# TOWARDS A THEOLOGY OF INTERACTIVE HOMILETICS:

# AN INVESTIGATION OF THEOLOGICAL VALIDITY

by

PAUL WARBY

A THESIS SUBMITTED FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER of THEOLOGY

at the

SOUTH AFRICAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

in

JANUARY 2008

SUPERVISOR: DR. RAYMOND MARTIN

# DECLARATION

I hereby acknowledge that the work contained in this thesis is my own original work and has not previously in its entirety or in part been submitted to any academic institution for degree purposes.


_____

Paul Warby

20/05/2008

## **ACKOWLEDGEMENTS**

To those who have supported me through the process of writing this thesis. To my wife, Tarryn Warby; to my parents, Tony and Althea Warby; to my brothers David and Joshua Warby; and to my supervisor, Dr Raymond Martin.

Many thanks.

To the Lord, without Him I would not be here today. Thank you.

Paul Warby

20/05/2008

**ABSTRACT**

Traditionally when evangelical homiletic works have developed theory on the medium, or form, of homilies they have focused primarily on the giving of speeches; that is that homiletics is produced in the form of a monologue. However in recent time's verbal interaction has been put forward as an option for homiletic medium within church practice.

The agenda of this thesis is to question to what extent a homily that has interaction as the medium is theologically validated. This question invokes elements of theological method and this thesis uses the sources of theological method as put forward by Stanley J Grenz and John R Franke (2001). Namely that in order for an evangelical teaching to be theologically valid it needs to be established in the three sources of the Scriptures, the Culture and the Tradition, with the Scriptures acting as the authoritative source. This thesis aims to investigate the teaching methods of Jesus and the early disciples (by surveying the gospel of Mark and the book of Acts). It will then correlate the homiletic practice to its cultural equivalent in the secular setting (that of educational theory). And finally it will look back at the tradition focusing most of the attention on the early years of the churches development and the church since the Reformation.

After these sources have been examined the thesis will conclude and answer the question as to what extent interactive homiletics is theologically valid.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**CHAPTER 3:        THE CULTURE**

**CHAPTER 4:        THE TRADITION**

**CHAPTER 5:          CONCLUSION**

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

This thesis aims to investigate the theological validity of a homiletic practice that has begun to emerge within post-modern culture. The thesis is developed from an evangelical perspective and works within the field of practical theology.

The problem addressed aims to investigate a practical theology of homiletics that is in line with the New Testament and relevant to the culture we live in (here referred to as a post-modern cultural context). The thesis works from a theological perspective and as such builds alongside a structure of theological method (how theology should be developed) and using that process investigates the issue of one area of homiletics in post-modernity, the mode or form. This thesis makes no attempt to critique other homiletic practices or theories and is not interested in a polemic between interaction (discussion/dialogue) and non-interaction (speech/monologue). Rather the thesis has an inclusive agenda examining an alternative process of homiletic practice while simultaneously acknowledging and affirming much of traditional methods.

This chapter begins by orientating and presenting the research question, sets down the study goals, presents the hypothesis, the research methodology and defines the major terms.

### 1.1.    Motivation for research

In recent years there have been many attempts within the discipline of homiletics to produce a more effective homiletic for the post-modern era. This has ranged from the more traditional expositional approaches (for example Lake 2003) to the development of the New Homiletic approaches (for example Craddock 1971, Lowry 1989) including poetics (for example Breuggeman 1989), the Roundtable approaches (for example McLure 1995) and various hybrids (for example Anderson 1997).

> The practice of preaching is at a crossroads. The last three decades have witnessed an abrupt change in the content and form of preaching…. (Anderson 1997)

> An emerging theme in contemporary homiletics is the struggle with how to address the mindset of the post-modern situation. (Immink 2004: 104)

Although much of traditional homiletics focuses on the preparation and delivery of religious speeches (Broadus 1870, Stott 1982, Robinson 2005, Craddock 1971, Lowry 1989 etc.) another model of preaching has begun to emerge that has a greater orientation towards interaction between preacher and congregation.

The first book on preaching from the emerging church movement[1] points in the direction of interaction (*Preaching Re-Imagined* by Doug Pagitt 2005). It talks of progressional dialogue that, "involves the intentional interplay of multiple viewpoints that leads to unexpected and unforeseen ideas." (Pagitt 2005: 52)

The move to interaction is also seen in certain ministers trained in the evangelical Fuller Theological Seminary who are beginning to find interaction a valuable tool.

> I stopped preaching monologue. I changed and started teaching by asking questions. That was the beginning for me of conversational Bible teaching. (Wechkama 2001)

But this move to interaction is not limited to Protestant practice as an investigation produced from a Catholic perspective points out.

> While the preference for the interactive style predominates among the younger more socially involved clergy, the demand for interactive preaching among parishioners is more frequently linked to the issues which had to do with their personal lives (Maguire 1980: 63)

What is interesting in this quote is that it is the younger clergy that prefer interaction which indicates the cultural shift from modernity to post-modernity within the clergy. No doubt there are many variations and nuances within the preaching

---

[1] "…the emerging movement… is not a theological confession nor an epistemological movement but an ecclesiological movement. It is about "how to do Church" in our age. Or, in the words of Gibbs-Bolger: how to practice the way of Jesus in postmodernity." (McKnight 2006:29)

practices but it can be see that interaction is a concept that is already in play within homiletics and therefore one that warrants closer examination.

A brief look into the gospels (Matt 9:14; Mark 2: 24; Luke 9: 18-19; John 6:25-40) as well as Acts (Acts 17:2, 18:4, 20:7, 9) also affirms that this form of discourse seems to have been practised within the New Testament era. And so, if preaching can be more of an interaction and less of a speech, there would be a need to develop this approach from theological perspective. This concept of the sermon as a live interaction between preacher and congregation has not been specifically developed within evangelical theological circles and so it is the focus of this thesis to question whether such an approach to homiletics is evangelically theologically valid.

### 1.2.    Thesis definitions

#### 1.2.1. Evangelical

> In its most general sense evangelical means being characterized by a concern for the essential core of the Christian message, which proclaims the possibility of salvation through the person and work of Jesus Christ. More specifically, evangelicalism has been used to refer to the transdenominational and international movement that emphasizes the need to experience personal conversion through the belief in Christ and his work on the cross, and a commitment to the authority of Scripture as the infallible guide for Christian faith and practice (Grenz, Guretzki and Nordling 1999: 48)

The Evangelical Homiletics Society has as their statement of Faith the following.

- *We believe* the Bible to be the inspired, the only infallible, authoritative Word of God.
- *We believe* that there is one God, eternally existent in three persons: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.
- *We believe* in the deity of our Lord Jesus Christ, in His virgin birth, in His sinless life, in His miracles, in His vicarious and atoning death through His shed blood, in His bodily resurrection, in His ascension to the right hand of the Father, and in His personal return in power and glory.

- ***We believe*** that for the salvation of lost and sinful people, regeneration by the Holy Spirit is absolutely essential.
- ***We believe*** in the present ministry of the Holy Spirit by whose indwelling the Christian is enabled to live a godly life.
- ***We believe*** in the resurrection of both the saved and the lost; they that are saved unto the resurrection of life and that they are lost unto the resurrection of damnation.
- ***We believe*** in the spiritual unity of believers in our Lord Jesus Christ.

(EHS Statement of Faith 2007)

The majority of these statements refer to doctrine that would fall predominantly under systematic theology, meaning that they refer predominantly to the possible content of the message and not so much the medium (This thesis will be dealing with McLuhan's maxim, "the message is the medium" in chapter 3). However the first statement (regarding the supremacy of the Scriptures) relates to our thesis' approach to developing theology which will be dealt with later in this chapter.

### 1.2.2. Post-modern

Post-modern (or any of its variant such as post-modernity, post-modernism etc.) is an illusive term that has sparked much controversy over attempts to define it. Cobb (1990: 149-158) has made two distinctions within post-modernism (Deconstructive and Process Post-modernism)  while McLaren (2003) made three (anti-modernism, deconstructive, and emerging) and Hauerwas is sceptical of definitions themselves and feels that when speaking of post-modernity "it is not clear to me that any of us know what we're talking about" (Hauerwas 2004: 138).

> Postmodernism then, means and has meant different things to different people at different conceptual levels (Bertens 1995:9)

Despite these difficulties Hauerwas points out that the term can be used to name "the time" (Hauerwas 2004:138).

> It is this recent wide proliferation of the post-modern, in ethnology, sociology, social geography, urban planning,

economics, law, and so on, that is responsible for the more frequent use of its terminology outside its original core area, the humanities, and that has increasing led people to speak of the post-modern world that we inhabit. (Bertens 1995: 9)

In this sense post-modernism is a term of unclear definitions that loosely defines the culture which we live in. Here I state three basic propositions on post-modernism that relates to the work of this thesis. Firstly this thesis focus' on Post-modernism as it relates to culture (rather than pure philosophy, architecture, art etc.). Secondly this thesis focus' on Post-modernism as it relates to culture in the developed world. Thirdly this thesis focus' on teaching and communications practices within that defined Culture.

Therefore this thesis holds to the plain understanding that those in the developed world, currently live in a culture that is after (post) the modern era. As such post-modernism is here defined as the present cultural ethos and practices within the developed world that impact and reflect on teaching and communications practices within that culture. Exactly how this culture, existing after the modern, practices teaching and communication will be dealt with in Chapter 3.

That being said, this thesis works off the theological sources of Stanley Grenz (as will be developed later in this chapter's section on theological method) and as such can refer to certain traits of post-modernity defined in his book *A Primer on Postmodernism* (1996). Here this thesis selects certain traits relevant to the topic while acknowledging that these are not exhaustive.

1.2.2.1    "The central hallmark of post-modernism is pluralism" (1996: 20).

1.2.2.2    "Post-modern holism entails an integration of all the dimensions of personal life –affective and intuitive as well as cognitive" (1996: 14).

1.2.2.3    The conviction that each person is embedded in a particular human community leads to a corporate understanding of truth" (1996: 14).

After working through post-modernism predominantly from a secular sense, Grenz puts forward traits of what he anticipates to be necessary of the evangelical post-modern.

1.2.2.4.   "a post-modern articulation of the Christian gospel will be post-individualistic" (1996: 167). This is the move toward a greater emphasis on community.

1.2.2.5.   "a post-modern articulation of the Christian gospel will be post-rationalistic" (1996: 169). By this Grenz does not mean that it will be anti-intellectual or that it will leave reason behind. "While remaining reasonable, therefore, the gospel must not be limited to the intellectual aspects of the human person. It must encompass other dimensions of our being as well" (1996: 170).

1.2.2.6.    "a post-modern articulation of the Christian gospel will be post-dualistic" (1996: 171). This is a move beyond the distinction of body and soul into a more holistic understanding of humanity. "The gospel we speak must speak to human beings in their entirety" (1996: 171).

1.2.2.7.   "a post-modern articulation of the Christian gospel will be post-neoticentric" (1996: 172). This is the move beyond knowledge toward wisdom.

What is evident in these traits is the move toward a more holistic gospel. As such the message of the gospel is needed to be reflected in the practices of the church (of McLuhans' the message is the medium) making the field of Practical Theology increasingly relevant within post-modernity.

### 1.2.3. Interaction

Interaction can be seen to be the engagement of entities in a two way  system.

This can therefore be taken to mean many things within different contexts, for example interactive processing (computers interacting), interactive fiction (persons interacting with and co-authoring the plot) and so on. So when it comes to the issues of interactive homiletics it needs to be asked how the context affects the term. Swank spoke of a dialogic style in preaching where the sermon interacts with the story of the community and requires sermon feedback and a listening preacher (Swank 1981), McLure increases the interaction with congregants engaging in

sermon preparation (McLure 1995), Stott refers to the congregants exclamations in African America Churches as interaction calling it Dialogical Preaching (Stott 1982:61) and so it can be seen that existing homiletic approaches have used and developed modes of interaction within their defined understanding of the subject. All these forms hold true to the term "interaction" however this thesis focuses its' attention on using the terms in line with the Anabaptist tradition (Williams 2005) which views interaction as a live verbal interaction.

Therefore this thesis defines an interaction as verbal or tactile interaction to such an extent that the sermon is significantly shaped by that interaction. In this understanding the congregation plays an active part in forming the sermon in content or structure or both. This moves beyond a subconscious mental engagement between speaker and listener, beyond affirming exclamations and is not limited to the time before or after the sermon. Rather the participants ask questions, make comments or any other form of interaction where the congregation impacts and influences the sermon as it is being delivered.

### 1.2.4. Homiletics

Traditionally homiletics falls under the academic discipline of Practical Theology (Turnbull 1967: 1-93; Berkley 1992: 1-34) with the majority of texts focusing on delivering speeches within the context of a Christian assembly (Berkley 1994: 12-134; Loscalzo 1992:25, Breuggemann 1989: 1).

Due to the nature of the thesis (investigation of a non-traditional homiletic practice) it needs to established that there is scope for this investigation within the homiletic field. *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, Third Edition* (1996) gives insight into the etymolgy of the word which states that homiletics is derived from the Latin *homìlêticus*, which in turn is derived from the Greek *homilêtikos*, meaning conversation. This is linked to *homilein* meaning "to converse with",  and to *homilos* (crowd), therefore it is seen in its historic context to mean to

converse with a crowd. Below are some definitions which add further insight into our subject matter:

> **Homiletics**. The theological discipline that seeks to understand the purpose and process of preparing and delivering sermons. Homiletics seeks to integrate an understanding of the place of the preacher, the sermon and the audience. Homiletics also seeks to help preachers to prepare themselves spiritually for preaching, to develop sermons that are faithful to the Scripture and to present the sermon in a culturally relevant way. (Grenz et al 1999: 60)
>
> **Sermon.** The word "sermon" comes from the middle English word which was derived from an Old French term, which in turn comes from the Latin word *sermo* ("discourse"). (Actually, it meant "conversation", and the early sermons were delivered in the form of question and answer, only later did it come to mean a monologue) (Sermon 2006)
>
> Significantly, both the Greek word *homily* and its Latin translation, *sermon*, mean nothing more definite than the act of speaking to the people in a public assembly. Both words are also used to designate informal and private speech or conversation. (Davis 1967:70)

Although some homilists have directly associated homiletics with *rhetoric* (for example Broadus 1944: 10) it can be seen from these definitions that homiletics can incorporate interaction and is not limited to monologue speeches from a linguistic perspective. This does mean that homiletics does not also include *rhetoric* or other modes of communication. It is merely point out here that from a linguistic perspective the term homiletics is broad enough to allow for the possibility of multiple modes of communication. Added to this it can be seen that the etymology (the origin of the word) of homiletics is one which is equally broad and one which clearly allows for our investigation into homiletics that is verbally interactive.

It is stated here that this thesis will not investigate *kerygma* (preaching) and *didache* (teaching) separately but assert that both concepts fall within the field of

homiletic theory and therefore whether one accepts the distinctions of Dodd (1946) or the integration of terms of McDonald (1980) it does not concern this investigation.[2]

And so this thesis accepts the ancient classical definition of homiletics as a discourse or discussion which, within the Christian discipline, refers to a spiritual topic. This naturally does not predetermine the mode of communication but validates the agenda of this thesis in investigating the possibility of homiletics  as an interactive mode.

## 1.3.    The problem

The main research question is, "What is the theological basis for Interactive Homiletics?"

Firstly, as this thesis is investigating a theological basis, this question needs to work within the confines of evangelical theological method as defined later in this chapter.

---

[2] A note on *kerygma* is that it is often directly correlated with a speech (implied by the translation of "proclamation").

Firstly it  should be mentioned that the current usage of the term "preach" is not synonymous with the biblical term *kerygma* as it (the current usage of the term preach) incorporates other Greek elements such as *didache* (teaching) and *paraclesis* (exhortation). As such *kerygma* (from the perspective of Scriptural usage) forms only a part of homiletics.

Secondly *kerygma,* in theological circles, is often in reference to the content of the message (Dodd 1964, Goppelt 1981: 228-250) and not the medium. This definition therefore does not impact on the current study which focuses on the mode and not the content of preaching.

Thirdly, it is the Scriptures, and not current definitions, that should determine the mode of *kerygma.* As such this thesis does not immediately correlate *kerygma* to "speech" but rather leaves the form of *kerygma* open to investigation (whether *kerygma* can be interactive as well as speech), to be dealt with by the Scriptures in a later chapter.

Secondly, the question orientates itself around a specific practice of sermon delivery; namely, verbal and tactile interaction between preacher and congregation. Therefore the investigation is focused on one area of homiletic theory, namely homiletic practice and as such refrains from addressing other homiletic topics such as sermon content, the use of the Scriptures within the pulpit, the relation between the sermon and other Christian education within the church, the role of human experience in religious discourse, the issue of anamnesis, and so on.

This singular focus on the validity of a particular homiletic practice within the confines of theological method ensures a specifically focused investigation.

## 1.4.    Evangelical theological method

> Theological method is a particular systematic procedure (or set of procedures), technique or mode of inquiry used in the development of a theological position. Systematic theologians generally treat matters of theological method in the opening sections of their treatise (the prolegomenon). (Grenz et al 1999: 78)

Because this thesis sets out to investigate the theological validity of a homiletic practice, and not to develop a theology itself, it limits its investigation primarily to the theological sources (alternatively called norms) that exist within our evangelical theological method. The thesis will look into each source and examine the extent of interaction within that source and so establish the extent of interaction's validity. In this section I will establish what is to be understood as the theological sources of this investigation as well as the weight which each source brings to bear on the research.

> The constructive theological conversation requires the interplay, or perichoretic dance, of three sources for theology. (Grenz and Franke 2001: 24)

What are theological sources? When constructing theology, sources are the dominant fields (or areas of investigation) that bring to bear on the theological investigation. Within Protestant theology there have been various proposals. The Anglicans have the Lambeth quadrilateral (Scripture, Creeds, Tradition and Reason;

historical episcopate). The Methodists use the Wesleyan quadrilateral (Scripture, Reason, Tradition and Experience) which has also been adapted by other evangelical scholars (for example Pinnock in Pinncok and Brown 1990: 40-44). A recent evangelical approach orientated towards post-modernism was developed by Stanley Grenz and John Franke found in their 2001 book *Beyond Foundationalism: Shaping Theology in a Postmodern Context.* Here Grenz and Franke argue that there are three Sources: The Bible, The Tradition and The Culture. These are the sources that this thesis investigates.

### 1.4.1.  The Scriptures

> The motto of all theology that claims to be evangelical is *sola scriptura* (Scripture alone). This should not be taken to mean that Scripture is the only source of revelation but that it is the original historical source of revelation …The Protestant reformers were adamant that ecclesiastical tradition, while containing much spiritual wisdom, should never be placed on a par with Scripture. The tradition must instead be corrected and judged by the Scriptures. (Bloesch 1973: 58)

> EJ Carnell defined Protestant orthodoxy as "that branch of Christendom which limits the ground of religious authority to the Bible" (Pinnock 2006 )

For Grenz and Franke, as evangelicals, the Bible is the dominant source of all their theology. They use the term "Norming Norm" to indicate that the bible is authoritative and acts as the primary agent of developing Christian theology. However the bible always comes to the church through an interpretive process as we (the church) reflect and think about God. And so other sources of theology are used, whether consciously or unconsciously, to guide our reflection on God as revealed through the bible.

### 1.4.2.  The Culture

> A Theological system is supposed to satisfy two basic needs: the statement of truth of the Christian message and the

> interpretation of this truth for every new generation. (Tillich 1964: 3)

> To be human is to be embedded in culture. (Grenz and Olson 2001: 147)

Grenz and Franke identify Culture as "Theologies Embedded Culture." By this they mean that the church is part of a culture whether we like it or not and are greatly influenced in our thoughts and processes (as pointed out by Lindbeck 1984). The issues the church faces is not the issues of another culture and our way of looking at things are different from others.

Grenz and Franke argue that all theology, if it is to be a living theology, is required to be practised in a specific place and time. They also argue that the church itself forms its own culture in that it embraces an identity and story that is distinct from those who live in the same geography. And so a multi-layered cultural source is seen to exist. Although evangelicals accept that culture will have a valued impact on theology (McGrath 2000:27) they are quick to assert that culture is not the dominant source but subject to the Scriptures as seen in the quote from Grenz and Olson's book "Who Needs Theology"

> We are not suggesting that society sets the agenda for theology or the church. Indeed, theology ought to do more in the way of setting agenda for society. At its best, theology does seek to respond to the perceived needs and questions posed by people around us. (Grenz and Olson 1996: 100)

As stated earlier this thesis defines the culture that it is orientated towards as post-modern and the study focuses on teaching and communication within that culture.

### 1.4.3. The Tradition

Tradition serves as a trajectory of theological thought. It shows that God has not been inactive from the time of the writing of the Bible to the present age. But rather that God has been active in communicating to and through his people. In understanding how other Christians of different eras have wrestled with and learnt

from God the church can learn and better understand God and our place in God's story. Tradition acts as the guiding hand of theological thought but is secondary to the Bible.

> As JI Packer pointed out in a careful and wise study of the role of tradition within evangelicalism we must be prepared to submit all our ideas to the court of Scripture and verify them on its basis. (McGrath 2000:30)

### 1.4.4. Conclusions on theological sources

Of the sources mentioned it is Scripture that carries the final authority. Yet scholars should approach the Scriptures in humility acknowledging that we do not come to the Scriptures from a vacuum. The reader of the Scriptures come to the text with cultural understandings and need to apply the gospel within our culture (contextual application). The reader of the Scriptures also approaches the text from a tradition of reading the text (Catholic, Reformed, etc.) as well as traditions of liturgy, missions etc. Therefore there will be an inevitable interplay of these three sources with the final authority (in our evangelical theology) resting on the Scriptures.

## 1.5. Study goals

The objectives of the study support the investigation as to what extent Interactive homiletics can be substantiated theologically. This will require investigations into the sources of theology (as put forward in the theological method) as well as to understand the extent that Interactive Homiletics can be embraced by evangelical churches.

1.5.1. To test Interactive Homiletics against the sources found within this theological method.

1.5.2. To understand the extent of Interactive Homiletics within the ministry of Jesus and the Apostles using the Gospel of Mark and the Book of Acts as literary sources.

1.5.3. To investigate the extent of Interaction in Post-modern educational theory and practice.

1.5.4. To investigate the history of Homiletics as it relates to interaction and non-interaction with regard to religious discourses.

If these objectives are reached the thesis would have addressed the main problem of investigating the validity of Interactive Homiletics from a theological perspective as well as to have developed basic elements of the theology.

1.6.    Study structure

| *Chapter Title* | *Chapter Description* |
|---|---|
| 1. Introduction | Introduction to the Research Problem and approach including definitions of thesis term, such as Interactive Homiletics and Post-modern, as well as describing the thesis' evangelical theological method. |
| 2. The Scriptures | An analysis of the Gospel of Mark and the Book of Acts investigating Interaction with regard to teaching events. |
| 3. The Culture | An investigation into the nature of educational theory and practice within our culture as it relates to interaction. |
| 4. The Tradition | An Overview of the tradition of homiletics with an investigation on interaction, dealing with the tradition surrounding the New Testament as well as the post Canonical era up to the present. |
| 5. Concluding | Concluding observations and remarks on the research done. At this stage the thesis will conclude on the extent of validity of interactive |

homiletics within the field of theology. If the hypothesis is proven accurate, suggestions for further investigation will be put forward in this chapter.

## 1.7.    Hypothesis

The hypothesis is that there is validity to Interactive Homiletics from a theological perspective, namely that there will be sufficient evidence within the three theological sources to warrant further theological construction.

## 1.8.    Research methodology

As stated earlier the problem raises the issue of theological method. As such this thesis has chosen to work with the theological sources as put forward by Stanley Grenz and John Franke found in their 2001 book *Beyond Foundationalism: Shaping Theology in a Postmodern Context*. This states that the three sources are; The Scriptures, the Culture and The Tradition. This thesis then addresses each of the sources and investigates the extent to which Interactive Homiletics (as defined in this Introduction) is validated within the sources.

For Scripture this thesis focuses on the New Testament and further delimit the primary investigation on the Gospel of Mark and Acts. While the thesis will later elaborate further on this choice of our source texts it can be said here that the thesis' subject matter revolves around a mode, or medium, of discourse and as such the more narrative orientated Scriptures are best suited. Mark is recognized as the narrative kernel of the Synoptic gospels (Combrink 1996: 35-36) and Acts is the only canonical historical narrative of the early disciples. As the process is a direct analysis of the text it uses primary literary sources and asks the texts such questions as "Did the audience initiate the teaching event?", "Was there recorded dialogue?" and "Was there tactile interaction surrounding the teaching event?"  These questions will categorize and define in a quantitative manner the medium of homiletics as practised

by Jesus and the early disciples with regard to interaction. Added to this, the thesis will examine homiletic texts that are recorded in the Epistles and query what light they can shed on our topic of the medium of homiletics.

With regard to Culture the investigation focuses on the field of educational theory and specifically the accepted practices within a post-modern culture. With regard to higher education and academic theory the thesis draws from the work of Samuelowicz and Bain who overviewed the field in their 2001 work *Revisiting Academics' Beliefs about Teaching and Learning*. The investigation seeks to establish to what extent interaction is valid within this context of post-modern educational theory. After investigating the validity of interaction within education theory a brief overview of teaching practices within business world will be looked into. This is because the business world deals with pragmatic adult education on the ground level. Once again the intention is to investigate the extent of interaction within teaching environments within the post-modern culture.

With regard to tradition this thesis will investigate firstly the educational tradition of the New Testament era, once again with regard to interaction between learner and teacher. The initial focus will be on the Jewish teaching tradition, the Greek teaching tradition and the Qumran community. From there an overview of homiletic theory over church history with an eye to interaction will be given. It is noted that there has already been significant investigations with regard to monologue speeches within homiletic theory and that this thesis' aim is simply to investigate the validity of interaction and not to deconstruct the monologue.

Due to the nature of the thesis the methodology is primarily related to literary research based on each area (Scripture, Tradition and Culture). Once each source has been investigated separately the thesis will conclude, drawing from its findings.

1.9.    Concluding the introduction

This opening chapter has defined the basic working definitions to be used throughout this thesis (Homiletics, Post-modernism and Interaction) as well as set

forth this thesis' process of investigating the extent of interaction within the three sources as set forward by evangelical methodology (Scripture, Tradition and Culture). It has also been established that within evangelical theological method that it is the source of Scripture that carries the most weight and is the primary source on which the other sources are evaluated.

