

2-10-2016

Developing an Applied Semiotics of Prophetic Perceptuality

Mark John Chironna

George Fox University, mchironna13@georgefox.edu

This research is a product of the Doctor of Ministry (DMin) program at George Fox University. [Find out more](#) about the program.

Recommended Citation

Chironna, Mark John, "Developing an Applied Semiotics of Prophetic Perceptuality" (2016). *Doctor of Ministry*. Paper 125.
<http://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/dmin/125>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Digital Commons @ George Fox University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctor of Ministry by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ George Fox University. For more information, please contact arolf@georgefox.edu.

GEORGE FOX UNIVERSITY

DEVELOPING AN APPLIED SEMIOTICS OF PROPHETIC
PERCEPTUALITY

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF GEORGE FOX EVANGELICAL SEMINARY
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF MINISTRY

By

MARK J. CHIRONNA

PORTLAND, OREGON

FEBRUARY 2016

George Fox Evangelical Seminary
George Fox University
Portland, Oregon

CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL

DMin Dissertation

This is to certify that the DMin Dissertation of

Mark J. Chironna

has been approved by
the Dissertation Committee on February 10, 2016
for the degree of Doctor of Ministry in Semiotics and Future Studies.

Dissertation Committee:

Primary Advisor: Loren Kerns, PhD

Secondary Advisor: AJ Swoboda, PhD

Lead Mentor: Leonard I. Sweet, PhD

Copyright © 2016 by Mark J. Chironna
All rights reserved.

Unless otherwise noted, all Scripture references are taken from the *New American Standard Bible*, Copyright © 1960, 1962, 1963, 1968, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1975, 1977, 1995 by The Lockman Foundation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many treasured relationships have added value to my life and made this journey possible. Without Dr. Leonard Sweet's enduring friendship, faithfulness, and theological investment, this moment would not have been realized. I am deeply indebted to my faculty adviser, Dr. Loren Kerns, who walked alongside me, exponentially expanding my critical-thinking skills. To Dr. Cliff Berger, an instrumental encourager, my appreciation overflows. To the doctoral committee who guided and invested in me, and to my doctoral cohort, who inspired exploration and honed my convictions, I am ever grateful. I am indebted to Derek Brown, Bishop Joseph L. Garlington, Dr. Adonijah Ogbannaya, and Vincent Manzo, whose thought-provoking critiques, insights, and compelling questions sharpened my argument. Misty Hood, my administrator, kept me accountable, carrying my schedule as if it were her own. I am humbled. The value-add of my editor, Donna Scuderi, cannot be repayed. She is one of the most inspirational, thought-provoking, forward-thinking persons I have known. Ultimately, I acknowledge the sacrifice and endless love of my wife, Ruth, who has given up countless hours, weeks, months, and years, to allow me to pursue this dream of a lifetime. She is my greatest encourager and my stalwart. I love her with my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The Promise-Experience Disconnect.....	1
The Problem.....	2
Inconsistency and a Lack of Understanding.....	2
Inconsistency and the Lack of Theology	3
Inconsistency Due to Inadequate Theories	5
Theological Persuasions Enforce Dogmatic Fallacies.....	7
My Story	8
The Method of Research for This Study.....	11
The Thesis.....	15
The Jesus Model and an Applied Semiotics of Prophetic Perceptuality	16
Jesus, the Semiotician	16
Incarnating Christ: The Jesus Model Manifested	17

CHAPTER 2: JESUS’S PHENOMENOLOGY IN RECENT AND CONTEMPORARY SCHOLARSHIP

The Landscape	18
Jesus’s Consciousness and Person	22
Jesus’s Consciousness as a Man	23

The Jesus Pattern.....	25
Interpretation and Prophetic Function	29
Jesus’s Perceptuality and the Nature of the Son	32
Tradition in the Father-Son Relationship.....	35
Continual Contemplation	37
The “Rebellious Son” Standard	40
Jesus’s Perception of Himself as the Father’s Son	43
Jesus’s Self-Perception as the Last Adam	46
Jesus’s Perception of Himself as a Man Anointed by the Spirit.....	53

CHAPTER 3: THE PATRISTIC VIEW OF JESUS’S ONTOLOGY AND PHENOMENOLOGY

The Patristic Legacy	57
Defending the Biblical Record.....	58
Hypostasis and Human Nature.....	63
Fully-Human Consciousness of the Only Begotten.....	72
The Ignorance of the Incarnate Son	74
The Weakness of the Incarnate Son.....	78
The Incarnate Son Endowed with Power.....	79

CHAPTER 4: WESLEYAN CONTEXT FOR AN APPLIED SEMIOTICS OF PROPHETIC PERCEPTUALITY

Historical Dispute	84
The Reformation Seedbed.....	85
Wesley’s Experiential Perspective.....	90
Wesley’s Roots: The Eastern Fathers	91
Wesley’s Roots: His Mother, Susanna.....	96
Wesley’s Practical Theology	99
Wesley’s Interaction with John 5.....	100
Wesley’s “Silence” on the Miraculous	104
Wesley and the Restoration of Wholeness.....	107
An Applied Semiotics of Prophetic Perceptuality: Wesley’s Legacy	110

CHAPTER 5: CONSCIOUSNESS STUDIES AND JESUS’S PHENOMENOLOGY

Face-to-Face Communion.....	112
Overview of Consciousness in History.....	114
John 5 and Polanyi’s “Tacit Knowing”	125
Jesus’s Phenomenology	132
Jesus’s Transpersonal Consciousness and the Possibility of Mystical Experience.....	135
Jesus’s Intentionality.....	142
Jesus’s Consciousness and the Spirit	145

CHAPTER 6: TOWARD AN APPLIED SEMIOTICS OF PROPHETIC
PERCEPTUALITY

The Direction of Inquiry	149
Signs: Wilderness Wanderings and the Man at the Pool	154
Jesus’s Purposeful View of the Sabbath	156
The Role and Condition of Intentionality	162
Union with Christ, by Faith, through the Spirit	166
Seeing as Jesus Saw	170

CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSION

Divine Intent: Prophetic Perceptuality and Power	176
Father-Consciousness and “Greater Works”	178
Application: Facilitating an Applied Semiotics of Prophetic Perceptuality	179
Suggestions for Future Research	181

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ABSTRACT

In John 5:19, Jesus defended the healing at the Pool of Bethesda and disclosed his capacity to see and perceive, in real time and from his interiority, his Father's activities. Jesus informed his accusers that they would witness even "greater works." In John 14:12, he said, "Truly, truly, I say to you, he who believes in Me, the works that I do, he will do also; and *greater works* than these he will do; because I go to the Father." These "greater works" would be possible because Jesus ascended to the Father and poured out upon them his Spirit, the Agent whereby the Incarnate Son, the Last Adam, accomplished his works and mission.

This dissertation argues that, throughout church history, a deficient understanding of Jesus's way of seeing has hindered fulfillment of the promised "greater works." I argue that Jesus's way of seeing the Father serves as the model for his followers' way of seeing, which in turn enables them to perform the promised "greater works." I will propose an approach to learning to see what Jesus saw by the Spirit, which I term an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality, that will in turn enable Jesus' followers to perform the promised "greater works."

Understanding Jesus's way of seeing (his phenomenology) is crucial and was directly impacted by the ontological reality of his *way of being*. All of this resulted from his abiding in the Father, by the Spirit. For Jesus's followers, fulfilling the "greater works" also proceeds from a mutual abiding, which Jesus described in John 14:20: "I am in My Father, and you in Me, and I in you."

The argument to be forwarded therefore is this: Jesus's *way of seeing* is both knowable and replicable by his followers, being a consciousness imparted by the Spirit,

of the Father-Son consciousness the Incarnate Son possessed.¹ It will also be argued that through the indwelling Spirit, the actions of Jesus's followers are accompanied by power, as they rely on the grace gifts to transact the "greater works" in Jesus's name.

Chapter 2 studies Jesus's consciousness and phenomenology in Scripture and contemporary theological work. Chapter 3 engages the early church fathers' views on the Son's nature and ontology; Chapter 4 examines the Reformers' and Wesley's responses to them. Chapter 5 peers through the lenses of modern consciousness studies and phenomenology, and Chapter 6 distills implications and applications from the previous chapters.

¹ This consciousness is "the same" to those who are in Christ, but not identical, because only he is the Son of God.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The Promise-Experience Disconnect

An often unspoken chasm in contemporary churches separates the promise of “greater works”¹ from the everyday Christian experience of lesser expectations and inconsistent outcomes. Because Jesus himself said that his followers would replicate his works and do even “greater works,” the disconnect, which is apparent even in the Pentecostal circles most familiar to this writer, demands attention. In Pentecostal churches, for example, the lack of consistent results often challenges the belief in divine healing. Many churches simply are not experiencing what Jesus did and promised.

The disconnect is supported by theological uncertainty, a lack of inquiry into root causes, and the drift engendered by flawed rationalizations. Makeshift theories add insult to injury, inadvertently blaming the sick and hurting for the apparent failure to “produce” the results Jesus modeled. Ingrained theological persuasions enforce divisions, opposing scriptural truths and those who operate in healing and other gifts.

In this dissertation, I will explore these issues and propose a solution: the proposition that an understanding of Jesus’s phenomenology (his *way of seeing*), as self-disclosed in John 5:19, is necessary for the churches to experience outcomes consistent with Jesus’s ministry model and his promise of “greater works.”² The logical and driving question is this: How do twenty-first century followers of a first-century Palestinian Jew

¹ John 14:12.

² Ibid.

understand the experiential and phenomenological way in which Jesus saw his Father's works?

The Problem

Inconsistency and a Lack of Understanding

Two well-known verses of Scripture point out Jesus's own experience and intent for his followers:

Truly, truly, I say to you, the Son can do nothing of Himself, unless it is something He sees the Father doing; for whatever the Father does, these things the Son also does in like manner (John 5:19).

Truly, truly, I say to you, he who believes in Me, the works that I do, he will do also; and greater *works* than these he will do; because I go to the Father (John 14:12).

In the first selection, Jesus responded to his interrogators after healing the lame man in John chapter 5. He revealed the real-time Father-Son exchange precipitating the man's healing, and made clear that he was not acting independently or satisfying his own will. Instead, his actions and results consistently and accurately revealed his consciousness and awareness of the Father and the Father's intentions.

The second selection was from an exchange with Jesus's disciple, Philip, who asked Jesus to show him and his peers the Father. Jesus explained that the Father was already revealed in the Son and his works. He then explained how the intentions of both Father and Son would be made manifest among God's people. The implications to Philip, and all of Jesus's followers, were profound: they would accomplish magnificent works, even greater than what the Son was doing.

Regardless of scale, Jesus's example to his Body was perfect. This perfection has presented a problem for churches that, historically and currently, have failed to replicate

it. By and large, the promised “greater works” remain just that—a promise neither widely fulfilled nor universally experienced. Because the promise was given by Truth himself, it behooves us to understand the reasons for the shortfall.

I propose that churches have been adversely affected by (1) a gap between firmly-held scriptural beliefs and the everyday experiences that contradict them, and (2) the fact that Jesus’s phenomenology has been largely unexplored and is therefore largely unknown. This dual-pronged discrepancy has disillusioned Christ followers and pressed many leaders who hold theologically to continuationism—the idea that the Spirit’s gifts and manifestations continued and did not cease when the early apostles died—to question their beliefs and abandon some or all demonstrations of God’s power, with obvious implications to the promise of “greater works.”³

This tendency is perhaps at least partly attributable to the failure to grasp, experientially and phenomenologically, *how to see* what the Father is doing, as the Son *saw*.

Inconsistency and the Lack of Theology

The gap between Jesus’s ministry example and outcomes experienced in churches poses personal and pastoral questions, as will be shown. Until the question of Jesus’s phenomenology is addressed adequately, the gap increasingly becomes a model unto itself, widened and hardened by ongoing disappointment and disillusionment.

Pentecostalism is not exempt.⁴ Within the American Pentecostal tradition birthed at the dawn of the twentieth century, “the gifts of healing and ministries of healing”

³ John 14:12.

⁴ In addressing Pentecostalism, this dissertation recognizes its history, as documented in Scripture and by scholars. Mark. J. Cartledge, *Encountering The Spirit: The Charismatic Tradition* (London: Darton,

discussed by Jacques Theron have played a major role.⁵ Pentecostals largely profess Christ's healing of physical infirmities as part the Holy Spirit's ongoing operation. Notwithstanding their beliefs, many Pentecostals have not consistently experienced healing for themselves nor consistently witnessed healing in others.⁶ These believers languish in an often unspoken disillusionment, deep sorrow, and disappointment. Though most agree with what Pentecostal pioneers have preached with conviction, expectations are often diminished by a festering "hesitation" and skepticism that breeds ambivalence toward the healing ministry,⁷ so that some abandon it altogether.

The inadequate attention paid to the inconsistency of healing outcomes fosters these responses. Those in pews and pulpits alike rarely address these failures and disappointments. No one argues for "modifying" healing theories,⁸ some of which gained acceptance without careful examination of their scriptural context or the divine intent. Theron suggests that the need for modification rests in "the primitive scientific"

Longman, & Todd, 2006), 34. The operation and manifestations of the charismata have been present since the Day of Pentecost. Justyn Martyr, Irenaeus of Lyons, Hippolytus of Rome, Tertullian of Carthage, and others refer to gifts of healing and prophetic revelations within the first two centuries of the church. Killian McDonnell, George T. Montague, "The Early Post-Biblical Evidence," in *Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1991), 104–338. McDonnell and Montague offer evidence of Holy Spirit baptism following the Day of Pentecost and throughout the first eight centuries of church history, from Tertullian and Origen, to Philoxenus. It is also important to recognize that the breadth and scope of the "neo-Pentecostal" outpouring in America (that began in Topeka, Kansas circa 1897–1900, and spread to Azusa Street in 1906) became a global movement, intending "an impatient, insistence on total change." Michael J. McClymond, "Charismatic Renewal and Neo-Pentecostalism: From North American Origins to Global Permutations," in *The Cambridge Companion to Pentecostalism*, eds. Cecil M. Robeck, Jr., Amos Yong, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 31–51.

⁵ Theron, "Towards Practical Theological Theory for the Healing Ministry in Pentecostal Churches," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 7, no. 14 (1999): 49.

⁶ Among pastors and other ministers who believe in healing, there is a consensus that although some are manifestly healed, not all experience that reality.

⁷ Theron, "Towards Practical Theological Theory," 54.

⁸ Ibid.

foundations of Pentecostal experience.⁹ Simply put, Theron's assessment is that the phenomenology of early Pentecostals preceded their theology, so that "[a]dequate belief systems" were not articulated prior to the experiences of healing or glossolalia.¹⁰ No theology was formulated until failure and disappointment challenged prevailing Pentecostal theories. As will soon be demonstrated, the lag time in adjusting those theories perpetuated the inconsistencies and deepened the skepticism.

Inconsistency Due to Inadequate Theories

Because many who receive prayer for healing are not manifestly healed, they experience a sense of guilt over their supposed lack of faith. Many assume that some unconfessed sin has thwarted their healing. These flawed theories do not offer life to the sufferers, but instead deliver large helpings of condemnation and shame. If the New Covenant based on Christ's finished work is indeed a ministry of life and not death and condemnation,¹¹ then laying blame at the feet of sufferers is its antithesis. If our words are not producing life, they are not the words of Jesus or the Father.¹² As pastoral problems go, this is fundamental.

Simon Chan explains that the Pentecostal view includes "the five-fold gospel (Jesus as Saviour, Sanctifier, Baptizer, Healer, and Coming King)."¹³ In this context, the

⁹ Ibid., 52.

¹⁰ Ibid. Pastor, professor, and author, Dr. A. J. Swoboda would dispute Theron's assessment. This writer would add that these theories were sometimes inadequate to describe the experience of healing, or insufficient to define the approach to it. For example, in jubilant response to the availability of healing, some believers discarded eyeglasses or indiscriminantly discontinued medications, sometimes to their detriment.

¹¹ 2 Cor. 3:7.

¹² John 6:63.

¹³ Simon Chan, *Pentecostal Theology and the Christian Spiritual Tradition* (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 68.

theory regarding healing relies on “a few verses in the Bible: Isaiah 53:4–5; Matthew 8:17; and 1 Peter 2:24.”¹⁴ Is the Pentecostal theory adequate based on these scriptures alone? Although, in theory, a Pentecostal hermeneutic substantiates healing as an aspect of the atonement,¹⁵ the theory has, in praxis, proven inadequate and incomplete.

The weakness and incumbent inconsistency with Jesus’s record are rooted in an oversimplified and fragmented theory of healing. When the prayer of faith or the laying on of hands do not alleviate suffering, many factors warrant consideration and many elements require integration. A holistic framework is essential; the sufferer’s total being must be considered, including mind, spirit, physical weaknesses, emotional attitudes, outlook, support systems, and interpersonal relationships.

Inadequate theories create lay and pastoral problems.¹⁶ Absent understanding in the pew and sound guidance from the pulpit, increasingly negative experiences calcify the gap between current outcomes and those Jesus modeled. Sufferers and leaders alike experience feelings of failure, guilt, and shame when expectations of the Spirit’s demonstrated healing power remain unfulfilled.

For introspective sufferers, the consciousness-affecting belief that they have not *been enough* or *done enough* creates the sense that they are undeserving of healing. These unhealthy assumptions can become cognitive distortions that exacerbate emotional affliction and engender endless and unproductive searches for remedies accomplished in the seekers’ own strength. For conscientious leaders, their sense of adequacy as caregivers to Christ’s followers seems diminished by unrealized expectations. The

¹⁴ Theron, “Towards Practical Theological Theory,” 51.

¹⁵ The idea is that healing, like salvation, is available to all.

¹⁶ It is perhaps more accurate to refer to *theories that are not fully articulated*.

internal struggle regarding their own faith and ability to discern the will and mind of God is profound. Often, it leads to agonizing, unhealthy ruminations on what they might have done differently. Both groups can mistake these unhealthy introspections for healthy forms of self-examination, thus compounding the pain already experienced.

Theological Persuasions Enforce Dogmatic Fallacies

Have the churches refused the lessons of failure, despite the sacred record of Jesus's earliest disciples learning from it?¹⁷ The problem of misguided theological persuasions is not limited to history. Contemporary mind-sets produce similar challenges, including stark disagreements over the charismata.

One mind-set being challenged is continuationism, the aforementioned belief that the Holy Spirit's gifts and manifestations operate to this day. A leading opponent of continuationism is John MacArthur, a pastor, teacher, and author of *Strange Fire* who condemns any demonstration or exercise of the charismata in today's churches.¹⁸ Controversy exists even within Charismatic and Pentecostal circles, where some theological persuasions are misunderstood. Swiss theologian Walter Hollenweger notes that within Pentecostal ranks "there comes a challenge for a critical historiography for social and political analysis, for a more differentiated treatment of the work of the Spirit, for a spirituality which does not blend out critical thinking."¹⁹

¹⁷ Matt. 17:16–19.

¹⁸ John MacArthur, *Strange Fire: The Danger of Offending the Holy Spirit with Counterfeit Worship* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2013). Dr. Michael Brown refutes MacArthur's arguments, saying, "MacArthur's criticisms of the Charismatic Movement are inaccurate, unhelpful, often harshly judgmental, sometimes without scriptural support, and frequently divisive." Michael Brown, *Authentic Fire: A Response to John MacArthur's Strange Fire* (Lake Mary: Excel, 2014), 1–2.

¹⁹ Walter J. Hollenweger, *Pentecostalism: Origins and Developments Worldwide* (Peabody: Hendricksen, 1997), 1.

