
But God looks at [David's] heart (not his physical appearance): bb (.d; ha,ry hw hyw: **(1 Sam 16:7)**
In integrity of my heart I made these offerings: hLae-lk yTbD; n.thi ybb l. rvy0B. **(1 Chr 29:17)**
(Approaching the Temple) with clean hands and pure heart: bb le-rbW ~yP; k; yqln> **(Ps 24:4)**

c. The heart and its thoughts as the object of divine testing, probing, etc.

You who test the kidneys and the heart: blw tAy l K. !xEBo **(Jer 11:20; cf. 12:3; 17:9; 20:12)**
***Ibid.*, (of the one falsely accused):** tAy l kW tAB li!xEbW **(Pss. 7:10; cf. 17:3; 26:2; 139:1, 23)**
***Ibid.*, (against the outward "walk"):** hw)hy> tAB li !kEtw> **(Prov 21:2; cf. 15:11; 16:2; 17:3; 20:27)**
[God] knows the secrets of the heart: bl¢tAm luT; [dey0 **(Ps 44:22; cf. Job 7:17-18; 13:9)**

The idea of the heart as a vehicle to express the intent, and the inner attitude and disposition has been recognized by scholars. In particular, we want to underline the scholarly understanding of the heart as the organ of

mental/volitional/psychological processes. If North and others are correct, namely that in the Bible the "heart" takes on the functions of "the nervous system centered in the brain", then we will have established a plausible dimension of the heart as a source of intentions and inward attitudes.[21] In this sense, Wolff has shown that the Bible employs ble to convey the notion of intention both in ethical and general cases, an aspect also recognized by Gemsler and Kaiser.[22] A more general approach toward this problem has been taken by Johnson, Baumgartel, Fabry, Krauss, Clements, and Nowell, even though their studies have less focused on the notion of intent.[23] One would be correct to assume a general level agreement among scholars with respect to the role of the heart in ethical, and in particular, the inward dimension of biblical thinking.

B. brq, !jbe; hylki

Typically the Scripture applies brq, to describe human organs, physical objects, and spatial locations (e.g., "in the midst of [...];" Hab 3:2; Num 14:13, etc). The word appears often in combination with ble, but when it stands by itself it conveys a meaning almost identical to that of ble[24] In this sense brq, has a semantic range with enough flexibility to convey the aspects of intention and inner attitudes in ethical and religious cases. Even though some of these presume a practical outcome, they also call into question the inward attitude/intention of the person. Thus:

There is no truth in mouth; only [thoughts of] destruction inwardly: tAWh; ~Brqi hn Akn>Whypi B. !yaeyKi **(Ps 5:10)**
Transgression speaks within the heart of the evil one: yBli brq<B. [vr l [vP, - ~a(> **(Ps 36:2)**
They bless with their mouth, but curse inwardly: Wllqy>~B rqbW Wkrb y>Wpi B. **(Ps 65:2)**
[People] devise plans, for the inward thought and heart are deep: qm[blew> vyai brq<w>fP xm. fpxe **(Ps 64:7)**
He is disguised with his lips and but inwardly he's laying deceit: hm(mi tyviy AB rqbW rkEN ylwyt p fBi **(Prov 26:24)**
He is speaking peace to his friend and laying ambush within:
ABtra ~yfi y AB rqbW rBedy>Wh[ereta, ~Al v **(Jer 9:7)**

!jbe and hylki are two other terms that refer to physical entitites and mental/spiritual states.[25] !jbe occurs twice as often as hylki, describing for the most part a physical part. In its metaphorical sense it refers to the inner being, the seat of thoughts and judgments. As with ble and brq, the Scripture uses !jbe in passages with ethical and religious connotations.[26]

   Second, unlike !jbe, hylki appears at least nine times in settings that may refer to the concept of inward dispositions and intentions.[27] Indeed, scholars have pointed out the semantic and conceptual proximity between

ble and hy lki, especially as both nouns form a pair that is the object of "divine searching/testing".[28] However, some have also suggested that the kidneys symbolize the emotive functions of the person, while the heart those of a mental/volitional nature.[29] Not all scholarly arguments support this interpretation. First, the occurrences of hy lki in the metaphorical sense are insufficient to justify this interpretation. Second, ble appears as the object of divine testing several times without hy lki, while hy lki is never used by itself in this sense. And third, we have shown that the Scripture often uses ble itself to depict the human emotions of joy, elation, and sadness. What is essential to our topic are the following passages:

You are near their mouth, but far from their kidneys (thoughts): ~h(tAylKmi qAx r w>~h, ypB. hT a; bAr q (Jer 12:2)
[The righteous God] tests the heart and the kidneys: tAy lkW tAB li !xEbW (Ps 7:10; 26:2)
[As a judge, God tests and] sees the heart and the kidneys: blw tAy lk. ha,ro (Jer 20:12; cf. 11:20)
[God] searches the heart and tests the kidneys: tAy‡ K. !xEBobl erqExo (Jer 17:10)

We believe that hy lki functions metaphorically as a designation both for emotions and the spiritual and mental attitudes and predispositions that only God may see. We also note the specific occurrence of hy lki in passages that, first, raise the issue of the inward reality versus the outward pretence (thus Jer 12:12; a point also made via ble hb v x[m, hM yzi, brq), and second, present God as the examiner of the inward motivations and intentions. [30]

2. Terms serving as intermediary between the physiological and purely intellectual spiritual/emotive processes

A. vpn<

The present category includes vpn< and xUr, two entities that may be characterized as both physiological and mental/spiritual. There is a sense in which each term has its own unique features (e.g., vpn< and xUr have a direct link to the physical body, whereas rcy, [to be analysed later] does not). Still, they fulfill certain functions or represent certain aspects that form a conceptual area of congruence, namely, the category of intent/motivation/plan, etc.

Like ble the word vpn< presents wide spectrum of meanings.[31] Scholars have noted the semantic and conceptual proximity of ble and vpn<.[32] In a sense, it may be said that vpn< functions less frequently than ble with the sense of inward desire, disposition, and intention. At the same time, as scholars have shown, the semantic range of vpn< is widen enough to encompass the sense of intention, even though the inward states that vpn< is

more likely to describe are desires, lust, craving, and diverse feelings and
emotions.[33]

B. xllr

As was the case with vpn, the word xllr also shares a common background
with ble Several scholars have shown that at times xllr comes close to
matching the functions of intentions and/or inward attitudes.[34] It may also
be observed that, unlike ble (or even vpn), the semantic range of xllr is less
flexible when it comes to expressing the specific meaning of "intention".

3. Terms denoting intellectual and spiritual/emotive processes

A. rcyE

The word rcy as a verb has the sense to "form, shape, create". The word also
functions with a meaning that comes close to the concept of inten-
tion/inward predisposition (Gen 6:5; 8:21 and Deut 31:21).[35] These texts
reveal a more spiritual/psychological sense that rcy may take (in Gen 6:5;
8:21 it occurs along with ble and tbovxm).

B. bvx (hb v xm)

The root bvx appears consistently in passages that describe the concepts of
intention, thoughts and inner dispositions.[36] Again, this is expected, since
the noun tbovxm can take both positive and negative connotations, though
often the Scripture uses it in the context of divine condemnation of
devising/intending/purposing evil. Notice the following examples:

You meant/intended evil against me, but God [...]: hb jd. Hb v x] ~yhil(a/
h[r yl; [~T, bvx] **(Gen 50:20)**
[God] frustrates the devices of the shrewd: ~ymllr[] tAb vxm; rpme **(Job 18:12)**
Every imagination of the thoughts of his heart (was continually evil): AB li
tbovxm; rcyE-lk w **(Gen 6:5; 8:21)**
The heart devises wicked thoughts: !wa tAb vxm; vrexo ble **(Prov 6:18)**
Do not think evil in your heart: ~kbb,l Bi Wb vxT;-la([...] [r w **(Zac 7:10; 8:17; cf.
Ps 140:3)**
The Lord understands every intent of the thoughts: !ybime tAb v xm; rcyE-lk w
hw hy> **(1 Chr 28:9; 18)**
Your thoughts and intentions [with which] you would wrong me: Wsmk.T;
yl; [tAM zmW ~ky tAb)vxm; **(Job 21:27)**
All the thoughts [of people oriented] toward evil: [r (~t bvxm;-lK **(Ps 56:6)**
Evil thoughts – an abomination to the Lord: [r tAb vxm; hw hy>tb; [AT **(Prov
15:26)**

He does not intend, his heart does not think: bvxy: !kE-al{ Ab b lW hM, dy> !kE-al{ allhw‹(Isa 10:7)

Given its narrower semantic range, bvx conveys an even more precise sense of thinking/intending/conceiving than does ble[37] Scholars have recognized the fact that the Bible uses bvx frequently in an ethical/moral/religious setting.[38] The survey of the biblical data suggests that the thought or the intention, as conveyed by bvx may not always be separated from the deed.[39] However, it is conceivable that thoughts and intentions alone could be and were held liable, at least in the "divine court". Overall, it appears that the Bible uses the verbal form bvx with a meaning that presupposes some sort of physical outcome, whereas the noun hb v xm; occurs often with the sense of intentions and thoughts that are evil regardless of any ensuing act. Both terms may work with more physical organs such as hands and palms, feet, and the like.[40]

C. ~mz/hm zm/hM zl

The Bible uses this form with the meanings of "intention" (or to "intend"), "purpose", "device" or "plan".[41] The strict sense "to intend" or "intention" may be assumed in several cases, although these forms generally reflect the meaning of inward, secret conceiving/devising of plans which may or may not result in an overt act.[42] It is also correct to say that some biblical authors, in reacting against what appeared to be the mere attitude of deceit, hurtful intent and planning (not only the act), used these terms.[43]

[People] conceive a plot, but won't succeed: hM zm. Wb vx (Prov 21:11)
[God] will condemn a man of [evil] intents/devices: [yvr]y: tAM zm. vyai w‹(Prov 12:2; cf. 14:17)
The "planner" of evil is called a man of "schemes:" ar qyl tAM zm-l [B(Al [rh l. bVe xm. (Prov 24:8-9)
The devising of folly is a sin: taJ x; tlWkai tM; zl (Prov 24:9)
The thoughts [of the wicked are]: "there is no God:" wyt (Mzm-lK ~yhi la/!yae (Ps 10:4)
Especially if one brings (the sacrifice) with [evil] intent: Wa(bwj> hM zb-yK(@a; hb AT ~y[iv r>xbz< (Prov 21:27)
He plans wicked schemes (against the poor) with lying words: rqv, -yrmaB. #[y tAM zl allh (Isa 32:7)
You shall do to him as he had intended to do to his brother: wyxa l. tAf []; ~m; z rv<aK; Al ~tyfi [w‹(Deut 19:19)
All that they purposed to do (divine punishment at Babel): tAf[]; Wm zy rv<a] lKo (Gen 11:6)

Notice also a "positive" meaning in Jer 23:20.[44]

The anger of the Lord will not turn back until it accomplished the intents of his heart: ABﬂi tAM zﬁm. Am yqﬁh}d[ﬁ▸At fﬁ}d[; h﬚ hy▸@a; bﬁﬂvy aﬁ **(Jer 23:20-24)**

D. hm d , vrx , hrﬁh

Several other verbs that convey a similar meaning, but which appear less frequently are hm d, vrx, **and** hrﬁh.[45] **Among the obvious similarities the exist among these verbs one may point out the functions of conceiving and devising (especially** vrx, hrﬁh, bvx) **and intending (thus** hm d **and** ~mz). **It seems evident that the meanings of conceiving, plotting, and devising inherent in these verbs present parallels on the conceptual level with the notion of "intent". At times, however, these terms do refer to more than just the aspect of mere intentions.**

The following table summarizes the list of idioms analyzed above:

Idioms for Internal Organs	blﬁe	heart - mind, brain, thoughts
	hy ﬁ ki	kidneys - emotion, thought, feeling
	brﬁq,	bosom, inwards - the inward life
	!jﬁbe	womb - inmost soul
Physiological and Spiritual/ Psychological Functions	vpﬁﬂ<	soul - inward life
	xﬂﬁﬂr	spirit, breath - inward life
Intellectual/ Emotive Functions	rcyﬁﬂ	inclination, striving, predisposition, intention
	hb v xﬁﬂm/bvx	thought, plan, intention (to think, plan, intend)
	~mz/hm zﬁﬂm/hM zﬁﬂl	devise, purpose, intention (to devise, purpose, conceive)
	hm d	to imagine, incline to, intend
	vrx	to devise, conceive, scheme
	hrﬁh	conceive, devise
Idioms for "Divine Examination"	Har	to see, look
	!yb	to perceive, know
	[dy	to know
	hﬁzx	to see
	!xb	to test, examine
	@rc	to test
	rqx	to search
	dqp	to visit, test, search
	vpx	to search
	!kt	to probe, evaluate, measure
	vrd	to search, seek
	asﬁﬂn	to try, test

Conclusions

It must be stated that this is not an exhaustive list of the idioms for the concept of intent.[46] As one would expect when studying the notion of "intent" as a state of mind, the terms that dominate in this category are verbs processes like thinking, conceiving, intending, and perceiving, along with nouns like thoughts, intentions, plans, devices, and predispositions. In addition, when referring to God, the Scripture also employs terminology borrowed from other realms such as testing, trying, searching, and seeing.

At the same time, our study offers a systematic review of some of the most important terms that the Scripture uses when referring to the notion of intention. A corollary of this analysis is the cultivation of a new appreciation for the way in which the Old Testament understands the inner world of the heart. Traditional scholarship has usually elevated the New Testament as that part of revelation that upholds the life of the Spirit, relegating the Old Testament to the domain of law and practice. Without minimizing the unique revelation of the New Testament in the under- standing of the human heart and of redemption as the inward rebirth and transformation, we also want to trace the line of continuity that runs through the revelation of God in the Old and New Testament.

Notes

[1] Thus der Toorn, "Ordeal Procedures", 434-35, who characterizes the ANE solar deities as gods of justice with intimate knowledge of the inward world of humans, and Pettazzoni, *The All-Knowing God*, 77-88, for texts describing Anu, Enlil, Ea, Sin, Marduk, and Shamash. For Egyptian parallels cf. Gerstenberger, *Psalms*, Part II (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2001), 515, who refer to the gods Amon, the "searcher of the body, who opens the hearts", and Sia, "who knows the inner parts of the body". Similarly Hogg, "'Heart and Reins'", 59-60, pointing to weighing of the heart of the deceased by Osiris, and Pettazzoni, *ibid.* 49-76, for the role of "many-eyed deities"; cf. also Currid, "The Egyptian Setting of the Serpent", *BZ* 39-40 (1996), 217ff.; Taylor, *Death and the Afterlife in Ancient Egypt* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001), 35ff. For the ritual of "haruspicy" in relation to "divine examination" of the heart (Ps 139:23-24) see Keel, *Symbolism,* 184-85; cf. Hogg, "'Heart and Reins'", 59-60.

[2] For Keel, *Symbolism*, 183ff, the worshippers were involved in the "gate liturgy", a ritual intended to "prevent one from approaching the holy in gross impurity". Thus Ps 11:4-5, 7, וְחֻ֫חָ֥ק וְיַ֥עַן אָדָ֖ם בְּנֵ֣י חֹ֭בֵי לְיֵ֗ פַּ֫שַׁע ("His eyes see, his eyelids test the sons of man"). Keel also refers to the "experience of God as a consuming fire" and to divine *testing* as "refinement" (Ps 26:6); cf. our analysis of Psalms 15 and 24.

[3] It was shown that the Temple may have served as a judicial forum for cases that could not be adjudicated at the level of the local courts (cf. Deut 17:8, "If a matter of justice is too difficult for you",). The process also included an *oath* (cf. 1Ki 8:31ff) which "came in force when the courts had to admit their own inability to administer justice and through the oath left to God to do so"; thus Phillips, "The Undetectable Offender", 148, and Frymer-Kensky, "The Suspected Sotah", *VT* XXXIV 1 (1984), 24, for the "oath" as a transfer of jurisdiction to God.

[4] Thus the phrase לִבָּ֑וֹת וּכְלָי֣וֹת בֹּחֵ֖ן in Ps 7:10, as a "hymn-like formula", in Krauss, *Psalms 1- 59*, 173. Krauss, *Worship in Israel* (Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1965), 217, also shows that the climax of the prayer used "during the testing" was the formula "Search me, oh, God, and know my heart. Try me, and know my thoughts" (Ps 139:23); cf. also Gerstenberger, *Psalms, Part 2, and Lamentations*, 513; der Toorn, "Ordeal Procedures", 429; Horst, "Die Doxologie im Amosbuch", *ZAW* 47 [1929] 45ff; Wurtheim, "Erwagungen zu Psalm 139".