CHAPTER 2: THE SCRIPTURES

## 2.1.    Approaching the Scriptures

Now this thesis begins the task of examining interaction within the Scriptures (our "norming norm") and so border on the field of biblical studies. This study does not focus on etymological and semantic studies and although biblical semantics plays a part in determining the meaning of the text there has been academic concern that an over-emphasis on terms can lead scholars to read into the text certain preconceived notions (Barr 1975, Norrington 1996: 8). As the later Wittgenstein pointed out words and sentences ascertain meaning from their contexts (Wittgenstein 1958: 65, 170) and words tend to have multiple meanings. Therefore, a view to the greater context (social and literary) should be held in order to better understand what is being communicated through words.[3]

As this chapter is interested in investigating the practice of homiletics of the early church (Jesus and the disciples) the focus will be on the narrative texts of the New Testament (the Gospels and Acts). It is acknowledged that there has been a move in biblical studies to view other Epistles within a narrative framework, (for example *Narrative Dynamics in Paul* Longenecker 2002) but it should also be noted that it is the narrative texts (as opposed to Epistles being understood within their narrative framework) which directly communicate peoples actions and are therefore more beneficial for our study which focuses on practice. With regard to the Gospels this thesis has chosen to focus on Mark (for reasons explained later) and as there is only one New Testament Narrative of the practices of the early church the thesis also

---

[3] This does not mean that semantic study is negated but that semantics is better understood in context. Within this chapter there is a focus on the literary context of two primary texts (Mark and Acts) and in the fourth chapter on Tradition- where, amongst other cultural contexts, this thesis will look to the cultural context within the early church (i.e. the tradition of homiletics within the ancient cultures).

surveys the book of Acts. And so our primary texts for this section are the Gospel of Mark and the book of Acts.

At the end of this chapter there will be an examination into certain Epistle texts to see if those add any light onto the issue of interaction. These will be broken up into two categories 1) Assembly texts and 2) often cited homiletic texts.


## 2.2.    Cautions of overstepping our parameters

This thesis is cautious not to draw conclusions that overstep the boundaries of what is possible.

Firstly, certain scholars (for example, Wills 1984:277) have pointed out that there is limited correlation between the Sunday sermon and what occurs within the New Testament Narratives. There, of course, were regular gatherings (Acts 2:46, Hebrews 10:25) but it should be acknowledged that much of what occurs in the canonical narratives (Jesus teaching Nicodemus, Peter at Cornelius' house and so on) can be seen to take place outside of such meetings. This raises a caution as to the extent these texts can be used as authoritative for church practice (here meaning practices that take place at church meetings) today.[4] It is noted here that  none of the definitions presented by other scholars earlier (in section 1.2.4) indicate that homiletics should be limited to church meetings and so this thesis reaffirms the definition of homiletics ("a discourse or discussion which, within the Christian discipline, refers to a spiritual topic") which makes no  judgement on whether the homily is limited in location.

Secondly much of what is recorded in the Canon could be thought of as exceptional activity and so can be questioned as to how these events can be defined

---

[4] This thesis has accepted that the majority of what is dealt with in the field of homiletics takes place within the context of church meetings. However acceptance of the status quo should not be read as affirming. Rather, in the tradition of evangelical theology, the thesis defers to the Scriptures  to define the context of homiletics. That however would move the inquiry beyond the scope of this investigation which merely focuses on the manner of communication in homiletics.

as normative practices. For example, after surveying speeches in the First Testament[5] Norrington states that, "there is no evidence to suggest that speeches were ever a regular part of the Israelite cultus either at the Temple or at their shrines" (Norrington 1996: 2).

Thirdly, there is the issue raised by Nineham regarding "how deep, intellectually and emotionally, the convictional and attitudinal differences between people of ancient cultures and those of modern cultures go" (quoted in Packer 1983: 331). This distinction between cultures can be used by "religious liberals who desire to eliminate some feature of the text" (Pinnock 1985:110). Although, as evangelicals, we acknowledge and wrestle with the issues of cultural difference (Pinnock 1985: 109; Packer 1983: 331-335; Grenz 2000: 128) we still assert that all of Scripture is useful. This hermeneutical agenda of relating the Scriptures to the current context is complex and moves far beyond the scope of this thesis. Here this thesis affirms the evangelical theological tradition developed in the introduction that it is ultimately the Scriptures that are the "norming norm" and that current culture is less influential. In the following chapter this thesis will inquire as to what extent interaction is a valid teaching practice in the current culture and so move towards validating our interactive homiletic. In this chapter the focus on the Scriptures.

It is in acknowledging the limitations of this type of research that the topic should be approached with the appropriate caution as this thesis looks with an eye toward the broad brush strokes of homiletic practices rather than the search for "proof" texts. The agenda is to look to the canonical narratives to shed light on the process of communication used by the early church with regard to interaction in homiletics.

## 2.3.    Critical approaches in biblical studies

As this section focuses on the biblical source an approach to the text needs to be found  that is academically credible and can be supplementary  with much of what

---

[5] Some speeches were poetic (Duet 32), some more of an exhortation (Josh 23-24), some were read (Exodus 24:7) some were at religious sites (Jer 36: 6) and others in a more private setting (Ezek 8:1). Once again this thesis affirms the legitimacy of speeches within both Testaments.

has been raised in the field of biblical studies. This sections gives a brief overview of the major themes in approaching the text within biblical studies as well as put forward approach that the thesis will take.

The term "critics" here is not meant to be taken in any negative connotation but is rather to be understood as a "reference to any method of interpreting texts that uses modern scientific insights into the nature of history, language, culture and literature." (Grenz et al 1999: 34)

## 2.3.1. Form criticism

"With the actual development of form-critical investigation of the New Testament after the First World War an important new phase dawned for New Testament study. Pioneering work was undertaken with a view to a better understanding of the evolution and the shaping of the gospel material in its preliterary period" (du Toit 1996:18) This is the scientific investigation into the original sources used before the text came into being in its current form.

## 2.3.2. Redaction criticism

"Redaction criticism depends on the work of the form critics. The redaction critic accepts the material as the form critics says it appeared in the pre-Markan [or any other source under investigation] stage and enquires what changes Mark has made to it and asks how he has put it together" (Best 1988:10). It is the investigation into the process that a writer/editor formulated the text with, in order to understand their theology and or setting.

## 2.3.3. Source criticism

In 1776 Griesbach (in his *Synopsis Evangeliorum Mathaei, Marci et Lucae*) set out the Greek texts in parallel and questioned their inter-relation (fathering the term "synoptic" gospels) and so the study of inter-relating the gospels began and is known as source criticism (Combrink 1996: 28).

## 2.3.4. Canonical criticism

  "An approach used to interpret the Bible in the light of its final form as a theologically unified collection of books rather than seeking to understand the books in their precannonical form and function." (Grenz et al 1999: 23)

McKnight identifies the pioneers of this form of Criticism as Brevard Childs and James A Sanders with Childs focusing on the books and Sanders on the process of their canonization (1990:75). Form and Redaction criticisms focus on the cultural setting which the texts emerge and although Canonical Criticism still looks at the social settings of the books it is never the less distinct due to its focus on the ancient cultural setting once the text has been accepted as canonical. Sanders focus enables him to look at how texts were understood in progression from their original setting, based on critical methods, and in their later setting within the canon (McKnight 1990: 77). This canonical hermeneutic looks to the pattern of how different canonical communities understood texts, which then gives the theologian a pattern to emulate in today's communities.

## 2.3.5. Reader-orientated criticism

"A radical reader-orientated approach sees the strategies, the criteria for criticism and verification, the ""information"" obtained by the process, and the use made of such ""information"" in the light of the reader" (McKnight 1990: 15).

In this criticism the critic moves "in front" of the text and places the majority of their critical thinking to the reader, for McKnight this is dominantly individuals (1990: 158) while Stanley Fish adds to this reading communities (Thiselton 1999: 157). There is less effort placed in understanding its original meaning or intent, rather the theologian looks at the text as it stands today and examine what the assumptions, values and other responses that the reader brings to the task of understanding the text. This is not to be necessarily equated with Roland Bathes "death of the author" (Sim and Van Loon 2001: 168) which implies no attempt at looking into the authors intent and original audience as Ricouer (1976: 25-33) and McKnight (1990:220-221) point out.

## 2.3.6. Rhetorical criticism

"Rhetorical critical approaches to reader-response criticism insist on reading the text in the light of the interpretive conventions which were operative for the culture which it was written." (Camery-Hoggatt 1995: 273)

This form of criticism takes into account much of what has been said by the reader-orientation critics, namely that the reader plays a significant role in forming meaning and by implication the author bears this in mind when constructing the text. The distinction between the rhetorical criticism and the reader-orientated criticism is the amount of emphasis the former places on the original communities' norms, customs and assumed responses to the text. In order for this to occur redaction criticism and form criticism is needed and so there is a move back to a discussion that occurs behind the text.

The above review gives insight into the variety of ways that the text can be studied and implies a multiplicity of answers the church can receive from the biblical text. It can be seen that certain methods use the biblical text as a source of data that the critic needs to get "behind" in order to establish their theology. Form, Canonical. Redaction and Rhetorical criticisms are the dominant methods used in historical-critical investigations with the agenda of going behind the text in order to "uncover" history. Source criticism is also one that tries to go beyond the text to construct an alternative narrative that combines all of the gospels. In contrast to these reader-orientated criticism does not criticize the text as such but focuses its energies on the reader. This can lead the biblical scholar on many quests (either behind or in front of the text) without ever simply taking the text as it stands.

It is here that this thesis turns to the work of Hans Frei to lay the platform of its approach to the texts of Mark and Acts. This platform will allow this thesis to examine the text as it stands without focusing on textual aspects behind or in front of the text for the current purpose of investigating a homiletic method.

2.3.7. Hans Frei's narrative approach to biblical studies

With regard to approaching the biblical text, particularly the narrative texts, it is difficult to find a figure that stands out more than Hans Frei. In his 1974 work *Eclipse of the Biblical Narrative* he put forward that much of Western theology had taken a wrong turn in trying to "detach meaning of the biblical story from its truth" (Grenz and Olson 1992:277). He continued by stating that this was because theology had overlooked the nature of the biblical narratives and that was that they were written as historical narratives. Now narratives are to be read as narratives and to use them as sources of history and or universal existential principles would be to overlook and distort the nature of the text itself. Hans Frei in a sense challenged the theological community to accept the Bible on its own terms and not on the agendas of modern (meaning current) thought.

> But in effect, the realistic or history-like quality of biblical narratives, acknowledged by all, instead of being examined for the bearing it had in its own right on meaning and interpretation was immediately transposed into the quite different issue of whether or not the realistic narrative was historical. (Frei 1974: 16)

Much has happened in theological circles since Frei wrote this initial work (he maintained his dominant views up until his death in 1988) and there certainly has been much work that focuses on the nature of the gospels as realistic narratives (for example Rhoads and Michie 1982, Best 1983, Ford 1997, Lee 1999) with these works making little attempt to argue or develop "historical" arguments[6] or to focus on the reader.[7]

---

[6] Frei was not unique in his agenda of attempting to free theological inquiry from the historical-critical debates of the day which have proven to be of little help in church life. For example in the early parts of the century Karl Barth made the move to neo-orthodoxy and his Biblical Studies counter part, Rodulf Bultmann; who was famous for his form criticism (History of the Synoptic Tradition 1963); worked hard on developing an existential hermeneutic similar to Barth's (McKnight 1978:66-71). So it can be seen that although others had made the move to develop a hermeneutic free of historical burdens they had made this move outside of biblical studies. Barth chose dogmatics as his field and although Bultmann was certainly a biblical studies scholar his approach to applying the text lay outside of that field (existential hermeneutics; McKnight 1990: 54-55)

Frei becomes the theologian who moved beyond the historical critical methods within the field of biblical studies by putting forward a literary approach to the biblical text[8]. The bible was to be read as it stands taking into account the genre in which it was written and the implications of this genre.

I acknowledge that I have not followed the precise process of Frei. For example the thesis does not attempt to uncover the spirit of the author (1974: 310) or the inner form/organic connection of the text (1974: 311).  What this thesis has done is to take the literary work as it stands (avoiding the historical-critical and reader response issues) and to look at character actions that take place within the narrative.

## 2.4.  Of character actions within a narrative

I do not know of any theologian, nor am I hopeful that one will arise, who says that the theological theme of Mark's gospel or Acts is to teach on homiletics. I would be more than suspicious of such an approach and could quite comfortably say that it would not speak the main message God would speak through these texts. That being said I do believe that often the Scriptures speak about important issues

---

[7] Frei's approach and that of the reader-orientated criticism is similar in that they both look at the Bible as it stands as literature. However Frei looks more to the text while the reader-orientated to the readers' response to the text.

[8] The research in this section of the thesis does not focus on what others have focused on as literary research. For example, the research does not take into account the literary monologue that is Mark's gospel, it does not look to the flow and structure of Mark's narrative but it rather looks at the flow and structure of incidents that occur within the narrative. This is because if this thesis were to evaluate the book of Mark as a monologue message (what could be determined a canonical approach similar to Brevard Childs in *Introduction to the Old testament as Scripture,* 1979) in and of its self it would be examining the teaching methods and discourse of Mark and not Jesus. No doubt valid and interesting investigations have been made if the theologian looks at Mark's entire structure as a possible sermon itself (for example Best 1988) but it is simply not the agenda of this thesis to investigate the possible homiletic of Mark. This section of the thesis is about looking at the teaching methods of Jesus, albeit through the lens of Mark.

outside of the immediate and obvious context. For example the doctrine of the *kenosis* can be derived from Phil 2:7-11 whose immediate context is on encouraging submissive attitudes within the church rather than Jesus ontological nature at the time of the incarnation. What is important is that words and ideas are not inserted and imposed on the voice of the Scriptures, that the text is read on its own terms. What this thesis does is to examine a broad overview of the nature of Jesus' and the early disciples' teaching methods with an eye toward interaction.

This can be defined as examining a character's actions (methods) that take place within a story. For example, a police investigator wanting to imitate the methods of Sherlock Holmes would be able to read the stories written by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle and make certain deductions based on Holmes' investigative methods recorded in those stories. This is possible even though the agenda of Sir Arthur Conan Doyle was by no means to create a text book on investigative methods. The surveys in this chapter have the agenda of categorizing events that were recorded in the Gospel of Mark (with regard to Jesus' homiletic practice) and book of Acts (with regard to the homiletic practice of the early disciples). Once categorized a quantitative assessment can be given establishing what practices are normative. The agenda is to examine the extent of interaction within these contexts and therefore to see to what extent interaction is theologically validated as a practice within the source of the Scriptures.

What is clear is that Mark has the intention of indicating that Jesus taught (du Toit 1996: 127-128) and that Acts is the only canonical record of the acts of the early church. Therefore they are the logical places to examine the homiletic practices of those persons. What is recorded in these narratives is not only the content of messages that most impacted the writers but also gives insight as to the medium that some of these messages took. They have therefore recorded within their narratives both the medium and the message of these homiletic events and as such are useful in this thesis endeavour to examine the validity of a homiletic medium that is interactive.

2.5. Survey of the gospel of Mark

2.5.1. Why Mark?

2.5.1.1. Mark uses the term *keryssein* (most commonly translated "preach") more than any of the other gospels (Kittel (ed) 1965: 704)*.* As such Mark is more likely to offer insight into the homiletic medium than the other Gospels.

2.5.1.2. Mark is the literary kernel of the other Synoptic Gospels.

> Matthew contains 90% of Mark's material, while more than 50% of it appears in Luke …never do they both (Matthew and Luke) deviate simultaneously from his sequence…Mark's sequence is maintained throughout all three gospels. (Combrink 1996: 35-36)

This thesis is not interested in arguing from form-criticism and so takes this data merely to point out Mark's usefulness for literary research. This thesis points out that Mark is uniquely positioned in both content and structure for this thesis to examine the teaching methods of Jesus.

2.5.1.3. Mark has greater candour

Out of the synoptic gospels Mark's gospel is more to the point and depicts in a more straight forward, candid manner what occurred (within the literary narrative). For example Mark reveals more of Jesus humanity (8:12); Mark says that Jesus *could not* perform miracles in his home town (Mark 6:5) while Matthew simply says he *did not* (Matt 13:58); in Mark's gospel Jesus reprimands his disciples (Mark 4:13) while this is missing from Matthew and Luke's parallels (Matt 13:18; Luke 8:25). This candour of Mark uniquely positions Mark among the synoptics for evaluation of Jesus teaching methods.

This is not an attempt to find the history behind the gospel of Mark, or any other gospel for that matter, rather it is simply a recognition that if a choice is to be made regarding which gospel serves our agenda (of looking at the interactive medium of Jesus' homiletic methods) then Mark would be the preferred choice.

### 2.5.1.4. Mark is a cross-cultural work:

Out of the Gospels Mark is most concerned in speaking across cultures, for example Mark explains Jewish customs of the day (7:2-4; 15:42) and translates words from Aramaic (3:17; 5:41; 7:11; 15:22).

If as Grenz states, "The central hallmark of postmodernism is pluralism" (1996: 20) then the gospel that acknowledges cultural diversity and attempts to address it in a helpful manner would be a preferred choice (it is more likely to address cultural differences). That Mark does not omit or attempt to explain the homiletic method of Jesus therefore implies Jesus' practice was understood in a pluralistic society and in no need of further clarification.

### 2.5.2. Asking the questions

This thesis has chosen to focus its attention on one activity of the church, homiletics. The thesis has also defined the term to incorporate any educational event whether teaching, preaching, illustrative, poetical etc.

The question asked of the gospel of Mark is, does Mark's account of Jesus life have anything to say with regard to his homiletic methods with regard to interaction? The thesis assumes that Mark does in fact have a voice to speak into the churches homiletic practices today. I acknowledge that cultural differences may indicate that the church could overlook certain activities (I'm not proposing preachers all rent out a boat and preach from the boat to the crowd at the shore) but this thesis believes that there still needs to be asked, "What does Jesus homiletic method through Mark's account have to say to the church?"  How this is done will be further defined later as the thesis explains the nature of the categories developed for this survey.

### 2.5.3. Conclusion on approaching Mark

In looking at the gospel of Mark this thesis looks at it as a literary whole and does not bring many of the historical questions that have been indicative of biblical studies

of Mark in the past (for example whether Mark 16:9-20 was in the original manuscript). Rather the thesis looks at the text as it stands and inquires as to how that story bears implications for the church today. Acknowledging that the choice of categorizing texts is more art than science and accepting that others may categorize differently the thesis has found it necessary to incorporate a comments section explaining why certain choices were made as well as other insights. The idea is for a transparent survey that can be amended and reworked by others if need be but still to put forward in a firm way the nature of interaction within the homiletics of Jesus.

In short this thesis examines the homiletic methods of Jesus, as recorded in the Gospel of Mark, and asks questions relating to the medium, focusing on interaction.

### 2.5.4. Category definitions and parameters

2.5.4.1. Homiletic events: As decided in the introduction this thesis affirms that homiletics can take place through many means.

The criteria assumptions are a) that each text does not need to fit all the criteria and b) that this thesis has focused only on the homiletic events of Jesus, i.e., the survey does not focus on the teaching of other characters (for example John the Baptist).

This thesis therefore gives the term to "homiletic events" that meet the following criteria:

2.5.4.1.1. When Jesus is quoted (homiletics as a discourse or discussion which refers to a spiritual topic).

2.5.4.1.2. The term preaching or teaching is specified in the text.

2.5.4.1.3. Actions that occurred in a context where Jesus was surrounded by others who could learn from his example (healing, exorcism, miraculous occurrences). It is noted that although the survey has focused on where there is a spoken word it has also allowed other instances into the survey.

2.5.4.1.4.  It is assumed Jesus had intention to educate (whether for praxis or theory) those around him.[9]

2.5.4.2. Interaction: This survey breaks Interaction down into 5 categories

2.5.4.2.1.  Unclear: This where extent or nature of interaction is unclear. The comments page might indicate what is thought to have happened and briefly supports those views as often, an understanding of historical culture, implies a form of interaction for these texts.

2.5.4.2.2.  None: This is where no interaction is recorded in the text.

2.5.4.2.3.  Audience Initiated: Where the audience initiated the homiletic event. Often the Comments category explains this further.

2.5.4.2.4.  Dialogue: Where two or more persons verbally dialogue with Jesus either recorded directly in the text or stated as occurring in the text (e.g."arguing" does not have the exact dialogue recorded but clearly states that dialogue occurred)

2.5.4.2.5.  Action event: these are physical actions that accompany the preaching (for example healing, exorcism etc.)

2.5.4.3. Audience: This term is also used broadly and indicates those who were recipients of the message. This survey has preferred the term audience to recipients due to the connotation that recipients actually "receive", affirm or understand the message. Therefore this survey applies the term audience loosely to those who surrounded Jesus at a time and were the intended recipients of his message. I note that this is more often than not a matter of location of the hearer rather than intention of the hearts to learn.

2.  Comments: The nature of the comments column is not to develop an exegetical scholarly work as that is not the nature of the thesis. Rather the agenda here is to give the reader insight into the surveys choice in categorizing the texts as well as to offer, at times, elementary observations. Therefore the comments

---

[9] This is a difficult aspect to define as it could be stated that all events recorded in any of the gospels were deemed to have these qualities by the authors. This has resulted in the survey incorporating a majority of Mark's gospel.

column merely plays a supportive role in the survey which focuses its attention on giving a quantitative insight into the homiletic mediums with regard to interaction as defined above.

## 2.5.5. Survey of Mark

**Table 1**

| | | | [ | | Interaction | | ] | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **No.** | **Text: Mark** | **Audience** | **Unclear** | **None** | **Audience Initiated** | **Dialogue** | **Action Event** | **Comments** |
| 1 | 1:14-15 | Region of Galilee | X | | | | | This is an unclear statement and does not comment on the structure and medium of any particular homiletic practice. |
| 2 | 1:17-20 | Simon and Andrew; James and John | | X | | | | Jesus knew his audience and commands them in a manner that they would understand (fishers of men) to follow him. |
| 3 | a) 1: 21-22 b) 1: 23-26 | Caper-naum Syna-gogue[10] | X (a) | | X (b) | | | Teaching (a) is unclear but most likely follows the synagogue practice of the day while teaching (b) occurs in response to a demonic utterance. |
| 4 | 1:29-35 | Simon Peters House | | | X | | X | Although Mark makes no reference to actual teaching the thesis assumes a teaching was conveyed |

---

[10] Mark 1:27 After this teaching event of Jesus a debate rose amongst the audience. Whether this debate occurred in the synagogue is uncertain but verse 29 indicates this to be probable.

| N o. | Text: Mark | Audience | Unclear | None | Audience Initiated | Dialogue | Action Event | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | whether spoken or unspoken. Jesus' statement in verse 38 states that he must *"preach in other towns"* implying that he had already preached in Capernaum. This could be a reference to the preaching occurrence at the synagogue or extend to the activities at Simon Peters' house. |
| 5 | 1:35-38 | Simon and his companions | | | X | | | |
| 6 | 1:39 | Synagogues in Galilee | X | | | | X | Although the teaching structure and move of a particular teaching is left unsaid in the text, the exorcism factor indicates interaction at some stage. |
| 7 | 1:40-44 | Leper | | | X | | X | |
| 8 | a)2:1-2 b)2:3-5 c)2:6-12 | Mixed Audience at Jesus' Home | | | X | X | X | It is unclear as to the structure and medium of the teaching as it began but it certainly moved into an interactive pedagogy (I note that the with regard to (c) I assume that they did not vocalized their objection yet never the less Jesus interacted with what was |

| N o. | Text: Mark | Audience | Unclear | None | Audience Initiated | Dialogue | Action Event | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | occurring around him at the time). |
| 9 | 2:14 | Levi (Public Street) | | X | | | | It should be noted that the survey has stated that there is no interaction here although I do believe more was said than is written and that it seems obvious to the author that there was interaction. However, the survey has limited itself to the text. |
| 10 | a)2:15-17 b)2:18-22 | Mixed Audience Levis House | | | X (a,b) | | | It is unclear as to whether both of these teachings occurred at the same place and time but here it is assumed. In any case, both follow the same pattern of audience initiation and so would not conflict with any findings of the survey. |
| 11 | 2:23-28 | Disciples and Pharisees in a grain field | | | X | | | |
| 12 | 3:1-5 | Syna-gogue | | | | | X | This is the healing of the man with the shrivelled hand. Jesus asks a question regarding the lawfulness of healing on the Sabbath but receives no answer. |
| 13 | 3:7- | Great Multitude | | | | | X | No oral teaching is |

| No. | Text: Mark | Audience | Unclear | None | Audience Initiated | Dialogue | Action Event | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 12 | from all over ("withdrew to the sea') | | | | | | specified. Healing and Exorcism occur. |
| 14 | a)3:21-30 b)3:31-35 | Mixed Audience Jesus' Home | | | X | | | a) It is doubtful whether at this point the scribes accused Jesus directly of being of Beelzebub but Jesus interacted with the accusation he had heard. b) The fact that you can send word that you've arrived to a person teaching (and expect them to respond) indicates the informal interactive nature of his teaching. |
| 15 | 4:1-9 | Mixed Audience (by the sea) | | X | | | | The parable needed an explanation for the teaching to be complete. |
| 16 | 4: 10-25 of. 4:34 | Disciples (privately) | | | X | | | The parables needed explanation. |
| 17 | 4:26-33 | Mixed Audience (Assum-ed) | | X | | | | The literary flow of Mark indicates that Jesus is back in public teaching unclear parables (verse 33-34) which then needed to be explained in private to his disciples. |
| 18 | 4:35-40 | Disciples at sea | | | X | | X | Here Jesus taught on the sovereignty of God over nature in his miracle of |

| N o. | Text: Mark | Audience | Unclear | None | Audience Initiated | Dialogue | Action Event | Comments |
|------|-----------|----------|---------|------|-------------------|----------|--------------|----------|
| | | | | | | | | calming the storm. |
| 19 | 5: 1-20 | Disciples and the demon-ized man | | | X | X | X | This is certainly an unusual homiletic event, but no doubt the disciples learnt a great deal in this encounter. The demonized man initiated the encounter and after the exorcism the townsfolk engaged Jesus (verse 14-16). Although the townsfolk were not present at the exorcism they may have been present when Jesus commanded the man to tell others of what had happened. In any case the disciples were present throughout. |
| 20 | 5:21-23 & 5: 35-43 | Disciples and Jarius' at the seashore (public) and Jarius home (private) | | | X | X | X | Although Jarius was not directly present for the healing and homiletic event (verse 37) he has been included for his role in initiating the process. |
| 21 | 5: 24-35 | Crowd (including the afflicted woman) on the road to Jarius' home (public) | | | X | X | X | The woman initiated the process while the crowd was present for the teaching that followed. |
| 22 | a)6:2 a | Syna-gogue | | | | X | X | Initially the teaching was probably not interactive |