Pentecostals often fail to engage the problem adequately. For example, to blindly and dogmatically claim that Christ's healing power will always be manifested in response to genuine faith, and to assume that the absence of manifestation hinges on the petitioner's lack of faith, is to bring great reproach on a truth intended to bring grace to sufferers. What of the psychological ramifications of suffering? Do inadequate theories offer relief from symptoms, pain, or the mental stress accompanying physical suffering? I suggest they do not. Oversimplification leads to rigid, legalistic applications in praxis that open doors to confusion, guilt, and condemnation rather than grace and any hope for change.

My Story

Lodged in the gap between one's beliefs and the reality of one's journey is the cognitive dissonance that predisposes even Jesus's followers to confusion and crises of faith. Often, inconsistency "causes the subject to seek to rectify the dissonance and move toward greater consonance and authenticity."²⁰

The following is my story. It is not unique. Having been raised in the liberal Presbyterian tradition, I experienced a radical conversion at age nineteen, amid the "Jesus People Movement."²¹ My conversion forced a break with the "long-developing theological liberalism, which denied the deity of Jesus Christ and the inerrancy and authority of Scripture."²²

²⁰ Paul N. Anderson, "Jesus and Transformation," in *Psychology and the Bible: A New Way to Read the Scriptures*, ed. J. Harold Ellens and Wayne G. Rollins (Westport: Praeger, 2004), 4:308.

²¹ David Di Sabatino, "History of the Jesus Movement," AllSavedFreakBand, November 1997, accessed June 2, 2015, http://www.allsavedfreakband.com/jesus_movement.htm.

²² Joe Carter, "How to Tell the Difference between the PCA and PCUSA," The Gospel Coalition, accessed June 5, 2015, <http://www.thegospelcoalition.org/article/how-to-tell-the-difference-between-the-pca-and-pcusa>. My pastors believed in Christ's deity, but were otherwise aligned with the denomination.

The arguments of Lutheran theologian Rudolph Bultmann and his adoption of Heidegger's demythologization presupposed that "we cannot believe in the interventions of God or supernatural beings in the affairs of our lives, and we have long ago discarded the cosmic framework of heaven, earth, and hell, which was assumed in the 1st cent., and for long after."²³ My conversion countered such claims.²⁴ I fully expected those in my Presbyterian heritage to embrace my experience. Instead, my pastor deemed it a fleeting, emotional response.

Disillusioned, I sought people who shared my experience and views. At college prayer meetings, I witnessed tongues and their interpretation with prophetic utterances and effectual healing prayer. Yet, after joining an on-campus fellowship, I faced new roadblocks. The group labeled the charismata illegitimate and even demonic. Soon I discovered that numerous denominations shared this view. Such opposition became the impetus for an impassioned quest for answers. I found a church that proclaimed the Spirit of Jesus alive in all his fullness. They embraced his gifts and manifestations, and I enrolled in their Bible institute. It was fertile ground in which to learn about the contemporary work and presence of the Spirit.

With a passion for Scripture, I particularly focused on the fourth evangelist's revelation of the Father-Son relationship. Jesus's self-disclosure to "the Jews"—"I do

²³ "The means by which the essential truth of the gospel could be made acceptable to modern people." W. R. F. Browning, ed., *A Dictionary of the Bible*, Oxford Biblical Studies Online, s.v. "demythologization," accessed June 5, 2015, <http://www.oxfordbiblicalstudies.com/article/opr/t94/e512>. For more insight into Bultmann's proposed demythologization, see Rudolf Bultmann, *New Testament and Mythology*, ed. Schubert M. Ogden (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1984).

²⁴ "Resurrection with Christ involves an existential component. The believer's continuing walk in newness of life is based upon resurrection with Christ as that has taken place in his actual life history." Richard B. Gaffin Jr., *Resurrection and Redemption: A Study in Paul's Soteriology* (Presbyterian and Reformed, 1978), 47. This statement reflected my conversion experience.

nothing but what I see My Father doing”²⁵—deeply impacted my faith and ministry perspective. I understood that Jesus’s miracles were signs,²⁶ and this particular sign pointed to what the healing represented.

As New Testament scholar N. T. Wright proclaimed: “The whole point of signs is that they are moments when heaven and earth intersect with each other.”²⁷ This question consumed me: When heaven and earth intersect, should we not ask how the intersection functions and is acted upon, so that what *wants to* happen *can* happen?

When I asked about John 5:19, my instructors said that (1) the text spoke of the Son as the Only Begotten of the Father, and (2) it described the Son’s subordination to the Father. No one addressed how the Son *experienced* the seeing of what his Father was doing. Their answers were predominantly ontological, and the Son’s interiority remained a mystery.

The notion of Jesus’s passivity also puzzled me. I wondered how a passive Jesus could actively cooperate so that signs were actualized through him.²⁸ If his passivity was factual, understanding it would seem essential in fulfilling the “greater works” he promised.²⁹

²⁵ John 5:19; paraphrased.

²⁶ John 20:30–31.

²⁷ N. T. Wright, *John for Everyone: Part 1, Chapters 1–10* (London: SPCK, 2002), 21.

²⁸ “There are also many other things which Jesus did, which if they were written in detail, I suppose that even the world itself would not contain the books that would be written.” John 21:25. Here, the fourth evangelist seems to refute any notion of Jesus’ passivity.

²⁹ John 5:20, 14:12.

This paper will address these questions through careful inquiry and the development of an *applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality*.³⁰

The Method of Research for This Study

Applied research will develop this semiotics of prophetic perceptuality based on Jesus's way of seeing what the Father was doing. In the fourth evangelist's intentionally semiotic Gospel, the healing of the man at the Pool of Bethesda is pivotal, as it was in Jesus's life and ministry. John Sanford explains: "this passage marks a transition ... from the theme of testimony ... to the theme of controversy."³¹ Opposition provoked Jesus's self-disclosure. In regard to the fourth gospel, this disclosure was Jesus's first delineation of his identity as the Son who came to do what the Father was doing. This opened a portal into his interiority, consciousness, mind-set, ontology, and phenomenology.

This is the proposed starting place for a semiotics of prophetic perceptuality to be developed. A discourse analysis of many scholars—contemporary theologians, early church fathers, Reformation voices, contemporary phenomenologists, and others—will uncover what the story reveals about Jesus's phenomenology, including how he saw what he saw. The objective in engaging scholarship from antiquity onward is to examine Jesus's way of seeing from ontological and phenomenological perspectives. Insights into Jesus's epistemology and ontology (the nature of his being, both as the divine Son and as the Spirit-governed Last Adam) will establish Jesus's way of being the Incarnate Son.³²

³⁰ Specifically, *learning to see by the Spirit the way Jesus saw by the Spirit*.

³¹ John Sanford, *Mystical Christianity: A Psychological Commentary on the Gospel of John* (New York: Crossroad, 1997), 131.

³² This dissertation presumes the dual natures of Christ, both human and divine, as confirmed by the Council of Chalcedon in A.D. 451.

Because of the hypostatic process within Jesus, this is consequential. He was the divine Son, a principal of mutual indwelling, but everything he did he did as the Last Adam. Only by virtue of his utter dependence upon the Spirit can we make an argument for his followers accomplishing the promised “greater works.”

Jesus was our model. Only by depending upon the Holy Spirit can we fulfill the promise of John 14:12. His way of being (his ontology) governed his way of seeing (his phenomenology). So does ours. He saw, experienced, and knew the Father from his relationship as the Incarnate Son filled with the Spirit. Likewise, our being in Christ by the same Spirit enables us to see, experience, and know the Father. Our seeing *is* experiential; our experience leads to knowing, and that knowing is intimate.

Chapter 1 proposes the development of a semiotics of prophetic perceptuality by: (1) outlining the discrepancy the churches face in fulfilling the promise of John 14:12, (2) presenting the discrepancy’s effect on my spiritual journey, (3) proposing a method of study, and (4) introducing the thesis of this study.

Chapter 2 will engage the biblical text and contemporary theologians who have explored Jesus’s consciousness, experience of the Father, phenomenology, and ability to demonstrate the power of the Spirit. A latitudinarian theological reflection of Jesus’s life in and by the Spirit can establish a Charismatic view of Jesus’s ontology and phenomenology, which inspired his way of seeing and functioning in a semiotics of prophetic perceptuality.

For that reason, I will interact with scholars (both cessationists and continuationists) from the Roman Catholic, Protestant, Orthodox, and

Pentecostal/Charismatic traditions,³³ including Raniero Cantalamessa, Thomas Weinandy, Anthony Dimpka, Colin E. Gunton, Paul N. Anderson, William Barclay, Leonard Sweet, Jürgen Moltmann, Bernard Lonergan, Stephen Verney, Leon Morris, Raymond E. Brown, James McGrath, Walter Kasper, C. H. Dodd.

Chapter 3 will engage early church fathers who bore the burden of refuting heresies involving the nature of the Son and of establishing a firm ontological perspective of him.³⁴ They include Cyril of Alexandria, whose work with Christological controversies defended the Incarnate Son's nature, and Ambrose of Milan, whose Christological influence on Augustine was significant. Engaging Augustine is warranted by his influence on Western Christianity and Western spirituality, and by his work in the Gospel of John. Gregory of Nazianzus' work in Trinitarian theology poses the implications of the Incarnation and of the Son's place in the Godhead to his salvific work. I will also consider the work by Maximus the Confessor on the two wills of Christ, as well as his views on Jesus's human experience and the development of the spiritual senses.

Chapter 4 will examine what the Reformers and Wesley understood the fathers to say, as this was the foundation upon which they built the Reformation. In particular, the demonstration of the Spirit and power in Wesley's personal life and public meetings contributes significantly to a semiotics of prophetic perceptuality.³⁵

³³ The historical traditions engaged provide context and background for Pentecostalism.

³⁴ This is critical to developing an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality; a shared experientiality is necessary for the miraculous in believers' lives to reflect that in Jesus' life. Our seeing must be similar to his. As the nature of the Son is one of hypostatic union with the Father—the interpenetration of the human and the divine—there is a mutual indwelling for his followers, as John 17:21 indicates.

³⁵ The modern Pentecostal movement can find its roots in the Wesleyan tradition, stemming from his “second blessing sanctification experience.” Vinson Synan, preface to *The Holiness-Pentecostal Tradition: Charismatic Movements in the Twentieth Century* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1971), preface, Kindle. Synan explains that this stressed a “‘deeper’ or sometimes ‘higher’ Christian life that went

Chapter 5 will engage scholars from more recent fields of consciousness studies, psychology, and contemporary phenomenology.³⁶ Such research explores the way of being that leads to one's way of doing. The sense of self and others is also integral to the realm of consciousness, as are modes of knowing and perceiving. This study will engage Polanyi, Galot, Smith, Husserl, Brentano, Spear, James, Gallagher, Zahavi, Walach, Schmidt, Jonas, Lancaster, Baruss, Tsakiris, Graziano, and others, integrating their respective discoveries with the contributions of theologians and scholars, including those previously mentioned.

Chapter 6 will consider inferences and applications pertinent to fulfillment of the "greater works" by exploring: Jesus's prophetic model and the connection between the speech and demonstrations of the Spirit and power, the semiotics of the healing at the Pool of Bethesda, intentionality and mental models, union with Christ, and Jesus's first-order observation through the Agency of the Holy Spirit. This will be accomplished through interaction with Scripture and with Kanagaraj, Stronstad, Fromke, Menary, Verney, Stutzman, Loder, and others.

As summation, Chapter 7 will present an application for a semiotics of prophetic perceptuality based on first-order observation, so that Jesus's followers can more effectively accomplish the "greater works" he intended and still intends in the contemporary context.

far beyond the level of nominalism that characterized the majority of Christians for most of the history of the Church." Ibid.

³⁶ In particular, I will engage experts in the structures of consciousness and experience who have added to that body of knowledge since the dawn of the twentieth century.

The Thesis

This dissertation will argue this piece of the semiotic puzzle: The scriptural record reveals that everything Jesus did, he did as a man under the governing power and directive of the Holy Spirit,³⁷ whom he received at his baptism,³⁸ so that his seeing what the Father was doing occurred by the power of the Spirit,³⁹ in his interiority.

To develop an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality, it is necessary to understand Jesus's way of seeing. With that foundation, we can refer to his *first-order observation*, and teach his example to his followers. Currently, detailed study of *how* Jesus saw what the Father was doing is virtually nonexistent. Even when scholars acknowledge both his ontology and phenomenology as divine Son and apostolic-prophetic Agent, his way of seeing remains a mystery.

This study assumes that Jesus's assessment of the Father-Son relationship disclosed in John 5:19 is accurate, so that the Son of Man was also God, sent on a mission by the Father.⁴⁰ In disclosing that he did nothing but what he saw his Father doing, it does not seem that Jesus intended a literal meaning applying to the sensate world. Instead, he seemed to speak metaphorically and spiritually. The account of the healing at the Pool of Bethesda involves no outward sensate experience of sight by Jesus, except that he saw the man lying there and *knew* he had long been in that condition.⁴¹ Jesus the man *saw* another man's history and understood his inner struggle. Jesus *saw* the

³⁷ "A man" specifically being the Last Adam; Luke 4:14.

³⁸ Luke 3:22.

³⁹ John 5:19.

⁴⁰ John 5:23.

⁴¹ John 5:5–6.

Father's heart for the man and recognized his loving intent. The question is: "How did Jesus see these things and what interior experience accompanied his seeing?"

The Jesus Model and an Applied Semiotics of Prophetic Perceptuality

Jesus's way of seeing is the model for a contemporary semiotics of prophetic perceptuality. In the pericope from John 5, Jesus actively observed, in real time, the Father and the lame man. He then accurately interpreted what he saw,⁴² his *first-order* observations leading to appropriate *second-order* interactions.⁴³ Discerning the first-order observation that was pretheoretical in Jesus's way of seeing is the means by which the problem already presented will be addressed. For James K.A. Smith, the pretheoretical is that which precedes theology and philosophy (which are "theoretical modes of reflection").⁴⁴ Stated simply, the pretheoretical is "fundamentally a kind of worldview."⁴⁵ Jesus's worldview was inseparable from his perception of his Father.⁴⁶ More precisely, Jesus's intimacy with and perception of his Father *are* his worldview, and are inseparable from his semiotics of prophetic perceptuality.

Jesus, the Semiotician

It can be said that Jesus was the quintessential semiotician who saw the physical world by seeing his Father with his inward eyes. Jesus's way of seeing revealed the

⁴² Given the nature of their relationship and the fact that Jesus was the Only Begotten Son of the Father, it can be said that Jesus' way of seeing was an accurate first-order observation. The fourth evangelist affirms this saying, "No one has seen God at any time; the only begotten God who is in the bosom of the Father, He has explained Him." John 1:18.

⁴³ James K. A. Smith, *Thinking in Tongues: Pentecostal Contributions to Christian Philosophy* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2010), 3.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 4.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ John 1:18.

workings of the world his Father created. Governed by his Father's way of doing things, Jesus's actions and thoughts were also dependent upon his ability to interpret tacitly, instinctively, intuitively, and instantly, all that he saw his Father doing. Jesus did this from a place and state of unconscious competence. His unbroken communion and exposure to his Father in his interiority, by his unique way of seeing, produced natural and unforced concomitant actions in response to what he observed. In every situation, Jesus understood the context of what his Father revealed, and precisely assessed, in real time, the Father's purpose. It can be asserted that at least in part, Jesus functioned semiotically.

Incarnating Christ: The Jesus Model Manifested

A crisis in leadership exists in the overall culture and in the churches, where some have embraced Bultmann's demythologization and abandoned Jesus's model for his followers. As Leonard Sweet often says, Jesus has not sent us to transform the culture, but to "incarnate Christ in it."⁴⁷ That which Jesus's followers need to perform the promised "greater works" requires the vital connection of what can be called *a prophetic perception and perceptuality of the activity of God the Father by way of his indwelling Spirit*. Because semiotics is an investigation into how meaning is created and communicated, and because it involves a way of seeing the world, it is useful in understanding precisely *how* Jesus saw his Father's will, so that his will might be accomplished in our midst.

⁴⁷ Leonard Sweet, "DMIN Applied Semiotics and Future Leadership Studies" (lectures, George Fox University, Portland, Oregon, February 10, 2014).

CHAPTER 2

JESUS'S PHENOMENOLOGY IN RECENT AND CONTEMPORARY SCHOLARSHIP

The Landscape

This chapter explores the continuationist-cessationist landscape, facets of Jesus's consciousness, Jesus as pattern and sign, and sign interpretation. Examination of Jesus's perceptuality as the Incarnate Son, the dynamics of the Father-Son relationship and Rabbinic expectations of such relationships, and Jesus's self-perceptions as the Last Adam and a man anointed by the Holy Spirit will also advance the development of an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality.

This dissertation assumes a continuationist position and recognizes that God's presence and power are found amid his people regardless of race, class, gender, and ethnicity.¹ The Gospel continues to be for the *have-nots* and the *haves*, as scholar Walter Brueggemann affirms.² It is the Spirit who guides followers into all truth.³ Gunton rightly asserts that Western theology "has notoriously neglected the work of the Spirit in our lives and thinking, and that is where there have been outbreaks of Pentecostal church life and belief."⁴

¹ Isa. 61:1; Luke 4:18.

² Walter Brueggemann, *The Collected Sermons of Walter Brueggemann* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2015), 2: chap. 28, sec. 4, Kindle.

³ John 16:13.

⁴ Colin Gunton, *Father, Son, and Holy Spirit: Toward a Fully Trinitarian Theology* (London: T&T Clark, 1991), 79.

In terms of communion and partnership in his mission, the promise and pattern for the “greater works” had to be revealed. It appears that Jesus’s self-disclosure in John 5:19 was therefore necessary for our sakes. This entire proposition requires a theological conviction that such manifestations have not ceased.⁵ Nevertheless, the divide persists between those who hold cessationist views and those who believe that manifestations in keeping with the “greater works” continue.

This study holds that a secular, humanistic⁶ mind-set has enculturated contemporary churches and diminished the possibility of supernatural experiences. James Emery White contends: “Even among card-carrying Christians and even among evangelicals ... they are increasingly thinking in a secular way.”⁷ Greek Orthodox Elder Paisios warned: “[T]he mysteries of God will be impossible to know and will appear strange and contrary to nature as long as we don’t overturn our secular mindset and see everything with spiritual eyes.”⁸

The mysteries of God can only be seen as the Last Adam saw them—“with *spiritual eyes*,”⁹ and from the context of communion between humans and God. Rodman

⁵ The development of an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality based on Jesus’ way of seeing would be futile if Cessationist claims were accurate.

⁶ *Secular* meaning “Not spiritual: of or relating to the physical world and not the spiritual world.” Merriam-Webster.com, s.v. “secular,” accessed September 23, 2015. <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/secular>. *Humanistic* meaning “A doctrine, attitude, or way of life centered on human interests or values; especially: a philosophy that usually rejects supernaturalism and stresses an individual’s dignity and worth and capacity for self-realization through reason.” Ibid., s.v. “humanism.”

⁷ Alex Murashko, “Megachurch Pastor: Christians Thinking in Secular Way Contribute to Fast Rise of the ‘Nones,’” *The Christian Post*, May 21, 2014, accessed September 2, 2015, <http://www.christianpost.com/news/megachurch-pastor-christians-thinking-in-secular-way-contribute-to-fast-rise-of-the-nones-120101/>.

⁸ Elder Paisios of the Holy Mountain, *With Pain and Love for Contemporary Man: Spiritual Counsels of the Elder Paisios of Mount Athos* (Sarouti: Holy Monastery of St. John the Theologian, 2011), 255.

⁹ Paisios, *With Pain and Love*, italics mine.

Williams contended: “The basis of miracles rests in God: His freedom, His love, His power. To believe in the God of the Bible, the God of Christian faith, is to believe that miracles are possible.”¹⁰ The secular mind-set questions the miraculous, claiming “the universe is self-contained and man is self-subsistent.”¹¹ However, science now claims the universe is not a closed system, but an open-ended one.