[5] *Die Psalmen*, 13, "Beobachtungen zur Korpererfahrung", 35, and Ps 7:10; cf. also Delekat, *Asylie und Schutzorakel* 63 (for Ps. 7:10); Beyerlin, *Die Rettung der Bedrangten*, 106 (Ps 17:3). As we have already shown, Kepler, "Beobachtungen zur Korpererfahrung", 35-37, finds a dual function for this formula: judgment of the conscience of the sinner and the "proclamation of innocence" for the one falsely accused. Similarly, Beyerlin, "Die Rettung", 102-03, 107, for the link between *legal justification* (ymjEpv , Ps 7:9) and the aspect of "divine examination (tNy l kW tAB li !xEbW, Ps 7:10); *ibid.* 118.

[6] We pointed to the reviews of Eaton, Hasel, and Tourney. Notice also the following interpretations regarding Psalm 15 and 24 (listed by Willis in "Ethics in a Cultic Setting", 145-69, and which Delekat argued might describe the process of admittance for refuge): Sabbath Day psalms, Commemoration of Conquest of Jerusalem by David, Polemic against the Samaritan population, and Entrance Liturgy. To these we want to add the problem posed by the nature of the *ordeal* and of the *theophany*. Der Toorn ("Ordeal Procedures") and McKane ("Trial by Ordeal") posit a trial by "the cup of wrath": the party that survived the test through the night (drinking a mixture of wine and poison) was deemed innocent. But Krauss, *Psalms 1-59*, 204, argues that "the specific original sacral connection" of the "cup" metaphor has faded away. For Schmidt, *Die Psalmen*, 26, Beyerlin, "Die Rettung", 107, and Krauss, *Theology*, 132, the "sacral process of judgment" consists simply in spending the night in the temple and receiving the verdict in the morning.

[7] 1 Sam 16:7; 1 Ki 8:38-40; 1 Chr 28:9; 29:17-18; 2 Chr 6:30, and second, Jer 11:20; 12:3; 17:9; 20:12; Job 7:17-18; 13:9; Prov 15:11; 16:2; 17:3; 20:27; 21:2; 24:12.

[8] Wurtheim, "Erwangungen zu Psalm 139", *VT* 7 (1957) 165-82, accepts a "theological development" from a juridical to a wisdom-type setting in Ps 139, where the motif of "divine examination" occurs twice (vv. 1-2, 24). Thus Psalm 139 is the final product of theological development of the law, practical application, and poetical style. For Weiser, *Psalms* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962) 802-09, the "Cult of the Covenant Festival" was the primary setting of many Psalms, and the notion of "divine examination" was a reflection of the religious experience of the psalmist; similarly Krauss, *Psalms 1-59*, 204; Gerstenberger, *Psalms*, Part II, 79.

[9] For ha r used with the sense of "intellectual apprehension" see Vetter, "har", *TLOT*, 1176-83, and Fuhs, "har", *TWAT* 7: 226-66, esp. 256, for the application of ha r, with God as subject, in "testing" (of the heart/reins) and "judgment". Thus Jer 12:3, yBi li T nxb W ynBaerTi ynlT [dy>hw hy>hT an> ("You know me, You see me and test my heart") and 20:12. Naude, "har", *NIDOTTE*, describes the perception of the "inner being" as one of the attributes of God; cf. Michaelis, "oraw, kaqoraw", *TDNT,* 5:315-57. We have already referred to the arguments of Pettazzoni, Eichrodt, Preuss, and von Rad, on the attribute of divine omniscience in Biblical and Oriental thought.

[10] Ringgren, "!yb", *TDOT* 2:99-107, sees !yb and [dy as synonyms (in Prov 24:12, where the object is the human heart). Both Schmid, "!yb", *TLOT*, 230-32, and Fretheim, "!yb", *NIDOTTE,* view the aspect of divine perception of the thoughts as a "religious/theological" usage of the verb. Still, the objects of divine perception in the case !yb (in the Bible) of are most often physical.

[11] For background on the idea of divine knowledge see Petazzonni, *The All Knowing God*, 97-114; Bultmann, "ginwskw", *TDNT*; Botterweck, "[dy", *TDOT* 5:448-81; LaSor, "Know/Knowledge", *ISBE* 3:48-50; Schottroff, "[dy", *TLOT*, 508-21; Fretheim, "[dy", *NIDOTTE.* Botterweck relates the aspect of divine knowledge of the thoughts to the realms of cult (worship) and law (justice), where the worshipper declares his or her innocence and calls on God for justice, based on his knowledge of the heart (Ps 44:21; cf. Job 31:6; Ps 40:10; Jer 12:3). Fretheim too views the act of *testing* as a step prior to determining what is in the heart: thus the formula ^ bb lB(rv<a}ta, t[d;l ^ tS)d. (Deut 8:2; cf. 13:3; Jud 3:4; Ps 139:23), with the aim to punish or reward (1 Ki 8:39; Jer 18:23).

[12] For !xb with the sense of "probing pure metals" see Bauldau, *Lautern und prufen im Alten Testament. Begriffsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu* srp *und* bhn (Diss. Greifswald, 1970); Tsevat, "!xb", *TDOT* 2:69-72 (1975); Keel, *Symbolism*, 182-86; *TWOT* "!xb"; Jenni, "!xb", *TLOT*, 207-09, and Brensinger, "!xb", *NIDOTTE*; cf. Grundmann, "dokimazw", *TDNT* 2:255-60; Seesemann, "peirazw", *TDNT* 6:23-36, and Bloomerg, "Test", *ISBE* 4:795-96. Scholars have noticed the transition from the technical sense (Zech 13:9, bh Z h-ta, !xobKi "as one tests gold") to the religious/metaphorical aspect: the testing of God by human beings (Ps 95:9; Mal 3:15),

people testing other people (Gen 42:15-16), the ear testing words (Job 12:11). We have mentioned the juridical setting of the idiom of "testing the heart/inwards" (Ps 7:10; 11:5; 17:3; 26:2), and texts such as Job 7:18; Prov 17:3; Jer 11:20; 12:3; 17:10; and 20:12, where the emphasis lies on the heart/mind as the locus of genuine *ethics* and *piety*; thus *TWOT.* Even here there is a *legal* dimension, especially in the depiction of God as a judge called to justify the innocent and condemn the wicked (on the basis of no other evidence than the realm of the inward life).

[13] Tsevat, "rqx" 5:148-50; *TWOT*, "rqx", Matties/Patterson, "rqx", *NIDOTTE.* Unlike !xb, and @rc, rqx is not used with the sense of testing the purity of physical objects. It rather connotes the idea of "searching" or "examining" a person (Job 13:9) a situation (Deut 13:15), or an entity (2 Sam 10:3 [a city]). Notice also the metaphorical sense behind the idiom hAla/rqxeh; (the "deep things of God", Job 11:7) or ~Ah T. rqxebW (\"the search of the depth", Job 38:18). For Tsevat, *TDOT* 5:149, rqx, more so than !xb and @rc, "stands for a purely cognitive and analytical examination and testing", although he is right to allow for borderline cases and frequent parallelism which "stand in the way of a uniform clear distinction". rqx also appears to be used in a more *religious/ethical* setting, and less a juridical one (unlike !xb). Thus 1 Sam 20:12, where Jonathan examines his father's *disposition* toward David (ybia-ta, rqoxa,-yKi); cf. *TWOT*, "rqx". See also Delling, "ereunaw", *TDNT* 2:657-57, and Greeven, "zhtew", *TDNT* 2:892-896.

[14] As a verb that means "melting, purifying" and "refining", @rc has a more technical application than !xb: thus the form ~ypir&h; (the "goldsmiths", Neh 3:32; cf. Prov 25:4; 27:21; Isa 1:25; 40:19, for "molten" images); cf. Wakely, "@rc", *NIDOTTE.* Psalm 66:10, @sK {@r cKiWhT prc. ~yhila/WhT nxb-yKi ("You have tested us like the testing of silver".) illustrates the transition from the physical to the metaphorical meaning (but see Judg 7:4; Ps 105:19). Less frequent, the idiom of testing the "heart" is still present: yBli> yt;Ayl Ki hp rc (Ps 26:2; cf. Prov 17:3; Ps 17:3). See also Keel, *Symbolism*, 182-86; *TWOT.*

[15] See Gehman, "episkepomai, episkeyij, episkopoj, and episkoph in the Septuagint"; Andre, "dqp", *TWAT* 6:707-723; Schottroff, "dqp", *TLOT*, 1018-31; Williams, "dqp", *NIDOTTE.* While dqp appears as a verb of "searching", it never takes the "thoughts" or "the heart" as its object, but the human person as a whole. Still, Williams argues that the "visitation" has a *theological/legal* aspect: to evaluate a person's inner life for the purpose of judgment or blessing; also Dhorme, *Le Livre de Job* (Paris: Librairie Victor Lecoffre, 1926) 98, and Schottroff, "dqp", *TLOT* 2:1026, who refers to "examination" in the context of the "confession of innocence in the prayer of the accused" (e.g., Ps 17); cf. Andre, "dqp", *TWAT* 6:718. Schottroff, "dqp", *TLOT*, 1021, is also correct to notice the semantic interchangeability between dqp and [dy (to "perceive", Job 35:15), har (to "see after something", Ps 80:15), @rc (to "test", Ps 17:3) and !xb (to "examine, put to the test", Ps 17:3; Job 7:18).

[16] *TWOT*, "fpx"; Matties, *NIDOTTE.* On the semantic level fpx has more in common with rqx, than with the verbs of "testing" !xb and @rc; thus the parallel occurrence hr qoxmW>Whyker d>hf Pxn: ("let us search [...] and examine", Lam 3:40). In most cases fpx takes physical *objects* (Gen 31:35; 44:12), *persons* (1 Sam 23:23), or abstract entities like *injustice* (Ps 64:7) and *wisdom* (Prov 2:4). Its conceptual range is flexible enough to include inward elements like the "spirit" (Ps 77:6) and the "innermost chambers" (Prov 20:27).

[17] *BDB*, "!kt", "to measure, estimate" (Ps 75:4), although scholars still debate its meaning; thus *TWOT*, "!kt". The objects that the verb may take are *actions* (tAlY{i[]Wh Ktnl AlW, 1 Sam 2:3), *silver* (2 Ki 12:12), *mountains/hills* (Is 40:12) *divine acts* (yn dea] %rD, !kiT ylal, Ez 18:29, 33:20) and the *human heart/spirit.* Thus Fuller, "!kt", *NIDOTTE,* who prefers the meaning "to weigh", and thus to "know accurately [...] the inner spirit and the heart" (Prov 16:2; 24:12). For the sense of "estimating" correctly the "state of man's heart", see *TWOT*, "!kt".

[18] The idea of "testing the heart" is rare with hsn. The most frequent object hsn is an *individual* (God, by Israel, Ex 17:2, 7; 20:20; Num 14:22; Ps 78:41; Abraham, Gen 22:1-19; envoy of Babylon, 2 Chr 32:31) and a *group of people* (Israel, Ex 15:25; 16:4). Notice also: testing with the *fleece* (Jud 6:39), *testing oneself* with pleasure (Ecc 2:1) and wisdom (Ecc 7:23). Thus Seesemann, "peira/peirazw", *TDNT* 6:23-36; Brensinger, "hsn", *NIDOTTE*; *TWOT*, "hsn"). Helfmeyer, "hsn", *TDOT* 9:453, views the "testing of the heart" as an act against the heart that was hardened toward God. Yet, in passages like Deut 8:2, 2 Chr 32:31, and Ps 26:2, the aim of

the "test" is to bring to light the intentions/thoughts of the mind; thus Brensinger, "hsn", *NIDOTTE* (notice the judicial setting of Ps 26:2).

[19] Virtually all scholars have acknowledged a common conceptual background concerning the idea of bl in the ancient Near East. Thus Hogg, "'Heart and Reins' in the Ancient Literatures of the Near East", *JMOS* 1 (1911) 49-91; King, "'Heart and Reins' in relation to Babylonian liver divination", *JMOS* 1 (1911) 95-98; Smith, "'Heart and Reins'", "Mummification", *JMOS* 1 (1911) 41-42; Brandon, "A Problem of the Osirian Judgment of the Dead", *Numen* 5 (1958) esp. 121-23; Morenz, *Egyptian Religion* (New York: Ithaca, 1973) 63f; Currid, "The Egyptian Setting of the 'Serpent'", *Biblische Zeitschrift* 39-40 (1995/96) 217ff; Fabry, "bl", *TDOT* 7:399-438; Taylor, *Death and the Afterlife in Ancient Egypt* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001) 35ff.

[20] To Johnson's statement, that ble is "by far the most important organ", *Vitality*, 77, we add the fact that ble also appears in most of the passages that deal with the notion of intention. Fabry's classification, "ble", *TDOT* 7:409ff, illustrates the complex meanings taken by ble from an *anthropological* perspective, the heart is "strong" (Isa 46:12), "powerful" (Ezek 2:4), and "faint" (Ps 61:3), *noetic*: "understanding" (1 Ki 3:12), "knowing" (Prov 14:10), "wise" (Prov 16:23), "pondering" (Prov 15:28), "senseless" (Prov 15:21); *emotional*: "cheerful" (Prov 17:22), "rejoicing" (Ps 105:3), "trembling" (Job 37:1), "fearful" (Isa 35:4), "dreading" (1 Sam 28:5), and *ethical*: "good" (Eccl 9:7), "evil" (Prov 26:23), "be haughty" (Prov 18:12), "be false" (Hos 10:2), "go after idols" (Ez 20:16; Job 31:7). For Johnson, *ibid.* 86ff, unethical human behavior stems from two major human defects, both originating in the heart: "a proneness to deceit, and above all, a tendency to be lofty or swollen with pride". This aspect has been recognized by Chamberlayne, *Hebrew Ideas of Man*, 30-31, and Nowell, "The Concept of Purity of Heart in the Old Testament", 17, who adds the interesting dimension of the heart as a source of impurity. cf. also Stolz (the "heart" with *physical, psychological, intellectual, ethical,* and *existential* meanings), "ble", *TLOT*, 639-40; Lucas, *NIDOTTE*; Robinson, "Hebrew Psychology", 362-64 (the "heart" denoting *inner life, emotion, will*). Ogushi, "Ist nur das Herz die Mitte des Menschen?", *Was ist der Mensch...?*, 42, also points to ble as the "center of the orientation of life and of the active interaction between God and men".

[21] North, "Brain and Nerve in the Biblical Outlook", *Biblica* 74 (1993) 577-97, argued for the identification of the "brain" and the "nerve functions" with the heart. In "Did Ancient Israelites Have a Heart?" *BibRev* 11 (1995) 33, he pointes out that ancient Israel had "no word for brain and did not associate thinking with the head", but with the heart; similarly, Johnson, *The Vitality of the Individual*, 77; Glasson, "'Visions of Thy Head' – the Heart and the Head in Bible Psychology", in the *Expository Times* 81/8 (1970), 247-48; Robinson, "Hebrew Psychology", 253-53; Jacob, "yuch", *TDNT* 9:626.

[22] *Anthropology*, 52-53. For the *general* sense see Isa 10:7, Ab b lBi dymi vh1. yKi ("it is in his heart to destroy", e.g. his "intention") and 2 Sam 7:3, hf{] %lE^ bb lB(rv<a] lKo ("Go, do all that is in your heart"; e.g. "what you intend to do"); also Fabry, "ble", *TDOT* 7:424, 1 Sam 14:7, rv<a] lKo hfe[] ^ble lB; where "a particular idea becomes crystallized as an intention". Wolff also points to Ps 24:4, bb le-rblW ~yP; k; yql n; namely, the parallelism between *hands/palms* and *heart*, a formula that presupposes a situation where one "has neither done evil nor intended to do so". For the parallelism *actions-intentions* see also Fabry, *TDOT* 7:424, e.g., yBi li !Ay ghw»ypi -yrmai ("the words of my mouth and the meditations of my heart, Ps 19:15), and Otto, *Theologische Ethik*, 98ff, who finds in it to the "totality of the moral/religious life"; cf. Ps 73:113; 78:72 (wyP K; tAn WbtbW Abb l. ~toK). See also Gemsler, "Moral Judgment in the Old Testament", 87, and Kaiser, *Toward An Old Testament Ethics*, 8, for the dualism between de(eds) and intentions, which can be shown to operate in the prophets (condemnation of "outward acts of piety"), in the cultic life, as well as in individual cases like that of David (Ps 51:17; 1 Sam 16:7).