| No. | Text: Mark | Audience | Unclear | None | Audience Initiated | Dialogue | Action Event | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | b)6:2b-5 | Nazareth | | | | | | (verse 2) and then Jesus responded to their unbelief with teaching as they verbalized their unbelief. It is unclear as to whether these remarks were directed to Jesus directly, but Jesus never the less taught in response to them. |
| 23 | 6:6 | Villages near Nazareth | X | | | | | This is a sweeping comment. |
| 24 | 6:7-11 | Disciples | | X | | | | Jesus instructed his disciples on their first ministry trip without him. There is no interaction in Marks gospel. |
| 25 | a)6:34 b) 6:35-44 | Crowds (ashore) | X (a) | | X(b) | X(b) | X(b) | Section b) is put in here tentatively, but because of the amount of teaching that has surrounded the text it has been allowed into this survey. |
| 26 | 6:45-52 | Disciples (at sea) | | | X | | X | Jesus walking on the water brought fear to the disciples. Jesus calmed them and revealed more of his nature. |
| 27 | 6:53-56 | Disciples and villagers | | | | | X | No oral teaching is mentioned. The healing of the sick as he travelled around the villages is recorded. |

| N o. | Text: Mark | Audience | Unclear | None | Audience Initiated | Dialogue | Action Event | Comments |
|------|-----------|----------|---------|------|--------------------|----------|--------------|----------|
| 28 | 7:1-13 | Pharisees at a meal | | | X | | | The Pharisees questioned Jesus about traditional washing. |
| 29 | 7:14-16 | Crowd (assumed to be at the same meal above) | | X | | | | Jesus taught the crowd about how *"nothing outside a man can defile him."* (verse 15) |
| 30 | 7:17-23 | Disciples ("entered the house" after the meal above) | | | X | | | Jesus explained the previous teaching he had spoken to the crowd. |
| 31 | 7:24-30 | Syrophoe-nician with some disciples assumed present (House in Tyre) | | | X | X | X | This text often used to investigate Jesus' teaching on Gentiles. |
| 32 | 7:31-37 | Deaf and Mute with Crowd | | | X | X | X | Here it is noted that Jesus took the man aside to perform the healing (verse 33) yet the crowd witnessed the results (verse 37). Therefore a dialogue is directly implied although not recorded in the text itself (verse36). |
| 33 | 8:2-9 | Disciples | | | | X | X | Although this teaching took place within the context of a crowd (feeding of a large crowd) it is the disciples who interacted with Jesus and received his teaching. |

| No. | Text: Mark | Audience | Unclear | None | Audience Initiated | Dialogue | Action Event | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 34 | 8:11-12 | Pharisees and Disciples | | | X | X | | The Pharisees argued for a sign. |
| 35 | 8: 14-21 | Disciples on boat | | | | X | | Jesus used leaven as a metaphor for the Pharisees and the disciples engaged (due to their literal underdtanding). |
| 36 | 8:22-26 | Disciples and blind man | | | X | X | X | The actual dialogue is once again not within the text but is directly implied (verse 22). |
| 37 | 8:27-33 | Disciples on the road to Ceasarea Philippi | | | | X | | Jesus began with a question ("Who do you say that I am?") and then a teaching dialogue followed. |
| 38 | 8: 34-9:1 | Crowd joins the disciples | | X | | | | Jesus taught on denying yourself. |
| 39 | 9:2-13 | Peter James and John | | | | X | X | The transfiguration was unique yet the survey comments on how the disciples engaged with Jesus and received teaching. |
| 40 | a) 9:14-27 b) 9:28-29 | Disciples, crowds, scribes | | | X | X | X | The interaction of a healing occurred. The disciples inquired as to why they could not caste out the demon. |
| 41 | 9:30-32 | Disciples | | X | | | | What is interesting is that Mark states the reason why |

| N o. | Text: Mark | Audience | Unclear | None | Audience Initiated | Dialogue | Action Event | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | they did not ask (they were afraid) implying that it was normative to ask when things were not clear. |
| 42 | 9:33-37 | Disciples (fairly open setting as a nearby child was used to illustrate a point) | | X | | | | Responding to their discussion about who would be the greatest Jesus engaged them with the current issue but they do not respond. |
| 43 | 9:38-50 | Disciples | | | X | X | | John asked a question of Jesus. |
| 44 | a) 10:1  b) 10:2-9 | Crowds and Pharisees | X(a) | | | X(b) | | In a) Jesus began to teach and the interaction is unclear. Then the Pharisees initiated a question and the body of the message is born. |
| 45 | 10:10-12 | Disciples ("the house') | | | X | | | Jesus explained his dialogue with the Pharisees. |
| 46 | 10:13-16 | Disciples and crowd | | | X | | | Jesus reacted to the disciples denying the children access to him and used that as a platform to teach the disciples. |
| 47 | a)10:17-22  b) 10:23-31 | Rich Man and Disciples | | | X | X | | The rich man initiated this message by asking Jesus what he must do to achieve eternal life (a). After Jesus had taught this he turned to |

| N o. | Text: Mark | Audience | Unclear | None | Audience Initiated | Dialogue | Action Event | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | the disciples who interacted with Jesus as they were taught more (b) |
| 48 | 10: 32-34 | Disciples on the road to Jerusalem | | X | | | | The text states that they were amazed and those who followed were fearful. I would like to intimate here that Jesus' teaching on his death and resurrection was to assure them in response to their fear and therefore could be seen to be interactive but I have chosen to limit the interaction here to the "none" category due to the lack of clarity on the issue from my perspective. |
| 49 | 10: 35-45 | Disciples (assumed on the road of. verse 46) | | | X | X | | James and John initiated the situation by asking to be given preferential treatment in the kingdom. The other disciples responded and Jesus, all the while, taught out of this context. |
| 50 | 10:46 -52 | Barti- maeus and disciples (by the road) | | | X | X | X | There was an action event which was supplemented with a teaching dialogue. |
| 51 | 11: 2- 11 | Disciples and Jerusalem crowds | | | X | | X | There was an action supplemented with a teaching monologue |

| No. | Text: Mark | Audience | Unclear | None | Audience Initiated | Dialogue | Action Event | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 52 | 11:12-14 and 20-26 | Disciples (near the fig tree) | | | X | X | X | Jesus cursed a fig tree and when Peter commented that it had withered the next day (verse 21) Jesus taught in response. |
| 53 | 11:15-18 | Temple of Jerusalem | | | | X | X | This is another unique event in Jesus' preaching. In all fairness the audience did not wilfully interact but due to the nature of Jesus actions (whipping and turning tables) some interaction was evident. |
| 54 | 11:27-33 | Temple of Jerusalem | | | X | X | | When questioned by the Pharisees Jesus answered with a question of his own. |
| 55 | 12:1-12 | Temple of Jerusalem | X | | | | | There is no interaction recorded in Mark but this teaching was born out of the conflict that was initiated earlier. Jesus gives parables against the scribes and elders (see verse 27) |
| 56 | 12:13-17 | Pharisees and Hero-dians[11] | | | X | X | | Jesus was questioned about taxes. |
| 57 | 12:18-27 | Sadd-uccees | | | X | X | | Jesus was questioned on the resurrection. |

---

[11] Given the context of Mark this inquiry most likely occurs in the Temple of Jerusalem (Mark 12:35) . It should be noted that most of these engagements most likely took place within the public eye (Mark 12:37) i.e. crowds (and the disciples) were listening in on these interactions.

| N o. | Text: Mark | Audience | Unclear | None | Audience Initiated | Dialogue | Action Event | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 58 | a)12: 28-34 b) 12:35 -40 | Temple of Jeru- salem: a Scribe and crowd | | | X | X | | When a nearby Scribe heard the previous debate (12:18-27) he asked what the greatest commandment is and interacts with Jesus. (a) After answering the scribe Jesus turned to the crowd and gave a monologue teaching. (b) |
| 59 | 12:41 -44 | Temple of Jerusale m: Disciples | | X | | | | Jesus commented to his disciples on the widows' mite. |
| 60 | 13:1- 37 | Disciples (leaving the temple and on the mount of Olives) | | | X | X | | The interaction took place earlier on in the teaching as they questioned Jesus about a statement made earlier. Jesus then launched into his longest monologue in Marks' gospel. |
| 61 | 14:3- 9 | Home of Simon the Leper (followers ) | | | X | X | X | After being anointed some make comments about the "wastefulness" and so Jesus responds. |
| 62 | 14:12 -15 | Disciples | | | X | | | Whether or not this was a teaching is unclear and is tentatively placed with the survey. |
| 63 | 14:16 -31 | Disciples: the last supper | | | | X | | |
| 64 | 14:32 | Disciples: | | | | X | | Even though Jesus was |

| No. | Text: Mark | Audience | Unclear | None | Audience Initiated | Dialogue | Action Event | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | -42 | Gethse-mane | | | | | | praying (not directly teaching) it is the view of this thesis that there was still a form of teaching that took place through his interaction with his disciples in those last moments. |
| 65 | 14: 45-49 | Judas and the temple guard in Gethse-mane | | | | X | X | Whether Jesus was intending to teach is uncertain in this context, however there is verbal interaction as well as a physical tussle. This event was added into the survey tentatively yet it was viewed as having sufficient activities to warrant its inclusion into the survey and insertion into the the relevant categories. |
| 66 | 14: 60-63 | Chief priests and the Council: (Peter followed at a distance) | | | | X | | Jesus interacted with his accusers. |
| 67 | 15:2 | Pilate | | | | X | | Jesus answered Pilate's question about being the King of the Jews. |
| 68 | 15:34 | Crowds near the cross | | X | | | X | Jesus cried out *"Eloi Eloi, Lama Sabachthani"* |
| 69 | 16: 14-19 | Disciples "reclining at the | | X | | | X | Jesus gave the great commission. The "x" is |

| N o. | Text: Mark | Audience | Unclear | None | Audience Initiated | Dialogue | Action Event | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | table" | | | | | | placed in the action event column as the act of Jesus' very presence (after being crucified) is deemed a miraculous event. |
| **Totals** | | | 7 | 13 | 37 | 34 | 28 | |

## 2.6. A closer look at the texts categorized as non-interactive

**Table 2:**

| 2 | 1:17-20 | Simon and Andrew; James and John | Although there is no interaction in the calling narratives, it can be noted that our basic knowledge of humanity implies interaction (that persons would verbally engage with such a calling). This is not to state a disagreement with the text (the immediacy of the disciples' response to the Jesus calling) but to point out the implied interaction that would take place either prior to or after a calling of this nature. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 9 | 2:14 | Levi (Public Street) | |
| 15 | 4:1-9 | Mixed Audience (by the sea) | The parables are an example of Jesus non-interactive teaching but it is noted that in order for the teachings to be complete, in these instances, it required an interaction (Mark 4: 34). Therefore it can be stated that the parable acts as prelude to interaction, that the teaching is not complete without the private interaction that the disciples later initiated. |
| 17 | 4:26-33 | Mixed Audience (Assumed) | |
| 24 | 6:7-11 | Disciples | Jesus instructed his disciples on their first ministry trip without him. There is no interaction in Marks gospel. |

| 29 | 7:14-16 | Crowd (assumed to be at the same meal above) | This survey notes that Mark's narrative (no. 29) does not separate the message to the crowd from the previous interaction with the Pharisees and scribes. |
|----|---------|----------------------------------------------|---|
| 38 | 8: 34- 9:1 | Crowd joins the disciples | This survey notes in no. 38 that Jesus followed on from engagement with his disciples. And so it can be seen that although the crowd did not initiate the teaching it is never the less linked to the previous interaction. |
| 41 | 9:30-32 | Disciples | What is interesting is that Mark states (no. 41) the reason why they did not ask (they were afraid) implying that it was normative to ask when things were not clear. |
| 48 | 10: 32-34 | Disciples on the road to Jerusalem | The text (no. 48) states that they were amazed and those who followed were fearful. It could be intimated that Jesus teaching on his death and resurrection was to assure them in response to their fear.<br><br>The disciples seem not to interact with Jesus whenever the issue of his death and resurrection comes up. In certain instances Mark says it was because they were afraid (Mark 9:32) at others he gives no reason (Mark 10:33-34). |
| 59 | 12:41-44 | Temple of Jerusalem: Disciples | Although the text does not indicate interaction this survey notes that the pedagogy of Jesus is an interactive one in the sense of interaction with the direct context. It could be called a contextual interaction as Jesus uses events that are occurring around him to teach those who follow him. This method may be similar to those put forward by McLure (1995) and Loscalzo (1992). |
| 68 | 15:34 | Crowds near the cross | Mark does not engage with the other interactive teachings that Jesus gave from the cross ("Today you will be with me in paradise"/ "This is your mother"). |
| 69 | 16: 14-19 | Disciples "reclining at the table" | Mark does not carry much of the interaction of the other gospels. Were another gospel used for the survey the argument in favour of interaction could have been strengthened. However this thesis suffices itself with Mark as it is sufficient for our purposes in presenting the often interactive nature of Jesus' homiletic medium. Yet even in restricting the survey to Mark it can be noted that the context of those reclining at a table is open to |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | interaction, namely that  it is an informal, conversational setting. |

2.7. Comments on texts excluded from the Mark survey.

2.7.1. Of the excluded texts only one contains a quotation from Jesus (Mark 6:31-33). In this context Jesus calls his disciples to *"come away for a while to a secluded spot".* It is excluded from the survey as it was not thought to imply a homiletic intention.

2.7.2. It can be noted that the majority of the texts excluded from the survey are narrative links (literary tools that may serve to give a backdrop to the teaching of Jesus' teaching (Mark 1:1-13; 8:1) or indicate a chronology of events (for example 2:13 *"And he went again to the seashore …",* 6:1, *"Jesus went out from there and came into His home town; and His disciples followed Him."*). Or they are events in Marks narrative that do not include Jesus directly.

2.7.3. The thesis notes that exceptions occur around the crucifixion Mark 15:3-33 and 15:35-41 which are unique incidents with regard to our survey. Jesus is present but is not engaging or interacting with the situation, he is allowing things to happen. This act of non-response is in itself a demonstration and a teaching (Phil 2) however the survey has not labelled it as a homiletic event. Martyrdom may be a useful and necessary teaching tool however it is not one that the church can develop (Christians can develop an attitude of submission Jesus taught about earlier regarding self denial of. Mark 8:34).

2.7.4. Mark 15: 42-47 occurs while Jesus is dead.

2.7.5. Mark 16: 1-13, although the resurrection is a teaching event in itself, implies a narrative connection to the message given in verse 14-19 of the same chapter and so as a text was excluded from the survey and deemed a narrative link (albeit a unique one).

2.7.6. Mark 3: 13-20 is one event (the calling of the twelve) that may have homiletic intent but was excluded from the survey for not meeting the following criteria:

2.7.6.1. No spoken words of Christ

2.7.6.2. Christ does not directly show any intention of educating

2.7.6.3. The term preaching or teaching is not in the text

2.8. Survey observations

Our survey identified 69 homiletic events in the gospel of Mark of those events:

2.5.5.     7 Events were unclear as to interaction

2.5.6.     13 Did not display interaction

2.5.7.     37 Were initiated by others

2.5.8.     34 Had verbal dialogue

2.5.9.     28 Had action events.

It can be seen that some form of interaction is normative in Marks portrayal of Jesus' homiletic practice. The agenda of this thesis is not to develop a theology of interactive homiletics and so restrains itself from developing theories from processing this data at this point. The agenda is to examine to what extent an interactive homiletic medium is validated in Jesus' teaching methods as portrayed by Mark.

With regard to the above figures this thesis can state that the majority of Jesus' homiletic practice displays some form of verbal or tactile interaction with those being taught. The above figures therefore express, in a quantitative manner, the extent to which the medium of interaction was practised by Jesus and the implication for homiletic theology to take note of interaction as a medium  and acknowledge the need for interaction to play a significant role in homiletics today.

Here this thesis acknowledges once again the limitations of the above approach acknowledging that others may wish to reconstitute the categories or exclude and

incorporate events basing their survey on different criteria. This study welcomes such approaches in the spirit of academic inquiry yet affirms that the current survey has served its purpose for the current thesis.

## 2.9. Survey of Acts (Homiletic events)

This survey of Acts focuses on the nature of interaction with regard to the homiletic methods of the early disciples. As such the survey begins its textual examination after the ascension of Jesus (after Acts 1:12).

The approach is similar to that of the survey of Mark. The Acts survey looks to the text of Acts and include texts that meet our definition in Chapter one of Homiletics, namely, "homiletics as a discourse or discussion which within the Christian discipline refers to a spiritual topic"

### 2.9.1. Category definitions and parameters

2.9.1.1.   Homiletic Events: Many events in Acts imply preaching but make no specific statement about it, for example *"It became known all over Joppa and many believed in the Lord"* (Acts 9:42). Although this text implies preaching it does not assist our investigation into the extent of interaction of preaching in the Scriptures. As such this survey has limited itself to:

2.9.1.1.1.  speech that is recorded in the context of someone communicating religious understanding to others

2.9.1.1.2.  the term preaching, teaching or a similar term is used

2.9.1.1.3.  the accounts of the disciples discourse or discussion referring to a spiritual topic.

2.9.1.2.   Interaction: This survey breaks Interaction down into 5 categories

2.9.1.2.1.  Unclear: This where extent or nature of interaction is unclear. The comments page might indicate what is thought to have happened and briefly supports those views as often an understanding of historical culture implies a form of interaction for these texts.

2.9.1.2.2.  None: This is where no interaction is recorded in the text.

2.9.1.2.3. Audience Initiated: Where the audience initiated the homiletic event. Often the comments category explains this further.

2.9.1.2.4. Dialogue: Where two or more persons verbally dialogue with the preacher either recorded directly in the text or stated as occurring in the text (for example, "arguing" does not have the exact dialogue recorded but clearly states that dialogue occurred).

2.9.1.2.5. Action event: these are physical actions that accompany the preaching (for example, baptism, healing, exorcism etc.)

2.9.1.3. Audience: Those who are hearing the message. In Acts this is often non-believers and this should be kept in mind when relating Acts to modern homiletics with its focus on discourses given to congregations of believers.

2.9.1.4. Comments: As with the survey of Mark the nature of the comments column is not to develop an exegetical scholarly work as that is not the nature of the thesis. Rather the agenda here is to give the reader insight into the surveys choice in categorizing the texts as well as to offer, at times, elementary observations. Therefore the comments column merely plays a supportive role in the survey which focuses its attention on giving a quantitative insight into the homiletic mediums with regard to interaction as defined above.

## 2.9.2.  The Acts Survey

**Table 3**

| No | Text: Acts | Audience | [ Unclear | None | Interaction Audience Initiated | Dialogue | Action Event ] | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 1:12-26 | Disciples: Upper Room | | | | X | X | In verse 15 Peter is said to have *"stood up among the believers"* (implying a homily of sorts) and raised the issue of the replacement for Judas. He used the Scriptures to high light this need. In response to this verse 23 states that *"they* [the 120 gathered] *proposed…"* indicating a dialogue.<br><br>The action event is the drawing of lots. |
| 2 | 2:6-40 | Jews in Jerusalem | | | | X | X | Peter began his sermon in response to the crowds comments on the infilling of the Holy Spirit.<br><br>The crowd interacted with Peter (verse 37) and Peter continued to preach the good news. |
| 3 | 2:42 | New | X | | | | | *"...they devoted themselves to* |

| No | Text: Acts | Audience | Unclear | None | Audience Initiated | Dialogue | Action Event | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | converts from Peters preaching | | | | | | *the apostles teaching"* The text here is not clear on how this was done with regard to interaction. |
| 4 | 3: 11-26; 4:1 | Jews at the Temple | | | X | | X | Although the text does not state exactly how this sermon was initiated the action of those flocking to see the miracle (healing of the lame man at the temple) are noted as being the initiating factor (verse 11-12) and therefore this event is placed as an audience initiated sermon.<br><br>As they were *"continuing to speak"* (*laleo* meaning to "talk at random" implying an unstructured sermon, also see 4:18) they were interrupted and thrown in jail. |
| 5 | 4:7-21 | Peter and John before the rulers, elders and scribes | | | X | X | | Peter and John responded to questions from the Jewish leaders. |
| 6 | 4:31 | Disciples | X | | | | | *"...began to speak the word of God with boldness."* This is an unclear statement indicating |

| No | Text: Acts | Audience | Unclear | None | Audience Initiated | Dialogue | Action Event | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | that all the believers boldly spoke the word of God. |
| 7 | 4:33 | Congregation (verse 32) | X | | | | | *"…apostles were giving testimony to the resurrection"* This is an unclear statement. |
| 8 | 5:1-11 | Solomon's portico | | | | X | X | Peter rebuked Annanias and Sapphira who were then struck down dead. |
| 9 | 5:21 | Jews in the Temple | X | | | | | *"…they entered the temple about daybreak and began to teach."* This is an unclear statement, |
| 10 | 5:26 | Temple Council | | | X | X | | The apostles were questioned again. |
| 11 | 5:42 | Temple and house to house | X | | | | | *"Day after day, in the temple courts and from house to house, they never stopped teaching and proclaiming the good news that Jesus is the Christ"* The fact that this is day by day and that the house or temple makes no difference implies a conversational rather than speech orientated |

| No | Text: Acts | Audience | Unclear | None | Audience Initiated | Dialogue | Action Event | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | proclamation. |
| 12 | 6: 8-10 | Among the people and men from a Synagogue | | | | X | | The phrases *"argue with Stephen"* (verse 9) and *"stand up against his wisdom"* (verse 10) identify the event as a dialogue. |
| 13 | 6:13-7:1-60 | Before the Council and other Jews | | X | X | | | This is the longest recorded speech in Acts. And although the bulk is recorded as a monologue (Acts 7:2-53) it began by the high priests question (Acts 7:1) based on the accusations of others (Acts 6:13) and therefore was initiated by others. It resulted in a stoning when the Jews refused to continue in dialogue. |
| 14 | 8:4-8 | Samaria | X | | | | X | Philip proclaimed Christ (verse 5) but the manner, with regard to interaction, is unclear. The Proclamation was accompanied by exorcisms and healing. |
| 15 | 8:14-24 | Simon the magician | | | X | X | | Simon is rebuked after trying to buy the power of the Spirit from the apostles |

| No | Text: Acts | Audience | Unclear | None | Audience Initiated | Dialogue | Action Event | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 16 | 8:25 | Samaritan villages | X | | | | | This is an unclear statement. |
| 17 | 8:28-39 | Ethiopian eunuch | | | | X | | Philip interacted with the eunuch, explaining the meaning of the text the eunuch was reading. |
| 18 | 9:17-18 | Annanias and Saul | X | | | | X | |
| 19 | 9:20-22 | Saul Proclaims Jesus in the Synagogue | X | | | | | Proclamation in the Synagogue could have been interactive or non-interactive. Given the nature of Jewish debate I believe it to be interactive but limit myself to the text with this regard and so categories this text as "unclear". |
| 20 | 9:28-30 | Paul 'moving about freely in Jerusalem", "Hellenistic Jews" | | | | X | | *"talked and debated"* (verse *29)* speaks of the interactive nature of Paul's evangelistic methods. |
| 21 | 10:24-48 | Peter at Cornelius house | | | X | X | X | In this story Peter is called to the house and engaged in questions, gave a brief speech (within the context of a |

| No | Text: Acts | Audience | Unclear | None | Audience Initiated | Dialogue | Action Event | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | dialogue) and is interrupted by the action event of baptism in the Holy Spirit. |
| 22 | 11:1-18 | Peter with the Jerusalem believers | | | X | X | | Peter returned to Jerusalem and is questioned by Jewish Christians about his involvement with Gentiles. *"When they heard this they quietened down"* (NASB verse 18) indicates heated discussion. |
| 23 | 11:19-21 | The scattered preach in Phoenicia, Cyprus and Antioch | X | | | | | This is an unclear statement. |
| 24 | 11:23-26 | Barnabas and Saul | X | | | | | This is an unclear statement. |

| No | Text: Acts | Audience | Unclear | None | Audience Initiated | Dialogue | Action Event | Comments |
|----|-----------|----------|---------|------|-------------------|----------|-------------|----------|
| 25 | 11:27 -30 | Agabus prophecies | X | | | | | The text states that Agabus stood up and spoke with no other speech recorded and so was considered for the non-interactive category. However it was placed in the unclear category for three reasons: 1) 1 Cor 14: 29-32 indicate Paul's practice with regard to prophesy as being interactive and 2) the text implies many prophets gathering (verse 27) and 3) Agabus' speech is merely a short declaration in this context of many prophets gathered. Not wanting to assert external meaning onto the text and place it in the dialogue category yet seeing the evidence of the New Testament not pointing towards a monologue the text was placed in the "unclear" category. |
| 6 | 13:5 | Salamis Synagogues | X | | | | | This is an unclear statement. |
| 27 | 13:7- | Proconsul | | | X | X | X | Paul called by the Proconsul to |

| No | Text: Acts | Audience | Unclear | None | Audience Initiated | Dialogue | Action Event | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 12 | and Bar-Jesus the Magician | | | | | | hear the word Bar-Jesus was interacting (*"opposed them"* verse 8) until Paul miraculously blinded him (action event). |
| 28 | 13:8-42 | Pisidian Antioch Synagogue | | X | X | | | Paul is invited by the Synagogue officials to bring an exhortation (verse 15) Paul does so and preaches the word. This may an example of a monologue sermon and is place in the "none" category because aside from the invitation to speak no interaction is recorded or implied in the text. |
| 29 | 13:43 | After the synagogue meeting | | | X | X | | *"…Paul and Barnabas, who talked with them and urged them to continue in the grace of God."* |
| 30 | 13:45 | Pisidian Antioch Synagogue following Sabbath | | | | X | | *"...contradicted the things spoken by Paul"* (NASB) |
| 31 | 13:49 | Region of Phrygia | X | | | | | This is an unclear statement. |
| 32 | 14:1 | Iconium | X | | | | | Paul and Barnabas "spoke" |

| No | Text: Acts | Audience | Unclear | None | Audience Initiated | Dialogue | Action Event | Comments |
|----|-----------|----------|---------|------|-------------------|----------|--------------|----------|
| | | Synagogue | | | | | | (*laleo* meaning to "talk at random" implying an unstructured sermon) in the Synagogues implying, but not definitely, interacting. The "stirring" up mentioned in the next verse could have occurred outside of the synagogue meeting. |
| 33 | 14:3 | Iconium | X | | | | X | *"So Paul and Barnabas spent considerable time there, speaking boldly for the Lord, who confirmed the message of his grace by enabling them to do miraculous signs and wonders."* |
| 34 | 14:8-18 | Lystra | | | | X | X | While Paul is was preaching he healed a lame man. The city erupted calling Paul and Barnabas Gods. The apostles corrected them. |
| 35 | 14:21 | Lystra | X | | | | | This is an unclear statement |
| 36 | 14:22 -28 | Revisiting the Churches | X | | | | | Paul and Barnabas returned to Antioch revisiting the churches they had established on the way, strengthened the souls of the disciples (verse 22), |