Besides dismissing the miraculous, cessationists have discredited Pentecostal-Charismatic scholarship.¹² C. Michael Patton admits to “a rise in respected evangelical scholarship.”¹³ He acknowledges the likes of Craig Keener, Jack Deere, Sam Storms, and others, but seems dismissive of scholars who defend continuationism theologically.¹⁴

¹⁰ J. Rodman Williams, *Renewal Theology: Systematic Theology from a Charismatic Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 129–130.

¹¹ Ibid., 128. The idea is reminiscent of Bultmann’s demythologization of Scripture. Williams *Renewal Theology*, 129–130. Williams challenges these assumptions, insisting that “the idea of the universe as a closed system with natural law all-inclusive (a kind of pancausalism) is no longer an acceptable scientific viewpoint.”

¹² “Cessationism claimed most if not all respected scholarship for a time.” C. Michael Patton, “The Rise of the Intellectual Charismatics,” *Credo House Blog*, October 4, 2007, accessed September 1, 2015, <http://www.reclaimingthemind.org/blog/2007/10/the-intellectual-rise-of-the-charismatics/>. This is the claim of some Cessationists. However, it ignores church history within Orthodox, Roman Catholic, and even Lutheran or Wesleyan or mainline denominational traditions, whose continuationist record is clear.

¹³ Patton, “Rise of the Intellectual Charismatics.”

¹⁴ Among them are Clark Pinnock, Gordon Fee, Vinson Synan, Howard M. Ervin, Raniero Cantalamessa, and even C. S. Lewis. For documentation of continuationist perspectives the following are noted: “As Jesus was empowered, the church is empowered for its mission by the Spirit. Outward forms are not enough—the power must be at work in us (Eph. 3:20; 2 Tim. 3:5).” Clark Pinnock, *Flame of Love: A Theology of the Holy Spirit* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1996), 119. “Because the Spirit was present with his people, for Paul his giftings were as normal as breathing and were intended for the building of the people in the present as they await the consummation.” Gordon D. Fee, *Paul, the Spirit, and the People of God* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1996), chap. 14, Kindle. “By the time of the Pentecostal outbreak in America in 1901, there had been at least a century of movements emphasizing a second blessing called the baptism in the Holy Spirit.” Vinson Synan, *The Century of the Holy Spirit: 100 Years of Pentecostal and Charismatic Renewal; How God Used a Handful of Christians to Spark a Worldwide Movement* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2001), chap. 1, Kindle. “A deist conception of the Church ... inadvertently obscures the actual, ongoing lordship of Christ over His Church, which expresses itself in His freedom to intervene in the Church by His Spirit.” Raniero Cantalamessa, *Sober Intoxication of the Spirit: Filled with the Fullness of God* (Cincinnati: Servant Books, 2005), 63. “When Lewis accounts for miracles he understands them to be events introduced by the supernatural realm into the natural realm.” William K. Kay, “C. S. Lewis: A Pentecostal Reading,” *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 23 (2014): 132. Also: Howard M. Ervin, *Spirit-Baptism: A Biblical Investigation* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1987).

Scholars such as Kilian McDonnell and George T. Montague also provide evidence for the ongoing presence of the work of the Spirit in the first eight centuries of church history.¹⁵ Patton also seems “unaware” of the scholarship of Jürgen Moltmann, Professor Emeritus at the University of Tübingen, in affirming the same for today’s churches. James K. A. Smith confirms the cessationist bias: “Pentecostalism ... rarely gets a seat at the theological table as a contributor to the conversation, even among serious theologians.”¹⁶ Smith offers a reason: “The Pentecostal movement emerged largely from an underclass with little access to formal education.”¹⁷

This fact remains: the conversation about Jesus’s way of seeing *began with Jesus*,¹⁸ who referred to “greater works” as signs and wonders,¹⁹ which the New Testament affirms.²⁰ If the Spirit that dwelt in Jesus also dwells in us,²¹ would not the same (and greater) works be forthcoming? With that in mind, I endeavor here to expand the conversation through a clearer understanding of precisely how Jesus saw what the Father was doing, presupposing that through the indwelling Spirit, believers can experience the communion shared by the Father and the Son.²²

¹⁵ McDonnell and Montague, *Christian Initiation*.

¹⁶ James K. A. Smith, “Thinking in Tongues,” *First Things*, April 2008, accessed September 1, 2015, <http://www.firstthings.com/article/2008/04/003-thinking-in-tongues>.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ “For the Father loves the Son, and shows Him all things that He Himself is doing; and the Father will show Him greater works than these, so that you will marvel.” John 5:20.

¹⁹ John 4:48.

²⁰ Acts 4:30, 5:12; Rom. 15:19; 2 Cor. 12:12; Heb. 2:4.

²¹ Rom. 8:11.

²² This interior way of knowing is essentially phenomenological, facilitated by the same Spirit who facilitated Jesus’ way of knowing and seeing.

Might contemporary scholars provide insights to equip Christ followers to accomplish the “greater works”? It would seem so. The way of seeing described in this paper could be the “sober intoxication of the Spirit”²³ mentioned by the Italian Catholic Preacher to the Papal Household, Raniero Cantalamessa, who borrowed the phrase from Saint Ambrose. Cantalamessa refers to the present and ever-growing phenomena of the Holy Spirit outpouring, including miracles, signs, and wonders in the Catholic Church worldwide.

The engagement with contemporary scholars is crucial in laying a foundation for an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality from both ontological and phenomenological perspectives.

Jesus’s Consciousness and Person

The scriptural record and Jesus’s self-disclosure are critical to understanding the Son’s Person and work. Also essential is the perception/consciousness of Jesus as (1) the divine-human Son of the Father, and (2) the Last Adam, the Incarnate Son whose works were accomplished as a truly human being under the Father’s governance and in the power of the Holy Spirit.

Jesus’s ontology and phenomenology are revealed by his self-disclosure and by the scriptural record, which affirms him as the Logos made flesh,²⁴ the Messianic fulfillment foretold by the Law and the Prophets.²⁵ Can we adequately recognize and

²³ Cantalamessa, *Sober Intoxication of the Spirit*, 2.

²⁴ John 1:14.

²⁵ Luke 24:44. In becoming fully human, an aspect of his nature derived from the genealogy of Mary. As for his divinity, the eternal Logos entered time and space and assumed human flesh. According to Isaiah 9:6, the (human) child had to be born; the (divine) Son had to be given.

comprehend Jesus's constitution or self-consciousness without the assistance of the Holy Spirit? Certainly not. For us to approach an illuminated understanding of Jesus's Person and nature, he must reveal himself to us, by the Holy Spirit.

For this paper, consciousness as a state involves the experiential dimension and can be described as one's "conscious experience of self and world."²⁶ Regarding the Person of Christ, his conscious experience stems from his awareness of himself as the Incarnate Son, as our conscious experience stems from our self-awareness as human beings. A difference must be noted: Jesus shared our human nature completely, but as the divine Son, he possesses a divine nature and a human one. Nevertheless, his entire Messianic work was accomplished as a human being entirely dependent on the Holy Spirit. His perfect human nature revealed God's intent for us, which before the Fall was one of unbroken communion with both Father and Son.

Jesus's Consciousness as a Man

Jesus the man was conscious of himself as a truly human being, self-describing as both Son of God and Son of Man.²⁷ Leonard Sweet rightly suggests that *Son of Man* can be translated "Human One."²⁸ Despite the duality of natures, there was unity of person,²⁹ which was necessary for the work he fulfilled. Jesuit theologian, Bernard Lonergan, describes what consciousness involved for the Son of Man:

²⁶ Robert Van Gulick, "Consciousness," *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Edward N. Zalta, Spring 2014, accessed August 23, 2015, <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2014/entries/consciousness/>.

²⁷ John 1:49–51.

²⁸ Sweet, "DMIN Applied Semiotics."

²⁹ The Incarnate Son is one Person, not two.

[A]s Christ as man senses, he is empirically conscious; insofar as he understands, he is intellectually conscious; insofar as he judges, he is rationally conscious; insofar as he chooses, he is morally conscious.³⁰

Lonergan contrasts the consciousness of God as God with that of human as human. God knows directly, without having to think. Human knowing is self-reflective, requiring thought processes. To be conscious, one must become aware of someone or something. Empirically, Jesus sees both the Father (someone) and what the Father is doing (something).

For Jesus the man, consciousness included his powers of observation and perception (empirical), his objective reasoning and understanding (intellectual), his ability to make logical decisions (rational), and his ability to choose (moral/volitional). His self-disclosure in John 5:19 revealed his perception of what the Father was doing (empirical), his understanding of what the Father was doing and why (intellectual), his acting in tandem and agreement with his Father (rational), and his active choice in doing so (moral/volitional). All were congruent with his Father's essence and activity.

What one perceives when reflecting upon oneself cannot be the totality of one's nature, even when identifying fully with the perception. The human spirit's depth is unfathomable even to the human possessing it. Without divine illumination³¹ and the Son's perfect congruence with the Father, the person abides unenlightened regarding the scope of personal identity.

³⁰ Bernard Lonergan, *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*, vol. 7, *The Ontological and Psychological Constitution of Christ* (Canada: University of Toronto Press, 2002), 209.

³¹ Job 32:8.

Although Jesus's human consciousness matured according to normal life-cycle development,³² Christ was not unenlightened about his Personhood. As Stephen Verney observes, Jesus was the truly "self-centered" human being, fully aware of self, but not "ego-centered" in the manner of fallen humanity.³³ Instead, Jesus's self-consciousness can be called an *other-* or *Father-consciousness* that produces an others-conscious life motivated by love to work on the Father's behalf.

Jesus the man was also the divine Son, perfect in his identity. For his followers, an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality that is based on genuine first-order observations (consciously, experientially, and phenomenologically) will be progressive and involve trial and error. As the apostle Paul understood, "we know in part and we prophesy in part."³⁴

The Jesus Pattern

The fourth evangelist's Gospel and ancient Christian formulations summarized that the Son became truly human so that humanity might partake of divine sonship.³⁵ There is a learning curve, however. So how do we "learn Christ" to partake of his nature?³⁶

³² Luke 2:52.

³³ Stephen Verney, *Into the New Age* (Great Britain: William Collins Sons, 1976), 47.

³⁴ 1 Cor. 13:9.

³⁵ John 1:12. "[Jesus] became incarnate from the Virgin Mary, and was made man." "The Nicene Creed," Anglicans Online, April 15, 2007, accessed August 20, 2015, <http://anglicansonline.org/basics/nicene.html>.

³⁶ Eph. 4:20.

The fourth evangelist's Gospel and Isaiah reveal Jesus as *the* pattern and sign.³⁷ All exploration of his words and works is by nature semiotic, semiotics being the study of signs and their interpretation. As a discipline, semiotics is derived from the Greek word *sēmeíon*, which scripturally refers to a “sign, mark, token, miracle with a spiritual end and purpose.”³⁸ Semiotics involves the signs themselves and the “end and purpose” to which the signs point.³⁹ Downing tells us that semiotics is about understanding “both verbal and visual signs: where they came from, how they function, when or why they change.”⁴⁰ Italian philosopher and semiotician Umberto Eco states that “semiotics is concerned with everything that can be taken as a sign.”⁴¹ As such, “signs take the form of words, images, sounds, gestures, and objects.”⁴²

Within the prophetic Messianic tradition, Jesus is a sign, and so are his followers.⁴³ His very words and acts are *semiotic*. Any investigation of what signs mean necessarily includes the study of Jesus and how he communicated, the point being *to know God*.

³⁷ John 1:1, 14; Isa. 8:18.

³⁸ Spiros Zodhiates, *The Complete Word Study Dictionary: New Testament*, s.v. “sēmeion” (Chattanooga, TN: AMG, 2000).

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Crystal L. Downing, *Changing Signs of Truth: A Christian Introduction to the Semiotics of Communication* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2012), chap. 1, Kindle.

⁴¹ Umberto Eco, *A Theory of Semiotics* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1976), 7.

⁴² Daniel Chandler, *Semiotics: The Basics* (London: Routledge, 2002), 2.

⁴³ “Behold, I and the children whom the LORD has given me are for signs and wonders in Israel from the LORD of hosts, who dwells on Mount Zion.” Isaiah 8:18.

Eco explains: “a sign is not only something which stands for something else; it is also something that can and must be interpreted.”⁴⁴ As sign, Jesus is the *arche*, Creation’s archetypal pattern⁴⁵ and the expression of the Father. Assuming that the divine intent is to be understood, why does Scripture say God’s “greatness is unsearchable”?⁴⁶ This “unsearchability” is a truth held in tension with other truths. Aspects of the Eternal God exceed the finite human ability to know him. Yet, what he reveals about himself shows that he is not beyond our experience or perception. He defies definition, but is not beyond interpretation; the Logos made flesh interprets and exegetes God for us.⁴⁷

Jesus *knew* the Father,⁴⁸ yet in John 8, his opponents accused him of having a demon.⁴⁹ Theologians John Peter Lange and Philip Schaff paraphrased verse 55, drawing out the shades of meaning: “you have not even indirectly made His acquaintance, but I have made His acquaintance directly; I have *looked at Him* and *know* Him by intention.”⁵⁰

The phrase *looked at him* distinguishes between Jesus’s direct and unbroken acquaintance with the Father and the Father’s activities, and his accusers’ lack in this

⁴⁴ Umberto Eco, *Semiotics and the Philosophy of Language* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press 1986), 46.

⁴⁵ “ἀρχή *archē*; gen. *archēs*. Beginning. Archē denotes an act. cause, as in Col. 1:18; Rev. 3:14 (cf. Rev. 1:8; 21:6; 22:13). Christ is called ‘the beginning’ because He is the efficient cause of the creation; ‘the head’ because He is before all things, and all things were created by Him and for Him.” Zodhiates, *Complete Word Study Dictionary*, s.v. “beginning.” The pattern is an aspect of the sign.

⁴⁶ Ps. 145:3.

⁴⁷ John 1:18.

⁴⁸ John 8:55.

⁴⁹ John 8:48–55.

⁵⁰ John Peter Lange and Philip Schaff, *A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures: John* (Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2008), 296–297; italics mine. To know (*ginōskō*) here, involves a knowing by firsthand experience (NT 1097).

area. Lange and Schaff's paraphrase describes Jesus's prophetic perceptuality from the perspective of his interiority. He saw his Father with the eyes of his spirit, from a pre-existent perspective *and* in the present moment. Additionally, Jesus's knew the Father by his intentions, which also worked within Jesus's intentionality and volition.

This is apparent in John 5, where something fundamental within Jesus's mind and mind-set caused him to intentionally heal the lame man. American philosopher Donald Davidson asserts that a "primary reason" causes human action.⁵¹ In this instance, the Father's intentions caused Jesus's actions. Per his self-disclosure,⁵² Jesus saw the Father's mind and knew what the Father wanted manifested through him, and ultimately through his followers.

Later in the pericope, the fourth evangelist states that the Son and the Father give and share life together.⁵³ Their willing and working are one; their giving and sharing of life are one. For Jesus's followers, this experiential knowing can be grasped through the Agency of the Holy Spirit, who leads and guides the disciple into all truth.⁵⁴ They, too, can be one with both Father and Son.⁵⁵

⁵¹ Donald Davidson, "Actions, Reasons, and Causes," in *Essays on Actions and Events* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 4.

⁵² John 5:19.

⁵³ John 5:21, 26. Adesola Joan Akala, *The Son-Father Relationship and Christological Symbolism in the Gospel of John* (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2014), 199.

⁵⁴ John 16:13.

⁵⁵ John 17:21.

Interpretation and Prophetic Function

Interpretation defines semiotics and the prophetic function. In developing a construct of an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality with Jesus as the pattern, we cannot separate the function of interpretation from the realm of the prophetic.

The notion that *prophetic* implies *predictive* can be misguided and ubiquitous. The prophetic extends beyond the predictive to something more significant. T. Austin Sparks agrees, saying: “Perhaps it would be better if we said that the *prophetic function*, going far beyond mere events, happenings and dates, is the ministry of spiritual interpretation.”⁵⁶

What then must we comprehend about spiritual interpretation in relation to Jesus’s functioning? Sparks explains that the prophetic ministry “is to hold things to the full thought of God ... a call back, a re-declaration, a re-pronouncement of God’s mind, a bringing into clear view again of the thoughts of God.”⁵⁷

Sparks’ excellent articulation of the prophetic function is not exhaustive, referencing only prophets who preceded Jesus. Certainly, the ancient prophets predicted the coming Messianic Age, and called the straying masses back to their foundations in the Mosaic economy. This is the call back Sparks indicates. The New Testament’s first letter of Peter, however, says that Yahweh’s ancient servants were “seeking to know what person or time the Spirit of Christ within them was indicating as He predicted the sufferings of Christ and the glories to follow.”⁵⁸ They “died in faith, without receiving the

⁵⁶ T. Austin Sparks, “Prophetic Ministry: Chapter 1—What Prophetic Ministry Is,” The Online Library of T. Austin-Sparks, accessed August 20, 2015, <http://www.austin-sparks.net/english/books/001003.html>.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ 1 Pet. 1:11.

promises,”⁵⁹ knowing they could not be made complete without the Father and Son’s teleological intention of “bringing many sons to glory.”⁶⁰

This dissertation argues that, regarding the earthly existence of Jesus’s followers, he brings many sons to glory partly by bringing them to maturity in seeing what the Father is doing and participating with him. Jesus’s prophetic function is not a call back but a call forward, as evangelical theologian, Wayne Grudem explains: “Jesus was not merely a messenger of revelation from God (like all other prophets), but was himself the source of revelation from God.”⁶¹

An applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality involves a prophetic consciousness and function that flow from seeing the Savior through the eyes of faith by the Agency of the Holy Spirit. This is spiritual sight and perception. As Jesus told Nicodemus: “unless one is born again he cannot see the kingdom of God.”⁶²

The synoptics use Kingdom terminology frequently. The fourth evangelist’s Gospel uses it only in the discourse with Nicodemus. New Testament scholar Gerald L. Borchert provides a plausible reason: the fourth evangelist preferred “eternal life terminology,”⁶³ because of the experiential dimension of God’s endless life in the believer in the present moment by the Spirit. Yet Borchert also suggests that Kingdom

⁵⁹ Heb. 11:13.

⁶⁰ Heb. 2:10.

⁶¹ Wayne Grudem, “The Offices of Christ: Prophet, Priest & King,” The Spiritual Life Network, August 28, 2007, accessed August 20, 2015, <http://life.biblechurch.org/about/48-paradigm/paradigm-av/3229-the-offices-of-christ-prophet-priest-a-king-wayne-grudem-systematic-theology>.

⁶² John 3:3.

⁶³ Gerald L. Borchert, *John 1–11*, The New American Commentary 25A (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1996), 172.

terminology in the exchange with Nicodemus serves “to explain the dynamic relationship humans can have with God.”⁶⁴

The Kingdom-dynamic relationship Jesus described for Nicodemus is rooted in spiritual sight resulting in proper spiritual interpretation. In this regard, Nicodemus was submerged in darkness; hence the fourth evangelist’s semiotic double entendre.⁶⁵ “this man came to Jesus *by night*.”⁶⁶

Did Jesus’s Kingdom terminology also mark the deep connection between Kingdom and the Spirit (including the Agency of the Spirit) in the lives of those who believe on him? Paul declared that the entire Kingdom is *in* the Holy Spirit.⁶⁷ Without the Spirit, the perception of unseen things is impossible.⁶⁸

In John 14:18–20, Jesus promised his disciples that he would not leave them orphaned, but would come to them. In demythologizing the resurrection, Bultmann claims that Jesus was speaking of the parousia.⁶⁹ In Bultmann’s estimation, the writer of the Gospel (whom he calls *the Evangelist*)⁷⁰ places this verse within the context of the coming of the Spirit. Carson however, notes that “Some false steps have been taken because too much has been made to rest on parallels to single words such as ‘coming’ or

⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁵ Although Johannine authorship is disputed in some circles, I hold the view that sufficient evidence exists to support John as writer of the Gospel bearing his name.