[23] Fabry, "ble", *TDOT* 7:424-25, refers to the role of ble in conceiving and planning "to the point of action, but not the act itself". Hence the heart itself is the locus of wickedness and evil machinations; similarly, Harrison, "Heart", *ISBE* 2:65 (the heart as the center "of will, purpose, and intentionality); Baumgartel "kardia", *TDNT* 3:607; Krauss, *Theology*, 145. A slightly different approach has been taken by Nowell, "Purity of Heart in the Old Testament", 26ff, who refers to the "divine searching" in the context of the demand for a "pure heart", where cultic terminology is now applied with a new moral, ethical, and religious sense. Thus

also Willis, "Worship", 280-81, underlying the "attitude of the offerer" in the performance of the ritual. Clements, "Abomination", 220-21, refers to the perspective of the authors of Proverbs, for whom harboring "evil intentions" may have adverse social consequences. For the importance of the theme of "interiority" in Job and its *judicial-theological* role, see Gammie, *Holiness*, 147-48. Cf. also Dentan, "Heart", *IDB* 3:550; Lesetre, "Coeur", *Dictionnaire de la Bible* (Paris: 1912) 2:823-24.

[24] Thus Rattray, *Theologische Wörterbuch*, 7:162-65, pointing to the similarities between the phrases brq<B. and blⁱeB, or simply xⱡlr (Ps 51:12, yBⱡⱡqB. vDex; !Ak n xⱡlr ⱡᵇyli -ar B. rⱡhj blⱡ). Do to its semantic range, brq, also functions as an indicator of *inward* nature: thus Rattray, "inwards" ("innerein"), both in the physical (e.g. giblets) and the metaphorical sense ("ideas, thoughts, emotions"); *HALOT*, "brq", "inward parts, thoracic activity (seat of emotions, etc.)"; *BDB*, "brq", "faculty of thought and emotion"; cf. Chisholm, "brq", *NIDOTTE*; Wolff, *Anthropology*, 63-64; Johnson, *Vitality*, 75. See also *TWOT*, "brq" for the notion that brq, is used in parallel with blⱡ vpⱡ, and other organs. Similarly Holladay, *Jeremiah 1,* who shows that brq, describes "the interior intentionality of persons within the total community" (Jer 4:14). As with blⱡ the Scripture uses brq, in passages with an *ethical, religious,* and *moral* import, since "one's inner being is also viewed as the seat of volition and moral character". For the *theological* significance of "inward attitudes" expressed through brq, see *TWOT*, "brq".

[25] For !jbⱡe see *DCH*, "!jbⱡ", "womb, stomach, innards"; cf. *HALOT*, "!jbⱡ"; *TWOT*, "!jbⱡ". In the case of hy Iki most scholars point invariably to the meaning of "kidneys". For the ANE background see Hogg, "'Heart and Reins' in the Ancient Literatures of the Nearer East", *JMOS* 1 (1911), 49-91; Kellerman, "hy Iki", *TDOT* 8:175-82.

[26] Thus Freedman, "!jbⱡ", *TDOT* 2:94-99, "inner man" which is searched by the lamp of Yahweh (e.g., Prov 20:27). Cf. also *BDB*, "!jbⱡ", "inmost soul, seat of faculties"; Rogers, "!jbⱡ", *NIDOTTE*; *HALOT*, "!jbⱡ". The ethical/religious application is evident in Job 15:35, dlⱡ ᵇ lm [hroh hm ⱡmi !ykiT ~n jbⱡ !wa + ("They conceive mischief and bring forth iniquity, and their 'inwards' prepare deception"). Thus it is unlikely that the "desires" are in view here, as suggested in *TWOT*, "!jbⱡ". Cf. Wolff, *Anthropology*, 63-64; Pedersen, *Israel*, I-II, 173ff. For the general notion of the usage of body parts with ethical/moral connotations see Robinson, "Hebrew Psychology", 364-65.

[27] This metaphorical usage is defined by *HALOT*, "hy Iki", "the innermost, most secret part of man"; cf. *BDB*, "hy Iki", *DCH*, "hy Iki" (the "seat of human conscience, joy, grief"). It is possible that the metaphorical sense of "inward being" might have been influenced by the fact that, "in dismembering an animal the kidneys are the last organ to be reached", as suggested in *TWOT*, "hy Iki". However Pedersen, *Israel* I-II, 174, argued that the hy Iki symbolize the functions of the "soul", not of the "heart", although it is unclear whether one could make a clear conceptual distinction between the two in this metaphorical sense.

[28] For this analogy see *DCH*, "hy Iki", *HALOT*, "hy Iki". Hogg, "'Heart and Reins'", 55ff; Wolff, *Anthropology*, 65-66; *TWOT*, "hy Iki"; Dentan, "Kidneys", *IBD* 3:9-10; Krauss, *Theology*, 145.

[29] Thus Robinson, for the dualism between blⱡ as the *intellectual* function of the person (*op. cit.* by Hogg, "'Heart and Reins'", 55-56), and hy Iki, with an emotional connotation". Yet Kellermann, *TDOT* 7:181, refers to the heart/kidneys pair as a construct meant to "characterize the total person by referring to an especially important organ in each of the two major portions of the body" (i.e., the upper and lower parts); cf. Kepler, "Beobachtungen", 34; Chisholm, "hy Iki", *NIDOTTE*. We note also Hogg's point in "'Heart and Reins'", 89, that when "only one of the terms occurs [...] one part stood for the whole".

[30] As noticed by Harrison (i.e., "motivations"), in "Kidneys", *ISBE* 3:13. Kepler, "Beobachtungen", 35-37, delineates two aspects of the "divine testing": the testing of the conscience of the sinners by God (the "enemies"), and the testing of conscience of those who proclaim their innocence (the "praying person"). See also Hogg, "'Heart and Reins'", 58ff; Kellermann, "hy Iki", *TDOT* 7:180-81; *TWOT* "hy Iki". Furthermore, see Chisholm, "hy Iki", *NIDOTTE,* for the legal-religious purpose of the testing, as "God examines [the kidneys] to discover one's true attitudes and motives and to determine one's appropriate reward or punishment".

31 **Thus Westermann, "vpn²", *TLOT*, 744, longing/desire/craving, soul, life, living person, and corpse (with "met"). Similarly, Fredricks, "vpn²", *NIDOTTE*, against importing "a Greek paradigm of psychology to vpn; cf. Seebass, *TDOT* 9:497-98; Jacob, "yuch", *TDNT* 9:608-66, esp. 621-22; Wolff, *Anthropology*, 10-25. Rendtorff, "Die sundige nefes", *Was ist der Mensch...?*, 211-20, argues that vpnis the term that the author(s) of Leviticus (cf. Num 15:31, hm r dyB) chooses to describe persons committing both *intentional* and *accidental* sins.**

32 **Thus Jacob, "yuch", *TDNT* 9:629-30; Westermann, "vpn²", *TLOT*, 746. In fact, ble and vpnappear in Prov 23:7, %M][i-lB; AB li>%l ᵻmay0htv/l lkoa/al/h -!K, Av pnB. r[: v -AmK yKi (as he will say "eat and drink, but his heart is not with you") with the sense of "inward calculation" (Av pnB. r[: v) masked by false behavior. Notice also the parallelism of Pro 24:12: tAB li !kᵻttv (God "weighs the heart") and ^vpn: rcᵻn/b (He "watches the soul").**

33 **Thus Westermann, "vpn²", *TLOT*, 746-47, citing Prov 13:21: [r -ht/lai [v r vpn (Prov 21:10; cf. Prov 13:2, sm (x -ydlgBo vpn<n; and 13:4, with the vb. h/l a:tm). More specific for the sense of "will/intention" is Ps 41:3, wyb (ao vpn<B. l/hnETTi -la/b ("God does not give him up to the intentions or desires of the enemies"). Thus also the formula ~k, vpn: vyf -~ai ("if it is your soul", 2 Ki 9:15), interpreted by Johnson, *Vitality*, 18-19, as an expression of *will* or *aim*. Though vpn; as *desiring/craving*, may take a positive connotation (2 Sam 3:21; 1 Ki 11:37), an evil inward attitude of the vpn<is usually condemned; cf. Fredericks, "vpn²", *NIDOTTE*, Similarly, Seebass, *TDOT* 9:505-08, and Jacob, "yuch", *TDNT* 9:621ff, who describes the "orientations" of vpn, toward an object or a person (sexual lust, hatred, the will). One may ask whether a passage like Isa 66:3, hc p(x -v pn: ~h, ycl/Qvbl/l ("and their souls delight in abominations") emphasizes the inward or the observable attitude/intentions of people. Wolff, *Anthropology*, 16, argues that the inward "desire and wish" determines entirely the "behavior" of a person; it "urges action". Cf. also Seebass, *TDOT* 9:507 (thus 1 Sam 20:4); and *TWOT* (2 Sam 3:21; 1 Ki 11:37).**

34 **Thus Ps 32:2, h/Y mir>Ax l/rB. !yaew; Prov 16:2, hu)y>tAx l/r !kᵻttv; Isa 29:24, xl/r -y[tl/ ("erring in the spirit"). Notice also the transference of terminology from the cultic and religious spheres to the "inward/spiritual" one: Ps 51:19, hr B vnl xl/r -yhil/a/ yxebzl (true sacrifice is a "broken spirit"); Hos 5:4, ~B rq/B. ~ynl/hz>xl/r yKi ("a spirit of harlotry is within"; cf. 4:12, Isa 19:3; Zech 13:2. For the relationship between ble and xl/r see Johnson, *Vitality of the Individual*, 84, Prov 16:18, xl/r) Hbg0 (cf. Eccl 7:8), Prov 29:23, xl/r -lpv/l ("humble spirit"), Isa 66:2, xl/r -hk/nl/ ("contrite spirit"), Eccl 7:8, xl/r -%ra(("patience of spirit"); cf. *TWOT*, "xl/r", and Kaiser/Block, "xl/r", *NIDOTTE*, for the relation between xl/r and vpn. For Albertz "xl/r", *TLOT*, 1210, in a way similar to ble, xl/r symbolizes the "private thoughts" that are searched by the Lord: hu)y>tAx l/r !kᵻttv (Prov 16:2; cf. Prov 21:2; 24:12) and the "directions" of one's spirit are known by him: h yT[dy>ynl a] ~k, xl/r) tAl [hl/l (Ez 11:5). Notice also *TWOT*, "xl/r", for Num 14:24, which shows Caleb as having a different *attitude* towards God than the rest of the people (AM [i trx, a: xl/r ht yh). For the general sense of "plan" or "intention" see Van Pelt/Kaiser/ Block, "xl/r", *NIDOTTE*, on Ezek 20:32: ~k, xl/r -l[; hl [h (e (what "will come up in your 'mind' [shall never happen "]).**

35 ***HALOT*, "rcy/f" defines rcf as "inclination" and/or "striving". See also *DCH*, "rcy", for the sense of "imagination, inclination, and intent"; cf. Schmidt, "rcy", *TLOT*, 566-68; B. Otzen, "rcy", *TDOT* 6:257-65; Hartley, "rcy", *NIDOTTE*. Smith, *TLOT*, 567, shows that the verb and the noun can express both act and thought (cf. Jer 18:11 for the pair rcy-bvx: hb y xl/n(~k, yl(] bvexu>h[r ~kyl(] rcᵻl/y). In addition to Gen 6:5 and 8:21, the form rcf occurs with the sense of "intention" or "purpose" independent of action in Deut 31:21 ("I know the 'purposes/intentions' which he is forming"), 2 Ki 19:25 (divine planning), 1 Chr 28:9 (!ybime tAb v xl/n: rcyf-lk u> hu hy, God understands "the intentions/purposes of the thoughts of the heart"); cf. 29:19 (AB li tbovxm; rcy/b).**

36 **Thus *HALOT*, "bvx", to "intend, to have in mind", with l. and the infinitive, and "hb v xl/n; *thought*, *intent*, *purpose*, *plan* (1 Sam 18:25; Jer 18:8; 23:27; Ps 140:5, etc.); *DCH*, "bvx", to "think, calculate, consider, plan, be about to". For the notion of "planning" Schottroff, "bvx", *TLOT*, 481, points to the combination "plans and counsels" (wyt Abvxm; W hu hy>tc[]) see Jer 49:20, 30; 50:45; Mi 4:12). Esth 8:3 uses it with the meaning of "plot" (~yd/n(h/yh>l[; bv; x rv<a] AT bvxl/n).**

37 **One should not, however, overstate the difference between the two terms. Thus Seybold, "bvx", *TDOT* 5:233-37, who points out to the parallel bvx/ble or hb v xl/n/ble as conveying the subjective and internal thought process of planning, reckoning, etc. Hartley, "bvx", *NIDOTTE*, shows that the Scripture uses both the noun and the verb in relation to ble (Prov 6:18 Isa 10:7;**

Ps 140:3; Zec 7:10, 8:17). Seybold argues that ble **may have the sense of "will" when in combination with** bvx **(Prov 16:9, "the human heart plans its course"** - AK¦Ð; bVexy>~d a bl**).**

38 For both the positive and negative connotations of bvx **see Schottroff, "bvx", *TLOT*, 481, and Fretheim, "Will of God in the Old Testament", *ABD*, 6:916ff, who shows that the form is used to express "divine intention", often with negative connotations, as a response for "Israel's own plots"; thus,** tAf []l; bvexoykimä rv<a]h[r h **("the evil which I intend to do", Jer 36:3; cf. 26:3).**

39 Wolff, *Anthropology*, 51, argues that at times bvx **shows the link "from deliberation to action (e.g., Prov 16:9, "a man's heart plans his course",** AK¦Ð; bVexy**). Similarly, Seybold, "bvx", *TDOT* 5:234, points out that the Piel form "shifts the semantic emphasis to the result of the thought process", the "planning that issues in action"; cf. Pedersen, *Israel I-II*, 126ff.**

40 We noted that the construct "hands/palms" and the "heart" (Ps 24:4 bb le-rblW ~yP; k; yqln**) suggests the totality of the ethical and religious life: *deeds* and *attitudes*. See also the texts of Isa 55:7,** wyt bwxm; !wa vyai wAK rÐ; [v r bz0[]; **("let the wicked abandon his ways, and the unrighteous man his thoughts"); Isa 66:18 (**~h, ytbovxmlW ~hyf{]m**); Gen 20:4,** yP; K; !y0qmblW ybi b l·~t B. **("with a pure heart and clean hands").**

41 Dictionaries typically distinguish between hm zm. **and** hM zl. **For** hm zm., *BDB*, **"hmzm",** *HALOT*, **"hm zm", "deliberation, plot, plan, shrewdness". For** hm zi, *BDB*, **"hm zi", "plot, device" but also "unchastity, adultery, licentiousness"; similarly *HALOT*, "hm zi", "intention, evil plan" but also "infamy, prostitution, incest" (Ju 20:6; Jer 13:27; Hos 6:9), and *DCH*, "hm zi", "wickedness, plan, device". For the verbal form** ~mz, *BDB*, **"~mz", to "consider, purpose, devise"; *HALOT*, to "think" or "plan evil"; *DCH*, "~mz", "plan, intend, determine, devise". Both** ~mz **and** hm zm. **take on positive (plan, anticipate) and negative (plot, plan evil) connotations.**

42 *BDB*, "hm zm", *HALOT*, interprets the phrase tAMzm. vyai **in Prov 12:2 as "a man of evil devices". Thus Ps 26:10, where** hM zl **appears in relation to** dy, **which connotes a physical action, not just intent:** hM zl ~h, ydyBi-rva]; **cf. Ps 119:150, Prov 10:23 (**hM zl tAf []**). Steingrimsson, *TDOT* 4:88, shows that** ~mz **is constructed 6 times with** l. **+ inf., usually in combination with verbs of action (Gen 11:6; Deut 19:19; Ps 31:14). A special case is the usage of in prophetic literature, where the *outcome* of the "planning" or "intending" is yet to occur (Jer 4:28; 51:12; Zac 8:15).**