| No | Text: Acts | Audience | Unclear | None | Audience Initiated | Dialogue | Action Event | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | appointed elders (verse 23) and reported on what God had done (verse 27). |
| 37 | 15:1-2 | Antioch believers | | | | X | | Men taught circumcision which caused Paul and Barnabas to debate them (verse 2) |
| 38 | 15: 4-5 | Jerusalem Church | | | | X | | Paul and Barnabas reported on God's movements among the Gentiles. Pharisee believers stood up saying that circumcision was still needed. And so a dialogue is recorded. |
| 39 | 15:6-29 | Apostles and elders (verse 6) All the people (verse 12) | | | | X | | It is difficult to be certain as to exactly who was at this meeting as verse 6 indicates only the leadership with other verses indicating the whole church (verse 12, 22). What is certain is that there was much debate (verse 7) and ongoing dialogue throughout (verses 12, 13, 22). |
| 40 | 15:30-33 | Judas and Silas at the Antioch Church | X | | | | | This text was considered for the "none" category because it uses the term *logos* for Judas and Silas' speech. However because it is both Judas and |

| No | Text: Acts | Audience | Unclear | None | Audience Initiated | Dialogue | Action Event | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | Silas who are presenting the message an interaction of sorts is assumed. Therefore this text is placed in the unclear category. |
| 41 | 15:35 | Antioch Church | X | | | | | This is an unclear statement. |
| 42 | 16:5 | Churches near Lystra, Derbe and Iconium | X | | | | | This is an unclear statement. |
| 43 | 16:13 -14 | Sabbath at the riverside (place of prayer) | X | | | | | Paul "spoke" (*laleo* meaning to "talk at random" implying an unstructured sermon). |
| 44 | 16:30 -34 | Jailer's household converted | X | | X | | | Paul "spoke" (*laleo* meaning to "talk at random" implying an unstructured sermon)<br><br>*"And they spoke the word of the Lord"* (verse 32) |
| 45 | 17:1- 3 | Thessal- onica Synagogue | | | | X | | In the words of the *Expositors Bible Commentary,* "But though miracles brought quick results, "reason," "prove," and "persuade"—[are] words that describe Paul's method of preaching—imply his careful |

| No | Text: Acts | Audience | Unclear | None | Audience Initiated | Dialogue | Action Event | Comments |
|----|-----------|----------|---------|------|-------------------|----------|--------------|----------|
| | | | | | | | | dealing with his hearers' questions and doubts." (Pradis 2005, Acts) |
| 46 | 17:10-12 | Berea Synagogue | X | | | | | That the Bereans *"examined the Scriptures every day"* (verse 11) implies interaction but it could also be examining outside of Synagogue meetings and so this is marked as an unclear statement. |
| 47 | 17:17-18 | Synagogue and Market place | | | | X | | *"reasoning with"* (verse 7) *"conversing with"* (verse 18) |
| 48 | 17:19-33 | Mars Hill | | X | X | | | |
| 49 | 18:4-6 | Corinthian Synagogue | | | | X | | *"Every Sabbath he reasoned in the Synagogue every Sabbath, trying to persuade Jews and Greeks"* (verse 4)  *"But when the Jews opposed Paul..."* (verse 6)  It can be seen from the texts that dialogue and discussion where the mediums of communication used in this context. |

| No | Text: Acts | Audience | Unclear | None | Audience Initiated | Dialogue | Action Event | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 50 | 18:11 | Corinth (house of Titus Justice) | X | | | | | This is an unclear statement. |
| 51 | 18:19 | Ephesus Synagogue | | | | X | | *"reasoned with the Jews"* <br><br> To reason with states that there was interaction. |
| 52 | 18:24 -26 | Ephesus Synagogue | X | | | | | Apollos is said to be eloquent (verse 24) speaking and teaching (verse 25). Priscilla and Aquilla take him aside (implying outside of the Synagogue meeting) to correct him. |
| 53 | 18:27 -28 | Achaia "in public" | | | | X | | *"powerfully refuted"* |
| 54 | 19:1- 7 | Ephesus (about twelve men) | | | | X | | Paul dialogue resulted in Baptism in the Holy Spirit at Ephesus. |
| 55 | 19:8- 9 | Ephesus Synagogue | | | | X | | Paul is recorded as *"arguing persuasively"* and some *"...refused to believe and publicly maligned the Way. So Paul left them."* (verse 9) indicating debate and interaction. |

| No | Text: Acts | Audience | Unclear | None | Audience Initiated | Dialogue | Action Event | Comments |
|----|-----------|----------|---------|------|--------------------|----------|--------------|----------|
| 56 | 19: 9-10 | Ephesus (school of Tyrannus) | | | | X | | *"reasoning daily"* |
| 57 | 19:11 -20 | Ephesus | | | | | X | Verse 20 states that *"...the word of the Lord spread widely and grew in power."* this is linked to confessions (verse 18) miracles (verse 11) and the destruction of magical books (verse 19). |
| 58 | 20:2 | Districts of Macedonia | X | | | | | This is an unclear statement. |
| 59 | 20:6-12 | Troas believers | | | | X | X | "At this time Paul "spoke to" (*dielegeto;* lit., "reasoned" or "discussed with") the believers till midnight."*(Pradis 2005, Acts)* After the healing of Eutuchus (action event) Paul continued *"talking until daylight"* (verse 11) These illustrate the mediums of verbal and tactile interaction used by Paul in presenting the good news to believers in this context. |

| No | Text: Acts | Audience | Unclear | None | Audience Initiated | Dialogue | Action Event | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 60 | 20:17-35 | At Miletus with the Ephesian elders | | X | | | | Once they had gathered Paul *"said to them"* (verse 18) and the text records Paul's speech with no interaction indicated. The context (verse 36-38) however makes the image of a pulpit type monologue highly unlikely but is more likely to be understood as part of a conversational communication model. This is simply the authors opinion (based on historical research which will be dealt with in chapter 4) and it is therefore the text, in the light of academic integrity, is placed in the "none" category. |
| 61 | 21:17-25 | Jerusalem church | | | | X | | Paul reported what God had done amongst he Gentiles (verse 19) and the church responded by glorifying God (verse 20) but this issue raised concerns about how Paul was perceived among the believing Jews (verses 21-25). |
| 62 | 22:1-21 | To the Jerusalem crowds | | X | | | | Paul's monologue was interrupted by the crowds |

| No | Text: Acts | Audience | Unclear | None | Audience Initiated | Dialogue | Action Event | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | calling for his life (verse 22). |
| 63 | 23:1-10 | Jewish Council in Jerusalem | | | | X | | Paul was struck, questioned and eventually raises the issue of resurrection which caused a dispute between the Pharisees and Sadducees. |
| 64 | 24:1-22 | Paul's trial before Felix | | | | X | | Paul was on trial and stood before governor Felix. He was questioned and answered (in a recorded monologue) before Felix postponed the trial further |
| 65 | 24:24-26 | Paul converses more privately with Felix and Drusilla | | | | X | | Several days later Felix arrived with his wife Drusilla, who was a Jewess. He sent for Paul and listened to him as he spoke about faith in Christ Jesus.<br><br>As Paul discoursed on righteousness, self-control and the judgement to come, Felix was afraid and said, *"That's enough for now! You may leave. When I find it convenient, I will send for you."* (verse 25) |

| No | Text: Acts | Audience | Unclear | None | Audience Initiated | Dialogue | Action Event | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 66 | 26:1-30 | Defence before Agrippa | | | X | X | | Paul is asked to give his defence again (verse 1) he did so (verse.2-23), Felix interjected (verse. 24), Paul responded (verses.25-27), Agrippa responded to Paul (verse. 28), Paul responded to Agrippa (verse.29). |
| 67 | 28:23-29 | Jews in Rome | | | | X | | The following quote from *the* Pradis commentary states the interactive nature of Pauls methods in this setting, "As for his [Paul's] method, he "tried to convince them" *(peithon autous),* which implies that Paul combined proclamation with persuasion... and that there was a good deal of impassioned debate" *(*Pradis 2005, Acts) |
| 68 | 28:30-31 | Rented quarters in Rome | X | | | | | This is an unclear statement. |
| **Totals** | | | 28 | 5 | 14 | 33 | 11 | |

2.9.3. . General comments

    2.9.3.1.1.  This survey has identified 68 homiletic events within the Acts text 28 are unclear as to the extent of interaction.

    2.9.3.1.2.  5 display no interaction

    2.9.3.1.3.  14 are initiated by others

    2.9.3.1.4.  33 had verbal dialogue

    2.9.3.1.5.  11 had action events

This places the extent of interaction within this Acts survey to be in the majority as can be seen in the figures above. As with the Mark text this survey exercises caution with regard to being dogmatic about the implications of the surveys conclusions. What can be seen is that when the author of Acts recorded homiletic events that the majority contained some form of tactile or verbal interaction.

    2.9.4.      Most of the "sermons" in Acts do not occur within the context of believers and therefore do not fall under the parameters of much of modern day homiletic practice. In Acts there are 25 teaching events with believers as the predominant audience.

    2.9.4.1.1.  13 of these are unclear as to there interaction no. 3, 6, 7, 18, 24, 25, 36, 40, 41, 42, 50, 58, 69 (10 of these are unclear statements e.g. Acts 2:*42 "...they devoted themselves to the apostles teaching",* others had interaction prior to the unclear statement but were not directly linked to the concept of teaching/preaching for example Acts 4:23-20 has worship preceding the unclear statement in Acts 4:31)

    2.9.4.1.2.  10 have dialogue no. 1, 8, 22, 29, 37, 38, 39, 54, 59, 61. Sometimes non-believers infiltrate the meeting and begin a debate (no.37) while in other the discussion is amongst believers (no. 38)

2.9.4.1.3.   3 have action events no. 8, 18, 59

2.9.4.1.4.   1 has no interaction recorded no. 60

2.9.4.2.   There are also meetings which have no indication of any form of homily. For example, the healing meetings found like those recorded in Acts 5:14-16 and Acts 9:32-43.

2.9.4.3.   Acts also records church meetings that do not engage in preaching/teaching. For example, the choosing of the seven in Jerusalem (Acts 6: 1-6).

2.9.4.4.   Of the 5 homiletic events placed in the non-interaction category 3 are initiated by others (no. 13, 28 and 48). The first is Stephen's sermon before his stoning. The second is a synagogue speech where Saul recounts the story of reconciliation starting from Israel in Egypt to its culmination in Jesus' resurrection and its significance for today. The third is the "Mars Hill" speech where Paul quoted Greek philosophers to support the message he preached. In all these major monologues the audience is not a believing congregation and is for the purpose of evangelism. Of the other 2 homiletic events which are non-interactive (no. 60 and 62) one takes place with an intimate gathering of leaders (Ephesian Elders) and the other occurs before the mob in Jerusalem where Paul, under Roman guard, addresses the masses and is cut short from completing his speech. Therefore it can be said that of the non-interactive monologues recorded in Acts only one addresses a Christian audience.

Having completed the survey of Acts the thesis now turns its attention to the Epistles.

## 2.10.    Assembly epistle texts

These are the texts that give insight into the activities of a Christian assembly in canonical times. This is of particular interest to the modern church where religious speeches have dominated much of the activities in the Western tradition (Stott 1982: 16).

### 2.10.1. 1 Corinthians 14: 23-40

This text is said to be the only extended New Testament passage that deals with the activities of a Christian gathering (Norrington 1996: 50). Although other activities are mentioned[12] this text is the most definitive and although there may have been different practices within the other churches (Witherington 1995: 285) Dunn puts forward the likelihood of this passage being normal for Pauline Churches (Norrington 1996: 51).

In this text Paul defines the purpose of the assembly as edification and puts forward the practice of each person bringing something for this purpose. If one accepts the traditional monologue approach to homiletics the Corinthian passage offers little light as is seen in the quote bellow.

> The worship, at least at Corinth, involved the participation of most, if not all, of those present… Paul says nothing about a sermon being part of Christian worship… He definitely does not assume or support the notion of a preacher or a service dominated by preaching… (Witherington 1995: 290)

---

[12] Some within 1 Corinthians itself as well as others which this thesis will deal with below indicating that this is not an exhaustive description

However if it is accepted that preaching can be interactive the Corinthian situation develops along the lines of the narrative dealt with earlier in this section, i.e. the narrative that supports interactive homiletics.

## 2.10.2. Hebrews 10:25

> *"Let us not give up meeting together, as some are in the habit of doing, but let us encourage one another--and all the more as you see the Day approaching."*

In this text the church assembles together to encourage one another. No reference is made to the nature of this encouraging however the term "one another" implies some form of interaction occurring at these meetings. However the exact nature is unclear and so the text offers little light on our subject.

## 2.10.3.1 Corinthians 11: 17-33

These verses imply that the Lord's supper was a regular part of gatherings. This form of tactile interaction is also encouraged daily in homes (Acts 2:46) and should not be limited to "church" gatherings. This practice adds little light into the nature of homiletics unless this is viewed as an action event and part of that form of interactive homiletics.

## 2.10.4.1 Corinthians 5:4

> *"When you are assembled in the name of our Lord Jesus and I am with you in spirit, and the power of our Lord Jesus is present, [5] hand this man over to Satan, so that the sinful nature may be destroyed and his spirit saved on the day of the Lord."*

Unlikely to be a normal occurrence for the Corinthian church it is acknowledged that church discipline is still apart of church gatherings and is anticipated by Jesus (Matt 18: 15-17). Once again this offers little insight into the subject.

## 2.10.5. Colossians 4:16

> *"After this letter has been read to you, see that it is also read in the church of the Laodiceans and that you in turn read the letter from Laodicea."*

This text gives another insight into assembly activities, that of the public reading of texts (See also 1 Thes 5:27 and 1 Tim 4:13).

Firstly, what is not clear is what takes place after the text has been read, i.e. does the reader continue speaking; interpreting the text (Robinson 2005) or is there room for interaction (Wechkama 2001)? Should the text be interrupted with explanations or read in a continuous flow? How regular should texts be read publicly is also unclear. Should the text be read once or many times? How often did these churches receive such letters?

Secondly, there is the issue of the diatribe. Stanley Kent Stowers points out that certain scholars (Bultmann, Hense, von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff) believed that the style of the letter reflected Paul's oratory style of public discourse (Stowers 1984: 62). However, Stowers points out that recent research has made this view untenable viewing the literary diatribe as being best suited as more of a reflection of style for students receiving private tuition in the Socratic method (Stowers 1984: 63). Elsewhere Stowers argues that the term diatribe was used "as a term for the school as we would speak of "going to school"' (Stowers 1981:77).

Should this argument be successful (that of the diatribe as a reflection regarding a monologue speech) this would merely point out the legitimacy of speeches in the church context (something which this thesis has already confirmed) and not point to the exclusion of interactive methods of homiletics.

Therefore the canonical texts that speak of the public reading of texts do not offer significant insight into homiletic method other than allowing for the public reading of texts to be present.


2.11. Homiletic epistle texts

2.11.1. Colossians 1:28

> *"We proclaim him, admonishing and teaching everyone with all wisdom, so that we may present everyone perfect in Christ."*

This verse does little to express or uncover the method of this proclamation (*katangellomen*). It is noted that it is accompanied by admonishing and teaching and that the text does state the purpose of these elements as to create a Christ-like character.

2.11.2. Colossians 3:16

> *"Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly as you teach and admonish one another with all wisdom, and as you sing psalms, hymns and spiritual songs with gratitude in your hearts to God."*

As the Expositors Bible Commentary points out "All the preceding appeals (with the possible exception of that in v. 15) have to do largely with duties Christians owe one another" (Pradis 2005: Colossians). And so this text implies an interactive nature of teaching within the New Testament. However, the thesis here limits itself to the text and state that the homiletic method is not specified here.

2.11.3. Romans 1:15-16

> *"That is why I am so eager to preach the gospel also to you who are at Rome. I am not ashamed of the gospel, because it is the power of God for the salvation of everyone who believes: first for the Jew, then for the Gentile."*

The method is not specified in the text.

## 2.11.4. 1 Corinthians 1:21

> *"For since in the wisdom of God the world through its wisdom did not know him, God was pleased through the foolishness of what was preached to save those who believe."*

There are two possibilities in interpreting the phrase "*morias tou kerugmatos*".

    2.11.4.1. "foolishness of preaching" (AV). This translation carries with it the possibility that it is the mode of preaching that is foolishness. This places Paul's method of preaching in contrast with the rhetoric skills of the orators of the day.

    2.11.4.2. "foolishness of the message preached" (NAS) This refers to the content of the message and so does not influence the subject of interaction.

If the implication of the first translation is accepted the theologian is faced with difficulty in that Paul is pitting his style of proclamation against the learned men of his era. This would make much of speech rhetoric, problematic. If the second interpretation is preferred it would have no implications for the current study which does not focus on content.

Therefore this text either is against developing speeches along the rhetorical lines known to Paul or it does not have any input with regard to the homiletic medium.

## 2.11.5. 1 Corinthians 9: 16

> *"Yet when I preach the gospel, I cannot boast, for I am compelled to preach. Woe to me if I do not preach the gospel!"*

The method is not stated.

## 2.11.6. 1 Timothy 4:13

> *"Until I come, devote yourself to the public reading of Scripture, to preaching and to teaching."*

See comments above (section 2.10.5.) with regard to "public reading". The phrase "preaching and teaching" does not specify the mode of either.

2.11.7. 1 Timothy 5:17

> *"The elders who direct the affairs of the church well are worthy of double honor, especially those whose work is preaching and teaching."*

Here the phrase "preaching and teaching" is developed from the Greek *"en logo kai didaskalia"* literally "in word and teaching". Not much can be deduced from this phrase and so the text does not offer any insight into homiletic practice other than that certain persons within the assembly are more gifted/equipped/called for such practices than others. (see also 2 Tim 2:2)

2.11.8. 2 Timothy 4:2

> *"Preach the Word; be prepared in season and out of season; correct, rebuke and encourage--with great patience and careful instruction."*

The method of preaching is not stated. That it is to be *"in season and out of season"* could imply that to *"keruxon en logon"* is relevant to particular periods within the life of a church or simply that Timothy should be ready at all times. In any case the text does not specify the manner that this *keruxon* would occur. Norrington points out that should this be referring to a speech act that there is nothing to suggest its regular use (Norrington 1996: 11).

2.11.9. Hebrews 4:2

> *"For we also have had the gospel preached to us, just as they did; but the message they heard was of no value to them, because those who heard did not combine it with faith."*

The method is not stated. The phrase "had the gospel preached to us" comes from the Greek *"euangelizomai"* which could carry the connotation of relatively passive recipients of a message (perfect participle passive).

The context, which refers to the generation of Moses also receiving the good news (Heb 3:16, 19, 4:2), makes the exact meaning to homiletic practice within the New Testament unclear.

## 2.12.  Looking at *Kerux – Kerusso – Kerygma*

The first chapter dealt very briefly with concept of *kerygma* stating that it would be elaborated on in further detail in the current chapter and that is the task that will now be turned to. It has been seen through this survey that the term *kerygma* is applied to the proclamation of a message to persons and that the mode of those proclamations (when recorded in the texts) had interactive elements to them (for example Mark 1:38 of Mark 1:21-34). An argument might be made that there were other instances where speeches were given but were not recorded and that the term "proclamation" (along with its etymological link to a government herald) would imply this. In this chapter so far the thesis has restricted itself as much as possible to the text at hand (Mark or Acts) and has trusted that the activities recorded in each text reflected what the author meant when elsewhere he uses the term *kerygma*. It seems evident that the texts examined have spoken in favour of including interaction to what can be termed "proclamation".

The reader here is reminded that this thesis has already pointed out that even if every instance of *kerygma* or its derivatives (70 occurrences according to Van Voorst 1990: 43) were to definitely speak of a non-interactive speech it would still not warrant

the exclusion of interaction within the field of homiletics which, as stated in chapter 1, develops from many other Greek words with no such speech connotation.

That being said the thesis now spends a little time examining if the option of an interactive proclamation is plausible from a lexical perspective.

2.12.1. The infrequency of *kerux.* In the Greek world the term *kerux* (herald) was commonly used yet it is surprisingly sparse in the New Testament (3 occurrences). This has caused some concern for Greek scholars who see the modern notion of preacher being very similar to that of the Greek *kerux* (Kittel (ed) 1965: 696)*.* Should proclamation include interaction,[13] the hesitancy of the New Testament writers to use the term would be easy to understand.

2.12.2. The term *kerusso,* which is more common in the New Testament, has multiple meanings in the ancient Greek "It can be used very generally for "to make known"" (Kittel (ed) 1965: 698)*.*

2.12.3. The Septuagint uses *kerusso* 33 times and also varies in meaning from "to cry," "to call,"  "to make a noise," as well as to mean writing in 2 Chronicles 36:22. The preference of the New Testament authors for a term that is less emphatic (rather than *kerux*) with regard to manner of proclamation as a monologue allows scope for interactive proclamation.

2.12.4. The suffix *ma* at end of *kerygma* can denote either the act or the content of the root. This is evident in certain scholars' preference to view *kerygma* as the

---

[13] This is not to exclude other issues such as ecclesial authority within the first three centuries (see von Campenhausen 1969 *Ecclesial Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the first three centuries*), in fact I believe the two to be inextricably linked, but to put forward the idea that an interactive homiletic would be less akin to the methods of the *kerux* and so play a part in accounting for its relative exclusion within the New Testament texts.

content of the message rather than the medium (Dodd 1964, Goppelt 1981: 228-250).

2.12.5. Philo uses *kerygma* for the herald's cry as well as the declaration or decree itself (Kittel (ed) 1965: 715). Once again the meaning has an implication of the content of the message rather than the medium it is presented in.

All of the above indicates that there is lexical scope within the term *keryx* (and its derivatives) to incorporate interaction. This brief lexical examination has also affirmed the direction of study to surveying the narrative texts as offering greater insight into the medium and form of the New Testament Homiletic method.

## 2.13.   Scriptural conclusions

The surveys have indicated that interaction is a normative practice for the New Testament homiletic method.

The categories have also given an indication as to the elements of the extent of that interaction.

2.13.1. Audience Initiated interaction indicates a form of spontaneity and audience/assembly interaction that allows the assembly to determine the homilies subject. This also implies homiletics that meets the assembly at their point of need in what might be thought of as an incarnational homiletic method.

2.13.2. Dialogue interaction implies flexibility within the homilies' subject matter as well as determining the pace of communication.

2.13.3. Action event interaction implies interaction that is allowed to move beyond the verbal and to incorporate demonstrations and other forms of tactile learning.

The examination into the Epistle texts proved of little significance with most texts avoiding the nature of the medium of proclamation or homiletics. The brief look into the semantics of proclamation language used by the New Testament also bore little fruit indicating non-specific (with regard to medium) terms within the majority of the New Testament.  It is with this in mind that this inestigation must return to the narrative texts to shed light into the medium of homiletics within the canonical era. This has proven to point to the inclusion of verbal and tactile interaction in homiletics.

That interaction as a homiletic method has been validated within the source of the Scriptures would be an understatement. As the survey shows the verbal and tactile interaction is dominant and a possible further survey would be needed to examine the extent of various methods of interaction. [14]

---

[14] The current survey has intuitively categorized interaction within the narrative texts examined which served the purpose of establishing the extent of interaction (as a broad term) within the texts and to give some indication of the different nature of those interactions. That being said, the possibility of further defining and investigating interaction within the canonical texts is still open and this thesis hopes to see further developments in this field.

CHAPTER 3: THE CULTURE

### 3.1.    Introduction to Culture

That homiletics has engaged with cultural modes of teaching is nothing new. From Aristotle's *Rhetoric* (Stanfield 1967: 50-51) to David Kolb's map of learning styles (Anderson 2006:1) homiletics has always needed to engage the culture and so it would seem natural that the culture would have an influence in the field. It is with this tradition of cultural engagement[15] that this thesis now turns to the second norm, that of Culture. Here the focus is on educational theory and practices within the post-modern culture. The thesis is asking the question of the culture "How do you learn?" and more specifically with the topic of interactive homiletics "Do we learn using interaction and how?"

The agenda in this chapter is not to directly critique the culture from a theological perspective. Rather here the thesis is content to examine culture (as a source separate from the Scriptures) with regard to the thesis topic.

The research done here is drawn predominantly from the field of educational theory and practice and focuses on the relevant research with regard to the inquiry of interaction.

---

[15] Cultural engagement is not seen as being in conflict with the belief that the church itself is a culture, or a counter culture (Hauerwas S and Willimon WH 1996: 46-66), but to be seen along the lines of Grenz and Franke's Embedding Context.

### 3.2.    Why focus on educational theory?

If the agenda of homiletics is religious instruction and exhortation (Broadus 1944:1), if the great commissions' agenda is to be taken seriously (*"make disciples…teaching them to observe"* Matt 28:18-20 of. *"preach the gospel"* Mark 16:16) then there needs to be a homiletic that moves beyond communication and results in formation (Butrick 1987: 453-456, Stott 1982:178). This is why homiletics here moves beyond only *rhetoric,* as some focus on (Buttrick 1992:10), and begins to incorporate the broader discipline of education.

It is true that some of what true preaching is moves beyond the natural sciences (Immink 2004: 91), however here it is pointed out that whether one draws from the natural science of *rhetoric*[16] or a wider field does not impinge on this objection.

Once again it is noted that the agenda of this thesis is not to exclude speeches but rather to include other elements with in the field of homiletics. If at any point it were to be said that homiletics includes such agendas as equipping, training, correcting, discipling then there would need to acknowledgement that homiletics correlates with the field of education. This is the focus of the current chapters investigation.

But before this thesis continues, a brief note should be given on the newly developed field of religious education. Farely (1996: 40-41) points out that it was the failure of the "homiletic paradigm" (here meaning a speech orientated *rhetoric*) that led to the emergence of religious education as a field of theology. This thesis rather argues that

---

[16] This thesis notes here that the belief that *rhetoric* is purely speech orientated is not founded. Today's rhetoric includes such thinkers as Marshal McLuhan (to be discussed later), Ernest Cassier, Hugh Duncan etc. (Wikipedia 2007: Rhetoric) who pointed to multiple means and methods of persuasion (rhetoric).

the Scriptural mandate (as seen in the previous chapter) expands homiletics to include religious education rather than the two acting as separate entities. Therefore the agenda to investigate educational theory within the field of homiletics is founded from an evangelical perspective which takes the Scriptures to determine the designations.

### 3.3. Educational orientation

#### 3.3.1. Pedagogy

> **Pedagogy** (or **paedagogy**) is the art or science of being a teacher... The word "paidia" (παιδιά) refers to children, which is why some like to make the distinction between pedagogy (teaching children) and andragogy (teaching adults). The Latin-derived word for pedagogy, education, is much more widely used, and often the two are used interchangeably. (Pedagogy, 2006)

An issue that is often raised is that pedagogy is predominantly orientated towards children (du Plooy and Kilian 1984: 4-12) and so Religious educators reference andragogy when referring to educating the adult congregation (for example, Wickett 1991: 45-51).