⁶⁶ John 3:2; italics mine.

⁶⁷ Rom. 14:17.

⁶⁸ Eph. 1:18–20; 1 Cor. 2:9–10. It is also noteworthy that prophets were originally called *seers* (1 Sam. 9:9).

⁶⁹ Rudolf Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*, trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray, R. W. N. Hoare, and J. K. Riches (Blackwell, 1971), 617–618.

⁷⁰ Ibid.

a related form of the verb.”⁷¹ The Gospel writer has not confused the coming of Jesus with the coming of the Spirit. Jesus “cannot ask the Father (as he has promised) for ‘another Counsellor’ (v. 16) unless he rises from the dead—in short, unless he comes to his disciples again after his impending ‘departure’ in death.”⁷²

Jesus also promised that he and the Father would send the Paraclete (the context being “greater works”).⁷³ In so doing, “groundwork is being laid for the ‘oneness’ between Jesus and his disciples that mirrors the oneness between Jesus and his heavenly Father.”⁷⁴ He therefore provided assurance that his *way of seeing*, which produced his *way of acting*, would be passed on to them. His perceptuality would become their perceptuality.

Jesus’s Perceptuality and the Nature of the Son

Jesus’s perceptuality is essential to understanding his way of seeing. Study of his self-consciousness and subjective experience based on his self-disclosure provides insight into (1) what informed his evaluations when encountering limitations within the human condition, and (2) how he evaluated his perceptions in light of what the Father sent him to accomplish.

Perhaps the key to understanding Jesus’s nature in relation to his Father *is* the self-disclosure in John 5:19. Former Anglican bishop, Stephen Verney, claims it is

⁷¹ D. A. Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, Pillar New Testament Commentary, ed. D. A. Carson (Leicester: W. B. Eerdmans, 1991), 501.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 502.

⁷³ John 14:18, 16, 12.

⁷⁴ Carson, *Gospel According to John*, 503.

“crucial to the understanding of John’s Gospel”⁷⁵ and the issue of sonship. The opening words, “Truly, truly”⁷⁶ point to Jesus’s profundity, transparency, and solemnity regarding the Father-Son relationship and its effect on his actions.

Verney argues: “Jesus does not say, ‘Yes I am equal to God,’ and He does not say, ‘No I am not equal to God.’”⁷⁷ Rather, Jesus describes his Sonship by saying that he “cannot do anything ... and cannot say anything out of Himself.”⁷⁸ In his translation of John 5:19, Kenneth Wuest affirms Verney’s view: “The Son is not able to be *doing by himself* anything except that which He is seeing the Father doing.”⁷⁹

Rather than being independent from the Father’s actions, the Son’s deeds were dependent upon them. In terms of prophetic perceptuality, Verney says: “Jesus simply looks at the Father, and whatever He sees the Father doing, He does it.”⁸⁰ In real time, the Son looked at the Father as the “source of everything.”⁸¹ Motivated by love for his Son, the Father revealed his intent.⁸² In his interiority, via the Holy Spirit, Jesus saw what the Father revealed. Jesus’s self-disclosure in John 5:19 indicated no intermittence in the Son’s looking and the Father’s revealing. Any intermittence would imply the possibility

⁷⁵ Stephen Verney, *Water into Wine: Introduction to John’s Gospel* (London: Fount Paperback, 1985), 72–73.

⁷⁶ John 5:19.

⁷⁷ Verney, *Water into Wine*, 72–73.

⁷⁸ Ibid.

⁷⁹ John 5:19–23 (Wuest); italics mine.

⁸⁰ Verney, *Water into Wine*, 72–73.

⁸¹ Ibid.

⁸² Ibid.

that by acts of commission or omission, the Son could do other than what the Father was doing.

This is reminiscent of David's experience: "I have set the LORD continually before me; because He is at my right hand, I will not be shaken."⁸³ As was true of David, the Son's beholding of the Father in unbroken communion was implied. Yet the Son's way of seeing the source of everything was rooted in a way of knowing—an ultimate beholding enjoyed exclusively by the Only Begotten Son (because "No one has seen God at any time; the only begotten God who is in the bosom of the Father ...").⁸⁴

Regarding the Son's seeing in John 5:19, Raymond E. Brown explains: "There is a reference to a (pre-existent?) vision of the Father in 6:46, 8:38. Jesus is the only one who has ever seen the Father."⁸⁵ Although Jesus as the pre-existent Logos had a pre-existent vision of the Father,⁸⁶ the text taken alone seems to contradict it. Within Jesus's revelation of the Father was the promise that Jesus's followers would share in his ability to know and see the Father.⁸⁷ It would not be based on his pre-existent vision, as that could not possibly apply to mortals with beginnings in time and space. That is the sole experience of the divine Son who has existed from eternity.

⁸³ Ps. 16:8.

⁸⁴ John 1:18.

⁸⁵ Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel according to John (I–XII): Introduction, Translation, and Notes*, Anchor Yale Bible 29 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 1:214.

⁸⁶ John 1:1; John 1:18.

⁸⁷ John 17:21–23; 1 John 1:3.

Tradition in the Father-Son Relationship

In the passage beginning with John 5:18 and regarding Jesus's "Truly, truly" emphasis and traditional and cultural implications surrounding father-son relationships, New Testament scholar Leon Morris states that "the language Jesus uses is thoroughly rabbinic."⁸⁸ Invoking Hugo Odeberg, Morris argues that the solemnity of Jesus's self-disclosure is important. It is characteristic to say, "Amen, amen" as "one's assent to words uttered by somebody else."⁸⁹ In the Gospels, however, "Amen" or "Truly, truly" "is used only by Jesus, and always as a prefix to significant statements."⁹⁰ In disclosing that he did nothing but what he saw the Father doing, Jesus made "a very strong affirmation of community of action with the Father,"⁹¹ prefacing it with solemn emphasis. Odeberg asserts: "This is exactly how one versed in Rabbinic thought would try to make his compeers understand the relation between the Father and the Son."⁹²

While under interrogation in John 5, Jesus essentially argued as in a court of law, and from a first-century Rabbinic perspective regarding the Father-Son relationship. For A. T. Robertson, Jesus's self-disclosure "is a supreme example of a son copying the spirit and work of a father."⁹³ In *copying*, Jesus did in real time only what he saw the Father

⁸⁸ Leon Morris, *The Gospel According to John*, New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1995), 276.

⁸⁹ Ibid., 148.

⁹⁰ Ibid.

⁹¹ Ibid., 276–277.

⁹² Hugo Odeberg, *The Fourth Gospel: Interpreted in Its Relation to Contemporaneous Religious Currents in Palestine and the Hellenistic-Oriental World* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksells, 1929), 203.

⁹³ A. T. Robertson, *Word Pictures in the New Testament*, s.v. "John 5:19" (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1933).

doing. Does his submission to his Father's initiative and intent suggest that Jesus's copying was rote imitation? Or was it an intimate sharing in the Father's work?

To claim rote imitation is to reduce the Son to something less than who he is in relation to his Father and the profound bond of love that makes them one. C. H. Dodd's elucidation of Jesus's response concurs:

[It is] another Johannine parable ... a perfectly realistic description of a son apprenticed to his father's trade. He does not act on his own initiative; he watches his father at work, and performs each operation as his father performs it. The affectionate father shows the boy all the secrets of his craft.⁹⁴

At the very least, Dodd's insight implies that despite the Son's divinity, his subordinate Messianic role required him to *learn* from the Father. From childhood, Jesus "kept increasing in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and men."⁹⁵ This implies growth, development, and learning involving his cognitive, perceptual, imaginal,⁹⁶ and intuitive faculties in addition to an increasing awareness of his Personhood and mission as the Father's Agent. This pattern reveals that, to accomplish the "greater works," Jesus's followers must also grow and develop in these faculties.

Dodd's explanation is helpful, but leaves to conjecture Jesus's *mode* of watching. It does, however, suggest that the Father's approach to his apprentice Son was "affectionate."⁹⁷ Regarding the Father-Son relationship and Jesus's doing only what he saw his Father doing, Dodd explains the process by which a first-century Jewish father would apprentice his son: "the affectionate father shows the boy all the secrets of his

⁹⁴ C. H. Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* (New York: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge, 1963), 386.

⁹⁵ Luke 2:52.

⁹⁶ "Of or relating to imagination, images, or imagery." Merriam-Webster.com, s.v. "imaginal," accessed October 23, 2015, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/imaginal>.

⁹⁷ Dodd, *Historical Tradition*, 386.

craft.”⁹⁸ Jesus affirmed this dynamic, saying, “The Father loves the Son, and shows Him all things that He Himself is doing.”⁹⁹ Jesus claimed that love motivated the Father’s disclosures. It can be said, therefore, that for Jesus’s followers to accurately perceive in real time what the Father is doing, “being rooted and grounded in love” is foundational.¹⁰⁰

Continual Contemplation

Leon Morris takes Jesus’s prophetic perceptuality further by describing the “continual contemplation of the Father by the Son.”¹⁰¹ This implies an uninterrupted, contemplative awareness that includes meditation, reflection, cogitation, musing, deliberation, intention, and rumination. The Son postured himself Father-ward; his prayerful observation, watchfulness, and abiding were ongoing. Furthering Morris’ idea, it can be said that Jesus intentionally, actively, and in real time contemplated his Father’s activity and inclusion of the Son in his affairs as an act of love.

Two questions arise: (1) What was the locus of Jesus’s seeing his Father? (2) Experientially, how did he see him? Dodd’s parabolic reference to apprenticeship may be helpful. Jesus revealed that *he had seen* and *was seeing* the Father’s activity in real time. He then acted on what he saw. As to locus, Dodd emphasized that the apprentice son “watches his father at work.”¹⁰² If Jesus described his watching as *seeing what the Father was doing*, exactly where did Jesus see these things? The necessary conclusion is that his

⁹⁸ Ibid.

⁹⁹ John 5:20.

¹⁰⁰ Eph. 3:17.

¹⁰¹ Morris, *Gospel According to John*, 277. *Contemplation* is the “‘act of looking at,’ from *contemplat-*, past participle stem of *contemplari* ‘to gaze attentively, observe,’ originally ‘to mark out a space for observation.’” *Online Etymology Dictionary*, s.v. “contemplation,” accessed August 15, 2015, http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?allowed_in_frame=0&search=contemplation&searchmode=none.

¹⁰² Dodd, *Historical Tradition*, 386.

seeing was not external, but interior, based on the following: experientially, the seeing involved more than the registration of light on Jesus's retina. The Greek word translated "see" is *blépō*. It is in the present tense, active voice, subjunctive mood and speaks to the faculty of sight,¹⁰³ a sense of perceiving "as with the eyes meaning to discern, to understand."¹⁰⁴ This discerning, through exercise of the spiritual senses, granted the Son insight, by way of the Spirit.

For Kenneth Gangel, this understanding indicates that Jesus "thinks the Father's thoughts after him and has already shown the Son all he does, and continues to show him."¹⁰⁵ When and where had the Father already shown the Son these things? Gangel does not elaborate. Is he suggesting that thoughts the Father shared preceded visual impressions, or that the thoughts *were* the visual impression? There is no elaboration here, either. We do know based on the word *blépō* that Jesus discerned his Father's actions. We also know that the Father's Agent did not act unless something was shown to him. Jesus's real-time awareness of his Father's movements is implied, so that by some function of perception and discernment, Jesus actively noticed them.

From a psychological perspective, *awareness* "refers to a consciousness of internal or external events or experiences."¹⁰⁶ Vincent quotes *Meyer's New Testament Commentary*, noting that in the Greek, "the participle brings out more sharply the *coincidence* of action between the Father and the Son: 'the inner and immediate intuition

¹⁰³ Zodhiates, *Complete Word Study Dictionary*, s.v. "see."

¹⁰⁴ Ibid.

¹⁰⁵ Kenneth O. Gangel, *John*, Holman New Testament Commentary 4 (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2000), 101.

¹⁰⁶ *Psychology Dictionary*, s.v. "awareness," accessed August 20, 2015, <http://psychologydictionary.org/awareness/>.

which the Son perpetually has of the Father's work' (Meyer)."¹⁰⁷ Vincent italicizes *coincidence* because the Son perpetually and immediately intuits the Father's activity, ensuring that their respective activity is concurrent.

"Inner and immediate intuition" negates the possibility of an exterior visionary experience, such as the Spirit descending "in bodily form like a dove."¹⁰⁸ It speaks instead of a phenomenological reality in Jesus's interiority, a way of seeing that involves intuitive perception, present-moment awareness, and discernment.

Because the Father is invisible and unseen, the only logical conclusion is an interior experience, phenomenologically borne of Jesus's actively contemplating the Father as the object of his attention. Key to this beholding was Jesus's consciousness of paternal relationship, with a paternal overshadowing—seeing the Father as an object of contemplation, through the lens of their perfect love.

This shared love has outward implications. The healing at the Pool of Bethesda was an act of the Father's love that fulfilled his Sabbath intentions. Jesus saw his Father's love toward the man, an imperfect and sinful creature who desperately needed life.¹⁰⁹ Despite common beliefs about the Sabbath, Father and Son agreed: the "Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath."¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁷ Marvin Richardson Vincent, *Word Studies in the New Testament*, s.v. "βλέπέ" (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1887), 2.

¹⁰⁸ Luke 3:22.

¹⁰⁹ John 5:21.

¹¹⁰ Mark 2:27.

Jesus's way of seeing, his pure perception of his Father's intent, caused him to intentionally heal the man, despite the contradictory perceptions of legalistic Sabbath-keepers.

The “Rebellious Son” Standard

Jesus's violation of Sabbath-keeping and his calling God *Father* rankled his accusers. Craig Keener says: “Jesus is the Father's supreme agent, and far from dishonoring the Father by claiming divine rank, Jesus is concurring with the Father's decree.”¹¹¹ Throughout the fourth evangelist's Gospel, Jesus is the divine Son and the Father's Agent. The tension between their unity and the Son's role as the Father's representative is noteworthy: the former speaks of his ontology; the latter of his phenomenology. The former speaks of his heavenly estate; the latter of his earthly mission—his prophetic mandate, which is “much greater than Moses,”¹¹² who was “faithful ... as a servant” while “Christ was faithful as a Son.”¹¹³

Nevertheless, “the Jews” equated Jesus's actions with rebellion and blasphemy. Commenting on Odeberg, James McGrath contends that Jesus's interrogation by hostile accusers in John 5:18 was rooted in first-century views about when “a rebellious son ... makes himself equal with his father.”¹¹⁴ McGrath suggests Odeberg's view might reflect Stoic philosopher Epictetus' statement: “A son's profession is to treat everything that is his as belonging to his father ... never to speak ill of him to anyone else, nor to say or do

¹¹¹ Craig Keener, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012), 1:634.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, 636.

¹¹³ Heb. 3:5–6. He was faithful not only as Son, but as the Only Begotten Son.

¹¹⁴ James F. McGrath, “A Rebellious Son? Hugo Odeberg and the Interpretation of John 5:18,” *New Testament Studies* 44, no. 3 (July 1998) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1998): 472.

anything that will harm him.”¹¹⁵ Ben Sira’s commentary supports the concept: “[D]o not glorify yourself by dishonoring your father, for your father’s dishonor is no glory to you.”¹¹⁶

Predictably, Jesus’s accusers saw his statements as blasphemous. McGrath sees Deuteronomy 21:18–21 as their likely grounds in seeking his execution, asserting:¹¹⁷ “It thus seems safe to conclude that to make oneself equal to one’s father, in the sense of claiming for oneself the unique prerogatives or honour which belonged to one’s father, would have been understood as making oneself a rebellious son.”¹¹⁸

“The Jews” charges exposed their blindness to the Father’s will as revealed through the Son. Paul N. Anderson, Professor of Biblical and Quaker Studies at George Fox University, offers a compelling argument regarding Jesus’s true intent:

In addition to a therapeutic interest in bringing health to humans, perhaps Jesus was also concerned to bring well-being and wholeness to humanity—the very thing the Sabbath was intended to effect.¹¹⁹

Jesus unashamedly claimed God as his Father. His motives were Father-inspired. The solemn emphasis of his “Truly, truly” statement in John 5:19 did not assuage “the Jews” contention that he was not “behaving in a way appropriate to sonship, because He is

¹¹⁵ Margaret Davies, *Rhetoric and Reference in the Fourth Gospel* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), 130.

¹¹⁶ Ibid.

¹¹⁷ Ibid. Also: “If any man has a stubborn and rebellious son who will not obey his father or his mother, and when they chastise him, he will not even listen to them, then his father and mother shall seize him, and bring him out to the elders of his city at the gateway of his hometown. They shall say to the elders of his city, ‘This son of ours is stubborn and rebellious, he will not obey us, he is a glutton and a drunkard.’ Then all the men of his city shall stone him to death; so you shall remove the evil from your midst, and all Israel will hear of it and fear.” Deut. 21:18–21.

¹¹⁸ McGrath, “Rebellious Son?” 472.

¹¹⁹ Paul N. Anderson, *The Fourth Gospel and the Quest for Jesus: Modern Foundations Reconsidered* (New York: T&T Clark, 2007), 141.

claiming for himself his Father's unique prerogatives."¹²⁰ "The Jews" essentially accused Jesus of saying one thing and doing another, thus contradicting his words with his actions. In reality, Jesus contended that, because he was a faithful Son, he could do nothing but disclose truthfully.

In a culture requiring obedient sons to imitate their fathers,¹²¹ Jesus was required to see what his Father was doing and then do it. Even the Son's multifunctional,¹²² interior way of seeing was dependent upon his Father. He could not, and would not, break from the Father's will or intent. He could not judge, nor give life, nor raise the dead without the Father having revealed it.¹²³

Because Jesus's opponents believed his Sabbath-day healing dishonored God as Father, they condemned both the Healer and the healed.¹²⁴ Referencing Paul's admonition that "the letter kills, but the Spirit gives life,"¹²⁵ nineteenth-century theologian Andrew Jukes summarized "the Jews" actions: "Hardened by the letter of truth, they judge the acts of love."¹²⁶

Paul called the Mosaic economy a "ministry of death" producing a hardening of minds and a lack of perceptual awareness, a "veil ... over their heart."¹²⁷ This was evident

¹²⁰ Ibid.

¹²¹ C. H. Dodd, *More New Testament Studies* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1968), 32–38.

¹²² These include his cognitive, perceptual, imaginal, and intuitive faculties.

¹²³ John 5:19–23.

¹²⁴ John 5:10.

¹²⁵ 2 Cor. 3:6.

¹²⁶ Andrew Jukes, *The New Man and the Eternal Life* (New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1882), 62.

¹²⁷ 2 Cor. 3:7, 14; 2 Cor. 3:15.

in “the Jews” inability to see the Father and his glory as Jesus saw them. Later, quoting Isaiah 53 and Isaiah 6, the fourth evangelist leveled against the Pharisees the same judgment Isaiah decreed against the Old Covenant Sons of Israel.¹²⁸ Jesus himself called his accusers sinfully blind,¹²⁹ “blind guides,” and blind leaders of the blind.¹³⁰ Because their hearts were hardened, they lacked experiential, perceptual clarity, and spiritual sensory awareness.¹³¹

Jesus was not a rebellious Son. As regards an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality, what distinguished Jesus from his opponents was a heart receptive to the Father who lovingly revealed truth to the Agent Son who embodied it.

Jesus’s Perception of Himself as the Father’s Son

From the perspective of recent and contemporary scholarship, three aspects of the Son’s self-perception come into view: first as the Father’s Son; second, as the Last Adam; and third, as the Incarnate Son submitted to his Father’s governance and fulfilling his call in the power of the Holy Spirit. Based on the argument thus far, it can be argued that Jesus’s reliable perception and self-consciousness produced an unwavering familiarity with and fidelity to his identity. Regardless of accusations of blasphemy, he remained settled in his role as the Father’s Son. When naysayers “focused their hostility on the equality aspect of Jesus’ relation to the Father,”¹³² he did not ameliorate their angst. Instead, Jesus responded in John 5:19 with a “double amen, affirming both his divine

¹²⁸ John 12:39–41.