43 Evidently, the attitude of "intending" or "conceiving" may result in a physical outcome. Still, in Wisdom and Poetic texts what is condemned is not always the act, as much as the attitude preceding the act. Thus Hartley, "~mz", *NIDOTTE*, citing Ps 17:3 (ytiMc ac mTi-lb; **"wicked schemes you have not found"), and Steimgrimsson, *TDOT* 4:88-89, for Job 21:27 as a condemnation of human thoughts that wrong God; cf. also Ps 10:4, (**wyt {Mzm-lK ~yhi la/!ya**). For the expression of "divine" intent with** ~mz **see Fretheim, "Will of God", *ABD* 6:916.**

44 Also Prov 1:4 (hM {mlW t[D: r[n: l, **"give [...] discretion to the youth"); Prov 5:2 (**tAMzm. rmov.li **"that you may keep discretion"); Prov 2:11 (**^yl, [rmov.Ti hM zm, **"discretion will watch over you").**

45 Thus *BDB*, "hm d", to "devise" or "intend"; *HALOT*, "hm d", to "imagine", to "incline to", cf. *DCH*, "hm d". For the general sense of "intent" see Num 33:56, tAf []l; ytiyMi Dl rv<a]K; **("I shall do to you as I intended to do to them"), Judg 20:5, Isa 10:7 (judgment for not "intending" and "thinking" the thoughts of God); thus Konkel, "hm d", *NIDOTTE*, who states that "some thoughts are intentions, a contemplated course of action". Concerning** vrx, **see *BDB*, "vrx", "devise, mischief", similarly *HALOT*, "vrx". Hamp, "vrx", *TDOT* 5:222, is correct to note a transition from the sense "to plow" to more ethical aspects. Thus, 1 Sam 23:9** h[r h vyrlxm; lWa v wyl [**("for Saul was plotting evil against him"); Prov 3:29,** h[r ^ []rel [; vrox]T;-la; **("Do not plot evil against your brother who lives trustingly besides you"), Prov 6:14,** [r vrexoAB lB. tAk PhnT; **("with perversity in his heart devises evil"); and similarly Prov 6:18, Prov 12:20 (**[r yvrxo-blB. hm rm**), Prov 14:22, and Hos 10:13). Concerning** hrh, **for its *ethical/religious* meaning see Job 15:35,** hm {rmi !ykiT ~n jblW !wa + dl{y wAlm [hroh **("they conceive mischief and bring forth evil, and inwardly prepare deception"), Ps 7:15,** rqv {dl{y wAlm [hr h wA**("conceives mischief and bring forth falsity"), 59:13,** rqv {yrbDl bLemi Ag hw>Ar ho**("conceive and reveal false words from the heart"); cf. also V. Hamilton, "hrh", *NIDOTTE*, for the metaphorical usage, and generally *BDB*,** hrh **in the Polel, to "conceive, contrive, devise", mostly with negative overtones; *DCH*, "hrh", "to devise".**

46 Among other idioms that the Scripture uses in a similar way are: vrd, **The Lord *searches* all hearts (**hw hy>vreAD tAbb l·lk yKi, **1 Chr 28:9);** tyvi, **God *sets* his *heart/*mind on people, testing and**

examining them (וֹמֶך בֹּקֶר לִבְקָרִים וּלִרְגָעִים תִּבְחָנֶנּוּ; **Job 7:17-18); and** רֹצֵן, **God, who** *keeps watch* over the *soul*, **knows [...] (**[וֹ יָדַע נֹצֵר נַפְשְׁךָ; **Prov 24:12).**

Essential Features of the Doctrine of Justification in the Theology of Martin Bucer

CORNELIU C. SIMUŢ

Emanuel University of Oradea

Historically, the theology of Martin Bucer is part of the early Reformed tradition. Unlike Lutheran theology, which presented justification mainly in terms of imputation of the righteousness of Christ to the believer, early Reformed theology developed an approach, which introduced the concept of impartation as the essence of justification. However, the imputation and the impartation of righteousness are by no means opposite and they were oftentimes part of the same theological enterprise.

The soteriology of the early Reformed tradition is focused on the doctrine of Christ as our moral example. We have salvation in the person of Christ; Christ should be the very centre of the Christian religion and every man should follow his way of living. One of the primary soteriological features that strongly marked early Reformed thought was the presentation of Christ as God, rather than man, which offered a unified theological pattern for the whole salvation and justification of humankind, from ancient times to contemporary life. Due to the importance of impartation for early Reformed soteriology, the doctrine of justification tended to be understood primarily in terms of ethics. The stress was set upon the concept of obedience and the moral life. Ethical obedience is important in any discussion on justification, because it persuades Christians not to remain content with justification by faith. Justification by faith has its outcome in holiness, which must be a characteristic of daily life.

Another crucial aspect of the early Reformed theology is that faith tended to be regarded in a very special connection to the doctrine of election. Election singles out the people who are given faith for their justification and salvation. The moral aspect of justification is vital for the confirmation of salvation.

Justification was somehow placed between the doctrine of election and that of moral obedience. The concern was to give to God the entire merit for the salvation of humankind, and this is clear from the Christological foundation of justification. Nevertheless, the doctrine of justification is attached an even stronger theological emphasis by means of election, which is also done by God in his sovereignty. Significantly, early Reformed theologians were also preoccupied with the human aspect of justification and moral obedience was the means of assessing the reality of salvation.

The starting point in Bucer's doctrine of justification is probably the fact that the Strasbourg reformer used the term "justification" ambiguously. This may be because theologically justification should never the separated from sanctification, but for the sake of clarity they are oftentimes distinguished from one another. Accordingly, some theological aspects clearly pertain to justification, like justification itself and faith, while others are part of sanctification, like righteousness and the law. It has been already shown that, in Luther's doctrine of justification, the righteousness of Christ is imputed, and in Zwingli's doctrine of justification, the righteousness of Christ is imparted.[1] Bucer, however, has two ways of approaching justification. Firstly, it should be said that he worked with a twofold approach to justification. Secondly, justification may also be threefold.

Concerning the twofold aspect of justification, Bucer made a distinction between the imputation of righteousness and the impartation of righteousness, although he never really separated them. Bucer is concerned to keep the forensic concept of primary justification, but in the same time he underlines the importance that this should be manifested under the form of good works in the secondary justification, which seems to be equivalent to the later concept of sanctification, expressed in terms of morality.[2] Bucer's *duplex justificatio* consists of two fundamental aspects. The first one is the forgiveness of the guilt of sin, which is realized through the new birth accomplished by faith and baptism. The second one is the righteousness of faith, which must by necessity lead to love.[3] It is rather clear that the imputation of righteousness necessarily involves the impartation of righteousness. God never imputes righteousness without also imparting it. When God transforms man's standing in his sight, he also transforms man's life in his sight and in the sight of men. In Bucer's thought, justification has an ethical dimension. Bucer wrote that justification is always through grace (*sola gratia*). This justification through grace is actually worked out by faith (*sola fide*), which comes through faith and becomes real both through the Holy Spirit and through a godly spirit. The godly spirit should always be willing to live in godliness (*animus verae pietatis studiosus*). In his *Commentary to Ephesians*, Bucer listed four stages of justfication: election, the consolation of the gospel, the life which reflects the image of God in daily living and holiness. The same ethical concern is clearly shown in *Commentary on Romans*.[4] Bucer thought it was necessary to teach an ethical or a moral obedience, because it persuades Christians not to be rest content with justification by faith, but to show its full outcome in holiness, which must be a feature of every day life.[5] In order to have justification, one must believe in Christ, which means he has to put his entire trust in him and in the fact that, through the blood of Christ, the believer is placed again within the grace of God and reconciled with him.

Christ is our saviour and he alone reconciles the Father to us, who have always lived in a sinful condition. Christ also offers to be our advocate before God and, as a result of this divine action, God lays aside all his wrath, forgives our sins and consequently pronounces us righteous, which

clearly means that he justifies us. This justification is worked out by Christ for all those who put their trust in him. Furthermore, all those who put their trust in him. Furthermore, all those who trust Christ receive the assurance of the Holy Spirit concerning reconciliation and justification. Nevertheless, justification must necessarily lead to love and holiness. Those who believe and put their trust in Christ must love both God and their neighbours in a life of constant holiness. In this respect, the righteousness of justification is both imputed and imparted. Bucer wrote:

> Therefore, when Paul asserts that we are justified by faith, the faith whereby we assuredly believe that Christ is our saviour and our sole peacemaker with the Father, he means that by this faith we are first of all delivered from all doubt that God, on account of the death of Christ undergone in our behalf, forgives us all our sins, absolves us from all guilt and passes judgment in our favour against Satan and all the ill we may have deserved. Furthermore, God breathes the power of his Spirit into those acquitted and declared righteous before him, to make immediate assault upon their corrupt ambitions and to urge on their suppression and extinction, and on the other hand, to fashion upright attitudes to every aspect of life, to arouse and foster holy desires, conforming us speedily to the likeness of Christ.[6]

The outcome is that Christ makes the believer useful again to all creatures. Hence, it is clear that faith must be active in love. In justification, the pneumatological aspect is vital for Bucer. The Holy Spirit is given to the believer with faith. Thus, the believer is in Christ and Christ in him by faith.[7] Now, faith necessarily generates good works, to which God predestined, called and justified men. Good works are a sign of godliness, but this is not something we achieve, but rather something God gives us. In Bucer's words:

> First, it is certainly necessary for God in his mercy to precede us and forgive all ungodliness. Thus he justifies the ungodly, but the ungodliness having been forgiven and remitted and then the Spirit having also been given, who shrinks from all ungodliness and is zealous for godliness, so that in this way he pays us the benefits of his that follow, as if a reward and recompense for godliness, a godliness in fact given by himself.[8]

For Bucer, to be justified is the opposite of being condemned. Righteousness is not acquired, for nobody can get the righteousness of Christ by his own intrinsic abilities. To be justified means to be pronounced just, non rendered (*reddi*) just. We are justified by faith, which means we are made (*efficimur*) just. This also means that we receive a justification that is freely given, on the basis of the things whereby God considers us just. To be justified means to receive a kingdom through Christ, the Son of God. When we are declared and judge just, we are considered righteous both in the sight of God and in the sight of men. God does not impute sin to the man who does acknowledge he is not righteous.[9] Imputation and impartation of righteousness are present throughout Bucer's theology of justification. No

matter how far we progress in sanctification, which is clearly God's work in us, our state of blessedness consists only of the fact that God does not reckon our sins to us and that he accepts the death of Christ as payment for our sins. We are justified by faith when we believe on account of Christ, who died for the very reason that our sins should not be imputed to us. For Bucer, our only righteousness is that our unrighteousness is forgiven.

Thus justification consists in two distinct aspects. Firstly, the remission of sins and secondly, the impartation of righteousness:

> Therefore, since Paul is accustomed to speak in this manner and under the term justification first indeed to express the remission of sins, but at the same time always to signify that sharing of righteousness which God equally brings about in us by the same Spirit, by whom he renders us certain of the forgiveness of sins of this own goodwill [...].[10]

Through the impartation of righteousness we are given the Holy Spirit, which means that our lives must display the righteousness of God that he effects in us. Concerning the threefold aspect of justification, Bucer lists the following stages. Firstly, by his own goodness and by the merits of Christ, God works out our election to eternal life, which is the equivalent of the imputed righteousness. Secondly, Bucer speaks of imparted justification, which is received by faith and is a characteristic of the believer's earthly life. Bucer links the justification by the impartation of Christ's righteousness to the doctrine of the priesthood of believers. He wrote:

> Christ himself (John 17) shows that all believers are one with him and with the Father. Therefore they are all spiritual, consecrated, sacrificers and what the one was the other was also. It is therefore clear from Scripture that all Christians, men and women, children and aged, are priests. It follows from the other article [justification by faith] that we all receive salvation from the one Christ, hence no one is better than the other. Similarly [...] no external thing makes a person either pious or blessed; then why does on want to be more consecrated or more of a sacrificer than another if such a distinction comes from something external like being anointed or saved.[11]

In the theology of Bucer, the impartation of righteousness (*iustitia*) as an essential part of salvation is included in justification. The reality of being made righteous (*iustum efficere*) by the Holy Spirit is always linked to the reality of being declared (*iustum pronunciari*), which is described as the "awarding of eternal life" (*adiudicatio vitae aeternae*).[12] Thirdly, justification is the full measure of eternal life. This may be considered an eschatological justification and it is to this that works are effective, but they are nevertheless the gift of God:

> Thus our justification is threefold, that is, God assigns eternal life to us in three ways. The first justification is that by which he destines eternal life to us. It assuredly consists solely in his goodness and in consideration of Christ's merit. The scholastics add the consideration of future merits, which no doubt God

> foresees in his own. But whence, I ask, does he foresee what no one ever has unless he himself gives it, which also he decided to give at the very time when he decided to give salvation? The second is that by which in some measure he now offers eternal life and grants enjoyment of it, having given his Spirit, in whom we cry "Abba, Father". This justification consists besides even in our faith, but this also God gives us freely out of his goodness and brings about in us by his Spirit. The third is when he at last offers in actual fact and fully eternal life or even the good things which we enjoy in this life, but then not just in faith and hope. To this justification what we do is relevant, but what we do is also itself the gift and work of God's gracious goodness.[13]

In spite of this threefold approach to justification, it is only the twofold scheme that Bucer oftentimes used in his theology. Thus, Bucer defines firstly the justification of the ungodly, as in the theology of Paul, and secondly the justification of the godly, as in the theology of James. God makes the first step in our salvation. He precedes any possible, although improbable, movement that man might try to advance in order to approach God. By this, God justifies the ungodly, namely he forgives and remits all sins. In the same time, he bestows the Holy Spirit to those he justifies. The spirit is very keen and zealous to godliness and he is constantly attempting to depart from sin. Because the spirit is within us, we should also be zealous to godliness and try to stay far away from sin.[14]

Forgiveness of sins, namely justification by imputation, has a specific purpose, as it opens a new relationship with God, which is the filial relationship of a son to a father. By his Spirit, God intends to make us in accordance with the image of his Son, Jesus Christ. Justification is the way by which Christ himself is found and is a genuine reality that encompasses human life, something that fundamentally transforms human life. If Christ is found by justification, then his righteousness is imparted to us in such a way that it transforms completely the whole of human existence. The double justification or the twofold approach to justification in the theology of Bucer could be described as a "forensic-effective" doctrine o justification, because justification must by necessity produce sanctification. We are justified by faith, which means that we are made just, and we are also justified by our works, which means we are declared and judged to be just.[15] Thus, justification includes the righteousness God works by his Spirit in those who believe in Christ. These, or the believers, are living proofs that God has forgiven their sins and that they had been chosen to be justified. Forgiveness of sins particularly or justification generally are both an act and a process. The believer is in constant need of the forgiveness of sins. He will remain in a relationship of total dependence upon God. This is why the righteousness of God is both imputed and imparted. Regardless whether Bucer spoke of a twofold or a threefold scheme, justification is always by faith. Here is his explanation:

> Our true justification, whether it happens at the beginning of our salvation or after, always consists in God's gracious forgiveness of sins and granting to us

> and reckoning to us the righteousness of his Son, which we receive when we rightly believe [...]. Justification is a gracious forgiveness of sins and the taking up into God's protection and the fellowship of eternal life in Christ our Lord.[16]

In his later theology, Bucer ascribes two meanings to justification. Firstly, justification is forensic and is the opposite of condemnation. By forensic justification, only the ungodly are justified by faith (*justificatio impii*). Secondly, justification is effectual and is that divine action by which God justifies the works of the godly (*justificatio pii*). The works of the godly, however, are not perfect and do not constitute a means to obtain God's approval. It is only by God's grace that the works of the godly are accepted. In Bucer's opinion, the twofold justification (of faith and works) is the only way to put together the theology of Paul and James. Nevertheless, the justification of works depends entirely on justification by faith.[17]

Faith is the means by which we approach the righteousness of justification, which is inseparably linked to Christ and his reconciling death. Because ultimately affected by sin, human nature has nothing good within it, nothing which is of God. Therefore, justification was decreed only by God on the basis of his loving grace and is appropriated by sinners by means of faith. On the other hand, faith is effective because of God's grace and Christ's merit and satisfaction. By the Holy Spirit, we are assured of God's benevolence towards us to forgive our sins and to make us actually righteous. The faith by which we are justified is not our work, but the gift of the Spirit. Thus, justification by faith means we are justified not by giving, but by receiving, not by doing, but by accepting, not by preparing God's benevolence for us, but by taking it as something that had been already prepared. The salvation of men is totally from God, because he firstly elects those whom he wants to justify and then he sends his Holy Spirit to enable them to believe and perform good works. These good works spring from a life that has been justified by faith and, although praised and approved by God, they are nevertheless imperfect. Man does nothing for his salvation. Actually, he cannot do anything for his salvation. Even the good works he performs had been prepared by God. Only faith counts for salvation and faith is a gift from God.[18]