#### 3.3.2. Andragogy

> **Andragogy,** a term originally used by Alexander Kapp (a German educator), was developed into a theory of adult education… Knowles held that andragogy (from the Greek words meaning adult-learning) should be distinguished from the more commonly used *pedagogy* (Andragogy, 2006)

As homiletics focuses most of its attention on addressing adults this thesis will examine the differences between these two types of learners briefly. Below is a table put together by Foltz (1986: 33-34)

TABLE 4: A comparison Between How the Child Learns and How the Adult Learns

| Child (Pedagogy) | Contributor | Adult (Andragogy) |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Biological Differences | JR Kidd | Decline-the question is how much and how the decline affects the learning |
| A. Visual | JR Kidd | |
| B. Hearing | JR Kidd | |
| C. Speed of Responses | JR Kidd | |
| 2. Intellectual Differences | | |
| A. Other-directed learning | JR Kidd | Self directed learning |
| B. Concrete and literal thought | Jean Piaget | Abstract Thought |
| C. Subject-centred | Malcolm Knowles | Problem-centred |
| D. Limited perception (of world) | Jean Piaget | Expanded- perception |
| E. Dependence | Malcolm Knowles | Independence |
| F. Not goal-orientated | NAPVAE- JR Kidd | More goal-orientated behaviour |
| G. Time (of minimal importance) | Malcolm Knowles – JR Kidd | Time (as valuable as money or effort) |
| H. Minimal decisions made | Malcolm Knowles | Decision maker |
| I. Nonverbal Activities | Donald Brundage & D. Mackeracher | Verbal activities |
| 3. Social Differences | | |

| Child (Pedagogy) | Contributor | Adult (Andragogy) |
|---|---|---|
| A. Limited Experience | Donald Brundage & D. Mackeracher - Malcolm Knowles | Experience as resource |
| B. Postponed Application | Malcolm Knowles | Immediate Application |
| C. Individual action-orientated | Donald Brundage & D. Mackeracher | Corporate action-orientated |
| D. Limited point of view | Jean Piaget | Expanded point of view |
| E. Readiness Development (social pressure) | Malcolm Knowles | Developmental tasks of social roles |

It can be seen that there are significant differences between the child and adult learner. Some differences have a greater impact on content (for example 2.B) while others will have an impact on the subject of interaction (for example 2.I.).

Acknowledging that there are many differences between adult and child learners there should never the less be an awareness that these differences need not be expanded too far. In Education there have been further distinctions which led certain academics to abandon the endeavour.

> Rachal (1983) and Courtenay and Stevenson (1983) called for an end to "gogy-mania" fearing an educational taxonomy of infantology, pedagogy, adolescagogy, androgagy, and gerogogy, or possibly such specialities as Caucasiogogy or Negrogogy. (Davenport J 1993: 11-112)

### 3.3.3. Education: a proposed synthesis of term

Davenport reviews the field of debate on andragogy and refers to research done by McLoghlin, Conti, Goodnow, as well as Rosenblum and Darkenwald which all point out that andragogy (as defined by Knowles) cannot be viewed as something totally different to child education (Davenport 1993: 113). In fact here the research points to two styles of education with varied effect which not only depend on the age of the learner but also on the subject matter.

Dewey, and later Bennet, contrasted approaches to teaching as traditional and progressive (Nikandrov 1990: 253) while a common term, as we will later see, used today is teacher-centred (pedagogy) and leaner centred (andragogy) education[17]. The basic emphasis is the shift between the teacher as the dispeller of truth or the guide for the learner (Taylor 2005: 4, Beck 1993:1).

Both of these styles (learner and teacher centred) have been proven to be effective for children as well as adults and so there has been a move toward an understanding of educational theory that includes pedagogy as well as andragagoy (or any other form of "gogy' that might analysed).

Therefore this thesis looks with an eye toward the field of education theory and practice investigating the extent of interactive practices.

### 3.4.  The Importance of the medium in the message
### 3.4.1. Marshal McLuhan

---

[17] This does not mean that this thesis equates andragogy as synonymous to a learner centred approach but that andragogy is orientated towards being learner-centred.

Marshal McLuhan first coined the phrase "the message is the medium" (Kappelman 2001:1) within the field of media studies. McLuhan was well aware that his views were not always wholly accepted (McLuhan 1975: 74) and they have also been argued within theology[18] (for example Sleeth 1986: 26-28) yet despite its controversies the McLuhan axiom revealed the inextricable link between the medium and what is communicated.

McLuhan put forward four laws which can be put as questions (McLuhan 1975:75-78)

>   3.4.1.1.   What does the medium amplify?
>   3.4.1.2.   What does the medium make obsolete?
>   3.4.1.3.   What does the medium retrieve?
>   3.4.1.4.   What does the medium reverse?

If any medium is investigated in this manner it can be seen how these "laws" play out. For example, here this thesis outlines McLuhan's laws as he applied them to printing which 1) Amplified private and individual spheres 2) Made oral tradition and guilds obsolete 3) Retrieved antiquity (here McLuhan uses the Copernican revolutions'

---

[18] Sleeth (1986: 26-27) states that some religionists have associated the sermon with the thinking developed within the print media culture and have opted for greater experience based communication. This has lead to a criticism on preaching and Sleeth suspects that it could lead to the call to abolish preaching. Here Sleeth juxtapositions the monologue (aligned with "the spoken word) with poetic, intuitive and Gestalt forms (film, dance, musical experience). Bar the fact that music and participatory worship have been a vital part of the Protestant tradition Sleeth has not allowed for other forms of "spoken word" (i.e. Interactive forms). Also there is a focus on one way communication as the more "McLuhaniacs" are said to reflect varied forms of one way communications (see above).

link to Pythagoras) and 4) Reverses the relatively private act of writing for one of mass consumption (McLuhan 1975: 77).

It is observed that these are not absolute laws but are meant as indicators of general trends in society (for example, there are still oral traditions and guilds in a print society). Also it can be noted that McLuhan focuses on what the medium communicates and so can't be taken to mean that the medium replaced message content. Rather McLuhan makes us aware that the medium plays a significant part in communicating and therefore should be taken into account when homiletics is being taught and produced. This emphasis on the medium further validates the significance of this thesis and others that take seriously the medium of homiletics.

### 3.4.2.  Communications theory

Within the simplest aspect of Communication Theory there is the Source (which encodes the message), the message (which is the code), and the Destination (which decodes the meaning) (Sebeok 1995: 37). In language this is often thought of in terms of words and their grammar (the code/message) being communicated between two persons (a source and destination). However even in the simplest of forms (for example a simple communication between two persons) how things are said, for example tone and body language, impacts on the meaning (Stott 1982: 80). From here interaction is the inevitable next step and so the convergence model of communication, in communications theory, can be seen to develop where feedback is an integral part of communication (Fielding 1997: 18-19).

Therefore effective communication requires a synergy of message (verbal content in homiletics) and medium (for example body language, tone, feedback) to be effective.

### 3.4.3. Biblical studies

When relating Biblical theology to homiletics the issue of the form of the medium plays a significant role in the form the sermon is to take (Keck 1992: 106, Camery-Hoggatt 1995: 161-174). The importance of the medium has led some to say that "recent Biblical Studies suggest, for example, that a parable doesn't have a point, it is a point" (Lowry 1989:20). What these have focused on (as pointed out in Chapter 2) is on the methods of the author and not the methods of the characters within the story (as this thesis did in Chapter 2). The principle is still accepted in homiletics that the medium in which content is communicated impacts significantly on the message understood. In this thesis what has been done is to shift the focus from the methods of the author (for example Mark, Paul, John or any other biblical author) to the methods of the characters depicted.

### 3.4.4. Significance of mediums to homiletics

This is significant to the theological endeavour (specifically for practical theology and in this case homiletics) in that the church should concern ourselves with how we do things and pay careful attention to what we are communicating (through our various mediums) in the process (even if our doctrinal orthodoxy is perfect). This concern on the medium is what concerns this thesis[19] and here the focus is on the mediums of education used within our culture.

---

[19] Here I will refrain from asking questions like, "what does a monologue communicate and what does an interaction? What does our architecture communicate? Our seating arrangement? Our style of worship?" Although interesting they would detract from the emphasis here which is to examine the cultural processes of learning with regard to interaction.

3.5.    Current academic teaching

This thesis draws here from the work of Samuelowicz and Bain *Revisiting Academics Beliefs about Teaching and Learning* (2001). Their area of investigation is within the field of higher education which naturally focuses on adult learners within a variety of subjects. Their survey serves this study by indicating what is the actual, rather than desired, teaching practice in adult academic education and so reflects on how our society learns.

3.5.1. Overview of the field

The first table of Samuelowicz and Bain (2001: 302-303), presented below, is an overview of various academic studies indicating ways of conceptualizing teaching and learning. They (Samuelowicz and Bain) categorized the academic approaches overviewed into various levels contrasting teacher-centred (with its focus on knowledge transmission) with learner centred (with its focus on learner facilitation) as well as adding an intermediary level. As can be seen from the columns below the knowledge conveying category (teacher-centred) is further broken down into two columns and the facilitation of learning categories (teacher-centred) is further broken down into three columns.

Table 5: Ways of conceptualizing teaching and learning

| Study | Knowledge categories | conveying | Intermediate categories | Facilitation of Learning Categories | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Larson (1983) (phenomenographic) | Transmitting information | | | Facilitating learning | | |
| Fox (1983)* | Transfer | Shaping | Building | Travelling | Growing | |

| Study | Knowledge conveying categories | | Intermediate categories | Facilitation of Learning Categories | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Dali Alba (1991) (phenomenographic) | Presenting Information<br><br>Transmitting information | Connecting theory to practice | Developing concepts<br><br>Developing capacity to be expert | Exploring ways of understanding | Bringing about conceptual change | |
| Martin and Balla (1991) (phenomenographic) | Presenting information | | Encouraging active learning | | Relating teaching to learning | |
| Samuelowicz and Bain (1992) | Imparting information | Transmitting information | Facilitating understanding | | Changing students conceptions | Supporting students learning |
| Pratt (1992) (phenomenographic) | Delivering content | | Modelling ways of being | Cultivating the intellect | Facilitating personal agency | |
| Martin and Ramsden (1992) (modified phenomenographic) | Presenting content of process | Organising content/or process | Organising learning environment | | Facilitating understanding through engagement with content and process | |
| Gow and Kember (1993) Kember and Gow (1994) | Knowledge transmission | | | Learning facilitation | | |
| Prosser et al (1994) (phenomenographic) | Transmitting concepts<br><br>Transmitting teachers | Helping students acquire concepts | Helping students develop concepts | | Helping students change concepts | |

| Study | Knowledge categories | conveying | Intermediate categories | Facilitation of Learning Categories | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | knowledge | Helping students acquire teachers knowledge | | | | |
| Trigwell et al (1994) Trigwell and Prosser (1996) (phenomenographic) | Information transmission - teacher focused | Concepts acquisition/teacher focused | Concept acquisition/student-teacher interaction | Conceptual development/ students focused | Conceptual change/students focused | |
| Kember and Kwan (in press) | Passing information | Making it easier for students to understand | | Meeting students learning needs | Facilitating students to become independent learners | |
| Kember (1997a) (synthesis of literature) | Imparting information | Transmitting structured knowledge | Student-teacher interaction | Facilitating understanding | Conceptual change/intellectual development | |
| *Although Fox did not order his "personal theories of teaching" along one dimension, he dis favour "developed" over "simple" theories and implied that student-initiated learning is more appropriate than teacher-initiated learning. His categories have been ordered in accordance with these constraints. | | | | | | |

This table reveals that there is an almost universal acceptance of learner centred approaches within educational theory today. This does not in any way negate the teacher-centred approach but is a clear indication that varied forms and approaches are

necessary. This move to incorporate alternative approaches is echoed in the nature of this thesis.

What is also interesting to note is the section, seen at the bottom of the table, which elaborates on Foxe's work and particularly how Fox believed that student-initiated learning is more appropriate. This approach (student-initiated learning) reflects the approach of Jesus and the early disciples where many of the homiletic events recorded were initiated by the "students".

3.5.2. Research findings

Below is a table which places the various orientations of educational beliefs on a continuum from teacher centred to learner centred (Samuelowicz and Bain 2001: 306-307). The 7 categorized within the continuum are further defined into the two overarching sections of teacher and learner centred approaches. These rows are cross referenced with 9 dimensions (the table rows) which I believe are self-explanatory.

The interpretive key to this table is the use of "A (teaching centred), A/b (teaching centred with learning emphasis), B/a (learning emphasis with aspects of a teaching emphasis) B (learning centred)" (Samuelowicz and Bain 2001: 305).

Table 6: Teacher centred and learner-centred orientations to teaching and learning defined in terms of their constituent belief dimensions and beliefs

| Dimensions | Teaching-centred orientations | | | Learner-centred orientations | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Imparting information* | *Transmitting structured knowledge* | Providing and facilitating understanding | Helping students develop expertise | Preventing misunderstandings | Negotiating understanding | Encouraging knowledge creation |
| *Desired learning outcomes* | recall of atomised learning A | reproductive understanding A/b | reproductive understanding A/b | change in ways of sinking B | change in ways of sinking B | change in ways of thinking B | change of ways of thinking B |
| *Expected use of knowledge* | within subject A | within subject for future use A/b | within subject for future use A/b | interpretation of reality B | interpretation of reality B | interpretation of reality B | Interpretation of reality B |
| Responsibility for organising or transforming knowledge | Teacher A | Teacher A | teacher shows how knowledge can be used A/b | students & teacher B/a | students B | students B | students B |
| Nature of knowledge | externally constructed A | externally constructed A | externally constructed A | personalized B | personalized B | personalized B | personalized B |

| Dimensions | *Imparting information* | *Transmitting structured knowledge* | Providing and facilitating understanding | Helping students develop expertise | Preventing misunderstandings | Negotiating understanding | Encouraging knowledge creation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Students existing conceptions* | not taken into account  A | not taken into account  A | not taken into account  A | not taken into account  A | used to prevent common mistakes  B/a | used as basis for conceptual change  B | used as basis for conceptual change  B |
| Teacher-students interaction | One way: teacher→students  A | two-way to maintain students attention  A/b | two-way to ensure/clarify understanding  B/a | two-way to negotiate meaning  B | two-way to negotiate meaning  B | two-way to negotiate meaning  B | two-way to negotiate meaning  B |
| *Control of content* | teacher  A | teacher  A | teacher  A | teacher  A | teacher  A | teacher  A | students  B |
| Professional development | not stressed  A | not stressed  A | not stressed  A | stressed  B | stressed  B | stressed  B | stressed  B |
| Interest and motivation | teachers  A | teachers  A | teachers  A | students  B | students  B | students  B | students  B |

93

This table highlights two significant issues for this thesis.

Firstly it is noted that the dimension of "teacher-students interaction" clearly illustrates the significance of interaction through both approaches. 6 out of 7 orientations have verbal interaction with differences revolving around outcomes of the learning experience (two-way to negotiate meaning, two-way to ensure/clarify meaning, two-way to maintain students' attention).

Secondly it is noted that the orientations of the learning-centred reflect much of the orientations of preachers. For example, if the "desired learning outcomes" are observed it can be seen that the learner-centred approach is to "change ways of thinking" which is a significant homiletic agenda (See 2 Tim 4:2) If the "expected use of knowledge" is observed it can be seen that the leaner-centred approach is used in the "interpretation of reality" which is also a significant homiletic agenda (See 1 Cor 1:21; 2:16). Although interesting the thesis refrains itself from spending time here on the issue but suffice to say that homiletic scholars would do well to concern ourselves with current teaching practices that significantly reflect the agendas of our field.

### 3.5.3.  What kind of interaction can be expected?

Samuelowicz and Bain go on to put forward two stories to illustrate the fundamental differences between the two approaches of teaching (Teacher centred –A and Learner-centred –B). Here the attention is drawn  predominantly to the section on student teacher interaction.

3.5.3.1.   Teacher Centred (Model A). Out of the two models the teacher-centred

model is less likely to be interactive yet interaction is still normative only

from a different perspective.

> He believes that interaction between himself and the students
> improves their understanding of the subject. Consequently he
> encourages students to interrupt him during lectures to ask
> questions to clarify their understanding. (Samuelowicz and Bain
> 2001: 313)

Academic A also gives his students "an opportunity to be active" (Samuelowicz and
Bain 2001: 314) by giving them problems to solve, questioning the connection between
what they've learnt and the world around them.

3.5.3.2.   Learner centred (Model B). As can be expected this model leads to greater

emphasis on interaction as there is a greater emphasis on the leaner.

> She does not see teaching (her words "empowering activity"[20]) as
> a simple affair where knowledge is dispensed to students by the
> teacher. Rather it is a challenging two-way process.
> (Samuelowicz and Bain 2001: 315)

> Academic B regards the interaction between herself and the
> students as vital to the process of learning. It is through
> interaction that students become involved in their learning and
> this is how they develop the understanding, knowledge, attitudes
> and skills needed for their future profession. (Samuelowicz and
> Bain 2001: 316)

Her interaction with students takes place with students in small groups and as
individuals as well as using creative methods such as role play.

---

[20] This correlates well to the agenda of the various "offices" of ministry recorded in Ephesians 4
which exist *"for the equipping of the saints"* (Eph 4:12).

3.5.3.3. Observations on academic A and B on interaction.

From these two models it is acknowledged that interaction is normative for both models, however academics that sway to learner-centred education will use interaction to a greater extent.

Another note is that Academic A was a Chemistry teacher and so is a less creative "hard" science while academic B was a teacher of Architecture, a more creative discipline. This indicates that the nature of the field has influence on the medium of education. Homiletic scholars would do well to think of what sort of discipline Theology[21] is and what our outcomes are as preachers.

 3.6.    Teaching methods

So what exactly are some of the teaching methods that have become common practice across the field of education (section 3.5. was restricted to higher education)?
 3.6.1.   Listing various practices

Due to the diversity of identifying teaching criterion, classification has often been difficult and so lists are often used for practical purpose (Nikandrov 1990: 255).

The following quote comes from Bradford and Gibbs' article *Developments in Group Behaviour in Adult Education* (1953). The correlation to those being taught as adults, as

---

[21] Farely, in his paper *Can church education be theological education?* (1996), makes the distinction between Church education (that which is taught from the clergy to the laity) and Theological Education (that which is taught from the scholars to the clergy). Here it is simply meant as the type of teaching that occurs within churches.

well as the group dynamic, to the *ekklesia* of our congregational gatherings where homiletics most commonly occurs is significant.

> Weaknesses in large meetings as listed by Badford and Corey (12) included audience passivity, feelings of anonymity and rejection, and unidirectionality of communication. Methods and techniques [sic] devised by technologists to overcome the felt weaknesses have included buzz sessions (7, 12, 73), multiple role playing, as used by Maier and his associates (66, 68), audience-listening teams as used by the National Training Laboratory (73), audience representation panels, post meeting reaction sheets for program evaluation (7, 73), role-playing scenes with an audience "in the round" (11) audience participation in program planning (7), and sensitizing panels (12). These methods, when used adequately, increased audience involvement and productivity. (Bradford and Gibb 1953: 240-241)

Firstly it can be noted from the above quote that non-participation is understood as a weakness with regard to group practice. What is of particular interest to this thesis is the identification of unidirectional communication and audience passivity (with the resulted feelings of anonymity and rejection) which lead to the need for active engagement of the group, i.e. for the group to interact.

Secondly if the suggested practices are identified as those that improve productivity it can be seen that audience interaction is the norm. From interacting before the meeting (participation in program planning), to during the meeting (role-playing, buzz session), to after the meeting (post meeting reaction sheets) the message of interaction is clear.

Therefore if effective education is to be achieved in a gathering of adults, according to Bradford and Gubb, there should be various forms of interaction while non-participation should be avoided.

Another list is put forward by Ascher (1966: 1-2) and although Henson called Ascher's list into question it was on the basis of not distinguishing between teaching methods and teaching behaviour rather than disagreeing that these are relevant practices (Henson 1980: 3-4).

Ascher's teaching methods (Henson 1980: 3)

Table 7

| Telling | Showing | Doing |
|---------|---------|-------|
| Lecture | Demonstration | Role-playing |
| Discussion | Modelling | Practice |
| Exposition debates | Pictures | Exercise |
| Panel discussion | Written words | Inquiry procedures |
| | | Simulation |

From this list the extent to which interaction is accepted as a normative within the teaching practices can be seen. The thesis also notes, as Henson points out (Henson 1980: 3), that these are not necessarily separate practices, for instance one could demonstrate (second column) while in the process of giving a lecture. Yet the table still significantly points to a variety of interactions that occur within teaching practice today.

Both lists illustrate that various forms of interaction are well established within the process of education.

3.6.2.  Discussion as normal

As the Scriptural investigation of this thesis in the second chapter led to a focus on verbal interaction (discussion), in this section the focus on discussion will be within educational theory.

Firstly, the thesis will define what is meant by discussion in the educational setting as seen in the quote below.

> What, then, is the discussion method in teaching? It is a strategy for achieving instructional objectives that involves a group of persons, usually in the roles of moderator and participant, who communicate with each other using speaking, nonverbal, and listening processes. (Gall and Gillett 1980: 99)

This definition is very similar to what the second chapter witnessed in the teaching practices of Jesus and the early disciples. There is both speaking and non-verbal communication that occurs as parties interact in a learning environment.

Group discussion has always been a part of education and particularly the education of adults. The trend to increase participation has emerged as early as the fifties and has continued to grow.

> While group discussion has always been a part of adult education, it was only a small part in earlier days. Research and study in group dynamics and group behaviour in recent years have accelerated the use of group discussion … Emphasis on member participation has become almost as important in large group meetings-usually a lecture situation-as it is in small group meetings. (Bradford and Gibb 1953: 233)

Yet it should not be thought that participation and discussion is in any way limited to adult education. Here the similarity of adult and child education can be seen as the following quote comes from Piek's *General Didactics* (1984) which is designed for trainee school teachers as well as those already in the school classrooms.

> It is practically a matter of course that the teacher, when designing and planning his lesson, should constantly take into account the share of the pupils in the progress of the lesson. The teacher must make it his objective to bring about the active and spontaneous participation of the pupils. (Piek 1984: 71)

The term "spontaneous participation" implies a learning environment where open interaction is not only allowed but encouraged as a main objective of the teacher.

The emphasis on discussion has increased as educational theory has developed. Although experience based learning is much more than an increase in discussion it can be noted that verbal interaction still plays a significant role in the learning process. Experience based learning is developing a substantial following (Kolb and Kolb 2005: 8-10) and so is significant in the trends of education within our culture.

> Human beings naturally make meaning from their experiences through conversation. Yet genuine conversation in the traditional lecture classroom can be extremely restricted or non-existent... Making space for good conversation as part of the educational process provides the opportunity for reflection on and meaning making about experiences that improves the effectiveness of experiential learning (Keeton, Sheckley, and Griggs 2002, Bunker 1999). For example the creation of learning teams as part of a course promote effective learning when psychologically safe conditions are present (Wyss-Flamm 2002). Conversational Learning describes the dimensions of spaces that allow for good conversation. Good conversation is more likely to occur in spaces that integrate thinking and feeling, talking and listening, leadership and solidarity, recognition of individuality and

> relatedness and discursive and recursive processes. When the conversational space is dominated by one extreme of these dimensions, for example talking without listening, conversational learning is diminished. (Kolb and Kolb 2005: 31-32)

In this extended quote some important observations can be noted that bring to bear on the trends in educational theory and practice.

Firstly, the statement that for mankind experience and conversation are natural parts of our learning is significant. This is not to deny other forms of knowledge development but to assert experience as an inclusive sphere[22]. It is an emphasis that sees mankind in a more holistic manner and as such to understand that we (mankind) require holistic learning strategies.

Secondly there is an obvious dissatisfaction with the lecture mode of education. The Kolbs point out that interaction already exists within the lecture (indicating that some, albeit minor, interaction is still normative) but that it is often an insufficient interaction for a learning experience.

Thirdly conversation spaces need to be made (I assume by the teacher) in order for good (effective learning) conversations to occur in. The quote goes on to list elements of a good conversation space (thinking and feeling, talking and listening) and there can be seen to be a clear correlation between this process and that practised by Jesus and the early in disciples in the 1st century.

---

[22] Experience based learning is based on the philosophy of Dewey (Kolb 2005: 3) who related knowledge to primarily to experience with thinking being a process of adjustment between man and his environment (Osborne R 1992: 140)

3.7.    Teaching skills

Having looked into what practices are considered effective for teaching persons the thesis now moves to a similar subject, teaching skills.

> Efforts have been made in recent years to specify the skills which are generic or common to teachers at all levels. Dwight Allen and Kevin Ryan have suggested fourteen such skills.
> 1. Stimulus variation
> 2. Set induction
> 3. Closure
> 4. Silence and nonverbal cues
> 5. Reinforcement of student participation
> 6. Fluency in asking questions
> 7. Probing questions
> 8. Higher-order questions
> 9. Divergent questions
> 10. Recognizing attending behaviour
> 11. Illustrating and using examples
> 12. Lecturing
> 13. Planned repetition
> 14. Completeness of communication
> (Olivia and Henson 1980: 118)

From the above list it can be seen that the teacher's skill of interacting with learners is substantial to the learning process.  Questions play a vital role (6-9) as well as the skill of reinforcing student participation in the process (5). This all implies a learning environment that is open to discussion and underpins the need for interaction in the learning process.

3.8.   Percentages of would-be learners preferring various methods and percentages of learners using the methods (Cross 1981: 209)

Table 8

| Method | Preferences of Would be Learners | Utilization by Learners |
|---|---|---|
| Lecturers or classes | 28 | 35 |
| On-the-job training, internship | 21 | 14 |
| Short-term conferences, institutes, or workshops | 13 | 8 |
| Individual lessons from a private teacher | 8 | 16 |
| Discussion groups | 8 | 4 |
| Study on my own, no formal instruction | 7 | 17 |
| Correspondence course | 3 | 5 |
| Group action project | 3 | 2 |
| Travel study program | 2 | -[23] |
| TV or video cassettes | 1 | - |
| Radio, records, audio cassettes | 1 | - |
| Other method | - | 2 |
| No response | 4 | 8 |

---

[23] -Less than one percent

The thesis now looks from the perspective of the student (both active and potential) within adult education. This table gives the reader an indication of the breadth of teaching methods available and experienced in our Culture. Many of the methods available do not correlate well to homiletics while others may be debated. For example, "study on my own" can hardly be deemed part of a homiletic event, while TV may be called into question on its ability to effectively identify with the congregation (Loscalzo 1992: 33).  That being said  many of the mediums indicate interaction in the learning environments (Internships, Workshops, Individual lessons and discussion groups). It is interesting that the lecture/classroom is still the preferred venue and medium for education however the interactive nature of the modern "Lecturers and classes" (see above) should be taken into account. This desire for lecture/classroom might be seen to indicate the desire for a structured learning environment where a more knowledgeable person is able to oversee the learning process rather than a preference for speeches.