¹²⁹ John 9:41.

¹³⁰ Matt. 15:14; Ibid.

¹³¹ Isa. 6:10; Mark 8:18.

¹³² Borchert, *John 1–11*, 237.

Sonship and his utter human dependence on the Father. Borchert notes: “The dangerous tendency today of some is to de-emphasize the divine exalted nature, and the tendency of others is to de-emphasize the self-effacing human nature of Jesus.”¹³³

Borchert urges “finding the balance between the two.”¹³⁴ When recognized, that balance supports an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality by which followers of Jesus can do the promised “greater works.” How so? Followers of Jesus, the *Only* Begotten Son of the Father, can never become who he is. Instead, they progressively become more perfected as his image-bearers, recognizing that, just as “the Father is the model for the Son’s activity,”¹³⁵ the Son is the model to his authentic followers. Paul calls these adherents the Son’s “imitators.”¹³⁶

Jesus’s self-disclosure was a portal into his intentions and actions, and implied a perfect harmony with the Father’s activities. This was based on his unimpaired comprehension of the Father’s intentions. The Son’s will was distinct from his Father’s,¹³⁷ but not separate from it. Had it been separate, one could conjecture that the Son could have opposed the Father’s will. The New Testament reveals that the Son never acted independently from, or entertained intentions not originating with, his Father. Bible scholar Alfred Plummer aptly summarizes the Gospels’ witness: “It is morally impossible

¹³³ Ibid.

¹³⁴ Ibid.

¹³⁵ Ibid.

¹³⁶ 1 Cor. 4:16; Phil. 3:17.

¹³⁷ Luke 22:42.

for Him to act with individual self-assertion independent of God, because He is the Son: Their Will and working are one.”¹³⁸

In John 5:19, Jesus publicly disclosed his place as the Father’s Son, foreshadowing the sonship he would make available to his followers. Regarding this verse William Hendricksen asserts: “[H]ere ... is the perfect pattern ... that whatever he (the Father) does that the Son does likewise (here, indeed, there is flawless correspondence).”¹³⁹ Hendricksen focuses on the unblemished accord between Father and Son, attributing it to Jesus’s perspective. This permits Hendricksen to propose Jesus’s saying: “being myself the Son, I know that the Father loves the Son.”¹⁴⁰ Within the context of this love, Father and Son shared unbroken communion, with the Father “constantly” showing the Son what he was doing.¹⁴¹ Borchert claims “the point is that the Son copied the Father,”¹⁴² the concept being *apprenticeship*.

In relation to an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality, this copying or imitating required a symmetry of *seeing* and *showing*, as Leonard describes: “The metaphor of ‘showing’ on the part of the Father corresponds to the metaphor of ‘seeing’ on the part of the Son.”¹⁴³ The Father presented to the Son’s interior sight that which he

¹³⁸ Alfred Plummer, *Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges: The Gospel according to S. John* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1896), 136.

¹³⁹ William Hendriksen and Simon J. Kistemaker, *Exposition of the Gospel According to John*, New Testament Commentary 1 (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 2001), 198.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid.

¹⁴¹ Ibid.

¹⁴² Borchert, *John 1–11*, 237. The apostle Paul revealed how this pattern is applicable to Jesus’ followers and offered a similar framework within which the believer is to function. Paul encouraged his followers “to copy him and his model of authentic life.” Ibid; 1 Cor. 4:16. As the Son copied the Father, so the followers of the Son copy the Son, as Paul did. 1 Cor. 11:1. That is the authentic life Paul espoused.

¹⁴³ W. Leonard, “The Gospel of Jesus Christ according to St John,” in *A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture*, ed. Bernard Orchard and Edmund F. Sutcliffe (Toronto: Thomas Nelson, 1953), 990.

was actively intending and doing, in real time. Jesus could then effectuate what he accurately perceived.

For believers to imitate the Son as he imitated the Father, we can reasonably and confidently expect the Spirit to reveal Jesus's ways and intent regarding the "greater works."¹⁴⁴ Additionally, Jesus's model of sonship extends to prayer, as he taught his disciples to pray, "[Father,] Your will be done."¹⁴⁵ His instructions imply his followers' ability to share the Father's intentions, and act on them, as he did. This is the foundation for executing the "greater works."

Jesus's Self-Perception as the Last Adam

Any integration of the ontological and phenomenological must begin by exploring Jesus's understanding of himself as a truly human being, as the eternally divine Son became the human Son who had to be born, eat, grow, and develop his capacities of consciousness, intellect, and ways of knowing, in relation to his Father and people.

Much is said about finding the historical Jesus; but what of the God-Man and promised Prophet? Colin E. Gunton argues that the quest for the historical figure is a "mistaken enterprise" divorcing the Jesus of history from the Christ of Scripture.¹⁴⁶ "Jesus' life was a temporal, historical life, and the documents with which we are concerned are temporal, historical texts."¹⁴⁷ How then did the Eternal Incarnate Son

¹⁴⁴ 1 Cor. 2:10; Eph. 1:17–19.

¹⁴⁵ Matt. 6:10. The Greek word translated "will" is *thélēma* (derived from *thélō*), meaning, "to have in mind, to purpose, to *intend*." Zodhiates, *Complete Word Study Dictionary*, s.v. "will."

¹⁴⁶ Colin E. Gunton, *Yesterday and Today* (London: SPCK, 1997), 59.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid.

consciously navigate his role as the Last Adam and Messiah of Israel, and how do we comprehend it?

Moses told Israel, “The LORD your God will raise up for you a prophet like me from among you, from your countrymen, you shall listen to him.”¹⁴⁸ The descriptors “like me” and “from your countrymen,” imply Moses as the paradigm prophet. However, Abraham is also called a prophet.¹⁴⁹ Moses admitted there were other prophets,¹⁵⁰ and prayed for a prophetic outpouring on all the sons of Israel.¹⁵¹ Yet the particular prophet Moses foresaw would have a certain commonality with Moses and the history, culture, and community of Israel. He would be like Moses, but also “one of us.”

Consider Leonard Sweet’s admonition:

In many ways, we have used Jesus’ divinity as an excuse to ignore him as a Moses figure: an intelligent and educated member of the Egyptian establishment, [and] ... of the Temple establishment. Jesus was a genius in his own right ... with all the perks and privileges of a Doctor of the Law. He infuriated his colleagues by giving up his “professional” status to claim his messianic birthright and become ... a dangerous subverter of the status quo. Jesus perfectly fulfills Moses’ prophecy [of] ... a “prophet like me.” Moses’ outstanding human characteristic was his education in the Court of Pharaoh, the very power which he was to destabilize. The comparison with Jesus-didaskalos in the Court of Israel is self-evident.¹⁵²

Sweet’s description comprehensively identifies Jesus as the New Moses, though he omits the essential fact that Abraham and others were also prophets. Still, a distinctive separates Moses the paradigm prophet, as Eugene Merrill asserts:

¹⁴⁸ Deut. 18:15.

¹⁴⁹ Gen. 20:7.

¹⁵⁰ Num. 12:6–8.

¹⁵¹ Num. 11:29.

¹⁵² Leonard Sweet, untitled manuscript. This excerpt is used by permission.

Moses introduced something new, however, a channel of revelation to whom the Lord spoke “face to face” and “not in riddles” (Num 12:8). ... Moses’ epitaph went on to say, in fact, that no one up to his own time had equaled Moses as a prophet, one whom the Lord knew “face to face” and whom he used to accomplish signs and wonders (Deut 34:10–11).¹⁵³

John 5:19 implies at the very least Jesus’s consciousness as the New Moses, seeing his Father “face to face.”¹⁵⁴ This proximity in communion, experienced by Moses and by the Incarnate Son, is modeled, not to exclude humanity, but to invite participation.

Even skeptics of exploring Jesus’s phenomenology can attest to the man’s humanness and historicity, as student of Christology Cardinal Walter Kasper does. Kasper dismisses phenomenological and psychological study of Jesus, claiming, “We are told nothing about any experience by Jesus of a call ... and even less about His psychology.”¹⁵⁵ However, Kasper seems to ignore New Testament texts that indicate Jesus’s inner life and self-perception. For example, when Jesus’s parents found him in the Temple after a three-day search and expressed their distress at his absence, he responded, “Why is it that you were looking for Me? Did you not know that I had to be in My Father’s house?”¹⁵⁶ The twelve-year-old Jesus indicated a sense of call, a knowing of his Father and of whom he was in relation to his Father, and a knowing of his connection to his Father’s house, which would have ramifications later.¹⁵⁷

¹⁵³ Eugene H. Merrill, *Deuteronomy*, ed. E. Ray Clendenen. New American Commentary 4 (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1994), 273.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵⁵ Walter Kasper, *Jesus the Christ* (Kent: Burnes and Oates, 1976), 65.

¹⁵⁶ Luke 2:49.

¹⁵⁷ Luke 2:49; John 2:16, 14:2.

At twelve, Jesus did what young Jews did: he continued in subjection to his parents and grew “in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and men.”¹⁵⁸ This wisdom development differs from the Western preoccupation with learning and articulating information. The Wisdom Literature in which Jesus was trained reveals that growing in wisdom meant preparing the heart to discern spiritual realities (such as seeing and knowing his Father?). Solomon’s declaration concurs: “The fear of the LORD is the beginning of wisdom, and the knowledge of the Holy One is understanding.”¹⁵⁹ The human Jesus learned and grew in wisdom and stature, relationally and socially, and in the context of his calling.

William Barclay would take issue with Kasper’s view, as his comments attest:

On that day in the Temple Jesus had a unique experience of God as His Father; and He had a unique realization that it was His life’s work to bring men to God and to bring God to men, in a way that neither priest nor rabbi could ever do. ... He knew why He had come into the world.¹⁶⁰

The twelve-year-old Jesus came of age in the Jewish tradition.¹⁶¹ His “unique realization” involved becoming “fully aware of as a fact; to understand clearly.”¹⁶² His awareness of his unique role was precisely phenomenological. Contrary to Kasper’s claim, Jesus was aware of whom he and his Father were; he possessed a sense of mission and identification with the human condition.

¹⁵⁸ Luke 2:52. See also Luke 2:50–51.

¹⁵⁹ Prov. 9:10.

¹⁶⁰ William Barclay, *The Mind of Jesus* (New York: Harper & Row, 1960), 6.

¹⁶¹ Tracey R. Rich, “Bar Mitzvah, Bat Mitzvah and Confirmation,” *Judaism* 101, accessed December 2, 2014, <http://www.jewfaq.org/barmitz.htm>.

¹⁶² Barclay, *Mind of Jesus*, 6; *Concise Oxford English Dictionary*, 11th ed., s.v. “realization.” In this case, the realization—the fact about which Jesus became fully aware—was his mission and purpose in coming into the world. Awareness, including in Jesus’ case, “refers to consciousness of internal or external events or experiences.” *Psychology Dictionary*, s.v. “awareness,” accessed December 8, 2014, <http://psychologydictionary.org/awareness/>.

From the New Testament writers' perspective, the Last Adam *had to* identify with the human condition. The Christological maxim proposed by Roman Catholic scholar Thomas Weinandy applies in every generation: "[I]f Jesus is to be credible to contemporary men and women, He must be like us."¹⁶³ Jesus had to assume the totality of our humanity and "sympathize with our weaknesses."¹⁶⁴ Consequently, he grew in his realization of his humanity and of whom he was—a son to his human parents, a brother to siblings, a skilled craftsman, and the hoped-for Messiah.

The Last Adam's realizations were necessary in his assuming the role of Savior, and in our embracing and experiencing his salvific work. Gregory of Nazianzus proposed this theological maxim in response to Apollinaris of Laodicea: "If anyone has put his trust in Him as a man without a human mind, he is really bereft of mind, and quite unworthy of salvation. For that which He has not assumed He has not healed; but that which is united to his Godhead is also saved."¹⁶⁵ Weinandy adds, "Jesus must not remain an isolated stranger to our personal struggles and to our universal needs."¹⁶⁶ For Jesus to sympathize and identify with our struggles implies his necessary and complete experience of the human soul's affective nature. God himself describes our universal needs, saying "It is not good for the man to be alone."¹⁶⁷ He intends that we experience

¹⁶³ Thomas Weinandy, *In the Likeness of Sinful Flesh: An Essay on the Humanity of Christ* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993), 5.

¹⁶⁴ Heb. 4:15.

¹⁶⁵ Gregory of Nazianzus, "Critique of Apollinarius and Apollinarianism, Epistle 101," Early Church Texts, accessed December 6, 2014, http://www.earlychurchtexts.com/public/gregoryofnaz_critique_of_apollinarianism.htm.

¹⁶⁶ Weinandy, *Likeness of Sinful Flesh*, 5.

¹⁶⁷ Gen. 2:18.

companionship, belonging, affection, emotional support, affirmation, and validation if we are to be humanly fulfilled.

Apart from this, it is impossible to identify with the Person of Jesus. His submission to John's baptism supports his identification with the human condition. Weinandy continues: "[W]hile Jesus had not sinned, yet He assumed our sinful nature, and thus as a man He, too, as truly one of us, was obliged to respond to John's call to repentance and baptism."¹⁶⁸ In the waters of baptism, Jesus fully identified with us. The Torah's righteous requirements demanded the Last Adam's resolute obedience to the Father and stand against sin.

Weinandy continues, "He must have been truly tempted; experienced hunger and thirst, alienation and hardship; suffered persecution and injustice; and finally have died as an outcast."¹⁶⁹ In the wilderness temptation, Jesus was tested after hunger had set in.¹⁷⁰ He can "sympathize with our weaknesses"¹⁷¹ because he could be tempted. Yet, how does a sinless man experience temptation? Were his temptations less intense than ours?

Weinandy suggests that because Jesus was conceived by the Spirit, took on our human nature, and at the Jordan was filled with the Spirit, he experienced "a clarity and holiness far exceeding our own, [and] temptation confronted Him with a sharpness and force we do not experience."¹⁷²

¹⁶⁸ Weinandy, *Likeness of Sinful Flesh*, 94.

¹⁶⁹ Ibid.

¹⁷⁰ Matt. 4:2.

¹⁷¹ Heb. 4:15.

¹⁷² Weinandy, *Likeness of Sinful Flesh*, 99.

The intensity with which Jesus faced Satan's opposition would be overwhelming to us. Still, he chose not to use the powers of his divine Sonship, instead saying, "*Man* shall not live on bread alone."¹⁷³ His words indicate that, despite the ferocity of his temptations, He overcame them as "one of us."¹⁷⁴

The Logos became flesh.¹⁷⁵ The fully-human Jesus would have possessed a genuinely conscious human self. This was not a diminishing, but an enlarging or "assumption" (as articulated in the Patristic era),¹⁷⁶ adding something entirely new to the Son's life while subtracting nothing from his divinity. Cyril addressed the heretical beliefs of Nestorius, who espoused a disunion between the human and the divine nature of Jesus. Cyril made it clear: "He become *God with us*. Most needful in another way too unto those on the earth was the Incarnation or Inhumanation of the Word."¹⁷⁷ As Cyril's work set the stage for the Council of Chalcedon, there could be no doctrinal compromise and no disunion whatsoever between the human and divine nature of Christ. Consider the words of C. F. D. Moule:

So God the Creator, when working in humanity, may be expected to express Himself most fully, so far as the idiom of that medium goes, by accepting the

¹⁷³ Matt. 4:4 (NKJV); italics mine.

¹⁷⁴ Weinandy, *Likeness of Sinful Flesh*, 100.

¹⁷⁵ John 1:14.

¹⁷⁶ "[O]f one Being with the Father. Through him all things were made. For us and for our salvation he came down from heaven." "The Nicene Creed," Anglicans Online. The fact that Jesus came for our sakes does not detract from his divine identity ("of one Being with the Father," the One through whom "all things were made"); it fulfills the divine purpose. Gen. 3:15.

¹⁷⁷ S. Cyril, Archbishop of Alexandria, *Five Tomes against Nestorius: Scholia on the Incarnation; Christ Is One; Fragments against Diodore of Tarsus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, the Synousiasts* (Oxford: James Parker and Rivingtons, 1881), 9.

human range of capacity and exploring the human medium to the full. There is no more self-emptying than it is complete self-fulfillment in a given medium.¹⁷⁸

Taking on human nature and “exploring the human medium to the full,”¹⁷⁹ the Last Adam revealed a human realm previously unknown, thereby allowing adopted sons and daughters to enter it, by grace.

Jesus’s Perception of Himself as a Man Anointed by the Spirit

Jesus so fully identified with humanity that he invited humanity to fully identify with him, saying: “Truly, truly, I say to you, he who believes in Me, the works that I do, he will do also; and greater works than these he will do; because I go to the Father.”¹⁸⁰

The Incarnate Son’s actions were fully intentional. He did nothing outside of his awareness and foresight regarding the implications to those called to perform the “greater works.” Father Anthony Dimpka states: “While one recognizes the solely ordinary human source of every other person’s acts, one recognizes also the especially humanness of every act of Jesus who preferred to perform those acts in His form as man.”¹⁸¹ Jesus’s *preferring* to perform signs and wonders as a man attested to his teleological perspective regarding his followers: the Last Adam revealed the First Adam’s real but unrealized potential.

This potential is realized through the risen Christ who went before us, just as his work is fulfilled through his redeemed followers. Jürgen Moltmann proposes that if Jesus

¹⁷⁸ C. F. D. Moule, “The Manhood of Jesus in the New Testament,” in *Christ, Faith and History: Cambridge Studies in Christology*, ed. S.W. Sykes and J.P. Clayton (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972), 98–99.

¹⁷⁹ Ibid.

¹⁸⁰ John 14:12.

¹⁸¹ Fr. Anthony C. Dimpka, *The Self-Consciousness of Jesus Christ: An Analysis of Its Main Christological Truth* (Enumclaw: Pleasant Word, 2010), 99.

is the “firstborn among many brethren”¹⁸² then “the experience of the Spirit is to be found in the community of Christ’s people through which Christ becomes the first-born among many brethren.”¹⁸³ Moltmann also suggests that “this first-born must be the archetype of divine sonship and daughterhood in the Spirit,”¹⁸⁴ which are impossible apart from the Spirit who makes alive.¹⁸⁵

It bears noting that Moltmann challenges the Mariology, contending that Mary was not and is not the mother of the church; rather the Spirit who generates life is “the divine Mother of all believers.”¹⁸⁶ In light of Jesus’s dialogue with Nicodemus, Moltmann’s view of the Spirit as the archetypal feminine is noteworthy. When Jesus told Nicodemus he must be born from above,¹⁸⁷ he identified the Source of that birth with the Spirit,¹⁸⁸ precisely because it is not a “human process of procreation and conception,”¹⁸⁹ but a direct encounter with the Spirit.

To “become children of God,”¹⁹⁰ we must be born from above, by the Spirit. Moltmann is emphatic regarding Jesus’s Messianic mission and the established Jewish expectation: “the messianic son of God is the human being who is filled with the Spirit of

¹⁸² Rom. 8:29.

¹⁸³ Jürgen Moltmann, *The Way of Jesus Christ* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), chap. 2, Kindle.

¹⁸⁴ Ibid.

¹⁸⁵ John 6:63.

¹⁸⁶ Moltmann, *Way of Jesus Christ*.

¹⁸⁷ John 3:3.

¹⁸⁸ John 3:5.

¹⁸⁹ Moltmann, *Way of Jesus Christ*.

¹⁹⁰ John 1:12.