Faith is related to Christ's reconciling death, the gift of the Holy Spirit and the new life of love. Justification is always connected to the immediate presence of the Holy Spirit in all those who trust Christ. The impartation of righteousness is not the work of the believer, but that of the Holy Spirit, who fashions the righteousness we must display in our lives. In this respect, Bucer is extremely careful to write that the holiness of imparted right-eousness must never be separated from the declaration of imputed righteousness, which both have the objective of conforming the believer to the image of Christ. Bucer wrote:

> Here without a doubt he [Paul] includes at the same time the word "justify" that righteousness which God produces by his Spirit in those who believe in Christ and which he intends to be his attestation to the effect that he has now forgiven

their sins and counts them among those he resolved to justify, that is, to count among the righteous not only by pardoning their sin, but also by conforming them to the image of his Son.[19]

Thus, justification primarily refers to the remission of sins and then to the imparting of righteousness, which God works out by the Holy Spirit. This is the same Spirit by whom he had granted us assurance of the pardon of our sins and of his benevolence towards us, by the very fact that the Spirit was established as a seal (*sphragis*) of the pardon of our sins. Genuine faith is not only a general assent, by which we believe that God is the creator of all things, that Christ was born, died and rose again. Faith is not only historical. True faith infers that we believe all these to have happened for our good, for our redemption, for our blessedness. Faith must be saving, and this comes only from God, the sole initiator and supporter of justification, and has as ultimate goal the very union with Christ. Bucer wrote that true, justifying faith is:

> The certain persuasion by the Holy Spirit of the goodness of God towards us and of his fatherly goodwill. It rests on our Lord, Jesus Christ, who expiated our sins by his death and by his life, in which he now reigns, he makes us participators in his righteousness.[20]

To conclude, Martin Bucer anchors his theology of justification in God, through his grace manifested in Christ. Justification is worked out by the Holy Spirit, who gives people the necessary faith, so that grace, faith and the work of the Holy Spirit are perfectly united in justification. In the Reformed tradition, justification depends on the sovereignty of God in election, which is based on the atoning work of Christ at the cross. In this respect, justification is understood as victory over and liberation from sin. Although election may seem arbitrary, it is nevertheless the very justice of God and a sign of God's mercy. As justification is a soteriological work of God, the Holy Spirit creates faith in whoever he wills with the purpose the all elected believers should perform good works and consequently follow the example of Christ. Justification consists of two main features: firstly, the imputation of Christ's alien righteousness to the believer and secondly, the impartation of the righteousness of Christ to the believer in order that the latter be made righteous, not only declared righteous. All these are made effective by faith on the account of Christ. The concept of imputation is very important for justification but it was expressed mainly in a negative form, in the sense that justification is essentially the non-imputation of sins and the forgiveness of sins. These must be personally appropriate by faith, which is not only a historical belief, but also a fundamental trust. Due to the fact that justification and sanctification have always been considered inseparably, Bucer's Reformed theology suggested a twofold approach to justification: justification of the ungodly by faith, by which sinners are considered and made righteous in the sight of God, and justification of the

godly by works, by which the works of the believers are considered to be righteous in the sight of God through the work of the Holy Spirit.

Notes

[1] W. P. Stephens, *The Holy Spirit in the Theology of Martin Bucer* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), 48.

[2] Alister McGrath, *Iustitia Dei. A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification from 1500 to the Present Day* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 34.

[3] Friedhelm Krüger, "Bucer and Erasmus", *Mennonite Quarterly Review* LXVIII/1 (1994), 17.

[4] *ibid.* 17.

[5] Basil Hall, "Martin Bucer in England", in D. F. Wright, *Martin Bucer. Reforming Church and Community* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 148-149.

[6] See Bucer translated in D. F. Wright (ed.), *The Commonplaces of Martin Bucer* (Appleford: The Sutton Courtenay Press, 1972), 162.

[7] Stephens, *The Holy Spirit in the Theology of Martin Bucer*, 49.

[8] See Bucer translated in *ibid.* 53.

[9] *ibid.* 50.

[10] Bucer translated in Stephens, *The Holy Spirit in the Theology of Martin Bucer*, 51-52.

[11] See Bucer translated in Willem van't Spijker, *The Ecclesiastical Offices in the Thought of Martin Bucer* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996), 77-78.

[12] *ibid.* 77-78.

[13] Bucer translated in Stephens, *The Holy Spirit in the Theology of Martin Bucer*, 52.

[14] See *ibid.* 53.

[15] For more details on the "forensic-effective" justification, see H. M. Barnikol, who also coined the term. H. M. Barnikol, "Bucer's Lehre von der Rechtfertigung" (Diss., University of Götingen, 1961), 98. Cf. Willem van't Spijker, *The Ecclesiastical Offices in the Thought of Martin Bucer* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996), 52.

[16] Bucer translated in Stephens, *The Holy Spirit in the Theology of Martin Bucer*, 54.

[17] For more details on the double justification in the theology of Bucer, see Alister McGrath, "Humanist Elements in the Early Reformed Doctrine of Justification", in *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 73 (1982), 5-19.

[18] Stephens, *The Holy Spirit in the Theology of Martin Bucer*, 59-62.

[19] Bucer translated in Wright (ed.), *The Common Places of Martin Bucer*, 163.

[20] Bucer translated in W. P. Stephens, *The Holy Spirit in the Theology of Martin Bucer* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), 64. Further bibliography on Bucer: Amy Nelson Burnett, *The Yoke of Christ: Martin Bucer and Christian Discipline* (Kirksville: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, 1994); Amy Nelson Burnett, "Church Discipline and Moral Reformation in the Thought of Martin Bucer", in *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 3 (1991), 439-456; Christian Krieger (ed.), *Martin Bucer and Sixteenth Century Europe* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1993); James M. Kittelson, "Martin Bucer and the Sacramentarian Controversy; The Origins of his Policy of Concord", in *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 64 (1973), 166-183; James M. Kittelson, "Wolfgang Capito, the Council and Reform Strasbourg", in *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 63 (1972), 126-140; Marijn de Kroon, "Martin Bucer and the Problem of Tolerance", in *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 2 (1988), 157-168; Martin Greschat, *Martin Bucer. Ein Reformator und Seine Zeit* (München: Verlag C. H. Beck, 1990); Hastings Eels, *Martin Bucer* (London: Yale University Press, 1931); J. V. Pollet, *Martin Bucer. Etudes sur les Relations de Bucer avec les Pays-Bas, l'Eléctorat de Cologne et l'Allemagne du Nord*, vol. I-II (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1985); J. V. Pollet, *Martin Bucer. Etudes sur la Correspondance*, vol. I-II (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1962); Gotfried Hammann, *Entre la Secte et la Cité: Le Projet d'Eglise du Réformateur Martin Bucer* (Genève: Labor et Fides, 1984).

Asahel Nettleton, Revivalist of the Second Great Awakening

ADRIAN GIORGIOV

Emanuel University of Oradea

Introduction

Asahel Nettleton (1783-1844) was one of the great spiritual leaders instrumental in the revival work in different areas of the eastern states during the Second Great Awakening (1787-1843). While he never pastored a church, wrote a book, or led an organization, "Nettleton was one of the earliest itinerant preachers born in America to have long-term success".[1]

Nettleton was converted at the beginning of the Second Great Awakening after a long struggle to understand God's sovereignty and election. His early ministry in eastern Connecticut, where the First Great Awakening produced some disorder, heightened his awareness of the potential dangers of some measures that can lead to fanaticism. Nettleton combined his preaching with personal discussions with those concerned about their spiritual state. He was greatly concerned about the "new measures" used by Finney and his followers in revival meetings. He was afraid that the result of those revivals will be superficial conversions based on hasty decisions, without a thorough conviction of sin. Both Nettleton and Finney had a genuine motivation, but their methods were different due to different theological convictions.

This paper will examine Nettleton's life and ministry starting with his early years and conversion, his mission call and education, followed by the presentation of his preaching style and methods of revival. Attention will be given to Nettleton's position regarding the New Haven theology and Finney's "new measures". The paper will conclude with a summary of Nettleton's contribution to the Second Great Awakening.

Early Years and Conversion

Asahel Nettleton was born on April 21, 1783, in North Killingworth, Connecticut, as the second child (and the eldest son) of Samuel and Anne (Kelsey) Nettleton. The family had six children, three sons and three daughters. Asahel grew up on his father's farm as a country boy. His

parents were Half-Way Covenant members of the Congregational church, and "he received a good grounding in religious and moral principles".[2]

Nettleton was converted in 1801. From 1798, during a period of four or five years "not less than one hundred and fifty churches in New England were favoured with the special effusions of the Holy Spirit", and thousands of people were converted.[3] Revival was unfolding in Connecticut, and the Spirit worked in Nettleton's hometown too, where religious meetings were held by Josiah Andrews from the Missionary Society of Connecticut.[4]

Nettleton's conversion struggle was triggered by a spasm of guilt that overcame him after he attended a ball for Thanksgiving. While reflecting on the preceding evening, the thought struck him that "we must all die, and go to the judgment".[5] He was overwhelmed with a sense of his lost condition and he turned his attention to a study of the Bible and other religious books. "An increasing sense of the wickedness of his heart brought about a corresponding attempt to prove the Bible wrong. He disliked the God he found there, for he knew that such a Holy Being must of necessity condemn him. He wished for God's non-existence".[6] Asahel often went to the fields and forests to cry to God for mercy, and he sometimes spent a large part of the night in prayer. The doctrines of divine sovereignty and election were sources of great distress to him. "He would sometimes say to himself: 'If I am not elected I shall not be saved, even if I do repent.' Then the thought would arise: 'If I am not elected I never shall repent'." Meanwhile he became fully convinced that it was his immediate duty to repent.[7]

After struggling in spiritual distress for ten months, "During which he passed through a religious experience as profound as that of an Augustine or a Luther, he found joy and peace in believing".[8] However, "he never expressed a very high degree of confidence that he was a child of God. He had such a deep and abiding sense of the deceitfulness of the human heart".[9] He was always cautious about the assurance of salvation. He said about himself, "The most that I have ventured to say respecting myself is, that I think it possible I may get to heaven".[10]

Mission Call and Education

Shortly after Nettleton's conversion, an epidemic (thought to be yellow fever) claimed six hundred lives in his town during the spring and summer of 1802; his father and youngest brother were among the victims. The death of his father brought more responsibilities to Nettleton. During the next four years at the farm "his desire to be a means of saving souls possessed him with increasing force, and the reading of missionary literature made him resolve to go to non-Christian lands".[11] This was a significant thought, since at that time no association existed in America for the purpose of sending missionaries to the dark places of the earth. He taught school by day and studied theology at night with his local pastor, Josiah B. Andrews (settled in the area by this time), who helped him to prepare for college.[12]

Nettleton entered Yale in 1805. During the winter of 1807-1808 New Haven and the Yale College experienced a revival which awakened Nettleton's interest, and he labored for the conversion of several of his colleagues.[13] During the revival, he could often be found walking on campus late in the evening talking to a fellow student about the Gospel.[14] In the spring of 1808, Nettleton passed through a season of deep mental anxiety and depression, in which he greatly questioned the genuineness of his Christian experience. Due to this depression he had to return home until his health would be restored.

During his college course, Nettleton carried on also a system of theological reading of the works of Edwards, Bellamy, and some others of the same school. "He left college better read in Divinity, than were many at that period who had gone through a regular course preparatory to preaching the Gospel".[15] Nettleton graduated from Yale in 1809. He was not a specially brilliant student, "but such was his devotion to duty that President Dwight said of him: 'He will make one of the most useful men this country has ever seen'."[16] In his junior year, Nettleton became acquainted with Samuel J. Mills.[17] They became friends and both intended to go to Andover Theological Seminary and then to enter the missionary field. However, neither one was able to carry this out.

There were three factors which did not allow for Nettleton the possibility to go to the foreign mission field. First, he had a debt incurred while at Yale which he needed to pay and he felt he had to stay until that was done. After graduation from Yale, Timothy Dwight offered him a job as college butler to get rid of his debts and to study theology.[18] After a year he went to study theology under Bezaleel Pinneo at Milford, Connecticut.[19]

Nettleton's abilities as a revivalist were discovered almost by accident when he was asked to interrupt his postgraduate theological studies at Yale to take an interim preaching assignment in eastern Connecticut. His next assignment was among the churches of western Connecticut. He was soon in demand also in New York and elsewhere in New England.[20] His preaching was so effective that leaders urged him to stay. Since there were no open opportunities in the foreign mission field at that time, he decided to stay. However, he did not want to take a settled pulpit because he hoped to leave soon to the mission field.[21] Finally, his contraction of typhus in 1822 eliminated all remaining hopes he had of work on the mission field.

Preaching

Nettleton's preaching was simple, direct, and powerful. According to a contemporary who knew him well, his sermons "were too plain to be misunderstood, too fervent to be unheeded, and too searching and convincing to be treated with indifference".[22] Although he was not exceptionally gifted as speaker or thinker,[23] "People were led to feel the very presence of God".[24] Some mentioned that when he reasoned or answered objections, everyone

felt that he wielded the Word as "a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces".[25]

Nettleton was well-known for his piercing eye-contact with his audience.[26] "When he spoke of heaven it was as though he had been there, and when he spoke of hell it was almost as though he had uncovered the bottomless pit for all to hear the groans of the damned".[27] Eternity was a constant theme of his sermons. He continually reminded his audience that their eternal destination was either heaven or hell. He also preached on "the necessity of the conscience being awakened to its danger prior to genuine conversion". He often alarmed the conscience through probing questions designed to pierce the hearts of the unconverted.[28] "Just as impressively as Nettleton placarded the monolithic foundation of God's sovereign pleasure and unilateral efficacy of his regenerative power, so he urged the immediate and unalterable obligation of all sinners to turn from sin, embrace the cross, and run toward heaven".[29]

During the average week, he would preach three times on Sunday and twice or more during the week. "He prepared sermons with just the aid of his Greek New Testament and concordance".[30] He once considered writing out his sermons, but "it was not the ministry to which he was called".[31] That is why only a limited number of sermons and outlines have survived. Nettleton paired his preaching with his methods of revival, which will be presented in the following section.

Methods of Revival

When he was first asked to do interim preaching in eastern Connecticut, Nettleton was aware that the First Great Awakening "had produced its most enthusiastic and disorderly responses in this region",[32] and therefore he adopted very sober methods. He knew the damage done by Davenport during the First Great Awakening and he had "an almost morbid horror of anything approaching fanaticism".[33] He found that the churches which had been made desolate by Davenport's ministry half a century before still used the measures which accompanied and promoted fanaticism, such as calling persons to the anxious seat, requesting them to rise to be prayed for, or to signify that they had given their hearts to God.[34] It was probably here that he began his lifelong opposition to what later was called "new measures".[35] Nettleton never requested people to rise to be prayed for or to signify that they were converted, he never encouraged women to pray in assemblies, never held meetings to a late hour in the night, he was never personal in his prayers, and he never denounced ministers and professors of religion, as cold and dead, and as the enemies of revivals.[36]

To carry out his evangelistic work, Nettleton utilized house calls, private conversations with townspeople on religious matters, conferences, and inquiry meetings. "Inquiry meetings and catechetical instruction for converts added to his effective manner of confronting individuals with

God's truth".[37] His converts were always thoroughly schooled in the fundamental teaching of Christianity.[38]

While he avoided and opposed new measures, Nettleton used the inquiry-meeting method in his work. Later it was called "The After Meeting".[39] "It is believed the appointment of meetings of inquiry, where the awakened might be conversed with individually, originated with him".[40] The meetings

> were usually opened with a short address, after which all knelt and united in a short prayer. The ministers present then proceeded to converse with every individual, in a low tone of voice, so as not to interrupt each other, or break the solemn stillness of the scene. [...] There was evidently much emotion, although no noise – there were many tears, although no outbreaking of the agony of the mind.[41]

The objective of the meetings and conferences was "to impress the simple truth on the conscience; to show sinners, from the word of the living God, that they are guilty, condemned, lost, and must be miserable for ever without a change of heart; and that it is their duty immediately to submit to God, and become reconciled to him through the efficacy of atoning blood".[42]

After counseling each inquirer, Nettleton advised them to quietly depart the meeting and deal with God alone. "It looks as though the Spirit of God was here. Go away as still as possible. Do not talk by the way, lest you forget your own hearts. Do not ask how you like the preacher, but retire to your closets, bow before God and give yourselves to him this night".[43] He would advice the new believers to "be humble, be thankful for what God has done, keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, pray much and fervently for the continuing outpouring of the Holy Spirit, do not be satisfied with what has already been done, and pray for us and your pastor, that the Word of God may continue to have free course and be glorified".[44]

This form of revivalism followed eighteen-century Edwardsian patterns more than those prevalent in the Second Great Awakening. Although Nettleton avoided high emotionalism in his preaching, converts multiplied as he preached and thousands of persons joined the churches.[45]

Ministry of Revival

Nettleton was licensed to preach by the Western Association of New Haven County on May 28, 1811. He was ordained as evangelist by the Consociation of Litchfield County on April 9, 1817. His most productive ministry was performed from 1811 to 1822, when he travelled as an evangelist through Connecticut and parts of Massachusetts and New York.[46] Before his health failed in 1822, he was involved in more than sixty awakenings in Connecticut, Massachusetts, and New York.[47] In 1822, Nettleton almost died in typhus fever. It took him two years to recover, and after that he was

not able to work as much as before. He preached and lectured occasionally until his death in 1844.