## 3.9.   The business world

In this section examines whether what is espoused and practised by the academic/educational communities has carried over with significant, positive effect into the business world.[24] What does the average adult who has ceased to participate in the educational environment experience and come to expect? Once again this thesis acknowledged the limitations of its investigation, namely, that the work environment is very different to that of the church. The objective here is not to directly correlate

---

[24] This thesis acknowledges that this is a blurred line with the existence of business schools as well as the interaction that occurs between educational institutes and the business sector. The objective here is simply to look into current practice that is clearly within the business sector and therefore is a more likely area of engagement of the average adult with educational theory.

business practice with church practice but merely to point out certain accepted social practices in organizations within the post-modern culture. Education has often been linked to economic developments and much has been discussed regarding the shift from an industrialist to a post-industrialist society (Lister 1989).

One company that aimed at educating the business community outside of the traditional curriculum based approach (offered by Universities and such) was founded by *Rich Dad, Poor Dad's* Robert Kiyosaki. He is mentioned here because of his popularity within our culture (#1 in *New York Times, Wall Street Journal, Business Week* and *Publishers Weekly*) and below is a quote to indicate his approach with regard to interaction.

> The company was an educational company using teaching
> methods almost exactly the opposite of what traditional schools
> use. Instead of asking the student to sit still, we encouraged them
> to be active. Instead of teaching via lecture, we taught by playing
> games. (Kiyosaki 2003:192)

Although Kiyosaki may be overly judgemental of traditional approaches (one would assume from past experience) and is no doubt unfamiliar with current trends within traditional institutes toward greater interaction, his quote serves as a reminder of the desire within the culture to learn via interaction.

## 3.9.1.  Dennis Kravetz

In 1988 Dennis Kravetz released his investigation into the relation of human resources practices of financially successful companies. The survey incorporated 150 companies over a five year period. Below is listed some of the practices as they relate to the topic of interaction (Mclagan and Nel 1995: 31).

Table 9:  Practices in high-performing and low-performing firms

| Work Practice | High-Performing Firms | Low-Performing Firms |
|---|---|---|
| Company culture emphasizes people | 90% | 20% |
| Company uses participative style of management | 70% | 4% |
| Company encourages creativity | 62% | 10% |

The emphasis on people here reflects the similarity in emphasis on people that is accepted within the church. The indication here is that where there is greater interaction and greater space for open discussion and creativity there is greater profitability.  While acknowledging that much of this research could be applied to other issues of Practical Theology (for example, Church Leadership[25], Structure) here it is simply used to refer to the active participatory nature of adults in their work setting and by implication the expectation of active participation within the church.

### 3.9.2. Peter Senge's fifth discipline

[25] The link between leadership style and preaching approach was developed by McLure (1995: 11-29) who contrasted the autocratic leadership style with the consultative and collaborative styles. Although acknowledging the validity of both styles (claiming they serve different purposes in different circumstances) McLure prefers the collaborative within the congregational context of today.

The issue can also be seen along the lines of McLuhan where it could be argued that the speech/monologue medium of the sermon communicates a form of autocracy despite the intentions of the preacher.

Peter Senges introduces the concept of a business organization being a learning organization (Senge 1997:486-513). As director of the Centre for Organizational Learning at MIT, Senge observed that organizations that aim at creating a learning culture resulted in better quality, superior performance, committed workforce, competitive advantage etc. (Senge and others 1994: 9-11).  In *The Fifth Discipline Fieldbook* (1994) the Section on Team Learning is broken up into further chapters, "Strategies for Team Learning" (1994: 351-355) includes headings like *"The art and practice of conversation"* (1994:352) and "Dialogue and Skillful Discussion" (1994:353). Other chapters are titled "Dialogue", "Designing a Dialogue Session", 'Skillful Discussion" and so on. What is evident throughout the book is a reliance on true interaction where there is a safe space for open discussion.

Senge makes mention of a criticism of traditional Western management by Matsushita from Japan (1994: 9-10). The West was accused of being a top-down management with little input from the lower levels other than to implement the ideas of those above them. Senge notes that this may have been true in the past but that Western organizations are moving away to a more participative model. Senge notes that this shift has many names ("self-managing work teams" or "empowered organizations") but the net result is the same, organizations that develop people in an engaging manner. Once again this thesis is cautious of overstepping its parameters with regard to homiletics but affirm that those learning within the business world are accepting and accustomed to an interactive learning environment.

### 3.9.3.  Columbia University research

In 1988, a Columbia University investigation was released by David Lewin, covering 495 organizations, with the agenda to investigate to what extent participative practices impacted on economic success (McLagan and Nel 1995: 32). Here this thesis points to two conclusions of the research as they relate to the thesis' subject.

    3.9.3.1.    Sharing Information and employee involvement. This is placed in contrast to companies that are run autocratically.

    3.9.3.2.    "Companies that combine group economic participation, intellectual participation, flexible job design, and training and development get an added productivity boost" (McLagan and Nel 1995: 32).

Once again the norm within the successful business environment is for the active participation of employees.

### 3.9.4. Some conclusions on the business world

This thesis is content to put forward the concept, as demonstrated above, that interaction within the workforce is normative. This is true with regard to managements engaging with workers (Kravetz and Columbia University studies) as well as within learning techniques used by companies (Senge). The data provided here is limited but sufficient to assert that it is never the less representative, although not exhaustively, of business practice within the post-modern culture. As the agenda of this thesis points towards the validity of interaction in homiletics this section merely serves to re-enforce and expand on what other sections within this chapter have said with regard to interaction and learning.

## 3.10.  Post-modern turns

This chapter has illustrated that interaction is an accepted component of education within the culture we find ourselves in which has been defined as a post-modern culture (Hauerwas 2004:138, Bertens 1995: 9). However post-modern does not mean that everything modern has been dispatched with or improved on (Grenz 1996: 162-165), or for that matter things pre-modern either (Bertens 1995: 241). There is significant overlap from pre-modern to modern to post-modern (Green 1993:1) and it has been pointed out that post-modernism is not necessarily something completely different to modern culture (Bertens 1995: 256-247). Post-modernism as a culture is also something relatively new (Mclaren 2005:1) and if modernism was said to emerge as far back as the Enlightenment (Bertens 1995: 248) then I believe all scholars would do well to be cautious in our interpretations and conclusions associated with a such newly developing culture.

In this section of the chapter this thesis is not concerned with distinguishing modern from post-modern but is interested in certain trends that either can be seen to emerge or are likely to emerge in the near future.

### 3.10.1. Cultural shifts

Sarno (1987: 68) developed thoughts[26] presented in the table below which collected the thoughts of Walter Ong, Avery Dulles and Pierre Babin to illustrate how the dominant forms of word communication influences society and churches.

Table 10

| Walter Ong: A schematic Synopsis of his theory on the historical transformations of the Word | | | | | | Avery Dulles's Historical Ecclesiology |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| When the word is … | Then…the races psycho-sexual stage is | Then…information is stored and retrieved by | Then…the teaching learning act requires | Then…the opposite view is treated with | Then…faith Education relies on | Then…the word of God comes to the Church through |
| Vocalized sound | Oral | Memory | Recitation | Vigorous polemic against other viewpoint | Apologetics | Spoken Witness |
| Written Text | Oral/Anal | A limited number of Scrolls | Debate on the meaning of the text | | Theology | Written Documents of Church officials |

[26] Another similar more work is *The Hidden Power of Electronic Culture* by Shane Hipps (2005). However there has been no significant work dealing with the interactive nature of the internet (Sarno focuses on Television and Hipps prefers to focus on the Graphic Revolution –Hipps 2005: 73-81).

| Print | Anal | Indices to many books and libraries | Silent Reading | Tolerant acceptance of the other viewpoint | Catechisms | Printed texts as magisterial documents for Catholics; the Bible for Protestants |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Audiovisual | Genital or Holistic | Instant and Omnipresent | Participation | | | |
| | | | | | Religious Education | All Human Experience |

The table illustrates how the shift in preferred medium (vocalized, written text, print text, audiovisual) impacts on culture. It can be seen how this relates to a McLuhan framework of thought where the media medium communicates a message that transforms society.

This thesis does not see this table as placing exclusive categories and practices but rather points out a shift in emphasis that is related to the medium of words. To illustrate, if one looks at the New Testament era it falls under the row "written text". This does not imply that the New Testament had no understanding of Apologetics (1 Peter 3:15) or religious education (Eph 4:11-16) but that there was an emphasis in society that revolved around the debating of textual meanings (for example, the Nicean Creed).

This therefore points to the table as a reflective indication of cultural emphasis and it is with this in mind that attention is drawn into the column that is of most interest to this thesis, the teaching learning act.

111

It can be seen that in the more current era the emphasized form is participation. This has been identified earlier in the shift toward learner centred teaching and can be seen to be re-emphasized here. The shift in culture is therefore to a more interactive stance on education and by implication a more interactive stance in homiletics.

### 3.10.2. "Post-modern pedagogy"

### 3.10.2.1.  Clive Beck

In his paper *Postmodernism, Pedagogy, And the Philosophy of Education* (1993) Clive Beck, after loosely defining the term based on the works of Lyotard, Derrida, Foucault and Rorty, lays out some implications for Post-modernism on Pedagogy. The area that will be focused on here is Beck's implication that points toward practices that express the "democratic and dialogical emphasis of post-modernism" (Beck 1993:1).

Beck states that post-modernism points us (post-moderns) away from top-down approaches and more towards learner-centred approaches. Beck believes that certain educational critics have overemphasized students' ability to engage in self-directed inquiry and subsequently emphasizes the teacher's role in motivating and facilitating learning. His argument is that the teacher still has a vital role in creating structures that support and guide the learning process which is still to have significant input from the student. For Beck Post-modernism means greater involvement of the student yet still affirming the guiding and supportive role of the teacher.

### 3.10.2.2.  Mark Taylor

Mark Taylor in his article *Postmodern Pedagogy: Teaching and Learning with Generation NeXt* (2005) states that the major shift is from teaching centred to learning centred practices (2005:4).

> The prime recognition is that our colleges do not exist to provide instruction; we exist to create learning, the traditional "teaching" practice of lecture to passive students has long been discredited as ineffective. (Taylor 2005: 4)

Taylor lists 6 changes that need to occur:

3.10.2.2.1. Changes in the dynamics of student instructor relationship

Once again the move is to emphasize learner centred education. Interaction here is defined as a "collaborative relationship toward shared goals" (Taylor 2005: 4).

3.10.2.2.2. Changes in responsibility for students and instructors

In the past the teaching was constant while the learner's outcome varied. Here teaching becomes a variable as instructors adapt to the learners' needs.

3.10.2.2.3. Focus on student change

The shift is away from recitation of knowledge and toward applicable skills (whether higher order thinking skills or other) development. The outcome focus' on students being "meaningfully and demonstrably different on exit" (Taylor 2005:4)

3.10.2.2.4. Changes in the Instructors role

Here Taylor further identifies 6 practices that need to be emphasized. 1) Identifies external goals 2) Helps students own and personalize goals 3) Offers Learning Options 4) Facilitates a variety of learning methods 5) Acts as resource 6) Assess against external criteria.

3.10.2.2.5. Working up educational taxonomies

Borrowing from Blooms' classification of educational objectives (knowledge through comprehension, application, analysis, evaluation) Taylor (here referencing Gardiner) points out that most faculty focus on the lower level with little time on the higher levels. Acknowledging the need for all levels Taylor emphasizes does not negate the lower levels but believes that a shift in emphasis is needed.

### 3.10.2.2.6. Increasing activity in learning

> Incorporating active learning methods is basically increasing the level of interaction and increasing student activity level in classes and related learning activities. (Taylor 2005: 6)

### 3.10.3.Post-modern turns conclusions

The shift in Post-modern Pedagogy is one that places an emphasis on the learner. That does not mean that there has not been academic interest in the teacher (Henson 1980:5) but that these endeavours have placed emphasis on how the teacher can facilitate the learner centred approaches (for example, Marzano 1993, Gall and Gillet 1980).

> …there is no single way to tell tradition from innovation in the matter of teaching methods. While some critics of education would merely say there is hardly any innovation at all, there is still a steady, albeit slow, movement from student passivity to active involvement as a general trend. (Nikandrov 1990: 260)

### 3.11.  Conclusions on Culture

Interaction has been an integral part of the education process within the post-modern culture. From the school classroom, to higher education, to the business sector, those in the post-modern culture tend to learn via interaction.  Discussion plays an essential part

in our educational process and educational theory has developed methods of incorporating discussion into group meetings.

Added to this, experiential learning is growing within this post-modern culture and this opens up education to more tactile strategies. And so holistic interaction is a pivotal part of education in today's context. The trend within this culture has been seen to be moving towards greater and greater interaction within the field of education and this thesis anticipates that this will influence the field of homiletics significantly.

The findings of this chapter therefore forms a synergy with the findings in the previous chapter on the interactive nature of homiletics. Namely that interactive homiletics is both Scripturally sound and culturally relevant.

This thesis concludes that when those from the post-modern culture gather for instruction or exhortation they expect to be active participants in the process.

CHAPTER 4: THE TRADITION

## 4.1.    Introduction to Tradition

Evangelical theology has always looked with some scepticism at the source of tradition and McGrath identifies two reasons (McGrath 2000: 141-142).

Firstly in that tradition can be seen as a "human fabrication, in opposition to the Word of God" (McGrath 2000: 141). This is what the Scriptures are opposed to (Col 2:8-9) and what the evangelical tradition has tried to avoid, hence the adherence to Scripture as the dominant source.

Secondly it is when tradition becomes traditionalism. The distinction between these two terms is understood as being between the living faith handed down to the church (Tradition of 1 Cor 15:1-4) and traditions devoid of life enforced on the church (traditionalism). Here a tradition that may have served an effective purpose in one context is restrictive and ineffective in another.

Grenz defines the role of tradition as to act as a trajectory (Grenz and Franke 2001: 93-129). Where the present theological body looks back and sees the moving of God throughout the ages and discerns the general direction of theology and so can find themselves' better in the story of God's people.

No matter how tradition is looked at it should be understood that tradition can be wrong (Pinnock 1992: 37) and so once again the evangelical caution and submission to the Scripture as the authority comes into play. Therefore this chapter addresses the source that carries the least weight of the three sources. The majority of the texts focus on what can be defined as the classical tradition (that which is closest to the New

Testament) and the current tradition (the rise of modernism in the Enlightenment and current Post-modern traditions), and so this thesis has placed little attention on the middle ages (500- 1500 AD).

## 4.2.    Classic Jewish tradition (Canonical Times)

Education within the Jewish tradition falls mainly on the shoulders of the parents (Wilson 1999: 279) but this thesis brings its attention mainly on adult learning in the congregational, or spiritual, setting.

### 4.2.1.  The Synagogue tradition

*"As his custom was, Paul went into the Synagogue, and on three Sabbath days he reasoned with them from the Scriptures"* (Acts 17:2)

#### 4.2.1.1.   The origin and purpose of the Synagogue

According to John Bright the exact origins of the Synagogue "are quit obscure and cannot be traced" (Bright 1971: 439). However he affirms that they were established toward the end of the third century BC and that their origins were naturally earlier than this date.

Bright points to a causal reasoning for the Synagogues development, namely that there were thousands of Jews distant from the Jerusalem Temple, forbidden by the Law to establish sacrifices in their own locations, and who had a desire to continue in the Jewish faith. These elements made the rise of the Synagogue (or a similar institution) inevitable. "In the exile, Jews apparently assembled where they could pray and listen to

117

their teachers and prophets (Ezek. 8:1; 14:1; 33:30f)" (Bright 1971: 439). And so this practice of public gathering is assumed to have continued and "[b]y the last pre-Christian centuries they were in every town." (Bright 1971: 439)

In this time the Law gained in importance and so there grew a need to interpret and apply the Law. This necessitated hermeneutical principles and so a class of scribes, who devoted themselves to the study of the Law and gather disciples to themselves, began to emerge. Bright states that the origin of this class is also obscure but that they were common by the end of the third century. The concern of this group was twofold: 1) A zeal to understand the Law and 2) an "intense practical concern for the conduct of the good life" (Bright 1971: 440)

Therefore the Synagogue can be said to emerge out of a need retain the Jewish faith in a context that does not allow for the prescribed sacrifices of the Law. Out of this need emerged a group of teachers who saw it as their task to study the Law and apply it to daily life. These teachers drew disciples to themselves and so the Synagogue was limited in its Jewish worship (much of the Old Testament concept of worship was linked to the Temple practices which were disallowed in the Synagogue) and focused on understanding and applying the Law to daily life. Therefore the Synagogue is seen to be an environment developed for the the ongoing education and spiritual formation of the people of God.


### 4.2.1.2.   Synagogue liturgy

"The service consisted of the Shema, prayer, the reading of the Law and the Prophets, usually followed by an exposition, and the Blessing" (Green 1970: 194-195).

When the Jewish Temple was destroyed, (70 AD) many of the worshipping rites (not including sacrifice) were transitioned into the Synagogues. The Synagogues were open to all people and therefore attracted Greeks, many of whom would later convert to Christianity (Matthews 1997: 260).
The Blessing was performed by a priest and if a priest was not available it was discarded from the liturgy.

Although the Synagogue liturgy may have varied from place to place (Matthews 1997: 260) it can be said that the average order of service for a Synagogue Sabbath gathering was: 1) Congregation citing the Shema 2) Scripture Reading 3) Homily 4) Blessing

What is of interest to the thesis is to what extent the homily section of the service was interactive.

### 4.2.1.3.    Interaction in the Synagogue

When James McDonald, in his book *Kerygma and Didache* (1980), looks to the topic of "Popular Teaching in the Jewish Tradition" (1980: 43-50) he states that the dominant form at the time of Jesus was the *Midrashic*. He then further breaks what he calls "homiletic *midrashim*" (1980: 44) into two broad types.

4.2.1.3.1. *Yelammedenu* Homily: In this homily the teacher is posed a question and so does not initiate the topic or text.

4.2.1.3.2. *Proem* Homily: In this homily the teacher begins with an introductory text (a proem) put forward by the teacher.

Later in the section on "The homily in the preaching and teaching of Jesus" (McDonald 1980: 48-50) McDonald points out with regard to Synagogue discourses that "evidence of specific homilies he delivered is very restricted" (McDonald 1980: 48). That being said McDonald points to two possible *proem* homilies (Luke 4:16-30 and John 6: 31-58). In both instances there is interaction between the synagogue and Jesus and so McDonald states, in agreement with P Borgen, that this "is a tenable hypothesis that the structure of the discourse reflects the form and procedures of the synagogue homily" (McDonald 1980: 49). McDonald then refers to the yelammedenu homily as being "found in a number of gospel passages" (McDonald 1980: 50) and goes on to name a few.

Although McDonald's writing carries other arguments (for example regarding Jesus' *pesher* approach to hermeneutics) it can be seen that Jesus as an interacting preacher is evident.

McDonald's argument now moves to the early church where he focuses on various homilies within Acts. McDonald is interested in putting forward an in depth study of the early churches structuring, orientation and hermeneutics and as such falls outside of the bounds of this thesis with its focus on homiletic practice. However when McDonald does refer to examples in this section (with regard to the Synagogue) they echo an interactive nature as put forward in the survey of Acts in the second chapter of this thesis (for example, Acts 13:45)

And so it can be seen that the examples of McDonald reflect the interactive nature of preaching within the early church and that interaction often occurred after a short speech was given.

Outside of McDonalds work the surveys in the second chapter of this thesis can be referenced to illustrate that the Synagogue was a place of interaction where the

Scriptures where reasoned from (Acts 17: 2; 18:4; 18:19), examined (Acts 17:11), and argued from (Acts 19:8). This type of inquiry, questions and answers, interaction is therefore normative to the writer of Acts and by implication the New Testament.

In conclusion, with regard to synagogue practice, it can be said that the practice may have varied from place to place (Matthews 1997: 260) but that the evidence from history as well as the canonical depiction is that the synagogue was comfortable with interaction within its meetings, some after the homily (*proem*) and others interacting from the start (*yelammedenu*).

### 4.2.2. Qumran tradition

In the Qumran book on community rules the writer describes the practice that all who have joined the "holy congregation" as:

> They shall eat in common and bless in common and deliberate in common…Each man shall sit in his place: the Priests shall sit first, and the elders second, and all the rest according to their rank. And thus shall they be questioned concerning the Law, and concerning any counsel or manner coming before the Congregation, each man bringing his knowledge to the Council of the Community. No man shall interrupt a companion before his speech has ended, nor speak before a man of higher rank; each man shall speak his turn.…" (1 QS Vi Vermes 1995: 77)

It can be seen that rank is a very important part of this interaction and it is noted that this ranking was continuously being re-evaluated (Vermes 1995: 78).[27] From this quote it

---

[27] Ranking began when the individual seeking to join the community was judged according to *"his understanding and his deeds"* (Vermes 1995: 78) and followed a further two year evaluation process and was accepted and ranked by the Congregation at the end of this period (Vermes 1995: 78). The ranking was also ongoing with each member being ranked yearly, was deliberated by the whole congregation, and

can be seen that the Qumran community believed in open interaction between members as they grew together as a community and as followers of YHWH. In this interactive mode of communication questions were posed to the congregation (with a clearly defined order) and issues were discussed. This form of interactive method is on the one hand rooted in the authority of the leadership who answered first and on the other hand allowed for any member to question or put forward a view.

### 4.3.   The classic Greek teaching tradition

> *"He took the disciples with him and had discussions daily in the lecture hall* [*schole*- from where we derive the English school] *of Tyrannus"* (Acts 19:9)

Campenhausen asserts that the generally accepted trend of the early church was to initially embrace the teaching approach of the Jewish tradition and later that of the Greek (1969:193-194). This may give insight into the rise of Greek rhetoric within the field of homiletics, however, as this chapter will illustrate, the tradition is often unclear.

The extent of the influence of the synagogue on the New Testament church has been questioned (Rankin 1993: 173) and some theologians (for example Shin 2004: 28-29, Broadus 1944: 10) have turned to elements of  teaching practices in the Hellenistic world for clarity on teaching methods.[28] However this thesis exercises caution on this subject as Paul, at times, chose to distance himself from Greek teaching practices

---

ensured that those who carried greater weight in the meetings where worthy of the honour.

[28] It should be noted that there is a correspondence of sorts between Hellenistic and Jewish practices in this regard (Norrington 1996:20) however in this thesis the two have been examined separately as the exact extent of consonance and divergence is not clear.

(Stromm 1997: 166). And so it with this in mind that certain methods of the Hellenistic tradition may be examined as they relate to interaction.[29]


### 4.3.1.1.   The Socratic method


*The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Third Edition* (1996) defines the Socratic method as the:

> Employment of Socratic irony in a philosophical discussion resulting either in a mutual confession of ignorance with a promise of further investigation or in the elicitation of a truth assumed to be innate in all rational beings.

In his Introduction to *Plato: Portrait of Socrates: The Apology, Crito and Phaedo* (1966) Richard Livingstone elaborates on the actual practice of Socrates as he taught. This was defined as "talk, question and answer" (Livingstone 1966: xx), "discussion by conversation" (Livingstone 1966: I) "question him, cross-examine him and test him" (Livingstone 1966: xliv). The nature of Socratic interaction is so distinct from lecturing commonly experienced in his day that Livingstone uses this polemic to discuss the shifts in education.

The Socratic method is therefore an element of Hellenistic education which is in favour of interaction. It is interesting to note that Xenophon identifies Socrates as the most successful with regard to persuasion (Livingstone 1966: xxxi). Persuasion being the main agenda of ancient rhetoric (Rhetoric: 2008), which as shall be seen later

---

[29] This thesis acknowledges that speeches were an integral part of the Hellenistic world and that much of education focused on training in the art of giving speeches (Norrington 1996: 21-22). Once again this thesis reminds the reader that the it is not attempting to ignore or discredit speeches but to focus on the inclusion of interaction.

(sections 4.3.1.3. and 4.4.5), dominated the field of homiletics yet without the element of verbal interaction championed by Socrates.

### 4.3.1.2.    The schools

The link between the professional public orator and the preaching style of Paul has been seriously questioned by Stowers (1984)[30] but what has been retained is the relation between Paul (and by implication the early church) and the philosophical schools. And so it is here that the focus attention is drawn on the tradition of teaching in that context.

It is was typical for philosophical schools to be held in private homes (Stowers 1984:66) and this reflects the common meeting place recorded in the New Testament (for example Acts 2:46; 1 Cor 16:19; Col 4:15). In this context Epictetus encourages philosophers to engage the outsider to his school in the tradition of the Socratic Method (Stowers 1984:69). These were places of engaging debate (much like the Synagogues) where the ebb and flow of discussion flowed as minds adapted and bent to the teachers understanding.

When Justin Martyr tells of his personal history in studying philosophy he talks of "personally conversing" and later refers to his teaching experience with another philosopher as "intercourse" (Martyr *Dialogue of Justin* Chapter II). The image of interaction is therefore firmly established in the philosophical schools.

### 4.3.1.3.    A note on rhetoric

---

[30] This does not mean that Paul did not possess these skills or that he never used them but that it is unlikely as a common activity.

Here the focus is briefly on the works of Aristotle (384-322 BC) due to his influence on the Western Civilization as well as on church tradition (Osborne 1992:17).

Firstly the context of *rhetoric* within Aristotle's work is examined. Aristotle puts forward three contexts in which rhetoric is practised, these being "(1) political, (2) forensic, and (3) the ceremonial oratory of display" (Aristotle *Rhetoric* Book 1 Chap 3). This serves as the backdrop for an understanding of classic rhetoric which immerses itself primarily in the context of debate (political and forensic). It warrants pointing out that in the Ancient world speeches were also a source of entertainment where "rhetorical displays ranked with theatrical performances as great spectacles of entertainment" (Norrington 1996:21). It would be possible therefore to correlate the spectacle of some rhetoric with modern day cinemas or other entertainment mediums. This thesis also bears in mind that pagan religions did not perform regular speeches (Norrington 1996: 22). This thesis refers back to the homiletic agenda of instruction and exhortation and notes that if Aristotle's rhetorical contexts are consider then rhetoric (in this form) is not an entirely appropriate synergy.

Secondly this thesis now examines whether some form of interaction was normative in Aristotle's *Rhetoric.* Although most of the Aristotle's content is regarding the logic and delivery of an effective speech the contexts of debating and discussing political and legal issues warrants some form of interaction. Aware of this Aristotle dedicates a chapter to the issue of interaction. "Next as to Interrogation… In replying, you must meet ambiguous questions by drawing reasonable distinctions, not by a curt answer" (Aristotle *Rhetoric* Book III Chap 18). Although this is by no means the main agenda it can never the less be said that a) there is direct indication that interaction was part of his rhetoric and b) that the context of rhetoric put forward by Aristotle was often one of interaction (perhaps even deliberation).