God.”¹⁹¹ Moltmann argues that Jesus’s Messianic mission will result in the outpouring of the Spirit on all flesh, giving birth and generating sons and daughters of God precisely because “He comes in the Spirit of the Lord and brings the Spirit of the Lord, so that it fills the whole earth.”¹⁹²

In his hometown synagogue where everyone knew him, Jesus took the scroll and read from Isaiah 61: “The Spirit of the Lord GOD is upon Me, because the LORD has anointed Me.”¹⁹³ Jesus’s made the declaration self-referential and fulfilled in the hearing of those present. As Messiah, he was anointed with the Spirit, the Agency whereby he worked the works of his Father. This same Spirit makes his followers adequate to work his works after him.

The Son of Man came to “seek and to save that which was lost.”¹⁹⁴ To do the “greater works,” the doing must be possible for us. Jesus’s way of seeing what the Father was doing must be within our capacity. Jesus had to make it possible by way of his Incarnation: first by his earthly example and then by the impartation his Incarnation allowed. This required his consciousness, not only of dependence upon his Father, but also upon the Holy Spirit.

Exploration of Jesus’s phenomenology regarding his perception and consciousness as the divine Son and the Last Adam uncovers Jesus the “pattern Son” who became fully human in order to invite us into divine sonship with the Father. As the pattern, he demonstrated not the independence expected of a king, but utter dependence

¹⁹¹ Moltmann, *Way of Jesus Christ*.

¹⁹² Ibid.

¹⁹³ Isa. 61:1 (NKJV).

¹⁹⁴ Luke 19:10.

upon the Father, and perfect fidelity in imitating him. For our sakes, he exposed his continuous communion with the Father, which proceeded from their relationship of mutual love and concomitant affection, and opened a portal of insight into his awareness of his Messianic and prophetic calling—an awareness as phenomenological as it was spiritual.

The overarching divine desire to restore is seen in its most sublime and practical sense—to renew fallen humankind’s access to the potential rendered dormant in the Garden. This examination of Jesus’s self-disclosed Person and work, his perceptual range, and his immersion in the Father-Son relationship shares this motive. The goal is to develop not only an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality, but the realization that firsthand, real-time intimacy with the Father was not for the Son alone; it is the standard by which every son and daughter of God is empowered to operate in the same Spirit as Jesus did, to the end of fulfilling the promised “greater works.”

In summary, the argument between continuationism and cessationism continues to impact all that this chapter has covered, including: our views of Jesus’s consciousness; his role as our pattern and sign; our perception of the Incarnate Son’s perceptuality regarding the Father-Son relationship, the role of the Last Adam, and his function as a man anointed by the Holy Spirit. The issues studied are elemental to the development of an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality.

CHAPTER 3

THE PATRISTIC VIEW OF JESUS'S ONTOLOGY AND PHENOMENOLOGY

The Patristic Legacy

Any hypothesis of an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality warrants examination of the writings and legacy of the Patristics following “the Apostolic period.”¹ Therefore, this chapter examines their defense of the biblical record and their work to define *hypostatic union*. Additionally, it examines concepts of the Incarnate Son’s ignorance, his acceptance of human weakness, and his endowment with power.

The Greek and Latin fathers of the “infant” church counteracted heretical doctrines and gnostic beliefs regarding the nature of the Son of God. Their Christological insights are foundational to Christian orthodoxy and tradition. Also key is the Patristics’ proximity to the first apostles, and their resulting insights into Scripture, Christ’s nature, and the Trinity. Nearly all branches in the vine of Christ’s Body honor the Patristics; Pentecostalism presumes and builds upon the Patristic consensus. The unbroken profession of Christianity expressed in the Nicene, Apostles’, Athanasian, and Chalcedonian creeds stems from their work and connects the church’s current expression to its historical apostolic roots.

The fathers’ questions and insights into the nature of the Incarnate Son, his perceptual consciousness, his phenomenology and way of seeing the Father, his way of perceiving and executing the Father’s intentions, and his spiritual sensibilities are integral

¹ “73. What are Patristics and why should we study them?” Monergism.com, accessed October 9, 2015, <http://www.monergism.com/thethreshold/articles/onsite/qna/patristics.html>. *The Apostolic period* refers to the era ending with the death of the last living original apostle, John.

to an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality. To peer into Jesus's way of seeing, his ontology must be better understood. Fortunately, in refuting heretical teachings, the fathers emphasized Jesus's ontology.

Defending the Biblical Record

The Patristics and early church councils defended Jesus's divine Personhood, refuting heretical and anti-biblical views that threatened church foundations.² Their contribution to orthodoxy and the faith is therefore seminal. They also established the *hypostatic union* (in Christ, one Person subsists in two natures)³ and the following reality:

² The following were the major threats resisted by the Patristics: Docetism was an "early Christological heresy deriving from the Greek verb *dokein* ('to appear') which treated Jesus Christ as a purely divine being who only had the 'appearance' of being human." Alister E. McGrath, *Christian History: An Introduction* (Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, 2013), 354. Arianism was a "major early Christological heresy, which treated Jesus Christ as the supreme of God's creatures, and denied His divine status." Ibid., 352. "An early Trinitarian heresy [Sabellianism] treated the three persons of the Trinity as different historical manifestations of the one God. It is generally regarded as a form of modalism." Ibid. The teachings of Gnosticism "were (at least superficially) similar to those of Christianity itself. Many Gnostic writers argued that salvation was achieved through access to a secret teaching, which alone insured that believers would be saved. The 'secret knowledge' in question, was almost like a form of 'cosmic password.'" Alister E. McGrath, *Historical Theology: An Introduction to the History of Christian Thought* (Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, 2013), 36–37. Donatism was "a movement, centering upon Roman North Africa in the fourth century, which developed a rigorist view of the church and sacraments." Ibid., 280. Ebionitism was an "early Christological heresy, which treated Jesus Christ as a purely human figure, although recognizing that He was endowed with particular charismatic gifts which distinguished Him from other humans." Ibid. Patripassianism was a "theological heresy which arose during the third century, associated with writers such as Noetus, Praxeas, and Sabellius, focusing on the belief that the Father suffered as the Son." Ibid., 284. Finally, Pelagianism was the "understanding of how humans are able to merit their salvation, which is diametrically opposed to that of Augustine of Hippo, placing considerable emphasis upon the role of human works and playing down the idea of divine grace." Ibid. Referencing these anti-biblical and heretical views is important to this study. If the Incarnate Son had been a purely divine being, his example, instruction, and promise of "greater works" would find no practical fulfillment through human followers. If he had been a purely human being, the taint of sin would have rendered his salvific work impossible or void. Denying the three distinct persons of the Godhead also denies their distinct relationships; so, for example, the Father's love of the Son (John 5:20) would be self-love—God loving an aspect or mode of himself. It also undergirds the Patripassianist view of who suffered for humankind. Among its many tenets, the "secret knowledge" suggested by Gnosticism challenged the authority of Scripture and encouraged the adoption of other "scriptures." Donatists believed that the power of the sacraments depended upon the purity of the human minister, rather than the authority and intent of God. Of course, any attempt to earn salvation through human merit is, by definition, dismissive of the work of the Cross.

³ *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, s.v. "hypostatic union," accessed September 28, 2015, <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/07610b.htm>.

The Father “sent” the human, Incarnate Son to fulfill a work.⁴ Likewise, the Son sends his disciples to continue that work,⁵ implying (particularly in relation to the “greater works”) that their miraculous results are to resemble his. As the Incarnate Son depended fully on the Spirit in executing his assignment, Jesus’s followers are to do the same. This suggests that Christ’s Person necessarily speaks to those who believe in him.⁶

Clearly, the early defenders of Christian orthodoxy were critical to preserving the nascent church. However, because of the challenges they countered, they focused almost exclusively on Jesus’s ontology, with little emphasis on his phenomenology. This will be demonstrated by the key Patristic responses to heretical impulses that are highlighted here.

Among them was Athanasius, a bulwark against Arius, the ascetic who challenged Christ’s integrity saying, “even the Son to the Father is invisible,”⁷ and, “the Word cannot perfectly and exactly either *see* or *know* His own Father.”⁸ If Arius’ claims were correct, Jesus’s words to the Jews in John 5:17–19 would be suspect and his way of seeing the Father discredited. Athanasius’ condemnation of Arius’ claims, including his statement that Jesus “knows not even his own essence,”⁹ are therefore germane here.

⁴ John 20:21.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ “He who has seen Me has seen the Father.” John 14:9. Through Jesus’ nature we perceive the Father, as Jesus’ words indicate.

⁷ Athanasius of Alexandria, “Four Discourses Against the Arians,” in *St. Athanasius: Select Works and Letters*, ed. Archibald Robertson. A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, 2nd ser., ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, vol. 4 (New York: Christian Literature, 1892), 309.

⁸ Ibid.; italics mine.

⁹ Ibid.

Gregory of Nazianzus countered Apollinaris' heresy, which claimed that the hypostasis of Christ replaced Jesus's rational human soul and Christ's body was a glorified human nature.¹⁰ These assertions deny Jesus's fully-human status as the God-Man. Gregory's refutation affirmed Jesus's humanity and its centrality to his salvific work:

If anyone has put his trust in him as a man without a human mind, he is really bereft of mind and quite unworthy of salvation. *For that which he has not assumed, he has not healed*; but that which is united to his Godhead, is also saved.¹¹

Apollinaris' truncation of Christ's human nature ontologically and psychologically precluded true healing, because Christ could not restore the mind and soul he had not assumed. Apollinaris' dualism threatened the Gospel. Gregory's refutation affirmed humanity's dignity, spirit, soul, and body. He also affirmed that, by assuming human flesh from the inside out (but apart from sin), Christ restored humanity to its intended place before God.

Admittedly lacking insight into Jesus's way of seeing, Augustine tackled "the Jews'" accusations that, in calling God his Father, Jesus blasphemed God.¹² Augustine's response was astute: "Now the Jews were moved and indignant: justly, indeed, because a *man* dared to make himself equal with God; but unjustly in this, because in the *man* they understood not the God."¹³ Augustine contrasted "the Jews'" blindness with Jesus's way

¹⁰ Matt Slick, "Apollinarianism," Christian Apologetics and Research Ministry, accessed April 23, 2014. <http://carm.org/apollinarianism>.

¹¹ James Stevenson and B. J. Kidd, eds., *Creeds, Councils, and Controversies: Documents Illustrative of the History of the Church, A.D. 337–461* (New York: Seabury Press, 1966), 88–89; italics mine.

¹² John 5:17–19.

¹³ St. Augustine, "Lectures or Tractates on the Gospel According to St. John," in *St. Augustin: Homilies on the Gospel of John; Homilies on the First Epistle of John; Soliloquies*, A Select Library of the

of seeing.¹⁴ However, regarding *how* the Incarnate Son saw what the Father was doing, Augustine confessed ignorance:

Do thou explain to me how He seeth! If thou canst not explain this, neither can I that. If thou art not yet competent to understand this, neither am I to understand that. Wherefore let each of us seek, each knock, that each may merit to receive.¹⁵

Augustine seemed to claim that Jesus's way of seeing is beyond knowing, but also appeared to suggest that it might be discovered. Did his confessed ignorance direct others to Matthew 7:7, hoping that God would reveal Jesus's way of seeing through their importunate prayer? The answer is unknown. Augustine was aware of Jesus's way of seeing, however mysterious it seemed to him.

Cyril of Alexandria vigorously refuted Nestorius, who held to a disunity between the two natures of Christ:

He *took hold of the seed of Abraham*, and the blessed Virgin being the mean to this same end, He *took part like us in blood and flesh*; for so and no otherwise could He become *God with us*. Most needful in another way too unto those on the earth was the Incarnation or Inhumanation of the Word. For if He had not been born as we according to the flesh, if He had not taken *part like us of the same*, He would not have freed the nature of man from the blame [contracted] in Adam, nor would He have driven away from our bodies the decay, nor would the might of the curse have ceased which we say came on the first woman.¹⁶

Cyril contended that Christ was co-substantial with the Father and co-substantial with humanity (two natures, one Person). Yet a question arises: Cyril and others equated

Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, 1st ser., ed. Philip Schaff, vol. 7 (New York: Christian Literature, 1888), tractate 18, chap. 5, v. 19; italics mine.

¹⁴ In John 9:41 Jesus implied the blindness of "the Jews." In John 8:44 he called them the sons of Satan, who was "a murderer from the beginning," and accused them of sharing the desires of their diabolical father. According to Second Corinthians 3:6, they opposed the Spirit of God who is the animating source by which Jesus' faith (and ours) is made effective.

¹⁵ St. Augustin, "Lectures or Tractates," tractate 18, chap. 5, v. 19.

¹⁶ Cyril, *Five Tomes*, 9.

Jesus's distinguishing "actions" related to his divinity as "notably his miracles."¹⁷ His divinity *is* unquestioned. Yet many prior prophets who were not divine in nature, also performed miracles. Christ's miracles can be soundly argued based on his prophetic calling as the Last Adam—a man who accomplished all his works as a fully human being, reliant not upon his divine nature but upon the power of the Spirit.

Moses said God would raise up a prophet "from your brethren."¹⁸ In modern vernacular, Jesus was "one of us." His limitation (as Cyril and others argued) stemmed from his genuinely human experiences with "hunger, thirst, suffering, spatial limitation,"¹⁹ and the like. Yet, in the agony of his passion, a dimension of suffering touched and required the participation of his divine nature.

Cyril agreed with other church fathers regarding Jesus's fully-human status in the economy.²⁰ Yet, in speaking of Christ's divine nature, he asked, "How then will the Son do likewise the works of the Father if on account of his inferiority he falls short of equal power with him?"²¹ For Cyril, power was the litmus test for divinity. What of Luke's

¹⁷ Andrew Louth, *Maximus the Confessor: The Early Church Fathers* (London: Routledge, 1996), 8.

¹⁸ Deut. 18:15 (NKJV).

¹⁹ Louth, *Maximus the Confessor*, 8.

²⁰ "The economic Trinity is the epistemological ground of the immanent Trinity whereas the immanent Trinity is the ontological ground of the economic Trinity." Seung Goo Lee, "The Relationship between the Economic Trinity and the Ontological Trinity," abstract, *Journal of Reformed Theology* 3, no. 1 (2009): 90, accessed December 2, 2015, <http://booksandjournals.brillonline.com/content/journals/10.1163/156973109x403741>.

²¹ Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentary on John*, ed. Joel C. Elowsky, Ancient Christian Texts, ed. Thomas C. Oden and Gerald L. Bray (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2013), 1:189.

report, then, that Jesus returned “to Galilee in the power of the Spirit”²²? Luke did not address Jesus’s divine nature, but his dependence on the Holy Spirit.²³

This question touches the core of an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality. How could Jesus’s followers do the “greater works” if divinity were required? It is only possible through the Spirit’s empowerment, which is divine, yet not of themselves. Had Jesus performed works from his divine nature, performing them would be impossible for others. Was Cyril’s “power” argument, rooted in the miracles of Jesus, a necessary one? What might have been an alternative? That Jesus “was declared the Son of God with power by the resurrection from the dead” would seem sufficient to prove his divinity.²⁴

Cyril merely hinted at Jesus’s mode of seeing what the Father was doing: “But whatever He *sees* the Father do (*in his thoughts as it were*), He certainly carries out.”²⁵ Exactly *how* Jesus saw in his thoughts remains unclear. This inadequacy highlights the disparity between the fathers’ thorough exploration of Jesus’s ontology and their virtual silence on his phenomenology.

Hypostasis and Human Nature

Professor Paul M. Blowers states that Maximus saw human desire “in all its cosmological and psychosomatic complexity”²⁶ serving in part as “a register of creaturely possibility and affectivity, and as integral to the definition of human volition and

²² Luke 4:14

²³ Regarding Nicaea or Chalcedon, there is no disagreement.

²⁴ Rom. 1:4.

²⁵ Cyril, *Commentary on John*, 189.

²⁶ Paul M. Blowers, “The Dialectics and Therapeutics of Desire in Maximus the Confessor,” abstract, *Vigiliae Christianae* 65, no. 4 (2011): 425, accessed December 2, 2015, <http://booksandjournals.brillonline.com/content/journals/10.1163/157007210x524286>.

freedom.”²⁷ Possibility and affectivity, being inseparable from human volition and freedom, are at the core of human phenomenology. As Christ’s followers, realms of possibility are tied to our affections and choices regarding the obedience of faith. Blowers focuses on Maximus’ assertion that the

malleable character of desire and the passions, and their ambiguous but ultimately purposive status within the economy of human transformation, decisively manifest the divine resourcefulness in fulfilling the mystery of deification—especially in view of Christ’s use of human possibility in inaugurating the new eschatological “mode” (tropos) of human nature.²⁸

Blower affirms the importance of desire and passion, and their role in human transformation as accomplished through cooperation with the Holy Spirit.

Phenomenologically speaking and regarding what the Incarnation made possible for us, Maximus’ *Ambigua* is monumental. Therefore, significant interaction with Maximus will aid the development of an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality. His confrontation of the monophytist and monothelist heresies challenging the reality of the Incarnate Son’s two natures and two wills is central. Regarding the doctrine of theosis, Polycarp Sherwood explains why: “Man’s becoming God is considered only as the result of God’s becoming man; the mystery of Christ therefore stands at the very heart of the Maximian synthesis.”²⁹

From an Orthodox perspective, hypostasis is a “unitary center of all its relationships, a concrete mode of existence.”³⁰ God’s intent for human nature is

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ St. Maximus the Confessor, *The Ascetic Life: The Four Centuries on Charity*, trans. and annot. Polycarp Sherwood, Ancient Christian Writers 21 (New York: Newman Press, 1955), 29.

³⁰ Emil Bartos, *Deification in Eastern Orthodox Theology* (Milton Keynes, UK: Paternoster, 1999), 169.

hypostatic. We were created to move toward God, but Adam retreated from partaking of the divine nature. Maximus' cosmic theology maintains that Adam's disobedience spurred the directional move toward destruction. Therefore, humanity can no longer fulfill its intention. Louth summarizes Maximus' understanding of humanity's potential, saying that "the human person is to be regarded as a microcosm and bond of creation."³¹

In Christ, by way of theosis,³² the potential of movement toward God is restored. Maximus said the Last Adam actively moved toward the Father,³³ and by participating in the Father's works³⁴ moved humanity away from corruption. For Maximus, the Incarnation and Christ's hypostasis reveal God's intent for "the ontological interiority of human being as created participation in God."³⁵ The Incarnation made possible genuine "human spiritual progress"³⁶ (including movement toward the Father). The question is whether Maximus saw the Incarnation as a renewal of Adam's race or an event precipitating a humanity exceeding anything Adam knew. The Pauline argument is clear:

"The first man, Adam, became a living soul." The last Adam became a life-giving spirit. However, the spiritual is not first, but the natural; then the spiritual. The first man is from the earth, earthy; the second man is from heaven. As is the earthy, so also are those who are earthy; and as is the heavenly, so also are those who are heavenly. Just as we have borne the image of the earthy, we will also bear the image of the heavenly.³⁷

³¹ Louth, *Maximus the Confessor*, 153.

³² 2 Pet. 1:4.

³³ Luke 2:52.

³⁴ John 5:19.

³⁵ Pauline Allen and Bronwen Neil, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Maximus the Confessor* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 360.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ 1 Cor. 15:45–49.

Despite Paul's clarity, Maximus' view remains uncertain and variously interpreted. Nevertheless, his understanding of the spiritual senses' development and function has bearing on this study.

Maximus believed "the humanity of Christ had its own distinctive, particular idioms"³⁸ because he was the Only Begotten Son of the Father. Yet within his humanity, he operated in a "mode of willing and acting" with a rational human soul.³⁹ Maximus was clear: we cannot deprive Jesus of this without depriving the divine intent for humankind. By willing and acting, Jesus rendered "the measure of the stature which belongs to the fullness of Christ"⁴⁰ an attainable human goal, through the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. Through the Incarnation, human beings can embrace their true origin and destiny, including the "greater works."