Nettleton entered the ministry with several convictions. First, he was a strong supporter of the settled pastors. There were many instances in which he strengthened the pastors' position in the church, speaking of them "with such respect, as to make the impression on the minds of their people that they were worthy of their confidence; and thus not a few who had almost lost their influence, were firmly reinstated in the affections of their people".[48] Second, he "would not seek to stir up interest where it was clear the Spirit of God had not preceded him". Third, he would not stay where he had the impression that people relied on him. He wanted people to focus on the remorse for sin and not on the human instrument. Fourth, he believed that those who were converted during a revival would be more dedicated to God than those who were converted in times without revival.[49]

The period from 1811 to 1822 was a decade of highly successful but emotionally restrained[50] revival work. In one instance, the revival in Salisbury, Connecticut, in 1815-16, "was taken hold of by some ignorant, officious hands; and they were set to groaning and screaming, and alarmed all the village", in Nettleton's absence. When he arrived back, he called them to order. The town seemed to interpret it as if Nettleton tried to stop the revival. However, after a few days "the work of God advanced silently and powerfully".[51] It was so intense that men would leave their fields and shops, women their domestic concerns, to "inquire the way of eternal life".[52] Special emphasis was laid on the change of life as well as feelings in the people of Salisbury. "Many family altars have been erected, and many children have been instructed in religion".[53]

In 1820, Nettleton started preaching in Nassau, a village a few miles east of Albany. It was not unfamiliar to people in that area to retire into the groves and fields, and some into their chambers and closets, to cry for mercy.[54] He was careful not to prematurely declare the existence of a revival. After the scenes of spiritual distress described from day to day in his journal, he would say cautiously, "A revival of religion is begun in Nassau".[55] In the same year, he preached in New Haven and in five weeks, one hundred were saved, twenty-five in Yale College. Overall, the New Haven revival resulted in between 1.500 and 2.000 conversions.[56] He was a prophet in his own country, when a revival broke out in 1821 in North Killingworth, his hometown, and "it produced unanimity of sentiment on doctrinal points about which they had long contended".[57] In May of 1822, he retired to Somers, Connecticut, to recover after a period of excessive ministry. Soon, a revival started in Somers.[58]

Often times, when Nettleton "was seen to enter a house, almost the whole neighborhood would immediately assemble to hear from his lips the word of life. Husbandmen would leave their fields, mechanics their shops, and females their domestic concerns, to inquire the way to eternal life".[59] Lost people experienced deep distress in his meetings. Often sinners were so overwhelmed with a sense of their lost condition "that it became

necessary to remove them to a neighbouring house”. The cases of deep distress which occurred under Nettleton’s preaching were not the effect of “mere sympathy, but of clear conviction of sin”.[60] He paid particular attention to the type of the first convert in a revival. “If the experience of the first converts was superficial, the whole number would, more or less, partake of that character. He had a plain saying, which was very significant, ‘plough deep’.” He was averse to numbering converts, till time had been given to test their true character.[61]

There was a vein of some eccentricity in Nettleton’s character. “His brethren sometimes marvelled at his sudden disappearance from one place, and his sudden appearance in another; and as he was little accustomed to commit himself to any engagements for a future day, not much could be known in respect to his movements, until they became matter of history”.[62] He was once a no-show for a speaking engagement in Bridgewater, Connecticut. However, his absence had its desired effect as revival went on without him.[63]

Nettleton worked everywhere without expecting to be paid. He refused to receive such support, except food and clothing. When he was taken sick, in 1822, he was found to be entirely destitute, and money was collected by his friends, in different places, to defray the expenses of his sickness.[64]

David Kling ascertains four major reasons for Nettleton’s spectacular success as a revivalist.[65] First, he had an uncommon insight into the human character. Second, he used his personal meetings with people as the catalyst of revival. Third, he received moral support from local pastors.[66] Fourth, he embraced a theology of revival. “He emphasized a dependence upon the Holy Spirit as the indispensable condition of a revival. Ministers and churches were not encouraged to try and get up a revival, but when sovereign grace gave indications that the set time to favor Zion was come, he believed in a wise and faithful use of means”.[67]

The *Village Hymns*

In 1820, the General Association of Connecticut appointed a committee to “devise measures for the prosperity of religion within their limits”.[68] Although one of the first items proposed was a selection of hymns, no progress had been made for four years. Sensing the need for a hymnal that would serve the revivalism and the evangelistic services, Asahel Nettleton assembled *Village Hymns for Social Worship: Designed as a Supplement to the Psalms and Hymns of Dr. Watts* (1824).[69]

The task proved more difficult than Nettleton had anticipated because he found a limited number of hymns that could be used in a revival. Although he was not a hymn-writer, “He was quick to discover the merits of a hymn, and his collection was so fresh and attractive that it sprang into immediate favor, and held its place for an entire generation”.[70] The book contained six hundred hymns, of which 109 were revival hymns. He

included works by Charles Wesley, James Montgomery, Anne Steele, "Some from the evangelical *Olney Hymns* published in England in 1779 by John Newton and William Cowper, and some from American writers".[71]

Nettleton published in the same year a tunebook called *Zion's Harp* to accompany *Village Hymns.* Westermeyer thinks that while he avoided the excesses of revivalism, Nettleton still moved American hymnody in a more emotive direction.[72]

New Haven Theology

Nettleton was disturbed by the theological transition underway at Yale in the 1820s. Nathaniel Taylor, professor of theology, dissented from the doctrine of total depravity and inability. The "New Haven Theology" held that sin was a function of man's sinful choices and not an innate characteristic. As opposed to this theological orientation, Nettleton is described as a "staunch defender of a strict Edwardsian Calvinism known as New Divinity theology. His solemn and searching sermons were laced with the 'hard sayings' of Calvinism: total depravity, election, and divine sovereignty".[73] For Nettleton "the Holy Spirit revealed New Divinity truths when the convicted retreated privately to the closet".[74]

The rift resulted in the founding of the Theological Institute of Connecticut, later to become the Hartford Theological Seminary.[75] Despite Nettleton's strong stand against the New Haven theology, "public sentiment increasingly supported the idea that man participated in salvation as well as God. Moralism and self-interest were prevalent characteristics of his age; the inability to affect them is a mark of how far Puritan piety had declined by that time".[76]

New Measures

In 1827, Nettleton had a controversy with Charles Grandison Finney (1792-1875), "Whose livelier practices as a revivalist he disapproved".[77] Finney used certain evangelistic techniques which became known as "new measures*".* Congregationalists advocated a style of revivalism that rejected as dangerous the use of Finney's "new measures", such as the anxious bench, loud prayer meetings, praying for people by name, and protracted night meetings. By 1826 Finney's opponents in western New York acted to put a stop to the revivalist's "excesses" by appealing to New England leaders, particularly Lyman Beecher and Asahel Nettleton, for help in squelching the "new measures".[78] Another reason which prompted Nettleton to take some action regarding Finney's "new measures" was the rumor that "those who adopted these measures often appealed to the example of Dr. Nettleton, and made use of his name to sanction their proceedings".[79]

There are various views about really transpired between Finney and Nettleton. Finney says he respected Nettleton and wanted to learn from him but was not warmly received. Nettleton, on the other hand, found Finney unwilling to change his approach.[80]

Nettleton declared Finney's "new measures" to be "false in theory, contrary to fact, and dangerous in consequences. Such practices were fit only for Methodists or Ranters because they excited temporary passions and fostered spiritual pride".[81] He wrote a letter to twenty ministers who adopted the new measures, but it seems he did not reach any results with it.[82]

Nettleton and Finney met probably on two occasions before the end of 1826, in Albany. Nettleton wrote that after his interview with Finney, before the conference in 1827, "the friends of the 'new measures' continued to report that N[ettleton] and F[inney] are one", although he had a rather different perspective on the subject.[83]

Finney, in his *Memoirs,* notes several times that he was never able to learn the true source of Nettleton's opposition. He thought that Nettleton and Beecher were deceived by information received from somebody else. "We regarded them [Nettleton and Beecher] as good men, and true; but we knew that somebody was giving them most unreliable information".[84] Finney notes that they were not able to find out more about the sources of information even when they asked during the New Lebanon Convention.[85] Lyman Beecher, in his desire to keep the revival camp intact, without a war breaking up between the western and eastern revivalists, called for a meeting at New Lebanon, New York, on July 18-27, 1827. He and Nettleton headed a delegation which met with the advocates of the "new measures".[86]

> Near the close of the conference, Nettleton read a letter outlining the disturbing practices and the conference approved resolutions rejecting the use of such practices. Finney and his followers, while clearly advocating some of the measures which caused these complaints, denied that these measures consisted of such abuses as outlined in the letter. Perhaps, Finney proposed, a resolution against lukewarmness should also be adopted.[87]

Although the issues were not resolved, the two camps did agree that certain measures could be used in promoting revivals as long as caution would be observed at all times. While Beecher wanted to put an end to the conflict, Nettleton wanted to censor Finney. By the end of the meeting, in reality, Nettleton was the loser.

Later in the fall of the same year, after the convention, Finney met Nettleton in New York City. He asked Nettleton if he would publish his letters against the western revivals. Nettleton said he had to do it to justify what he had done. Finney told him that "it would react to his ruin as all who were acquainted with those revivals would see that he was acting without a valid reason".[88] Beecher also wrote to Nettleton warning him that any further controversy would react against him.[89]

While Beecher finalized a peace settlement between the two parties in 1828, "Nettleton was upset because he wanted the battle to go on; he did not believe in unity at the price of truth". The resulting friction led to a split in the orthodox party in New England.[90]

In spite of this opposition the "new measures" penetrated into Connecticut.[91] However, Nettleton was convinced that "success [was not] an evidence that all which is done in revivals is right".[92] There were several factors that did not allow a satisfactory resolution to the conflict, especially in the dynamics of the New Lebanon Conference. They focused on the methods and the underlying theological distinctions garnered only brief attention. "The orthodox participants, in fact, seemed unaware at this time that distinction in methods arose from radically different theological assumptions".[93]

Though the impression of Nettleton's person was less powerful than before the unfolding of the conflict between the two revivalist camps, accounts of his visits to churches still abound with testimonies of the effectual working of the Spirit of God. He traveled not only in New England during these years but also into the South as far as Virginia and South Carolina. He went to the United Kingdom in 1831, ostensibly to rest, but preached frequently. In addition, he regularly had opportunity, as well as necessity, to distinguish between revivals in America and the more recent impact of the "new measures" excitements.[94]

The battle with the new revivalists was also reflected in the work of William Weeks, *The Pilgrim's Progress in the Nineteenth Century,* which appeared in installments in a number of journals from 1824 to 1826.[95] In the book, Nettleton appears under the guise of "Mr. Meek". His revivals are contrasted with those conducted by "Mr. Bold", who is Finney.

The controversy over the "new measures" damaged Nettleton's emotional health. "He believed in the old doctrines because he had seen them work, and he believed they were biblical".[96] Although he was against the "new measures", Nettleton is presented by Tyler, his biographer, as not having any bitter hostility toward those from whom he differed.[97]

Beecher considered both Nettleton and Finney to be original personalities, and he compared the difference of the two men in their styles of labor saying that Nettleton set snares for sinner, while Finney rode them down in a cavalry charge.[98] Terry L. Williams observes that "Nettleton's dislike of Finney has been construed as jealousy. There was no doubt that some jealousy was involved, but Nettleton really believed that Finney was doing harm. He believed that the end does not justify the means, and Finney's means would not bring about lasting fruit as had Nettleton's".[99]

Iain Murray points out that history provided evidence later that "Nettleton's charge that the new approach would militate against conviction of sin was correct. It was as evangelicalism increasingly came to accept the appeal system that the phenomenon of conviction of sin gradually disappeared".[100]

Last Years

Nettleton contracted typhus fever in October 1822, after visiting a sick person.[101] Although he recovered two years later, he was too weak for sustained preaching and was forced into semi-retirement. After his recovery, he spent three winters in Virginia (1827-29), and visiting England, Scotland, and Ireland in 1831. On his return, in 1832, he was appointed professor of pastoral theology in the new theological seminary founded at East Windsor, Connecticut (Hartford Seminary), but he did not accept this office due to poor health, and simply took up his residence in East Windsor, where he spent the last ten years of his life. He lectured occasionally to the students.[102]

In 1839, Hampden-Sidney College, Virginia and Jefferson College, Pennsylvania, awarded him honorary doctorate degrees.[103] He reluctantly received these after considering all the attention he would draw if he refused.[104]

He never married, first because of his desire to go to the mission field, later because of his chronic illness. In 1841, and again in 1843, he had surgery for gallstones. After two unsuccessful and painful surgeries, he died on May 16, 1844.[105]

Contributions to the Second Great Awakening

Nettleton's revival had a lasting impact. By 1820, he was the leading evangelist in the East, in demand everywhere, called by many as their spiritual father. "Through all of this Nettleton refused to take any credit for what was happening in his ministry".[106] As Thornbury wrote, "Perhaps the most striking and important thing about these testimonies is the continuance of the converts under Asahel's ministry, and the durability of the results of these revivals".[107] The reputation was based upon the permanence of the converts. Most of his preaching was in small towns and villages, yet he is credited with at least twenty-five thousand conversions at a time when the population of the United States was only 9 million.[108] Richard Carwardine thinks that the fact that eastern Calvinist churches' revivals generally conformed to a conservative model was in great part due to Nettleton's restraining influence.[109]

Nettleton was the pioneer of the professional evangelists in America. "Although he opposed the establishment of such an order, nevertheless by his unique ministry he established the precedent of an outside leader assisting local pastors for protracted periods in special evangelistic campaigns".[110] He expressed his belief that a few men might be usefully employed as evangelists, "If we could be sure of obtaining men of the right character, men of distinction, who would cooperate with the settled pastors, and aid them in putting down irregularities, and promoting order". He was

afraid that it would be difficult to find such men. He did not accept the offer of the General Association of Connecticut, in 1820, to be their evangelist because he did not want to set a precedent for a new order in the church.[111]

Among Nettleton's contributions to the Second Great Awakening was the *Village Hymns,* which was not formally adopted by any denomination,[112] and it had a wider sale and influence than any previous American collection.[113] Benson called it "the brightest evangelical hymn book yet made in America".[114]

Conclusion

Nettleton was among the few men in the early part of the nineteenth century who devoted all his time to revivalism.[115] "His lifelong desire to go as a foreign missionary, though thwarted, found a partial satisfaction in the opportunity to give to his hymn book a distinctly missionary tone". There were fifty-one hymns on missions in this book, a proportion not approached in any collection.[116]

Nettleton was a humble man, trying to live up to the maxim he read when he was a young man, "Do all the good you can in the world, *and make as little noise about it as possible*".[117] "If God would be so kind as to 'revive us again' (Ps. 85:6), perhaps he will use people like the farm boy from North Killingworth, Connecticut, who 'wished to be the means of saving one soul' and instead became one of the most extraordinary evangelists the church of Jesus Christ has ever known".[118]

On his dying bed, among Nettleton's last words were those he used in a farewell sermon he preached in Virginia. These words are timely for the Christians stepping into the twenty-first century: "While ye have the light, walk in the light."[119]

Notes

[1] Malcolm McDow and Alvin L. Reid, *Firefall: How God Has Shaped History through Revivals* (Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 1997), 238. According to John Thornbury, Nettleton "may very well have been, next to George Whitefield, the most effective evangelist in the history of the United States. See also Robert Swanson, "Asahel Nettleton, The Voice of Revival", *Fundamentalist Journal* 5 (May 1986), 50.
[2] *Dictionary of American Biography,* s.v. "Nettleton Asahel".
[3] Bennet Tyler, *Nettleton and His Labors: The Memoir of Dr. Asahel Nettleton* (Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1975), 19.
[4] Andrews presided in the absence of a permanent pastor. See Swanson, "Asahel Nettleton", 51.
[5] Frank Grenville Beardsley, *History of American Revivals,* 2nd edn. (New York: American Tract Society, 1912), 110.
[6] Asahel Nettleton, *Sermons from the Second Great Awakening* (Ames, IA: International Outreach, 1995), iv.
[7] Tyler, *Nettleton and His Labors,* 28.
[8] Beardsley, *History of American Revivals*, 111.
[9] Terry Lee Williams, "The Impact of Timothy Dwight on Evangelism in the Second Great Awakening", (PhD diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1996), 138.
[10] Tyler, *Nettleton and His Labors,* 30.