Thirdly this thesis relates, as did Aristotle, Rhetoric to Dialectic. For Aristotle Rhetoric is not the sole agent of inquiry and presentation and so puts forward that "Rhetoric is the counterpart of Dialectic" (Aristotle *Rhetoric* Book 1 Chap 1). This is similar to this thesis' approach to move beyond speeches being the sole medium of homiletics and to engage other approaches. In Aristotle's work on refuting the sophists he states that their approach to persuasion was "best brought about by a certain manner of questioning and through the question" (Aristotle *On Sophistical Refutations* Section 2 Part 12). This confirms the nature of the tradition of philosophical debate in the previous section on the Hellenistic schools. Now as the above quote is a refutation of the Sophists it might be expected that Aristotle would try an alternative approach (other than the sophistic method of asking questions that is) but he rather chooses to refute them in the same medium "rejoin with the question" and to "question him as to some point wherein their doctrine is paradoxical to most people" (Aristotle *On Sophistical Refutations* Section 2 Part 12)

In conclusion it can be said that the link between classic rhetoric and common modern homiletic practice (meaning the delivery of speeches with no room for interaction) does not directly correlate, that Aristotle's *rhetoric* had elements of interaction and that other mediums of persuasion were known, practised and espoused by him.

## 4.4.    Tradition in the early church (to 500AD)

The second chapter of this thesis examined the manner of preaching within New Testament times. Holland in *The Preaching Tradition* (1980) corroborates this thesis' findings by stating that the "apostolic preaching must have been as personal and direct

as a private conversation" (Holland 1980: 20). Much like the New Testament epistles the writings' of the early fathers offers little clear evidence with regard to the homiletic method practised during this period (Wills 1984: 277, Holland 1980: 21). Below is a sampling of texts from these early fathers.

### 4.4.1.  The *Didache*

The *Didache*, which most date to the late first century (Louth 1987:189), speaks of apostles, prophets and teachers who are to be subject to "any tests or verifications" (*Didcahe* 2:11) and again to "test him and find out about him. You will be able to distinguish the true from the false" (*Didache* 2: 12). Are these related to his teaching? Is this to be done in public or private? Does it imply interaction or is it unrelated to teaching and preaching?

Later with regard to the assembly on the Lord's day the writer mentions the breaking of bread, confession and reconciliation of differences (*Didache* 2: 14). There is no direct reference to homily and seems in line with 1 Corinthians.

There is another section with regard to prophets and teachers but there is no indication of method. In that context the writer mentions that the church should "reprove one another" as well with regard to conversing (*Didache* 2: 15). Once again whether this is a reference to activities that take place within or outside of the assembly is unclear. And once again there seems to be a similarity to 1 Corinthians church practices.

### 4.4.2.  Clement

The First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, dated around 96 AD (Louth 1987: 30) talks with regard to "offering of gifts and public services" (Clement: 1 Corinthians 40) and refers to "they that present their gifts" (Clement: 1 Corinthians 40). Once again there is no certainty as to exact nature and method here. Later he mentions preaching but makes no attempt at describing the method (Clement: 1 Corinthians 42). Clement references Paul's epistle (verse 47) and later encourages them to mutually admonish one another (verse 56) and states that they are to "[l]earn to subordinate yourselves, curb those loud and overbearing speeches" (verse57). This implies that multiple persons where conducting speeches in the assembly and is reminiscent of Paul's charge for order in prophecy at the same Church (1 Cor 14:29).

### 4.4.3. Ignatius

The Epistles of Ignatius are dated between 98 and 117 AD (Louth 1987:55). In the Epistle to the Ephesians Ignatius commends them for refusing to give certain speakers a place in their hearing (Ignatius, Ephesians verse.6) and later how they refused to allow pernicious teaching to be dissemination among them by stopping their ears (Ignatius, Ephesians verse 9). Although this is hardly a clear passage or one that encourages what today would consider an open dialogue there is still the implication of the congregation expected to interact with the speaker (although here it is negative) as well as the informal nature of speaking within that context (that pernicious teachers would be allowed an opportunity to speak). He later talks of those who instruct others to practice what they preach (Ignatius, Ephesians verse 15). The manner of instruction is not recorded.

In the Epistle to the Romans Ignatius states that "the work we have to do is no affair of persuasive speaking" (Ignatius, Romans verse 3). This could imply a negative view of rhetoric or simply juxtaposing right action (in this case greatness in the face of persecution) against only speech.

In the Epistle to the Philadelphians Ignatius makes mention of the prophets proclaiming the Gospel in their preaching (Ignatius, Philadelphians verse 5). Once again no mention is made with regard to method. The designation of prophets in the plural could imply multiple speakers in one meeting or singular speakers over many assemblies. The evidence is inconclusive.

In Ignatius' letter to Polycarp there is talk of those in Polycarp's congregation as pupils (Ignatius to Polycarp verse 2) implying the teaching tradition of the Greeks. Later Polycarp is encouraged to preach publicly against sinful men (Ignatius to Polycarp verse 5). This could imply a public debate or to simply to declare a message publicly.

### 4.4.4.  Justin Martyr

Quoted below is what is considered to be the earliest (post-canonical)"full description"[31] of Christian Worship (Gibbard 1993: 7).

> And on the day called Sunday, all who live in cities or in the country gather together to one place, and the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read, as long as time permits; then, when the reader has ceased, the president verbally instructs, and exhorts to the imitation of these good things. Then we all rise together and pray, and, as we before said, when our prayer is ended, bread and wine and water are brought, and the

---

[31] The term of course "full description" can be debated and might simply mean the form that most resembles the modern day liturgy.

> president in like manner offers prayers and thanksgivings, according to his ability, and the people assent, saying Amen; and there is a distribution to each, and a participation of that over which thanks have been given (Martyr Apology 1 Chapter LXVII)

This text indicates homiletics as being central to the assembly (other early documents, for example *Didache*, do not indicate a homiletic event as being common). The nature of the "verbal instruction" or exhortation is unclear with regards to interaction. Does this follow the more common biblical pattern of interaction or is it a later development of a monologue based on the need for unity in doctrinal teaching? What is clear from this text is that the speaker is associated with authority in congregation and that whether the instruction was a monologue or dialogue does not affect the authority structure of the one delivering the message and the recipients of the message.

### 4.4.5. The rise of rhetoric

As the church expanded more and more into the Gentile world so the homily changed (Holland 1980: 22) and in the fourth and fifth centuries a major shift in homiletic theory developed with Stanfield supplying three reasons 1) Christianity became recognized and grew in popularity 2) rhetorical instruction became the culturally dominant field in schools at the time and 3) men who now preached were already trained in rhetoric in the secular sphere (Stanfield 1967: 51). Here the influence of rhetoric (as opposed to any other form of traditional thought) on preaching can be seen, as well as that this move was an adaptive church strategy to be more effective in the culture of the day.

> Before Augustine, there was a great scorn and fear for the use of classic rhetoric, taught and practised by secular culture, among the Latin Fathers. The Latin Father's strong rejection of rhetoric came from their misconception that rhetoric would have a tainting

effect on God's truth and gospel because of its extra- Christian use (Resner Jr. 1999:41). Some Greek Fathers, on the other hand, showed favour toward rhetoric. (Shin 2004: 28)

Then [4th Century AD] for the first time, if, perhaps, we except St. Cyprian, the art of oratory was applied to preaching. (Homiletics 2006)

This does not mean that aspects of rhetoric were not present (Stanfield 1967: 51) but rather that it was not fully embraced by Christianity. It is assumed that the nature of common homiletics (here distinguished from exceptional events) within the first three/four centuries was something other what has become (as will soon be seen) the standard approach of performing a speech.

Holland identifies two preachers who epitomize this embrace of rhetoric, Augustine and Chrysostom (Holland 1980: 23). Here this thesis briefly focus' on Augustine because his work *On Christian Teaching,* which was later published under the title *The Art of Preaching,* was widely used during the Middle Ages and little was added to the subject until the Reformation (Stanfield 1967: 52).

Augustine (354-430 AD) raises the question of whether it "is Lawful for a Christian Teacher to Use the Art of Rhetoric?" (Augustine *Book IV,* chap 2). Augustine, who was a professor of *rhetoric*, argues that *rhetoric* can either be used for good or bad and that Christians should use the most effective means available to them (Augustine *Book IV,* chap 2). This is an interesting argument as it implies three things 1) that *rhetoric* was not universally accepted at the time of writing otherwise there would be no need to raise the issue and 2) that the appeal to effective means of communication need not stop with *rhetoric* 3) Augustine does not defend *rhetoric* from a Scriptural stand point but merely refers to the pragmatic uses of *rhetoric.*

The second point implies the adaptive nature of the gospel to cultural norms and so here in the tradition of Augustine the reader is referred to the third chapter as to what the present culture deems effective in communication and instruction.

### 4.4.6.  Concluding on the early church tradition

In this section it has been seen that the move from common interaction (based on the second chapter) to the possibility of interaction (the tradition of the early church) towards the embrace of speech rhetoric and by implication the negation of interaction.

### 4.5.    Tradition from 500AD- 1 500 AD

As stated earlier, during the middle ages there was no significant development within homiletic theory.

Scholars state that the importance of preaching declined in this period (Stanfield 1967: 52; Holland 1980: 31-32) although the extent of that decline may be debated (Beecher 1910:1). De Kock (2001) pointed out that architecturally in the Middle Ages the sacramental table was central and the place of homily to the side while in the Reformation the pulpit was architecturally central and the sacramental table removed to the side. This architectural shift reflects the emphasis in the church with regard to homiletics and the sacraments.

Homiletic works were produced by Isidore of Seville (636 AD), who focused on rhetorical principles and Rabanus Maurus (776-856 AD) who followed Augustine "almost slavishly" (Stanfield 1967: 52).

In this period the preaching orders of the Dominicans and the Franciscans were established (Stanfield 1967: 52). Sermons were simple and powerful and some were even presented wholly in verse (Beecher 1910:1).

But the monologue was not the only tradition of preaching. For example, in addition to vagrant preaching the Lollard's "formed illicit conventicles, kept schools, wrote books and held disputation" (Gairdner 1908: 47). This was not limited to purely evangelical issues but also referred to textual expositions which where both privately and publicly debated (Gairdner 1908: 62). The Lollard's also developed what was called "reading circles" where Scriptures were read and ideas discussed (Williams 2004:1).

## 4.6.    The Reformation onwards

At the turn of the 16th century there was a renewed interest in the classics (Greek and Latin) as well as scholastic writing (Stanfield 1967: 52). The most important writer of this period, with regard to the subject matter of homiletics, was Desiederius Erasmus in his 1535 book *The Gospel preacher* which covers "discourse construction" (Stanfield 1967: 52). Once again the trend predominantly continues along the development of monologues associated with preaching.

Here this thesis will look to two "movements" that emerged from the Reformation, the Puritan and the Quaker Movement. What is presented here is merely a sampling of the relationship between homiletics with regard to the topic of interaction. This thesis has no intention to diminish the theological works and practices of this era that were monologue in nature but to investigate a lesser established tradition.

### 4.6.1. The Puritan movement

The Puritan movement started in England from the 1560's onward and was Protestant in nature and therefore emerged as a response (a protest) to the Roman Catholic Church. They were determined to rid themselves of the "rags of popery" and so a massive public education strategy was set in place to educate the people about the protestant way. As most of the people were illiterate they developed a folk theology that was very *ad hoc*. And so "Puritan preaching was designed to remedy this situation by making a strong, systematic, didactic element the centre of all church services" (Pearse and Matthews 1999: 93)

If an investigation were conducted that looked specifically at the defined homiletic works produced within the Puritan flow (for example William Perkin's *The Art of Prophesying,* Westminster Assembly *Directory of Public Worship*) the structured monologue would be seen to be dominant (Ryken 1986: 99-101). However if the approach of this thesis' is taken into account, namely that of homiletics as relating to equipping, training, correcting, discipling and then refer to activities of the Puritan era there would be seen an interactive tradition parallel to the monologue tradition (Collinson 1990: 375).

It can be noted that home meetings were a standard feature of the movement (Ryken 1986: 118) which was in light of the elevation of the laities role in this movement. Here they would confer together and especially with the minister (Collinson 1990: 377). They were known for not only reading and meditating on the Scriptures but in "talking to others about ones grasp of doctrine" (Ryken 1986: 124).

However the type of discussion was not only limited to home meetings but sometimes occurred "on the spot" immediately after the sermon was delivered (Collinson

1990: 380). Jesuit William Weston on attending "preaching exercises" commented on how people arrived with their bibles and after the sermon "held arguments also, among themselves, about the various meanings of texts" (Collinson 1990: 380). The nature of discussion taking place within homes and in other forums is therefore seen to have infiltrated into the main church meetings. It might be argued that the homily had already occurred and that what took place was something other than the homily, perhaps a discussion regarding the homily. It is assumed that this is how the Puritans themselves felt however if the Scriptures are allowed to stand over the traditional designation of the term homiletics then the whole event of speech and interaction after the speech can be seen to be part of a homiletic whole. The presentation, teaching, preaching and encouragement and so on are all part of homiletics, the public communication of a spiritual topic.

### 4.6.2.  The Quakers

Quakers had Puritan roots but soon emerged as a separate movement, even suffering persecution at Puritan hands (1986:12). Their practices have adapted over time and in different locations but here the focus is on some of their recorded practices with regard to the thesis topic.

In 1656 a group meeting at Balby, West Riding produced advice for church government within the Quaker movement.

> 4.-That as any are moved of the Lord to speak the word of the Lord at such meetings, that it be done in faithfulness, without adding or diminishing… (The epistle from the elders at Balbly, 1656)

This advice implied spontaneity in meetings where multiple "word[s] of the Lord" could be expected. The text goes on to instruct private correction if a person where to speak not of the "light" unless public correction where necessary. It was only in the 1880's and 1890's that the Quakers began to adopt a prepared sermon (Punshon 1986:202)

In 1871 David Duncan formed a group where after worship there was a "group discussion" ( 1986: 189).

In the roughly same time period in Indiana there was a Quaker group who aimed to allow for a greater participation of members beyond what was previously experienced (Punshon 1986: 1990).

This brief recounting allows this thesis to identify that an approach of interaction with regard to teaching and discipling was embraced by the movement in various settings.


4.6.3. Concluding on the Reformation and its children

To do justice to the nature and extent of interaction within any era would be a formidable task. Here the thesis has sufficed itself to give a very brief sampling of two Movements that fit within the evangelical tradition.

An overview of the era within the evangelical tradition is that preaching is consistently viewed as a monologue and that aspects of interaction are not developed within homiletic theory (Stanfield 1967: 53-54). And so it can be said that the dominant evangelical tradition, as it relates to the term homiletics, is one which does not favour an interactive format and has focused on the delivery of monologues.  However it can also

be said that interactive aspects of teaching and communication have also been part of the evangelical tradition.

4.7.    Evangelical preaching in the 20th century

Here this thesis references the work of JS Lakes in his doctoral dissertation *An Evaluation of Haddon Robinson's Homiletical Method* (Lake 2003). In his second chapter he evaluates the evangelical homiletic scene and states that, "The first half of the 20th century in America Homiletic theory was dominated by O*n the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons* by John A Broadus" (Lake 2003:   21-22). Here he references Dargan, Weatherspoon as well as Rose, who dubbed the first half of the last century the "Broadus era" (Lake 2003: 22).

After that a second era arose with the focus on the work of Grady Davis' *Design for Preaching* (Lake 2003: 22). A 1974 survey performed by Donald F Chatfield focused on what text books were used and it was Grady who came out tops (Lake 2003: 22).

The main distinction between Broadus and Davis was that Broadus focused on the construction of sermons while Davis preferred that a sermon be viewed as something that grew replacing words such as "structure" and "outline" with "design" and "sketch" (Lake 2003: 23). Both still adhere to the formation of a monologue presented by one person.

By the 1980's no single text book dominated (Lake 2003: 24) and yet a preference began to emerge between 1980 and 2001 within evangelical circles of using Haddon Robinson's *Biblical Preaching* (Lake 2003: 26). Once again the emphasis is clearly on the monologue.

From this it can be deduced that the dominant theme within evangelical homiletic theory is still the preparation and delivery of speeches.

4.8.    Current academic trends (the new homiletic)

> During the closing decades of the twentieth century, American homiletics was dominated by the so called ""New Homiletics,"" and now, during the first years of the new millennium, the emphasis has been moving further away from the modernist *logos* to a post-modern *poetics,* a further move to the listener: how faith is enacted by the listener.  (Immink 2004: 89)

Although the New Homiletic has been called into question by evangelical scholar DL Allen (2001) it has been affirmed by other scholars (for example Reid, Bullock and Fleer 1995). Here it is not the task of the thesis to theological critique the New Homiletic but to place it in the context of the homiletic tradition.

Craddock, who is credited with the birth of the New Homiletic (Allen 2001: 74), defines the monologue nature of homiletics as a weakness:

> In recent years a number of techniques have been employed to overcome a fundamental weakness in traditional preaching, its monological character. Without question, preaching increases in power when it is dialogical, when speaker and listener share in the proclamation of the Word (Craddock 1971, Chapter 1**)**

He goes on to explain how preachers have tried to solve this dilemma from interaction before and after the sermon (later developed by Mclure 1995) as well as during, using "forms of forums, dialogue between pulpit and lectern, press conference sermons, planned interruptions from the congregation, and other variations" (Craddock 1971, Chapter 1). These practices have not been further developed from a theological perspective of homiletic theory. Craddock saw the need to change homiletics into a

more effective medium for post-modernity but saw much of the problem in the preacher's comfort with the traditional methods.

> In the present atmosphere of open-ended dialogue, sermons in the classical tradition will less and less be accepted. This fact is unsettling to many preachers, of course, because in the traditional method, the preacher was safe, free from all the contingencies and threats of dialogue. (Craddock 1971, Chapter 2)

Craddock sought to move beyond this tradition but, as is know, Craddock did not develop a homiletic theory that sought to develop interaction in the verbal and tactile sense that this thesis is investigating but rather chose to develop an inductive approach to homiletics (Sweet 1999: 206).

Continuing in this vein others of the New Homiletic still chose to work within the tradition of preparation and delivery of a monologue but broke from tradition in the move away from more propositional and rational thought to a more poetic and experiential model (Reid et al 1995).

What is evident is that the recent tradition of homiletic theory is a move towards a greater engaging of the congregation within the homily. This thesis can then been seen as a proposal to begin to take seriously verbal and tactile interactivity in homiletics. This has been seen to be supported by Scripture, current cultural teaching trends and now can be seen as being in line with recent homiletic trends towards a greater engagement of the congregation.

## 4.9.    Current trends of Christian practice

A tradition in its most basic sense is that which is handed down (McGrath 2000: 141). The current generation therefore is in some sense establishing traditions for the next

generation. Here this thesis takes a brief look at Christian practices (as distinct form the previous chapter with focused on mainly secular practices) that are currently being established as traditions.

### 4.9.1. Barna's Research

George Barna (founder and director of The Barna Group) in his book "Revolution" (2006) discusses what he feels is "likely to be the most significant transition in the religious landscape that you will ever experience" (Barna 2006: viii). Here the focus is merely on a few elements that relate to the thesis topic.

4.9.1.1.   Barna acknowledges that we are in a post-modern world and that this there will be a shift from persuasive monologue to influence through dialogue (Barna 2006: 43).

4.9.1.2.   Barna emphasizes the need for people to participate in activities. "[P]eople expect to be active and creative participants in developing the reality of their experience" (Barna 2006: 46). Barna links this to the rise of small groups where people can more meaningfully interact. The setting that is being developed here is one that reflects the practices of Jesus and the early disciples who engaged in a predominantly in a process of interaction.

4.9.1.3.   Barna sees evangelism orientating towards faith based-conversations which he identifies as similar to the preaching of the early church (Barna 2006:23). Here Barna is seen to echo the findings of this surveys presented in the second chapter of this thesis. The distinction between this point and the previous one is the context (here he is referring to the context of unbelievers)

And so Barna points out the the trend within the church under his research is seen to be moving towards an verbal interactive (conversational) model of persuasion and instruction which correlates directly to the field of homiletics.

### 4.9.2.  The Emerging movement

Most emerging churches have evangelical roots (Carson 2005: 1) and has been defined as "not a theological confession nor an epistemological movement but an ecclesiological movement. It is about "how to do Church" in our age. Or, in the words of Gibbs-Bolger: how to practice the way of Jesus in post-modernity." (McKnight 2006:29)

> Emerging churches demonstrate a high level of participation at their worship gatherings as well as in discussion of issues and decisions making in relation to every aspect of the community's life and witness… Participation is not orchestrated but consists of both prepared and spontaneous contributions. (Gibbs and Bolger 2005: 172)

As stated in the introduction, the first book on preaching from the emerging church movement points in the direction of interaction (*Preaching Re-Imagined* by Doug Pagitt 2005). It talks of progressional dialogue that, "involves the intentional interplay of multiple viewpoints that leads to unexpected and unforeseen ideas" (Pagitt 2005: 52).

### 4.9.3.  Home Church movement

Another evangelical movement today (Atkerson 2005: 213) is the house church movement. Here the shift is again to greater participation of church members.

Meetings are aimed at being interactive (Atkerson 2005: 35- 52) with "teaching and preaching" incorporating aspects of interaction. Preaching is referred to as a monologue

(although it may contain interaction afterwards, Atkerson 2005:60) while teaching is said to be a "strictly dialogue" (Atkerson 2005: 60). It is teaching that is said to be more normative for the Sunday gatherings (Atkerson 2005: 60) and therefore the designation of teaching to be the normal practice of homiletics that occurs in these church gatherings. People are free to question what is being taught (Atkerson 2005: 58). Added to this Atkerson makes mention that it is normal for there to be multiple teachers on a given day (Atkerson 2005: 35).

### 4.9.4.  Conclusions on current trends

It can be seen from the trends mentioned above that there is a move toward greater participation and that this leads to greater interaction within the homily. Once again the reader is reminded that it is not the intention of this thesis to develop a polemic against the monologue but to act as an expansion of the current homiletic theory into areas of interaction.

These fledgling traditions are another indication of the necessity of this move toward an interactive homiletic and the further investigation into these areas.

### 4.10.  Concluding tradition

The classic traditions of both Jews and Greeks contain aspects of interaction. This is of considerable interest to the development of an evangelical homiletic with its emphasis on understanding the Scriptures within the culture of their day.

The tradition of the early church was not clear from a direct reading of the sources yet this thesis was able to ascertain through implication and from secondary sources the early interactive nature of homiletics and its move towards the monologue.

The tradition recorded in the Middle Ages pointed towards the continuation of preaching as a monologue yet there was a lesser a tradition of interaction in certain circles.

The tradition of the Reformation to the 20th Century continued to see preaching as a monologue however there was a lesser noted tradition of interaction when viewing homiletics from the perspective of this thesis.

The tradition in the 20th century was also dominated by the monologue and this led to the rise of the field called religious education (Farley 1996:40-41) which developed, in part, interaction into the discipling process. The late 20th Century saw the rise of the New Homiletic within the academic setting which has been seen as addressing the need to engage the congregation to a greater or lesser extent.

The most recent Christian trends (and by implication traditions in their early stages) point toward an interactive homiletic and it is assumed (based on the assessment of the post-modern culture) that these trends will continue.

Out of the three sources of theology the tradition seems to be the most negative with regard to homiletic interaction. This is noted as taking place from around the fourth century to the present age yet there is still room for interaction within this tradition dominated by the monologue. If a search is broadened for homiletics to include aspects of the homiletic agenda (discipling, teaching, communication) it can be seen that despite its lack of support (in the theory and cultural understanding of homiletics) that interaction

has never the less been part of that tradition from a church practice perspective. The latest moves within homiletics from a church practice perspective (here defined as distinct from academic theory) are towards areas of interaction.

Therefore the extent of interaction within the dominant tradition of Christianity has been minimal from a homiletic theory perspective but never the less existing within church homiletic practice.

Here the reader is referred back to the emphasis of the evangelical theological tradition to be sceptical of tradition and to affirm that the Scriptures are in fact the final authority. It is to the interplay of these three sources (with Scripture as the norming norm) that the final chapter now turns to.

CHAPTER 5: THE CONCLUSION

### 5.1. Introduction

The main research question that this thesis has addressed is, "What is the theological basis for Interactive Homiletics?"

To investigate this the thesis turned to the three sources of theology put forward by Grenz and Franke (2001) namely Scripture, Culture and Tradition. Homiletics has been defined as "a discourse or discussion which within the Christian discipline refers to a spiritual topic" and the thesis further defined the homiletic agenda to be in consonance with that of education.

The investigation has focused on a specific practice of sermon delivery, namely verbal and tactile interaction between preacher and congregation.

The sources that have been put forward are in a continuous state of interplay with each other and certain sources are more authoritative than others. In the context of evangelical theology the Scriptures have been established as the one source that carries the final authority and of the remaining two sources tradition is the one that carries the least weight.

### 5.2. The ground that has been covered
### 5.2.1. The Scriptures

In examining the homiletic practice (with regard to interaction) of Jesus and the early disciples it was established that interaction was normal and in fact can be seen to be the

dominant form. If the church is to follow the practice of Jesus and the early disciples then interactive homiletics is something that definitely needs to be further developed and is an area of homiletics that cannot be ignored.

It is well validated from this source and as stated in the chapter dedicated to the Scriptures warrants further investigation in what promises to be fertile soil with in our culture, the subject that will now be addressed.

### 5.2.2.  The Culture

This chapter established that interaction was normative in the educational environment and that there is a growing move in that direction. From this source interactive homiletics is well validated. There was seen to be a noted  move toward learner centred education which is on the rise although there is the understanding that there will always be a place for teacher centred learning.

Naturally the church does not need to accept and embrace all that is discussed within secular educational circles (there is and will continue to be ongoing debate within the field itself). However this identifiable trend in effective communications and education cannot be ignored on the grounds of pandering to the Culture, because the practice of interaction can be seen to be in line with the Scriptures. If the Scriptures were proved to be against interactive homiletics as a medium, if the questions and answers and conversations where not a part of the scriptural story, then and only then would the proponent of interactive homiletics be said to be pandering to culture. But that is simply not the case.

In short the church in the first world exists in a post-modern culture that expects and is most effective when interaction is a part of the educational/transformational/communication process and as the church we have the Scriptural witness of Jesus and the early disciples that further affirms this.

## 5.2.3.  The Tradition

The dominant tradition of evangelical homiletic theory is not aimed at interaction and has focused on the monologue. However, the classical Christian tradition (defined within in this thesis as the era surrounding the writing of the canonical New Testament) is inclusive of interaction and the current trends can be seen as a move in the direction of interaction.

From the tradition of evangelical church practice perspective (as opposed to homiletic theory) there can be seen to be interactive elements, although it may have not been practised under the banner of homiletics at the time.

Even if the connections sited by this thesis between homiletics and interaction (within Tradition) were to be argued against it would not invalidate interactive homiletics within evangelical theology which places each theological issue under the court of Scripture (McGrath A 2000:30). As has been seen the Scripture (as well as Culture) is prevailing in its support of interaction.