The movement of God and human beings toward each other in the Incarnation fulfills the divine intent. Commenting on Maximus and the Incarnation's effect, Bingaman outlines the reaching down of God and the reaching up of humankind:

Man has become God to the degree that God has become man, for he (man) has been led by God, through the stages of divine ascent, into the highest regions to the same degree that God has descended down to the farthest reaches of our nature, by means of a man and through a destruction of his own self that nevertheless implies no change.⁴¹

For Maximus, God's Incarnational descent into humanity made possible humans' ascendant partaking of the divine nature. In stooping down, God fully identified with and

³⁸ Demetrios Barthellos, *The Byzantine Christ: Person, Nature, and Will in the Christology of St. Maximus the Confessor* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 102.

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Eph. 4:13.

⁴¹ Brock Bingaman, *All Things New: The Trinitarian Nature of the Human Calling in Maximus the Confessor and Jürgen Moltmann* (Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2014), 34.

assumed the human condition (apart from sin), nullifying humanity's estrangement from God and from its potential in him.

What are these stages of divine ascent, and how might they relate to an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality? For Maximus, the answer is in Christ, "the embodiment of God's purposes" who reveals our vocation in living unto the Father.⁴² Maximus claimed that Jesus modeled "a life of ascetic discipline, contemplation, and loving union with God."⁴³ Did Jesus actually practice ascetic discipline, as John the Baptist clearly did?⁴⁴ Because of his activities and associations, Jesus was labeled a glutton and drunkard.⁴⁵ Despite forty days of fasting in the wilderness,⁴⁶ he seemed to enjoy and encourage feasting.⁴⁷

What did Maximus mean by *ascetic discipline*, if not mere abstinence? Sherwood proposed that Maximus' "whole system is ascetical and mystical."⁴⁸ Maximus implied what *ascetical* means by describing its antithesis: "[T]he devil knew that there are three things by which everything human is moved—I mean food, money, and reputation, and it is by these too that he leads men down to the depths of destruction."⁴⁹ He then affirmed Christ's victories over these temptations in his wilderness testing.

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ Matt. 11:18.

⁴⁵ Matt. 11:19.

⁴⁶ Luke 4:2.

⁴⁷ Matt. 9:14.

⁴⁸ St. Maximus, *Ascetic Life*, 28.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 109.

It is difficult to ascertain whether Maximus' use of *ascetic* was a rigid, legalistic approach to a lifestyle or system of regulations.⁵⁰ For him, the term reflected the monastic tradition of the Desert Fathers. His predecessors, Origen and Clement of Alexandria, studied the Hellenistic philosophy of the Stoics and "the theoretical foundations of asceticism";⁵¹ they saw ascetic practices as a means of "purification of the soul from its passions,"⁵² and for "loving God more perfectly and for attaining to contemplation."⁵³ The Desert Fathers favored "a more temperate external asceticism, [laying] more stress on interior abnegation and the cultivation of the virtues."⁵⁴ This was congruent with Maximus' view of theosis (deification) as the outcome of transformation by the Spirit, the *working out* of that which God by his Spirit was *working in* the individual.⁵⁵

That Maximus appreciated asceticism is evident as he "opens up the whole question of how embodied, passible human existence is the frontier of human salvation and deification."⁵⁶ Yet, his writings do not indicate agreement with extreme Origenist practices. Instead, he favored stages of ascent, including the partaking of sacraments, denial of self, and the cultivation of prayer and contemplation based on the divine gift of *agape*, the foundation of ascetical technique. As Maximus proclaimed:

⁵⁰ To suggest this would create tension with Paul's teachings; the apostle believed such regimens were ineffectual in overcoming the flesh, which could be accomplished only by the Spirit. Col. 2:20–23. Jesus overcame by the Spirit, and in the Spirit's power he returned from his testing triumphant. Luke 4:14.

⁵¹ F. L. Cross and E. A. Livingstone, eds., *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, s.v. "asceticism" (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ Phil. 2:12–13.

⁵⁶ Blowers, "Dialectics and Therapeutics," 425.

[T]he divine gift then of *agape* to the creature enables him so to be fixed in the faith already here on earth and in the good, that, partaking of the divine fixity and firmness, he can in that measure imitate the divine love.⁵⁷

An intrinsic human conflict, a war of passions requiring “a technique of opposition” controls “the passions and the right use of natural powers,”⁵⁸ including desire and volition. These have “practical”⁵⁹ implications in resisting evil and serve “the attainment of understanding and knowledge.”⁶⁰ For Maximus, the latter is the “theoretical,”⁶¹ contemplative aspect of his recommended ascetic practice. This blend of the practical and theoretical produced what Maximus believed was a balanced approach.

Maximus saw anger, sexual drives and lusts, and a wandering mind as paths to corruption; ascension was a mind poised toward God in the perfect devotion requiring the virtues of “love, self-mastery, and prayer.”⁶² These are essential because “love tames anger; self-mastery quenches concupiscence; and prayer withdraws the mind from all thoughts and presents it, stripped, to God Himself.”⁶³ The Cross was central to his thoroughly cruciform theology and its application in the believer’s life. Essentially, asceticism called for a dying to the world and the flesh that reflects Jesus’s death to both on the Cross.

Apprehending and knowing God, experientially and perceptibly, are inseparable from ascetic discipline, prayer and contemplation, and union with God based on love.

⁵⁷ St. Maximus the Confessor, *Ascetic Life*, 83.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 84.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

⁶¹ *Ibid.*

⁶² *Ibid.*, 114.

⁶³ *Ibid.*

How might these disciplines aid the development of prophetic perceptuality? Frederick Aquino asserts that Maximus “links spiritual perception with the integration of the self.”⁶⁴ For Maximus, the Incarnation created a “new way of being human.”⁶⁵ In Christ, therefore, spiritual progress toward the divine destiny is an integration accessible because of the Cross. Aquino claims that Maximus held to an “epistemology of perception”⁶⁶ that “focuses on the interplay of the rational, the volitional, and the sensate.”⁶⁷ This interplay directs Jesus’s followers God-ward to partake of the divine nature.

Maximus believed the mind poised toward God engaged a conjectural form of reasoning that “dares ... to behold the foolishness, the weakness and the play of God.”⁶⁸ He compared this “play” to human growth from childhood to maturity, particularly the lessons learned when children play under parental oversight. Louth suggests this possibly “refers to the liability to change of the material things to which we entrust ourselves.”⁶⁹ Desired material things are changeable; they “possess no stable basis.”⁷⁰ Depending on the meaning (logos)⁷¹ human beings ascribe to material things, those things will either

⁶⁴ Paul L. Gavrilyuk and Sarah Coakley, *The Spiritual Senses: Perceiving God in Western Christianity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 103.

⁶⁵ Maximos the Confessor, “Ambiguum 7,” *The Ambigua: On Difficulties in the Church Fathers: The Ambigua*, ed. Nicholas Constas, Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library 29 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2014), 1: 107.

⁶⁶ Gavrilyuk and Coakley, *Spiritual Senses*, 103.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ Louth, *Maximus the Confessor*, 165.

⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁷¹ Ibid.

rule them or they will rule the things. In the former case, the humans are yet children; therefore, these things evade their grasp.

Maturity requires not being moved by material things. God uses experiences as a form of play through which he “draw[s] us to that which really is and can never be shaken.”⁷² Thus, he matures us in the unchanging Person of Christ and His unshakeable Kingdom.⁷³

Maximus likened this to what the sons of Korah described: “deep calls to deep at the sound of Your waterfalls”⁷⁴—in Maximus’ words, “abyss calls to abyss in the noise of the divine cataracts.”⁷⁵ For him the metaphor spoke of “the mind that reaches after knowledge and calls upon wisdom”⁷⁶ in order to discern God in the Incarnate Son. This included contemplation of the Son, his ineffable nature, and his way of interacting with the Father. In essence, the descent of God in the Incarnation provided our ascent to him in deification via the Cross.

Maximus indicated that those who focus on contemplation as an aspect of ascetic technique can discern that which comes from God. The mind is “called abyss because of its capacity”⁷⁷ to comprehend even partially the divine wisdom which is given freely when it is requested in prayer. This requires “divine grace” and hearing the Scriptures,⁷⁸

⁷² Ibid.

⁷³ Heb. 12:28.

⁷⁴ Ps. 42:7.

⁷⁵ Louth, *Maximus the Confessor*, 165.

⁷⁶ Ibid.

⁷⁷ Ibid.

⁷⁸ Ibid.

which could imply the hearing of faith that produces a paradoxical experience,⁷⁹ a “flowing that remains still.”⁸⁰ This apparently suggests a stillness of mind that allows the recognition (or *seeing*) of wisdom when it is presented.

Maximus’ goal was deification—the partaking of the divine nature, including participation in the divine economy and working the promised “greater works.” This requires development of the spiritual senses within the context of the divinely-intended hypostatic human nature. As the Incarnate Son saw in his human soul what the Father was doing, the Incarnation empowers those in Christ to do likewise.

Fully-Human Consciousness of the Only Begotten

The understanding of Christ’s nature that steeled the early fathers’ opposition to heresy can now guide exploration of Jesus’s self-consciousness from a phenomenological perspective so that an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality can be developed.

Use of the term *self-consciousness* here precludes any diminution of the Person of Jesus. Rather than making him a *mere* human being, his self-consciousness made him a *true* human being who was also truly divine.⁸¹ This identity within the Economic Trinity establishes the pattern and paradigm by which adopted sons by grace might do his works and even “greater works.”⁸²

⁷⁹ Rom. 10:17.

⁸⁰ Louth, *Maximus the Confessor*, 165.

⁸¹ “For us and for our salvation he came down from heaven, was incarnate of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary and became truly human.” “The Nicene Creed,” accessed September 29, 2015, <http://www.creeds.net/ancient/nicene.htm>. Selection is taken from the English Language Liturgical Commission translation.

⁸² Lee, “Economic Trinity and Ontological Trinity”; Gal. 4:4–7; John 14:12.

Self-consciousness means being “[a]ware of oneself as an individual or of one’s own being, actions, or thoughts.”⁸³ In contemporary thought it involves “a perception of oneself as subject,”⁸⁴ rather than the introspective perception of oneself as object. In his humanity, Jesus’s self-consciousness, self-disclosure, and experiential human knowledge were integral to his salvific work.

The Incarnate Son uniquely, transcendently knew his Father *because* he was the Only Begotten Son.⁸⁵ How he experienced his knowing and seeing (the unity of his ontological constitution) was inseparable from his assuming of human flesh, including the entire psychological and somatic experience of humanness. By speaking in the third person about “the Son” seeing and doing only what “the Father” was doing,⁸⁶ Jesus indicated his filial state of conscious awareness and his intentionality.⁸⁷

Jesus’s awareness was not perception of an object, but experience as a subject self-disclosing as Son of God and Son of Man—two natures and two wills, but *one* subject via the hypostatic union. His present-tense awareness of seeing what his Father was doing revealed the ontological unity of his Personhood with the Eternal Father in chronological time;⁸⁸ it harmonized his humanity and divinity in his self-disclosure; it

⁸³ *American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*, 5th ed., s.v. “self-conscious,” accessed September 24, 2015, <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/self-conscious>.

⁸⁴ Lonergan, *Collected Works*, 209.

⁸⁵ John 1:14.

⁸⁶ John 5:19.

⁸⁷ “Of or relating to a son or daughter: appropriate for a son or daughter,” Merriam-Webster.com, s.v. “filial,” accessed April 25, 2014, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/filial>.

⁸⁸ “βλέπω—present, active, subjunctive, third person, singular—to be able to see, to have faculty of sight; perceive with the eyes meaning to discern, understand; to perceive with the mind, to be aware of; to look at or upon, to direct the eyes upon.” Zodhiates, *Complete Word Study Dictionary*, s.v. “see.”

impacted his psychological state; and it revealed a communion of this unity within his psychological framework.

The Ignorance of the Incarnate Son

Understanding the Incarnate Son's fully-human mode of seeing means recognizing his unique place, while apprehending the limits of human perception and the implications to his work. The Last Adam was not merely human but *truly* human⁸⁹—unbound by sin's taint; not alienated from the Father, humanity, or the Creation; unhindered from fulfilling the Father's will (thereby freeing us to fulfill the "greater works"). The Eternal Son had to *will* to be born and assume human finitude. Tertullian said, "If God had willed not to be born, it matters not why, he would not have presented himself in the likeness of man."⁹⁰ If God willed to be born by sending his Son "in the likeness of sinful flesh,"⁹¹ every resulting limitation was self-imposed.

The omniscient Eternal Son knew humanity perfectly. The Incarnate Son chose to know himself and others experientially, as a man. His truly human nature emphasized his true humanness, which the Councils of Nicaea (A.D. 325) and Constantinople (A.D. 381) affirmed. Through his human personality, he related to other humans. He was named *Jesus* in keeping with his truly human self-identity⁹²—the "I" of Jesus, the Logos made flesh, which produced his truly human self-consciousness and self-awareness.

⁸⁹ 1 Cor. 15:45.

⁹⁰ Tertullian, "On the Flesh of Christ," in *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 3, *Latin Christianity: Its Founder, Tertullian*, ed. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905), 522.

⁹¹ Rom. 8:3.

⁹² Matt. 1:21.

The question becomes whether the First Adam possessed perfect knowledge prior to the Fall. If so, could the serpent deceive him? If the Last Adam was *truly human*, how was his knowledge different from that of the pre-Fall First Adam? The First Adam, created innocent, was to transform innocence into holiness through his choices. The Last Adam was the beginning of Creation: “In him was life, and the life was the Light of men.”⁹³ Only the pre-existent One possessed perfect knowledge. Only he was a “life-giving spirit.”⁹⁴

Kline explains that the “redemptive identity and function of the Son of God stands in continuity with what was already true of him as the Logos in the beginning under the Covenant of Creation.”⁹⁵ The Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil, which Kline calls a “probationary tree,”⁹⁶ stood in contradistinction to the Tree of Life. In partaking of the latter, Adam would partake of the likeness of the glory of God. This eschatological aspect of the blessing is possible in and through the Last Adam, the “express image” of the Father’s glory.⁹⁷

Although created innocent, the First Adam lacked perfect knowledge. If it was somehow perfect, it remained finite and uncertain, with the possibility of being incorrect. By Roman Catholic tradition, the “human soul that the Son of God assumed is endowed

⁹³ John 1:4.

⁹⁴ 1 Cor. 15:45.

⁹⁵ Meredith G. Kline, *Kingdom Prologue* (South Hamilton: Gordon Conwell Theological Seminary, 1993), 59.

⁹⁶ Ibid.

⁹⁷ Heb. 1:3 (KJV).

with a true human knowledge [which] ... could not in itself be unlimited.”⁹⁸ The probationary tree substantiates Adam’s awareness of covenant sanctions for disobedience, including the curse of death; yet his experiential knowing of sin began when he partook of the forbidden fruit.⁹⁹ Before the Fall, no experiential consciousness of sin existed;¹⁰⁰ neither moral guilt nor the consciousness of shame had been experienced.¹⁰¹

Pre-Fall humankind possessed a purity of cognition and of cognitive ability. Does this imply *perfection of cognition*? Was the woman deceived by the serpent capable of being deceived?¹⁰² Scripture answers affirmatively: “It was not Adam who was deceived, but the woman being deceived, fell into transgression.”¹⁰³ This capability implies a limitation on her mind and will. Does her being bone of Adam’s bone then imply Adam’s similar limitation?¹⁰⁴ His willful disobedience of God’s command suggests the affirmative.¹⁰⁵ How could Adam fall if he could not be deceived? How, too, could the Last Adam be tempted without the possibility of transgression?¹⁰⁶ To conclude that being *truly* human and possessing *true* human knowledge implies limitation seems reasonable, even if limitation is chosen willingly, as it was by the Incarnate Son.

⁹⁸ “Catechism of the Catholic Church,” The Holy See, accessed April 25, 2014, http://www.vatican.va/archive/ccc_css/archive/catechism/p122a3p1.htm.

⁹⁹ The Godhead, however, cannot *know* sin because God cannot sin. Yet, the Incarnate Son was “tempted in all points.” Heb. 4:15.

¹⁰⁰ Gen. 2:25.

¹⁰¹ Ibid.

¹⁰² 1 Tim. 2:14.

¹⁰³ Ibid.

¹⁰⁴ Gen. 2:23.

¹⁰⁵ Gen. 3:11.

¹⁰⁶ Matt. 4:1.

For Chrysostom, the Eternal Son possesses perfect knowledge of the Father, “speaking of a distinct kind of knowledge, and such as no other can possess,”¹⁰⁷ Yet, Jesus confessed *ignorance* regarding the last day, saying, “Of that day or hour no one knows, not even the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but the Father alone.”¹⁰⁸ The Arian and Apollinarian heretical views of the Incarnate Son’s nature used Christ’s own words to deny his deity. Gregory of Nazianzus countered their argument:

Thus everyone must see that He knows as God, and knows not as Man ... we are to understand the ignorance in the most reverent sense, by attributing it to the Manhood, and not to the Godhead.¹⁰⁹

Gregory explained that although the Logos knows what the Father knows, the Savior had to assume our total humanness, including cognitive and perceptual limitations, in order to redeem us. Athanasius also distinguished between the ontological and Economic Trinity: “For this as before is not the Word’s deficiency, but of that human nature whose property it is to be ignorant.”¹¹⁰

Gregory, Chrysostom, and Athanasius agreed that although the human Jesus expressed deficiency of knowledge he maintained consciousness of himself as “the Son.”¹¹¹ Athanasius summarized the Savior’s choice: “It became the Lord, in putting on

¹⁰⁷ John Chrysostom, “Homilies of St. John Chrysostom, Archbishop of Constantinople, on the Gospel of St. John,” in *Saint Chrysostom: Homilies on the Gospel of St. John and Epistle to the Hebrews*, A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, 1st ser., ed. Philip Schaff, vol. 14 (New York: Christian Literature, 1889), 134.

¹⁰⁸ Mark 13:32.

¹⁰⁹ S. Cyril and S. Gregory, “Gregory Nazianzen, Archbishop of Constantinople: Select Orations,” in *S. Cyril of Jerusalem: Catechetical Lectures [and] S. Gregory of Nazianzen: Select Orations, and Letters*, A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, 2nd ser., ed. Henry Wace and Philip Schaff, vol. 7 (Oxford: Christian Literature, 1894), 315.

¹¹⁰ Athanasius, “Four Discourses,” 410.

¹¹¹ Mark 13:32.

human flesh, to put it on whole with the affections proper to it.”¹¹² In love, the Incarnate Son shared our limitations and sufferings. Athanasius explains:

For He was made man that we might be made God; and He manifested Himself by a body that we might receive the idea of the unseen Father; and He endured the insolence of men that we might inherit immortality.¹¹³

The adage, *Nemo dat quod non habet* applies.¹¹⁴ Christ assumed ignorance in order to free us from it and its concomitant deception and insecurity. He thereby made the limited knowledge of God secure forever.

The Weakness of the Incarnate Son

The Eternal Son chose the Incarnate Son’s weakness,¹¹⁵ despite being the “power of God.”¹¹⁶ He accepted limitation and “learned obedience through the things which he suffered.”¹¹⁷ The One who “existed in the form of God” had to be nurtured,¹¹⁸ experience childhood, and develop by growing and learning to speak, think, and reason.¹¹⁹

Luke’s Gospel reveals twelve-year-old Jesus’s filial consciousness of his Father and his own mission.¹²⁰ After his three-day “disappearance,” Jesus was surprised that Joseph and Mary had not surmised his whereabouts. Still, he remained in “subjection” to

¹¹² Athanasius, “Four Discourses,” 410.

¹¹³ Athanasius of Alexandria, “Introduction to the Treatise on the Incarnation of the Word,” in *Select Works and Letters*, 65.