[11] *Dictionary of American Biography,* s.v. "Nettleton Asahel". Nettleton read about the founding of missionary societies in England in the *Connecticut Evangelical Magazine* and in Melville Horne's *Letters on Missions.*

[12] *ibid.*

[13] Beardsley, *History of American Revivals*, 111. A comprehensive narrative of revivals of religion in Yale College is found in Prof. Goodrich, "Narrative of Revivals of Religion in Yale College, from its Commencement to the Present Time", *American Quarterly Register* 5 (1838), 289-310.

[14] John Thornbury, *God Sent Revival: The Story of Asahel Nettleton and the Second Great Awakening* (Grand Rapids, MI: Evangelical Press, 1977), 38.

[15] William B. Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit,* vol. 2 (New York: Robert Carter, 1857), 544.

[16] Beardsley, *History of American Revivals*, 111.

[17] Mills became part of the Haystack group, whose members pledged to become America's first foreign missionaries.

[18] Williams, "The Impact", 139.

[19] *Dictionary of American Religious Biography,* 2nd edn., s.v. "Asahel Nettleton". See also *Dictionary of American Biography,* s.v. "Nettleton Asahel" and Beardsley, *History of American Revivals*, 112.

[20] Sydney E. Ahlstrom, *A Religious History of the American People* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972), 421.

[21] Nettleton never settled into a pastorate. *Dictionary of American Religious Biography,* s.v. "Asahel Nettleton".

[22] Charles Roy Keller, *The Second Great Awakening in Connecticut* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1942), 52.

[23] *Dictionary of American Religious Biography,* s.v. "Asahel Nettleton".

[24] *Who Was Who in Church History,* s.v. "Nettleton Asahel".

[25] Tyler, *Nettleton and His Labors,* 175.

[26] *ibid.* 230.

[27] Swanson, "Asahel Nettleton", 51.

[28] Nettleton, *Sermons,* ii. He used questioning in effective ways. Here are some of the questions he used to ask the inquirers: "If your heart is so hard that you cannot repent now, what will you do when it becomes a great deal harder? What reason can you assign why you should not love God? What reason have you to think that you ever shall repent?" See also Tyler, *Nettleton and His Labors,* 302-3.

[29] Nettleton, *Sermons, x.*

[30] Swanson, "Asahel Nettleton", 52.

[31] *ibid.* 51.

[32] Ahlstrom, *A Religious History*, 421.

[33] Charles Beecher (ed.), *Autobiography, Correspondence, Etc. of Lyman Beecher, D.D.,* vol. 2 (New York: Harper, 1865), 92.

[34] Tyler, *Nettleton and His Labors,* 57.

[35] Arthur Barsalou Strickland, *The Great American Revival: A Case Study in Historical Evangelism with Implications for Today* (Cincinnati: Standard Press, 1934), 120.

[36] *ibid.* 158-9.

[37] *Dictionary of American Religious Biography,* s.v. "Asahel Nettleton".

[38] William Warren Sweet, *Revivalism in America: Its Origin, Growth and Decline* (New York: Scribner, 1944), 127.

[39] Strickland, *The Great American Revival*, 158.

[40] "Life of Dr. Nettleton", *The Christian Review* 38 (June 1845), 219.

[41] Keller, *The Second Great Awakening*, 47.

[42] *ibid.*

[43] Bennet Tyler, *Memoir of the Life and Character of Rev. Asahel Nettleton, D.D.* (Hartford: Robins & Smith, 1844), 208.

[44] Swanson, "Asahel Nettleton"52.

[45] *Dictionary of American Religious Biography, s.*v. "Asahel Nettleton".

46 *Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature*, s.v. "Nettleton, Asahel". Here are some of the towns where he worked during this time: in Connecticut he preached in Derby, South Britain, South Salem, Danbury, Moroe, North Lyme, Hadlyme, Bloomfield, Milton, South Farms, Chester, East Granby, Bolton, Manchester, West Granby, Salisbury, Bridgewater, Torrington, Waterbury, Upper Middletown, Rocky Hill, Ashford, Eastford, New Haven, North Killingworth, North Madison, Wethersfield, Newington, Farmington, Litchfield, Somers, and Tolland. In Massachusetts, in the towns of Pittsfield, Lenox, Lee, Wilbraham. In New York, at Saratoga, Ballston, Malta, Milton, Schenectady, and Nassau. See also Sprague, *Annals*, 545. He developed an enduring friendship with Bennet Tyler, who was a pastor in South Britain, Connecticut, and who subsequently became Nettleton's biographer.
47 James Edwin Orr, *The Eager Feet: Evangelical Awakenings, 1790-1830* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1975), 118.
48 William Francis Pringle Noble, *1776-1876. A Century of Gospel-Work: A History of the Growth of Evangelical Religion in the United States* (Philadelphia, PA: H. C. Watts, 1876), 291.
49 Nettleton, *Sermons*, v.
50 Nettleton's meetings were not to "work up" a revival but rather to sustain its progress. Nettleton was against hasty admission of converts and he was known to leave in the middle of a revival if he felt that too much might be expected from his presence alone. Richard Carwardine, *Trans-Atlantic Revivalism: Popular Evangelicalism in Britain and America, 1790-1865* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1978), 5.
51 Noble, *A Century of Gospel-Work*, 292.
52 Carwardine, *Trans-Atlantic Revivalism*, 25.
53 Keller, *The Second Great Awakening*, 46.
54 *ibid.* 298.
55 Noble, *A Century of Gospel-Work*, 306.
56 Thornbury, *God Sent Revival*, 119.
57 Tyler, *Nettleton and His Labors*, 141.
58 Noble, *A Century of Gospel-Work*, 303.
59 Tyler, *Nettleton and His Labors*, 88.
60 *ibid.* 300.
61 "Life of Dr. Nettleton". *The Christian Review* 38 (June 1845), 217.
62 Sprague, *Annals*, 550.
63 Swanson, "Asahel Nettleton", 52.
64 Tyler, *Nettleton and His Labors*, 71.
65 David William Kling, *A Field of Divine Wonders* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1993), 140-2.
66 He did itinerant ministry, and the ministers welcomed him, knowing that his one – or two – month stay would cost them nothing, since he never asked remuneration for his services.
67 Beardsley, *History of American Revivals*, 117.
68 Strickland, *The Great American Revival*, 122.
69 He gave the royalties to the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions and to the new seminary in East Windsor. Earle Edwin Cairns, *An Endless Line of Splendor: Revivals and Their Leaders from the Great Awakening to the Present* (Wheaton, IL: Tyndale, 1986), 126.
70 Edward Summerfield Ninde, *The Story of the American Hymn* (New York: Abingdon, 1921), 116.
71 *Encyclopedia of the American Religious Experience: Studies of Traditions and Movements*, vol. 3, s.v. "Religious Music and Hymnody".
72 *ibid.*
73 *The Blackwell Dictionary of Evangelical Biography 1730-1860*, s.v. "Nettleton Asahel".
74 Kling, *A Field of Divine Wonders*, 223.
75 Swanson, "Asahel Nettleton", 52.
76 *Dictionary of American Religious Biography*, s.v. "Asahel Nettleton".
77 *The Concise Dictionary of Religious Knowledge and Gazetteer*, 3rd edn., s.v. "Nettleton Asahel". He snubbed Finney's westernnew-measures revivalists as "ragamuffins". See also

Encyclopedia of the American Religious Experience: Studies of Traditions and Movements, vol. 2, s.v. "Nineteenth-Century Evangelicalism".

[78] *Encyclopedia of the American Religious Experience: Studies of Traditions and Movements,* vol. 1, s.v. "Congregationalism from Independence to the Present".

[79] Tyler, *Nettleton and His Labors,* 341.

[80] Beecher, *Autobiography,* 93-4. See also Charles E. Hambrick-Stowe, *Charles G. Finney and the Spirit of American Evangelicalism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1996), 63; Garth M. Rosell and Richard A. G. Dupuis, (eds), *The Memoirs of Charles G. Finney* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1989), 205-6.

[81] *Dictionary of American Religious Biography,* s.v. "Asahel Nettleton".

[82] Lyman Beecher, *Letters of the Rev. Dr. Beecher and Rev. Mr. Nettleton on the "New Measures" in Conducting Revivals of Religion with a Review of a Sermon* (New York: G & C. Carvill, 1828), 20.

[83] *ibid.* 103.

[84] Rosell, *Memoirs of Finney,* 141.

[85] *ibid.* 219.

[86] The minutes of the convention were published in the *New York Observer* and *The Christian Examiner.* See Hambrick-Stowe, 69; William Weeks, "Important Convention", *The Christian Examiner and Theological Review* 4 (July-August 1827), 357-70.

[87] Nettleton, *Sermons,* vii.

[88] Rosell, *Memoirs of Finney,* 223.

[89] *ibid.* 249.

[90] Williams, "The Impact", 143-144.

[91] Keller, *The Second Great Awakening,* 49.

[92] Beecher, *Letters,* 94.

[93] Nettleton, *Sermons,* vii.

[94] Tyler, *Nettleton and His Labors,* 290.

[95] Rosell, *Memoirs of Finney,* 196.

[96] Williams, "The Impact", 141.

[97] Tyler, *Nettleton and His Labors,* 397.

[98] Beecher, *Autobiography,* 95.

[99] Williams, "The Impact", 143.

[100] Iain Murray, *Revival and Revivalism* (Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth, 1994), 372.

[101] Nettleton, *Sermons,* vi.

[102] *Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature,* s.v. "Nettleton, Asahel". Hartford Seminary was founded by a pastoral union of Congregationalists in 1834, under the presidency of Bennet Tyler, the former president of Dartmouth College. Its purpose was to block the inroads of the New Haven theology. See *Encyclopedia of the American Religious Experience: Studies of Traditions and Movements,* vol. 1, s.v. "Congregationalism from Independence to the Present".

[103] *Appleton's Cyclopaedia of American Biography,* s.v. "Nettleton Asahel".

[104] Swanson, "Asahel Nettleton", 52.

[105] Tyler, *Memoir of Nettleton,* 304.

[106] Thornbury, *God Sent Revival,* 105.

[107] *ibid.* 78.

[108] McDow, 238. Emerson Andrews, a prominent Baptist evangelist, was also converted through the preaching of Nettleton. See also Beardsley, *History of American Revivals,* 176; Swanson, 50.

[109] Carwardine, *Trans-Atlantic Revivalism,* 4.

[110] Strickland, *The Great American Revival,* 123.

[111] *ibid.* 164.

[112] *Encyclopedia of the American Religious Experience: Studies of Traditions and Movements,* vol. 3, s.v. "Religious Music and Hymnody".

[113] *The Concise Dictionary of Religious Knowledge and Gazetteer,* 3rd edn., s.v. "Nettleton Asahel".

[114] Louis FitzGerald Benson, *The English Hymn: Its Development and Use in Worship* (New York,: Hodder & Stoughton, 1915), 376.

[115] Sweet, *Revivalism in America*, 168.
[116] Ninde, *The Story*, 117.
[117] Tyler, *Nettleton and His Labors,* 420.
[118] Swanson, "Asahel Nettleton", 52.
[119] Tyler, *Nettleton and His Labors,* 439.

The Introduction of the Concept of *Logos* in the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel

GHEORGHE DOBRIN

Emanuel University of Oradea

Introduction

The concept of *logos* is richly presented in the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel. It is important to focus upon this majestic introduction with which this Gospel begins, and to discuss the place the significant title of the logos has in it. Sanday's description is fitting here:

> The Fourth Gospel is like one of those great Egyptian temples which we may see to this day at Dendera or Edfu or Karnak – and we remember that the Temple on Mount Zion itself was of the same general type – the sanctuary proper is approached through a pylon, a massive structure overtopping it in height and outflanking it on both sides. The pylon of the Fourth Gospel is of course the Prologue.[1]

The awesome nature of the Gospel of John takes its character not least for the way it starts. Matthew begins his gospel with a genealogy tracing the lineage of Jesus back to a human being – Abraham. Mark commences with a quotation from Isaiah and introduces John the Baptist while Luke outlines the divine pronouncement of the coming Messiah and circumstances into which John and Jesus were born in Palestine. John takes a different approach. He uses a cosmogony as the background for his message of salvation.

The reasons for John's choice and manner in which he introduces his gospel have been matters of considerable debate. For some the Prologue is "a foyer to the rest of the Gospel, simultaneously drawing the reader in and introducing the major themes",[2] or "the key to the understanding of this gospel".[3] It can be maintained that in the message of the Prologue, we can find the message of salvation too, but in presenting of this message John use cosmogony as a background in a unique way. The Prologue, therefore, commences a presentation of the person of Christ, which is quite different from that of other Gospels. It is theological rather than biographical or historical in its approach. It asserts that Jesus, the historic personage known to man, is the Ultimate Fact of the universe.

The Length of the Prologue

General Opinion about the Length of the Prologue

It is generally accepted by scholars that the first eighteen verses of the Fourth Gospel constitute a division technically known as the Prologue. Here as in any other well-written introduction, the plan of the work is set out. The Logos doctrine is stated there because it supplies the key to right understanding of the history that follows. The Prologue divides naturally into the following sections:

1. Cosmological (vv. 1-5)
2. The Witness of John (vv. 6-8)
3. The Coming of the Light (vv. 9-13)
4. The Economy of Salvation (vv. 14-18)

These verses bring before us some of the great thoughts that will be developed as the narrative unfolds; the Excellency of Christ, who is the Word of God, the eternal strife between light and darkness, and the witness borne by the Baptist, the greatest of the sons of Israel. But the principal topic in these verses is the incarnation, together with its astounding sequel, the rejection of the Word by those who might have been expected to welcome Him.[4]

Smalley's View

There is, however, another point of view that has been articulated by Smalley. He suggests that the whole of the first chapter of John ought to be considered an introduction to the Gospel. For Smalley "the first chapter of John as a whole, then, appears to be a microcosm of the Fourth Gospel as a whole and to summarize the entire sweep of salvation history with which it is concerned".[5] In fact Smalley's suggestion is that the climax of the introduction ought to be considered the first of John's Son of Man sayings: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Ye shall see the heaven opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man".[6]

> John 1 as a totality, it is being claimed, provides an important introduction to The Fourth Gospel; as a unity itself, this chapter is intimately related to the rest of John, and has a vital part to play in the Gospel's careful over-all structuring. It summarizes and points forward to the theological material which will be treated in John 2-21: the revelation of the Word to the world (we notice the response foreshadowed in John 1:11), and the glorification of the Word for the world (see John 1:12).[7]

With respect to Smalley, his point of view regarding the length of the Prologue is not very widely accepted.

The Origins of the Prologue

The Prologue, the Result of the Redaction of Already Existing Material?

Some scholars have thought that the Prologue was originally separate, perhaps being composed by someone other than the Evangelist. They see it as having no real connection with the Gospel, but as adapted more or less successfully for its present position. In viewing the Prologue like this as the result of the redaction of already existing material, J. H. Bernard[8] laid down the following criteria for this type of literary analysis. They were: (1) in accordance with the character of Semitic poetry the verse lines must be short, roughly the same length, and fall into parallel clauses; (2) as the unit hymn it must consist of statements; hence the argumentative verses (vv. 13, 17 and perhaps 18) are to be excluded; and (3) as it is an abstract statement, proper names (John, Moses, Jesus Christ) are to be excluded (i.e. vv. 6-8, 15, 17).