## 5.3.    Some observations

Therefore the theological basis for interactive homiletics is well supported by elements observed in the sources, namely:

5.3.1.  Jesus' homiletic practice was largely interactive.

5.3.2.  The early disciples homiletic practice was largely interactive.

5.3.3.  The classic synagogue tradition was largely interactive.

5.3.4.  The classic Greek teaching practice was largely interactive.

5.3.5.  The teaching practice in today's post-modern culture is largely interactive.

5.3.6.  Communication Theory points to interaction as being necessary.

5.3.7.  Church Practice in History indicates the practice of interaction.

5.3.8.  Church practice today is moving towards greater incorporation of interaction.

5.3.9.  Current trends in homiletic theory have interactive leanings (The new homiletic).

Some may feel that these elements have been effectively developed under the theological field of "religious education" and should be kept distinct from "homiletics". If this is the case then theological tradition (the current designated fields of theology) are superseding Scripture which makes no such distinction. This thesis has shown that there is scope in the Scriptures both lexically (taking the most commonly used homiletic term used in favour of a monologue, *kerygma*) and textually (looking at what the practices were that the New Testament writers recorded in association with homiletic terms) for interaction. Not only would there result in a confusion of terms (persons reading into the "teaching" and "preaching" texts of the New Testament a monologue form which is not accurate) but there would be an increased discrepancy between biblical church meeting practices and modern church practices. The evangelical tradition has placed the homily,

or sermon, as central to our Sunday community meetings. If the homily remains purely a monologue the discrepancy between New Testament church meeting practices and our current practices will continue to grow and there will be an expectation for more works to emerge querying the importance of the homily itself (for example Norrington 1996). However if interactive homiletics is ebraced, a synergy can emerge, and a deeper reliance and understanding of Scriptural homiletics can be forged.


### 5.4.    Future research

As this thesis was defined as an investigation into the theological validity of a homiletic practice, and was not itself intending to develop a theology, this concluding chapter now turns to possible areas of further development within the practice of interactive homiletics.

Is there the possibility of developing a homiletic theology of interaction to include the traditional monologue? Here interaction would naturally not follow the strict definition applied to this thesis and broaden to include such elements that could stand alongside the delivery of monologue (for example the cognitive and emotional interaction between the monologue deliverer and the listener).

What are the processes and educational purposes of questions and answers including the necessity and development of a conducive learning environment and skills? What can we learn from the Scriptural approach to this and how would that be applied in today's world?

What is the Scriptural approach as it relates between learner centred and teacher centred educational models? Was Jesus teacher-centred or learner-Centred? Would this

shed light on Jesus' obtuse teaching methods at times (parables, mysterious statements, unanswered questions)? Were the early disciples teacher-centred or learner-Centred? Should there be a distinction between Jesus teaching and ours (and the early disciples) teaching? i.e., Does the incarnation allow Jesus certain methodological liberties that are beyond our limited capabilities?

As this thesis has championed for the inclusion of interactive as well as monologue homilies there could be further investigation into what is the Scriptural (as well as Cultural) relation between content and these forms of presentation. Which form is best suited and under what circumstances should it be applied?

This is just a sampling of further investigations and as this is a relatively untapped avenue there is expected to be a diversity of perspectives and approaches to be developed.

### 5.5.    Final conclusions

It can be said that interactive homiletics (as defined by this thesis) is well validated from a theological perspective. It is supported by Scripture, current to our cultural context (post-modernity) and is line with the trajectory of Christian practice found within the Christian Tradition.

To negate interactive homiletics would be to negate the final authority of evangelical theology, the Scriptures. If evangelicals are to be true to our theological heritage of allowing the Scriptures to influence our practice and theories then we are compelled to embrace interaction as a part of our homiletic theory and practice.

To negate interactive homiletics would also be a further move away from cultural relevance and although this distancing from culture may be necessary in certain regards (for example embracing religious relativism) it cannot be an option here where the Scriptures themselves support the concept. This is an area of synergy between Scripture and Culture and so warrants our embrace.

Homiletics that engages the congregation in verbal and tactile interaction is therefore not only validated theologically but needs to be put forward as an integral element of homiletic theory in our times.

Works cited

Allen DL 2001. Online article, "Preaching and Postmodernism: An Evangelical Comes to the Dance". Available at http://www.sbts.edu/resources/publications/sbjt/2001/2001Summer6.pdf.

Anderson KC 1997. *"Global" Preaching: A Paradigm for Preaching Cross Cultural Change.* Available at http://homepage.mac.com/kentoncanderson/preaching.org/Global%20Preaching.pdf. 2006-10-03.

Andragogy 2006. Online article. Available at  http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Abdragogy. 2006-10-28.

Aristotle *Rhetoric* Book I, II & III. Translated by W. Rhys Roberts, 1954 . Available at http://www.public.iastate.edu/~honeyl/Rhetoric/download.html. 2007-06-25.

_____ *On Sophistical Refutations* Translated by W. A. Pickard. Available at http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/sophist_refut.2.2.html. 2007-06-25

Ascher RS 1966 article "Methods and Techniques in Teacher Development" in *Educational Technology*. November issue.

Atkerson S (ed) 2005. *Ekklesia: To the Roots of Biblical House Church life.* Atlanta, Georgia: NTRF.

Barna G 2006. *Revolution.* Vereeniging, South Africa: Christian Art Publishers.

Barr J 1975. *The Semantics of Biblical Language.* London, England: Oxford University Press.

Beck C 1993 article "Postmodernism, Pedagogy, And the Philosophy of Education" available at http://www.ed.uiuc.edu/EPS/PES-yearbook/93_docs/BECK.HTM

Beecher PA 1910 article "Dedicated to the Sacred Heart of Jesus Christ" first published in *The Catholic Encyclopedia, Volume VII*.. New York: Robert Appleton Company. Nihil Obstat, June 1, 1910. Remy Lafort, S.T.D., Censor. Imprimatur. +John Cardinal Farley, Archbishop of New York. Available at http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/07443a.htm. 2007-14-04

Berkhof L 1992 (original 1950). *Principles of Biblical Interpretation.* Grand Rapids: Michigan: Baker Book House

Berkley JD (gen ed) 1994. *Leadership Handbooks of Practical Theology. Vol. 1: Word and Worship.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House.

Bertens H 1995. *The Idea of the Postmodern.* London and New York: Routledge.

Best E 1988. *Mark: The Gospel as Story*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Bloesch DG, 1973. *The Evangelical Renaissance.* London, England: Hodder and Stoughton.

Bradford LP and Gibb JR 1953. Article "Developments in Group Behavior in Adult Education" in *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 23, No. 3, Adult Education. (Jun., 1953), pp. 233-247. Available at http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0034-6543%28195306%2923%3A3%3C233%3ADIGBIA%3E2.0.CO%3B2-M.

Broadus JA 1994 (revised edition original 1870). *On the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons*. Hodder and Stoughton

Brueggemann W 1989. *Finally Comes the Poet: Daring Speech for Proclamation.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Buttrick D 1987. *Homiletic: Moves and Structures.* London, England: SCM Press Ltd.

_____ DG 1992 Foreword to *Preaching Sermons that Connect.* Loscalzo CA. Illinois: InterVarsity Press.

Camery-Hoggart J 1995. *Speaking of God.* Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers.

Campenhausen H von 1969. *The Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries.* London, England: Adam and Charles Black.

Carson DA 2005. Article "The Emerging Church" in *Modern Reformation Magazine,* (July / August 2005 Issue, Vol. 14.4) Available at http://www.modernreformation.org/dac05emerging.htm.

Chalke S 2000. *He Never said …Discover the real message of Jesus.* London, Sydney, Auckland: Hodder and Stoughton.

Childs B 1979.  *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Clement *The First Epistle Clement* 1968. Translated by Staniforth M in *Early Christian Writings.* London; Penguin Books.

Cobb JB 1990 article *Two Types of Postmodernism: Deconstructive and Process* in *Theology Today –Vol. 47, No 2 July 1990.*

Collinson P 1990. *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Combrink HJB, 1996 "The Synoptic Problem" in *Guide to the New Testament IV*. Johannesburg South Africa: Orion Publishers.

Craddock FB 1971. *As One Without Authority.* Chapter 1 available at http://www.religion-online.org/showchapter.asp?title=797&C=985; Chapter 2 available at www.religion-online.org/showchapter.asp?title=797&C=986.

Cross KP 1981. *Adults as Learners: Increasing Participation and Facilitating Learning.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Davenport J 1993 article "Is there any way out of the andragogy morass?" in *Culture and Processes of Adult Learning* Thorpe M, Edwards R and Hanson A (eds). London and New York: Routledge.

Davis, H. Grady, 1967 "Sermon Structure and Design." In *Baker's Dictionary of Practical Theology* Turnbull (ed). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House.

de Kock W 2001. Unpublished lecture notes. Open Seminary Lectures (Durban, 16-20 July 2001).

Dodd CH 1946. *The Johannine Epistles (Moffat NT Commentary).* New York, Evaston and London: Harper & Row Publishers. Available at http://www.archive.org/download/johannineepistles012044mbp/ johannineepistles012044mbp_djvu.txt

_____ CH 1964. *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments.* Available at http://www.religion-online.org/showbook.asp?title=539 on October 2006.

*Didache* 1968. Translated by Staniforth M in *Early Christian Writings.* London; Penguin Books.

Du Plooy JL and Kilian CJG 1984. *Introduction to Fundamental Pedagogics.* Johannesburg: HAUM Educational Publishers.

du Toit  AB 1996 "General Introduction to the Gospels" in *Guide to the New Testament IV*. Johannesburg South Africa: Orion Publishers.

_____ AB (ed.) 1996. *Guide to the New Testament IV*. Johannesburg South Africa: Orion Publishers.

EHS Statement of Faith 2007. Online Article. Available at http://www.ehomiletics.com/sof.php on April 2007

Farley E 1996 article "Can church education be theological education?" in *Theological Perspectives on Christian Formation* Astley J, Francis LJ and Crowder C (eds). Grand Rapids Michigan: W.B. Eerdmans Publishing Company

Fielding M 1997. *Effective Communication in Organizations; Preparing Messages that Communicate; 2nd Edition.* Kenwyn, South Africa: Juta & Co. Ltd.

Foltz NT 1986. *Handbook of Adult Religious Education.* Birmingham Alabama: Religious Education Press.

Ford DF 1997 article "System, Story, Performance: A Proposal about the Role of Narrative in Christian Systematic Theology" in *Why Narrative.* Hauerwas S and Jones L (editors). Eugene, Origen: Wipf and Stock Publishers.

Frei H 1974. *Eclipse of the Biblical Narrative.* New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Gaddy DG and Pritchard D 1985. *When Watching Religious TV is Like Attending Church*. Originally published in "Journal of Communication: Winter 1985". Referenced in "Communication Semiotics" Oosthuizen LM (ed). Pretoria, South Africa: UNISA.

Gall MD and Gillett M 1980. Article "The Discussion Method in Classroom Teaching" in *Theory into Practice*, Vol. 19, No. 2, Teaching Methods: Learning Applications. (Spring, 1980), pp. 98-103. Available at http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0040-5841%28198021%2919%3A2%3C98%3ATDMICT%3E2.0.CO%3B2-V.

Gairdner J 1908. *Lollardy and the Reformation in England Vol 1.* New York: Burt Franklin.

Gibbard SM 1993. article "Liturgy as Proclamation of the Word" in *Studies in Early Christianity.* Ferguson E, Scholer DM and Finnry PC (eds.) New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc.

Gibbs E and Bolder RK 2005. *Emerging Churches.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic.

Goppelt L 1981. *Theology of the New Testament Vol 1.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Grant R 1992. *Preaching As if One-On-One* in "Leadership Handbook of Practical Theology. Vol .1 Word and Worship". Berkley JD (Gen. Ed. 1992)

Green M 1993. Online article, "The Plays and Ploys of Postmodernism" available at
http://www.ed.uiuc.edu/EPS/PES-yearbook/93_docs/Greene.HTM

Grenz SJ 1996.*A Primer on Postmodernism.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

_____ 2000 article "Articulating the Christian Belief-Mosaic: Theological Method after the Demise of Foundationalism" in *Evangelical Futures* Stackhouse JG (ed). Vancouver, Canada: Regent College Publishing.

_____ and Franke JR 2001. *Beyond Foundationalism, Shaping Theology in a Postmodern Context .* Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press.

_____, Guretzki D and Nordling CF 1999. *Pocket Dictionary of Theological Terms* Downers Groove, Illinois: Inter Varsity Press.

_____ and Olson RE 1992. *20th Century Theology* Illinois, USA: Inter Varsity Press.

_____ and Olson RE 1996. *Who Needs Theology? An Invitation to the Study of God.* Downers Grove Illinois: Intervarsity Press.

Hauerwas S 2004. *Performing the Faith.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: Brazos Press.

_____ and Willimon 1996. *Where Resident Aliens Live.* Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Henson KT 1980. Article "Teaching Methods: History and Status" in *Theory into Practice*, Vol. 19, No. 1, Teaching Methods: Designs for Learning. (Winter, 1980), pp. 2-

5. Available at http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0040-5841%28198024%2919%3A1%3C2%3ATMHAS%3E2.0.CO%3B2-A.

Hipps S 2005. *The Hidden Power of Electronic Culture.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.

Holland DT 1980. *The Preaching Tradition.* Nashville: Abingdon.

Homiletics 2006. Online article. Available at http://wikipedia.org/wiki/Homiletics. 2006-10-28

Lister I 1989. Article "Review: Education and Schooling in Post-Industrial Society; Reviewed Work(s): *Teach Your Own* by John Holt, *Flexischooling* by Roland Meighan and *Learning Relations* by Doreen Grant" in *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, Vol. 10, No. 4. (1989), pp. 501-506. Available at http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0142-5692%281989%2910%3A4%3C501%3AEASIPS%3E2.0.CO%3B2-P.

Ignatius *Epistle to the Ephesians; Epistle to the Romans, Epistle to the Philadelphians; Epistle to Polycarp* 1968. Translated by Staniforth M in *Early Christian Writings.* London; Penguin Books.

Immink FG 2004. Online article, "The Current Debate". Available at http://www.degruyter.de/journals/ijpt/2004/pdf/8_89.pdf

Justin Martyr *Dialogue of Justin Philosopher and Martyr, with Trypho, a Jew* Available on CD ROM Christian Classics Ethereal Library 2000 link file:///E:/CCEL/FATHERS2/ANF01/ANF0148.HTM#P4043_787325

Kappelman T 2001. Onlien article, "Marshall McLuhan: The Medium is the Message" available at http://www.leaderu.com/orgs/probe/docs/mcluhan.html

Keck LE 1992. *The Bible in the Pulpit.* Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Kittel G (ed.) 1965. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Kiyosaki RT 2003 (First International Mass marketing Print: first released 1998). *Cashflow Quadrant*. New York: Warner Books.

Kolb AY and Kolb DA 2005. Online article, 'Learning styles and learning spaces" available at www.learningfromexperience.com/images/uploads/Learning-styles-learning-spaces.pdf

Lake JS 2003. *An Evaluation of Haddon Robinson's Homiletical Method: An Evangelical Perspective.* Doctoral dissertation, University of South Africa. Available at http://etd.unisa.ac.za/ETD-db/ETD-desc/describe?urn=etd-06082004-092033

Lee D 1999. article *Luke's Stories of Jesus: Theological Reading of Gospel Narrative and the Legacy of Hans Frei.* Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Lindbeck G 1984. *The Nature of Doctrine: Religion and Theology in the Postliberal age.* Philadelphia: Westminster Press.

Livingstone R 1996. "Introduction" in *Plato, Portrait of Socrates: The Apology, Crito, and Phaedo.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Long TG 1989. *The Witness of Preaching.* Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/ John Knox Press.

Longnecker BW 2002. *Narrative Dynamics in Paul. A Critical Assesment.* London: Westminster John Knox Press.

Loscalzo CA 1992. *Preaching Sermons that Connect.* Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press.

Louth A 1987 *Early Christian Writings.* England. Penguin Books.

Lowry E 1989. *How to Preach a Parable.* Nashville, Abingdon Press.

Lundin R (editor) 1997 *Disciplining Hermeneutics.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B Eerdmans Publishing Company.

_____ 1997. 'Introduction" in *Disciplining Hermeneutics.* Lundin R (editor), Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B Eerdmans Publishiing Company.

McDonald JIH 1980. *Kerygma and Didache.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McGrath AE 2000. Article "Evangelical Theological Method: The State of the Art" in *Evangelical Futures: A Conversation on Theological Method*. Stackhouse JG (Ed.). Grand Rapdids, Michigan: Baker Book House.

_____ 2000. Article "Engaging the Great Tradition"  in *Evangelical Futures: A Conversation on Theological Method* (2000), Stackhouse JG Jnr (editor) USA: Baker Books, Inter-Varsity Press and Regent College Publishers.

McKnight EV 1978. *Meaning in Texts.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press

McKnight S 2006. Online article, *"What is the Emergent Church?"*. Available at http://www.jesusvolgen.nl/nederlanderverander/whatistheemergingchurch_mcknight.pdf

McLagan P and Nel C 1995. *The Age of Participation.* San Francisco: Berret-Koehler Publishers.

McLaren B 2003. Online article, "The Three Postmodernisms: A Short Explanation"*.* Available at http://www.anewkindofchristian.com/archives/000071.html

McLuhan M 1975. Article "McLuhan's Laws of the Media" in *Technology and Culture*, Vol. 16, No. 1. (Jan., 1975), pp. 74-78. Available at http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0040-165X%28197501%2916%3A1%3C74%3AMLOTM%3E2.0.CO%3B2-0

McLure JS 1995. *The Roundtable Pulpit.* Nashville, USA: Abingdon Press

Maguire JT 1980. *Review of Religious Research,* Vol.22, No. 1 (Sep., 1980), pp. 60-65 available on http://links.jstor/sici?.sici=0034-673X%28198009%2922%3A1%3C60%3AASOPSH%3E2.0.CO%3B2-K

Martyr J 2000. *Apology* 1, 1 Chapter LXVII. Christian Classics Ethereal Library (CD ROM)

_____ 2000. *Dialogue of Justin* Chapter II. Christian Classics Ethereal Library (CD ROM)

Marzano RJ 1993. Article "How Classroom Teachers Approach the Teaching of Thinking" in *Theory into Practice*, Vol. 32, No. 3, Teaching for Higher Order Thinking. (Summer, 1993), pp.154-160. Available at http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0040-5841%28199322%2932%3A3%3C154%3AHCTATT%3E2.0.CO%3B2-6.

Matthews VH 1997. *Manners and Customs of the Bible.* Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers.

Nikandrov ND 1990. Article "Teaching Methods: Tradition and Innovation" in *International Review of Education / Internationale Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft* (1990), pp. 251-260. Available at http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0020-8566%281990%2936%3A2%3C251%3ATMTAI%3E2.0.CO%3B2-2.

Norrington DC 1996. *To Preach or Not to Preach.* Carlisle, Cumbria: Paternoster Press.

Oliva PF and Henson KT 1980. Article "What Are the Essential Generic Teaching Competencies?" in *Theory into Practice*, Vol. 19, No. 2, Teaching Methods: Learning Applications. (Spring, 1980), pp. 117-121. Available at http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0040-5841%28198021%2919%3A2%3C117%3AWATEGT%3E2.0.CO%3B2-K.

Osborne R 1992. *Philosophy for Beginners.* New York: Writers and Readers Publishing.

Packer JI 1983. Article "Infallible Scripture and the Role of Hermeneutics" in *Scripture and Truth* (1983) Carson DA and Woodbridge JD (editors). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Academie Books; Zondervan Publishing House.

Pagitt D 2005. *Preaching Re-Imagined.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing.

Pedagogy 2006. Online article. Available at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pedagogy. 2006-11-11

Piek GC 1984. *General Didactics.* Pretoria, South Africa: de Jager- HAUM Publishers.

Pinnock CH 1985. *The Scripture Principle.* London, Sydney, Auckland, Toronto: Hodder and Stoughton.

_____ and Brown D 1990. *Theological Crossfire.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House.

_____ 1992. Article "Response to John F Walvoord" in *Four Views of Hell*. Crockett WV (ed.). Grand rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House.

_____ 2006. "How I Use the Bible in Doing Theology". Online article. Available at http://www.religion-online.org/showartcile.asp?title=9

Placher WC."Hans Frei and the Meaning of Biblical Narrative" Online article. Available at http://www.religion-online.org...

Pradis 2005. CD-ROM of Expositor's Bible Commentary, Acts/Exposition of Acts/Part II. The Christian Mission to the Gentile World (12:25-28:31)/Panel 6-To Jerusalem and Thence to Rome (19:21-28:31)/B. The Journey to Jerusalem (19:23-21:16)/3. The raising of Eutychus (20:7-12), Book Version: 4.0.2

_____ 2005. CD-ROM of *Expositor's Bible Commentary,* Colossians/Exposition of Colossians/V. Appeal for Christian Living (3:1-4:6)/B. Guidelines for the Christian Life (3:5-4:6)/2. Virtues of the new life to be cultivated (3:12-17)/c. The indwelling of Christ's word (3:16), Book Version: 4.0.2

Preaching 2006. Online article. Available at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Preaching. 2006-10-10.

Punshon J 1986. *Portrait in Grey: A Short History of the Quakers.* London: Quaker Home Service.

Rankin OS 1993. Article "The Extent of the Influence of the Synagogue Service upon Christian Worship" in *Early Christianity and Judaism.* Ferguson E (editor). New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc.

Reid R, Bullock J and Fleer D 1995. Article "Preaching as the Creation of Experience: The Not-So-Rational revolution of the New Homiletic" in *Communication and Religion* (March, 1995). Available at http://gcc.bradley.edu/com/faculty/lamoureux/rsca/jcratchive/jcr95/reidetalpreaching.html

Rhoads and Michie 1982. *Mark as Story: an introduction to the narrative of a Gospel*. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Rhetoric 2008. Online article. Available at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rhetoric. 2008-01-05.

Ricouer P 1976. *Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning.* Fort Worth, Texas: The Texas Christian University Press.

Robinson HW 2005 (6th Printing). *Biblical Preaching.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Publishing Group.

Ryken L 1986. *Worldly Saints: The Puritans as They Really Were.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: Academie Books.

Samuelowicz K and Bain JD 2001. Article "Revisiting Academics' Beliefs about Teaching and Learning" in *Higher Education*, Vol. 41, No. 3. (Apr., 2001), pp. 299-325. Available at http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0018-1560%28200104%2941%3A3%3C299%3ARABATA%3E2.0.CO%3B2-9.

Sarno RA 1987. *Using Media in Religious Education.* Birmingham, Alabama: Religious Education Press.

Sebeok T 1995 article "Communication" in *Communication Semiotics* Oosthuizen LM (compiled by). Pretoria: University of South Africa.

Senge P, Kleiner A, Roberts C, Ross RB and Smith BJ 1994. *The Fifth Discipline Fieldbook.* London: Nicholas Brealey Publishing.

Senge P 1997 article "Building Learning Organizations" in *Organization Theory: Fourth Edition.*  Pugh DS (ed). London, England: Penguin Books.

Sermon 2006. Online article. Available at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sermon. 2006-08-15.

Shepherd MH 1993. Article "The Origin of the Churches Liturgy" in *Studies in Early Christianity.* Ferguson E, Scholer DM and Finnry PC (eds.) New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc.

Shin SW 2004. *Paul's use of Ethos and Pathos in Galatians: Its Implications for Effective Preaching.*   Available at http://upetd.up.ac.za/thesis/available/etd-10052004-105545/unrestricted/01tthesis.pdf

Sim S and Van Loon B 2001. *Introducing Critical Theory.* Duxford, Cambridge: Icon Books.

Sleeth RE 1986. *God's Word and Our Words: Basic Homiletics.* Atlanta: John Knox Press.

Stanfield VL 1967. Article "The History of Homiletics" in *Bakers Dictionary of Practical Theology* Turnbull (ed). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House.

Stott J 1982. *I Believe in Preaching.* London, England: Hodder & Stoughton

Stowers SK 1981. *The Diatribe and Paul's Letter to the Romans.* Chico California: Scholars Press.

_____ 1984. Article "Social Status, Public Speaking and Private Teaching: The Circumstances of Paul's Preaching Activity" in *Novum Testamentum*, Vol. 26, Fasc. 1. (Jan., 1984), pp. 59-82. Available at http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0048-1009%28198401%2926%3A1%3C59%3ASSPSAP%3E2.0.CO%3B2-T

Strom M 1997. *Conversing Across the Ages.* Available at http://library.uws.edu.au/adt-NUWS/uploads/approved/adt-NUWS20030708.120607/public/05Chapter4.pdf

Swank 1981. *Dialogic Style in Preaching.* Valley Forge: Judson Press.

Sweet L 1999. *SoulTsunami.* Grand Rapids, USA : Zondervan Publishing House.

Taylor M 2005. Article "Postmodern Pedagogy: Teaching and Learning with Generation NeXt" in *MCLI Forum* volume 9, Spring 2005.

*The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Third Edition* 1996 by Houghton Mifflin Company. Electronic version licensed from INSO Corporation. (Editors unspecified on software)

*The epistle from the elders at Balbly, 1656*. Available at www.qhpress.org/texts/balby.htm 2007-03-05

Thiselton AC (co-author) 1999 "Communicative Action and Promise in Hermeneutics" in *The Promise of Hermeneutics.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B Eerdmans Publishiing Company.

Tillich P 1964. *Systematic Theology: Volume One.* London: William Clowes and Sons Ltd.

Van Voorst ER 1990. *Building Your New Testament Greek Vocabulary.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Vermes G 1995. *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English.* London, England: Penguin Books.

Wechkama B translated By Paul DeNeui delivered to Fuller Theological Seminary 2001. Available at http://www.thaicov.org/resources/contextualize/voices_4.html

Wickett REY 1991. *Models of Adult Religious Education.* Birmingham Alabama: Religious Education Press.

Williams SM 2004. Online article, "The Lollards" Available at http://www.anabaptistnetwork.com/node/28

_____ 2005. Online article, "Interactive Preaching". Available at http://www.ananbaptistnetwork.com/node/322

Wills L 1984. *The Form of the Sermon in Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christianity* in *The Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 77, No. 3/4. (Jul. - Oct., 1984), pp. 277-299. Available at http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0017-8160%28198407%2F10%2977%3A3%2F4%3C277%3ATFOTSI%3E2.0.CO%3B2-Z

Wilson MR 1999. *Our Father Abraham: Jewish Roots of the Christian Faith*. Grand rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing Company & Dayton, Ohio: Centre for Judaic-Christian Studies.

Witherington  B 3ʳᵈ 1995. *Conflict and Community in Corinth.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Wittengesntein L 1958. *The Blue and Brown Books.* Composed from his 1934-1935 lectures. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Yoder JH 2002. *Preface to Theology.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: Brazos Press