For Brown the Prologue was "An early Christian hymn, probably stemming from Johannine circles, which has been adapted to serve as an overture to the Gospel narrative of the career of the incarnate Word".[9] In discussing the formation of the Prologue, Brown[10] asked some difficult questions concerning the particular verses from the Prologue which belong to the hymn and how was it joined to the Gospel.

In his work on *John*, Brown has presented a cross section of scholarly opinion. All the scholars cited regarded vss. 6-8, and 15 as secondary additions; and many would add vss. 9, 12-13, 17-18. The only general agreement was on vss. 1-5, 10-11, and 14 as parts of the original poem.

Bernard	accepts:		1-5	10-11	14		18
Bultmann	accepts:		1-5	9-12b	14	16	
De Ausejo	accepts:		1-5	9-11	14	16	18
Gaechter	accepts:		1-5	10-12	14	16	17
Green	accepts:	1	3-5	10-11	14a-d		18
Haenchen	accepts:		1-5	9-11	14	16	17
Kasemann	accepts:	1	3-5	10-12			
Schackenburg	accepts:	1	3-4	9-11	14abc	16	

The great diversity of the suggestions about how the "poem" hangs together confirms what classical scholars are quick to point out on other grounds: these verses do not reflect the structure and rhythm of Greek poetry. Some therefore propose that the poetical features of the Prologue be explained by appealing to the poetic characteristics of Hebrew or Aramaic, on the assumption that the Prologue is a Greek translation of an underlying Semitic work. But, for Carson, the characteristics in question – parallelism of various kinds, short clauses, frequent chiasms and the like – are found throughout the prose text of the entire Gospel.[11]

The Prologue as It Stands Written by the Evangelist Himself

J. A. T Robinson[12] believes that the Prologue may have been written at a later date and added on but he has no doubt that it was written by the Evangelist. Barrett also rejects the idea of a hymn and concludes: "The Prologue is one piece of solid theological writing, and that is necessary to the Gospel, as the Gospel is necessary to the Prologue. The history explicates the theology, and the theology interprets the history". Carson also in his commentary commences his study of the Prologue by listing all the phrases and themes from it which are used in the remainder of the gospel. He points out that there are twelve terms used which appear again in the main body of the Gospel and that the central thematic words of this Gospel are first introduced in verses 1-18. For Carson, "Suggestions that the Prologue, though written by the Evangelist, was composed later than the rest of the book (as the introduction of this commentary was written last!) are realistic, but speculative".[13] He does, however, concede that on certain occasions the use of the words in the Prologue sometimes have a slightly different emphasis from what follows. However, it is a difference in emphasis not a difference in use and is not significant enough to add to the theory that the two parts of the Gospel are loosely attached and somewhat different in thought and approach. I believe F. F. Bruce was right when he made this statement about the Prologue:

> It is certainly the work of the Evangelist himself, if we may judge from the way in which it anticipates the various forms in which the main theme of the Gospel is presented in the chapters which follow. Several of the key-words of the Gospel – life, light, witness, glory (for example) – appear in the prologue.[14]

Comparison with the Opening of Mark's Gospel

Lightfoot and Hooker note certain general parallels between Mark 1:1-13 and John 1:1-18, and designates both as "Prologue". In his commentary on John's Gospel, Lightfoot[15] himself refers to the small differences in their opening narratives (the Markan and Johannine Prologue) to illustrate an important truth.

The Markan approach to the doctrine of the Lord's person is said to be "chiefly by way of the Jewish messianic hope, and hope implies an attitude towards the future", whereas the Johannine approach is said to be "chiefly from the divine side", with the Prologue emphasizing the eternity of the Logos, and His equality with God.[16] Hooker[17] in her approach notes a theological distinction throughout the respective Gospels and their Prologues. If the Markan Prologue is, like the rest of the Gospel, in narrative form, the Johannine Prologue offers us something much closer to a theological discourse.

The Content of the Prologue

Bultmann's View

Perhaps the most debated view is the idea that the Prologue is a Christian hymn, which has been adapted for use as an introduction to the Gospel. The main proponent of this approach is Bultmann. As early as 1923, R. Bultmann put forward the thesis that the Logos-hymn was originally a Gnostic composition, from the Baptist circles, which the Fourth Evangelist appropriated to sing in praise of his Christ. The analysis Bultmann undertook was based on the work of J. H. Bernard whose suggestions about the character of Semitic poetry and the short verse lines have been noted.

The form of the Prologue is not loose or haphazard, but rigid and even minor details are governed by strict rules. The construction is similar to that of the Odes of Solomon; each couplet is made up of two short sentences. Sometimes both parts of the couplet express one thought (vv. 9, 12, 14b); sometimes the second completes and develops the first (vv. 1, 4, 14a, 16); sometimes the two parts stand together in parallelism (v. 3), or in antithesis (vv. 5, 10, 11).[18]

Bultmann concludes that "the Evangelist has made a cultic community hymn the basis for the Prologue, and has developed it with his own comments. It is further clear that in vv. 1-5, 9-12 the source spoke of the pre-existent Logos".[19] Bultmann further insists that it is the polemical character of vv. 6-8, 15, which deny John the authority of Revealer.[20]

Bultmann's assertion that the Prologue is a hymn led him to exclude verses 6, 7, 8, 15 and 17 for the following reasons – proper names are not generally included in poetry (in this case John and Moses verses 6 and 17). Clauses which are argumentative in tone need also to be excluded because these bring to the text an apologetic emphasis that again was not in keeping with poetry. In the opinion of Bultmann, the evangelist utilized a Gnostic Baptist hymn, in which the cosmology of Gnosticism had already given way to an expression of belief in the Creator-God of the Old Testament. In a similar vein Bultmann excluded references to the law as being apologetic in nature and related more to the view that Paul had of the law than with John's aim and message.

The influence of Bultmann's type of analysis upon a whole range of scholars may be seen in the table printed by R. E. Brown in his commentary, where he gives the reconstructions of an original hymn made by J. H. Bernard, S. de Ausejo, P. Gaechter, H. C. Green, E. Haenchen, E. Käsemann and R. Schnakenburg.[21]

But are the proper names – Moses, John and Jesus – integral to the text or are they insertions? What significance should be attached to the phrases and Christological titles used and the themes outlined in the Prologue?

Carson's View

D. A. Carson does not share Bultmann's view. "The term poem can be applied to the Prologue only with hesitation [...] The great diversity of the suggestions[22] about how the poem hangs together confirms what classical scholars are quick to point out on other grounds: these verses do not reflect the structure and rhythm of Greek structure".[23] In his commentary he suggests that the Prologue is not only the work of the Evangelist, but that its themes are expanded in the rest of the book. Parallelism of various kinds, short clauses, frequent chiasms and the like are found throughout the prose text of the entire Gospel. Carson's conclusion on this point "is that the frequency of such features in 1:1-18 enables us to speak of rhythmical prose".[24] Dodd[25] falls into this group and expresses dissatisfaction with the term Prologue, preferring rather to write about a "proem" and a Prologue as a means of describing what John intended at the beginning.

The Unity of the Prologue with the Gospel

The German scholar Adolph Harnack[26] denied that the Prologue was from the pen of John. He considered that because the term logoj does not occur in the body of the Fourth Gospel; the Prologue could not really belong to it at all, but was added to it later.

It is true that when we pass beyond the Prologue the word logoj is not repeated. The author nowhere puts it into the mouth of Jesus. But, all the same, the doctrine of the Prologue manifestly works right through the narrative from the beginning to the end. It is very noticeable that in 20:31 where the writer reveals the motive of his work, he really sums up the great ideas of the Prologue as he declares that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing the readers may have life through his name. Many scholars, however, accept the Prologue as organically part of the book, and this for the following reasons:

The Manuscript Evidence is Solidly for It

There is not a single complete manuscript of the Gospel in existence, which begins at verse 19; all include the Prologue. It is unthinkable that this should be so if verses 1-18 was added a century or even half a century after the Gospel had been published.

At all events, when the Fourth Gospel was published and received by the Church, the Prologue stood as an integral part of it. It is for us to interpret it as such, whatever its previous history may have been.[27]

The Similarity of Diction and Style

The diction and style of the Prologue and the rest of the Gospel are admitted by many scholars to be identical, in fact also, for many, with the Johannine writings as a whole.

The stylistic unity of the book has been demonstrated again and again as concrete evidence against this or that source theory. Even the prologue (1:1-18) and the epilogue (chapter 21) exhibit a style remarkably attuned to the rest of the book.[28]

The Same Themes

The same topics of the Fourth Gospel are practically all embodied in the Prologue. The key words from the Prologue like life; light and love (with their opposite's death, darkness and hate) are key words in the Fourth Gospel too. However, the most characteristic term in the Prologue, the term logoj does not reappear in the body of the Gospel in the sense, which it bears in the Prologue. Nevertheless, in what it says about the logoj, the Prologue shows us the perspective from which the Gospel as a whole is to be understood. All that is recorded shows how the eternal Word of God became flesh, that men and women might believe in him and live.

The Development of the Prologue's Themes in the Corpus of the Gospel

The embryonic development, however, of these themes is the greatest proof of organic unity. What is patent in the Gospel is always latent in the Prologue; what the Prologue enfolds the Gospel unfolds. The following parallel[29] between the Prologue and the rest of the Gospel makes clear that the Prologue harmonizes with the Gospel as a whole.

Themes	Prologue	Gospel
The pre-existence of the Logos or Son	1:1-2	17:5
In him was life	1:4	5:26
Life is light	1:4	8:12
Light rejected by darkness	1:5	3:19
Yet not quenched by it	1:5	12:35
Light coming into world	1:9	3:19; 12:46
Christ not received by his own	1:11	4:44
Being born to God and not to flesh	1:13	3:6; 8:41-42
Seeing his glory	1:14	12:41
The "one and only" Son	1:14, 18	3:16
Truth in Jesus Christ	1:17	14:6
No one has seen God, except the one who comes from God's side	1:18	6:46

The Purpose of the Prologue

The noun prol ogoς, derived from the verb prol egein in the sense of "to announce beforehand", means "the statement announced in advance". It became a technical term of literary criticism and rhetoric, and would seem to have a long period of development.

In the sixth century BC, Thespis was concerned with the drama regularly presented in lyrical odes sung by a chorus of fifty dancing round the Dionysian altar, and he broke with tradition in introducing one more members into drama, who opened the presentation with a spoken prologue. The function of this prologue was to announce beforehand the plot to the audience, although the sacred tradition of Epic dramas was already thoroughly familiar to them. The Fourth Gospel commences with a Prologue, written apparently with the express intention of placing the reader[30] at the point where he can understand the story that is to follow.

> In the Fourth Gospel the Prologue is a verbal scenery, giving information about coming action, introducing the main characters, stating the subject of the whole and so preparing the recipients for a true understanding of the state of affairs, which is ordained from heaven, concerning the relationship of humankind to heaven.[31]

Between the Synoptic records and that of the Fourth Evangelist, there is one broad difference, evident on the very surface. The earlier writers are concerned almost wholly with the life of Jesus in its outward expression, with the actions and sayings in which He revealed his spirit. They are content to set the life before us and leave it to produce its own effect, as it did on the disciples who first witnessed it. John, on the other hand, starts from the impression, which had been made on him by his knowledge of divine life. He assumes from the outset that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God, and construes the history in the light of this assumption. Reversing the method of the Synoptists, he does not reason from the outward actions to the person behind them, but judges the work from his theory of the person. This person is Jesus, whose life on earth is about to pass before us, as a divine Person. He was one with the Logos, who had been with God from the beginning, and through whom the world was made.

Introducing the term Logos in the Prologue, John presented to the Greeks the Jesus of Nazareth, the Christ of his experience in a two-fold sense. First, as infinite God, John uses a word, the Logos, familiar to all philosophers, as meaning (a) God who is alone, infinite, absolute yet (b) who acts as an intermediary or emanation and is immanent, in earth, and mediated to every man that comes into the world. Second, this term Logos is useful to express to Greeks a Lord Jesus who is absolute and infinite. Yet the word has certain serious limitations. While indicating infinity, it did not indicate personality. John however attributes to the Logos partnership with God, deity, co-equality and consubstantiality and co-eternity with God, co-creatorship with God, Light and Life.

It is the unique contribution of the Prologue of the Gospel of John, that it reveals the Word of God not merely as an attribute of God, but as a distinct Person within the Godhead, dwelling with the Creator before creation began, and acting as the divine agent in creation. The Prologue speaks not of "the word of God" but of "the Word who was with God, and was God". The message of the Prologue became this: the Logos is God's life that is imparted to all living creatures. But in men and women the life that is infused into them by the Word, is more than physical. In 1:4 we are informed, "The life was the light of men".

Notes

[1] W. Sanday, *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905), 185.

[2] D. A. Carson, *The Gospel According to John* (Leicester: IVP, 1991), 111.

[3] R. H. Lightfoot, *St. John's Gospel, A Commentary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956), 78.

[4] L. Morris, *The Gospel According to John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 71.

[5] S. S. Smalley, *John. Evangelist and Interpreter* (Paternoster Press, 1998), 136.

[6] John 1:51.

[7] S. S. Smalley, *John: Evangelist and Interpreter*, 138-139.

[8] J. H. Bernard, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to John* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1928), cxlv.

[9] R. E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John (I-XII)* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966), 1.

[10] R. E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John (I-XII)*, 21-22.

[11] D. A. Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 112.

[12] J. A. T. Robinson, "The Relation of the Prologue to the Gospel of the St. John", *NTS* 9 (1963), 120-129.

[13] D. A. Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 111-112.

[14] F. F. Bruce, *The Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 28.

[15] R. H. Lightfoot, *St. John's Gospel*, 57.

[16] E. Harris, *Prologue and Gospel* (Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 22.

[17] M. D. Hooker, "The Johannine Prologue and the Messianic Secret", *NTS* 21 (1974), 41-42.

[18] R. Bultmann, *The Gospel of John* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971), 15.

[19] R. Bultmann, *The Gospel of John*, 17.

[20] The motive for the insertion of vv. 6-8, 15 is clear from their polemical character. For their purpose is not only a positive one of proclaiming the Baptist as witness for Jesus; it is also polemical: to dispute the claim that the Baptist has the authority of Revealer. This authority must therefore have been attributed by the Baptist sect to their master; they saw in him the φῶϛ and thus also the pre-existent Logos become flesh. This suggests that the source-text was a hymn of the Baptist-Community. R. Bultmann, *The Gospel of John*, 17-18.

[21] E. Harris, *Prologue and the Gospel*, 20.

[22] See the diversity of the suggestions in the previous point of this chapter, *The Origins of the Prologue*.

[23] D. A. Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 112.

[24] D. A. Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 112.

[25] C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge University Press, 1968), 292.

[26] A. von Harnack, "Über das Verhältnis des Prologs des vierten Evangeliums zum ganzen Werke", *ZTK* 2 (1892), 189-231. See also E. Harris, *Prologue and the Gospel* (Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 9, and E. F. Scott, *The Fourth Gospel. Its Purpose and Theology*, (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1951), 155.

[27] C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, 268.

[28] Carson, Moo and Morris, *An Introduction to the New Testament* (Leicester: Apollos, 1992), 152.

[29] D. A. Carson, *John*, 111.

[30] The Prologue is a directive to the reader how the entire Gospel should be read and understood. See G. R. Beasley-Murray, *John* (Waco: Word Books, 1987), 5.
[31] E. Harris, *Prologue and Gospel*, 16.

NOTES FOR CONTRIBUTORS

Articles for *Perichoresis* can be submitted on disk and in hardcopy to the Board of Editors. However, we advise all contributors to send their articles by email to the Managing Editor at perichoresis@emanuel.ro. Each submission will be acknowledged in this format.

The average length of articles should be 5.000-8.000 words. We are willing, however, to consider articles in excess of 8.000 words should such a length be absolutely necessary. All articles should be written at a single line spacing with endnotes (not footnotes), which must be typed at a single line spacing and must be justified entirely. For instance, we suggest the following format: Philip E. Hughes, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), 140-141. Endnotes should not contain a single tab between the endnote marker and the text. Terms like *idem, ibidem (ibid.)*, and *op. cit.* can be used but not exceedingly. Double quotation marks should be used for quotation, and single quotation marks for quotation within a quotation. Greek and Hebrew words need not be transliterated and they should not be used very often. Transliteration is accepted only if performed in accordance with current academic rules.

The Board of Editors will assess every submission and all contributors will be informed in due course on whether their articles are considered for publication or not.