¹¹⁴ “No one gives what he does not have.” *Latin Dictionary*, s.v. “nemo dat quod non habet,” accessed April 28, 2013, http://www.latin-dictionary.org/Nemo_dat_quod_non_habet.

¹¹⁵ 2 Cor. 13:4.

¹¹⁶ 1 Cor. 1:24.

¹¹⁷ Heb. 5:8.

¹¹⁸ Phil. 2:6.

¹¹⁹ 1 Cor. 13:11.

¹²⁰ Luke 2:49.

his earthly parents and continued to increase “in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and men.”¹²¹

This implies psychological growth and gnoseological growth. His question—“Did you not know I had to be in My Father’s house?”¹²²—displays his developmental awareness, the maturation of his consciousness and perception, and his awareness of his salvific mission.

The Incarnate Son Endowed with Power

By what agency was the Last Adam aware of his Sonship and mission? Citing the Incarnation, John the Baptist’s witness of the Spirit descending on Jesus, the Father’s audible voice at Jesus’s baptism, the Spirit’s leading of Jesus into the wilderness of testing, the inseparable presence of the Spirit in Jesus’s miracles, and the words of Peter to the household of Cornelius,¹²³ Saint Basil asked: “Who would deny that the accommodations made for man by our great God and Savior Jesus Christ according to the goodness of God are accomplished through the grace of the Spirit?”¹²⁴ Basil summarized by saying, “His every work was performed in the presence of the Spirit.”¹²⁵ This included all aspects of Jesus’s mission fulfillment including his conception,¹²⁶ resurrection, and glorification. No insight into the Son’s self-consciousness and prophetic perceptuality is possible apart from the Holy Spirit.

¹²¹ Luke 2:52. This continued until the time of his public baptism.

¹²² Luke 2:49.

¹²³ Luke 1:35; John 1:32; Luke 3:22; Matt. 4:1, 12:28; Acts 10:38.

¹²⁴ St. Basil the Great, *On the Holy Spirit* (Yonkers: St. Vladimir’s Press, 2011), 16, 39.

¹²⁵ Ibid.

¹²⁶ Luke 1:35.

“Your throne, O God, is forever and ever.”¹²⁷ Athanasius applied Psalm 45 to Christ’s anointing by the Spirit at his baptism. He contrasted the Kingship of the Eternal Son with that of the Incarnate Son in relation to history’s Israelite kings, arguing that “being said as man to be anointed with the Spirit, he might provide for us men, not only exaltation and resurrection, but the indwelling and intimacy of the Spirit.”¹²⁸ Here Athanasius underscored the Spirit’s central role in the Incarnate Son’s experience and in the Incarnation’s foundation for the Spirit’s indwelling us.

Several metaphors express the Spirit’s anointing of the Incarnate Son. Gregory of Nyssa said, “The Spirit accompanies the Word as breath speech.”¹²⁹ In other words, the same Spirit who was present at Creation overshadowed Mary at the Incarnation¹³⁰ and was present when John baptized Jesus.¹³¹ Athanasius described the purpose and process: “He is anointed with the Spirit in his manhood to sanctify human nature. Therefore the Spirit descended on him in Jordan, when in the flesh.”¹³² Ambrose also exegeted Psalm 45 to substantiate the Holy Spirit’s work in Jesus’s baptism, and used a well-known metaphor in doing so: “This is the oil of gladness of which the prophet says: ‘God even Thy God hath anointed Thee with the oil of gladness above Thy fellows.’”¹³³ The *oil of*

¹²⁷ Ps. 45:6.

¹²⁸ Athanasius, “Four Discourses,” 410.

¹²⁹ Thomas C. Oden, *Systematic Theology*, vol. 3, *Life in the Spirit* (San Francisco: Harper, 1992), 37.

¹³⁰ Gen. 1:1–2; Luke 1:35.

¹³¹ Oden, *Systematic Theology*, 37.

¹³² Athanasius, “Four Discourses,” 410.

¹³³ Ambrose of Milan, “Three Books of St. Ambrose on the Holy Spirit,” in *St. Ambrose: Select Works and Letters*, trans. E. De Romestin, A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, 2nd ser., ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, vol. 10 (New York: Christian Literature, 1896), 107.

gladness is the Spirit himself anointing Jesus for service and mission. Ambrose focused on this, indicating the term as both metaphoric and semiotic of the Spirit's Personhood:

But when the Son of God Himself says: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me, because He hath anointed Me," He points out the *ointment of the Spirit*. Therefore the *Spirit is the ointment of Christ*.¹³⁴

For Ambrose, the anointing with oil of kings and prophets under the Mosaic economy semiotically foreshadowed the Person and work of the Holy Spirit in the life of the Anointed One. Luke's Gospel speaks of "the ointment" in regard to Jesus who "rejoiced greatly in the Holy Spirit."¹³⁵ It seems that Jesus's joy originated within the Godhead. Could the *beloved* Son be glad and rejoice without the awareness of his Father's love?¹³⁶ If "the Father loves the Son,"¹³⁷ then Jesus was experientially and extraordinarily conscious of that love by the Spirit.

The Holy Spirit is often referred to as the "Spirit of Glad Surprise" because he makes us glad by his deeds.¹³⁸ According to Augustine, the Holy Spirit is not solely the Father's or the Son's, but the Spirit of both "by which the Father and the Son *love* each other."¹³⁹ Although it is strongly disputed in the Eastern Christian tradition, Jesus's self-disclosure of his Father's love is arguably at the root of his consciousness by the very Agency of the Holy Spirit.

¹³⁴ Ibid.

¹³⁵ Luke 10:21.

¹³⁶ Mark 1:11; Luke 3:22.

¹³⁷ John 5:20.

¹³⁸ J. Sidlow Baxter, *A New Call to Holiness: A Restudy and Restatement of New Testament Teaching concerning Christian Sanctification* (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1967), 68; Ps. 92:4.

¹³⁹ Augustine of Hippo, *The Trinity*, trans. Stephen McKenna, *The Fathers of the Church* 45 (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1963), 519.

The Spirit's permanent presence with the Incarnate Son implies his active role in shaping and influencing the Son's self-consciousness. The Spirit's work in the Son's consciousness development from infancy to maturity, including his Messianic role, is therefore the foundation for the Incarnate Son's semiotics of prophetic perceptuality.

The fourth evangelist's details of the Incarnate Son's discourse on the Holy Spirit reveal how the Spirit would be intimately involved with Jesus's followers.¹⁴⁰ Were not these things spoken in absolute awareness and consciousness of the Spirit who led and guided the Son? The same Spirit who would lead and guide into all truth the apostles and every follower of Christ, was the Spirit involved in the Son's becoming fully self-conscious of (1) his identity as the Logos made flesh, (2) his Messianic role, and (3) his unique place as the revealer of the Father and Savior of all humankind.

The Spirit's presence and power cannot be separated from the self-consciousness of the "I" of Jesus of Nazareth, as his testing in the wilderness demonstrates. After prevailing over every temptation of the powers of darkness, Jesus returned to Galilee "in the *power* of the Spirit" to do the works of his Father,¹⁴¹ culminating in his death, burial, and resurrection.

The early church fathers' stand against heresies preserved Christian orthodoxy and the foundation for an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality. Having upheld the biblical fully-human, fully-divine Jesus, they maintained believers' access to his way of seeing and doing what he saw the Father doing.

¹⁴⁰ John 14–16.

¹⁴¹ Luke 4:14; italics mine.

As Maximus explained, the Last Adam corrected the course of humanity. Millennia after the First Adam “moved away” from the Father, the Last Adam modeled “movement toward” the Father, restoring his followers’ pathway of spiritual progress. Maximus’ appreciation for ascetic disciplines also suggested ways of living unto the Father in the new creation life by which spiritual perception leads to internal integration and the partaking of the divine nature.

As regards the God-Man, his salvific work, and his example, the fathers laid the ontological foundations in their reflections on the character of the Incarnation, but failed to address Jesus’s phenomenology significantly. The quest to discover how Jesus saw, to probe his phenomenology, and to develop an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality based on his archetypal example remains.

In summary, the partaking by mortals of the divine nature was made possible because, by way of the hypostatic union, the omniscient Eternal Son took on limited human perception; the omnipotent Eternal Son subjected himself to human weakness; and the Incarnate Son was endowed by the Holy Spirit with power to fulfill his mission. This is the pattern for the Son’s followers.

CHAPTER 4

WESLEYAN CONTEXT FOR AN APPLIED SEMIOTICS OF PROPHETIC PERCEPTUALITY

This chapter will explore the era's contribution to the historical continuation-cessation dispute, the implications of the Reformation, and the role of John Wesley's experiential perspective, including his: Eastern roots, family influences and "outsider" approach, practical theology, interaction with John 5, seeming silence regarding miracles, views on restoration, and the contribution of his legacy to the twentieth-century Pentecostal and Charismatic movement and an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality.

Historical Dispute

Because they believed the medieval church was tainted by corruption, leading reformers Luther and Calvin reflected, not on medieval voices, but on the Patristics' legacy. This study follows their lead, moving past the medieval period and tracing the history of the current continuationist-versus-cessationist dispute back to the substantive and ideological dispute between shifting factions including the Reformers and Wesley, and the Roman Catholic Church. In tracing Jesus's phenomenology through Christian history, the record of early and late Reformers reveals a tension of opposing theories that continues to this day. Although it ultimately settled great theological issues and produced forms of renewal, the crisis combusting with Luther's formal protestation against the Church of Rome also became the seedbed of division between continuationist and cessationist thought.

Two voices will highlight the strains of this division: Wesley, because his immersion in pneumatology was actively demonstrated in signs and wonders; and Calvin because his role in Reformation history and his cessationist view warrant his inclusion. Having already explored the dispute's bearing on the development of an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality, we will now see how Calvin's cessationistic view claimed validity from the Patristics' writings. Wesley also drew from Early Orthodox Fathers and Mothers, but his direct, immediate, and phenomenological experience with the living Christ and his openness to Counter Reformation voices extended the continuationist view into our own era.

Wesley and those following in his footsteps embraced the ongoing presence and power of the Spirit with all his gifts. In developing an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality, this paper will show how and why Wesley's insights into Jesus's self-disclosure in John 5:19 and their implications for the "greater works" are important. Because his Christological presuppositions and views regarding the Person and work of the Holy Spirit apply from ontological and phenomenological perspectives, this study will explore those who influenced Wesley and his pneumatology.

The Reformation Seedbed

Two centuries before John Wesley's birth, the Augustinian monk, Martin Luther, nailed his Ninety-five Theses to the door of Wittenberg's Castle Church, igniting the Protestant Reformation and an extended season of religious and political conflict in Europe.¹ The Roman Catholic Church and the Holy Roman Empire synergistically ruled

¹ "Protestant Reformation," *Theopedia*, accessed September 30, 2015, <http://www.theopedia.com/protestant-reformation>.

Western Europe: the Pope governed the Italian Papal States; in German-speaking European sectors, “princes, dukes, and electors” ruled,² while kings reigned in England, France, Spain.

The Reformation created a political choice: align with the Holy Roman Empire and the papacy, or with those who defected from them. Believing that the Roman Catholic Church had lost its organic vitality and intended influence on society, Reformers focused on three major areas of belief: justification by faith, the authority of Scripture, and the priesthood of all believers.³ Luther and Calvin, the major Reformation voices, shared these focal points, basing their work on their understanding of Scripture and on the Patristics’ work regarding Christ’s mediatorial priesthood and its soteriological significance.⁴ This foundation was so substantial and thorough that the Reformers built upon it, adding little in terms of Christology.

For today’s continuationists, the threefold Reformation platform affirms the ongoing demonstration of the Spirit and his power. Cessationists cite the same platform to deny such demonstration. Similar dynamics prevailed during the Reformation, where the most recent form of cessationism is rooted. Cessationist Reformers like Calvin argued against the sale of indulgences and other abuses, and resisted the Counter Reformation argument for the miraculous, calling it “superstition.”

The controversy extended beyond continental Europe. English Jesuits challenged Protestant polemicists who accused the Roman Catholic Church and the papacy of

² “An Introduction to the Protestant Reformation,” KHAN Academy, accessed October 1, 2015, <https://www.khanacademy.org/humanities/history/1500-1600-Renaissance-Reformation/protestant-reformation/a/an-introduction-to-the-protestant-reformation>.

³ *Theopedia*, s.v. “Protestant Reformation.”

⁴ In particular, as Christ’s work leads to salvation by faith through grace alone.

“pagan and “magical” beliefs.⁵ Although syncretistic elements and nonorthodox practices existed in Roman Catholicism, legitimate miracles were well-documented. For Calvin and others, however, the need to “eradicate vulgar superstition”⁶ and promote their idea of biblically-based living forced their dismissal of the miraculous.

Thus, modern cessationism was born. Calvin “turned the Cessationist polemic against both Roman Catholicism and the radical Reformation, undercutting their claims to religious authority based on miracles and revelations.”⁷ Commenting on Calvin’s polemic, Jon Mark Ruthven says:

What proof, other than his *a priori* association of the miraculous with accreditation of Scripture, does Calvin offer for their cessation? Surprisingly little: he appeals only superficially to Scripture and to the testimony of historical experience. But mostly, Calvin assumes the traditions enshrined in Aquinas, rather than attempts systematically to prove his contention.⁸

Calvin’s modification of Aquinas’ cessationism became the means to “attack the authority of the Roman Catholic Church.”⁹ Aquinas never denied the possibility of miracles, but claimed that “Christ and his disciples had worked miracles sufficient to prove the faith once for all; this having been done, no further miraculous proof of doctrines could be required.”¹⁰

⁵ Alexandra Walsham, “Miracles and the Counter-Reformation Mission to England,” *The Historical Journal* 46, no. 4 (December 2003): 780.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Jon Mark Ruthven, *On the Cessation of the Charismata: The Protestant Polemic on Post-Biblical Miracles* (Sheffield: Sheffield Press, 1997), 41.

⁸ Ibid., 23.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ S. Thomas Aquinas, *Catena Aurea: Commentary on the Four Gospels, Collected out of the Works of the Fathers; St. Matthew*, ed. John Henry Newman (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1841), 1:362.

These disputes notwithstanding, Protestants see Luther and Calvin as God's instruments in bringing the church to the three truths mentioned earlier. It is worth noting that cessationist positions were not ironclad in Reformers' circles. Portions of Luther's writings recognized the presence and power of the Spirit for healing, as evidenced in the following selection regarding sickness and the prayer of faith:

But in Extreme Unction as practised in our day, there is no prayer of faith. No one prays in faith over the sick, confidently expecting their restoration. Yet James describes that kind of faith in this passage [in James 5] There is no doubt at all that if, at the present day, this kind of prayer were offered over the sick, i.e., by the older and graver men, men saintlike and full of faith, as many as we desired would be healed. Nothing is impossible for faith.¹¹

Luther affirmed his deeply held conviction that healing was possible, even in a day when the prayer of faith was not being offered.¹² Although he questioned the canonicity of James' epistle,¹³ he affirmed James' admonition regarding such prayer. Clearly, Luther contended in the prayer of faith for the sick because he believed God would honor it. When his friend, Phillip Melanchthon, lay dying, Luther prayed for his recovery, and God answered.¹⁴ "Melanchthon would rather have passed away in sleep to eternal peace, than have returned to earthly strife; but the spiritually powerful words of Luther recalled him."¹⁵

¹¹ Martin Luther, *Martin Luther: Selections from His Writings*, ed. John Dillenberger (New York: Anchor Books, 1962), 354.

¹² James 5:15.

¹³ Luther called James' letter an "epistle of straw." Brother André Marie, "The Epistle of Straw," Catholicism.org, January 30, 2006, accessed November 25, 2015, <http://catholicism.org/epistle-of-straw.html>.

¹⁴ "This time I besought the Almighty with great vigor; I attacked him with his own weapons, quoting from Scripture all the promises I could remember, that prayers should be granted, and said that he must grant my prayer, if I was henceforth to put faith in his promises." "Luther at the Sick Bed of Melanchthon," *The Lutheran Home Journal* (Philadelphia: Lutheran Board of Publication, 1858), 3:101.

¹⁵ Ibid.

This exemplified the promised “greater works” seen through Luther’s ministry acts and preaching. In a sermon on John 14:12, he said this:

Christ preached and worked miracles only in a small nook, and for just a short time. The apostles and their successors, however, have come to all the world, and their activity has extended over the whole history of Christianity. Thus Christ personally merely initiated His work. It has had to be extended farther and farther through the apostles and the preachers who came after them; it must go on until the Day of Judgment. Thus it is true that the Christians do greater works, that is, more works and more extensive works, than Christ Himself did.¹⁶

Luther’s perspective was eternal, encompassing the promise and purpose of John 14:12: for Christ’s followers to imitate his example and, by way of their numbers, reach the lost everywhere. Although modern cessationists such as Tom Pennington and John MacArthur would claim Luther and others as adherents to their doctrine,¹⁷ Luther evidently believed that faith in Christ by the power of the Spirit would lead Jesus’s followers to perform the works Jesus did, and even “more extensive works.”¹⁸ For Luther (as for us), the Day of Judgment remained in the future, suggesting the continuation of miracles by Jesus’s followers, through faith.

The real and perceived ills of the Roman Catholic Church inspired a movement with effects perhaps more wide-ranging and long-lasting than expected or intended. Some Reformers steered so far clear of corrupt practices that they rejected manifestations issuing from the life of the Spirit himself. In obeisance, perhaps, to intellectualism and

¹⁶ Martin Luther, *Luther’s Works*, vol. 24, *Sermons on the Gospel of St. John: Chapters 14–16*, ed. Jaroslav Jan Pelikan, Hilton C. Oswald, and Helmut T. Lehmann (Saint Louis: Concordia, 1999), 78.

¹⁷ “After the New Testament era, we see the miraculous gifts cease. John Chrysostom and Augustine speak of their ceasing. Martin Luther, John Calvin, Jonathan Edwards, Charles Spurgeon, and B. B. Warfield all agree that the gifts ended after the 1st century and had been given only to confirm the message when it first appeared.” Tim Challies summarizing the remarks of Tom Pennington at the Strange Fire Conference of October 17, 2013, in “Strange Fire Conference: A Case for Cessationism,” Challies.com, accessed October 5, 2015, <http://www.challies.com/liveblogging/strange-fire-conference-a-case-for-cessationism>.

¹⁸ Luther, *Luther’s Works*, 78.

the drive to purify the church by human means, they cast aspersions over God's miraculous works.

Wesley's Experiential Perspective

Marked, from the phenomenological perspective, by a deeply personal, experiential reality in the life of the Spirit, the late Reformer, John Wesley, was God's instrument of revival. Wesley's life and ministry yield rich insights into the development of a prophetic perceptuality. In 1738, while listening to a Moravian preacher read Luther's introduction to the Book of Romans, Wesley sensed his "heart strangely warmed" and trusted Christ as his Savior.¹⁹ His phenomenological, immediate experience with the living Christ spawned a new era in the mission and history of the church that continues even today.

At the point of Wesley's encounter, Britain and its churches suffered from society's many ills:

In 18th century England, poverty was widespread and endemic. The nation was on the verge of revolution. One out of every four women were prostitutes, many of them as young as eight years old. Thousands died annually from syphilis and gonorrhea. Crime abounded. Slavery was widespread and brutal.²⁰

The Church of England was impotent in countering such decline. According to G. W. Taylor, it fell into opposite errors: "a deadening orthodoxy and an equally deadening rationalism."²¹ Taylor claimed that dead orthodoxy resulted from the "close union

¹⁹ G. Curtis Jones, *1000 Illustrations for Preaching and Teaching* (Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 1986), 203; Ibid.

²⁰ Paul Lawler, "Wesley, Wrath, and the Revival that Changed a Nation," *The Seedbed Blog*, June 16, 2014, accessed October 1, 2015, <http://seedbed.com/feed/wesley-wrath-revival-changed-nation/>.

²¹ G. W. Taylor, *John Wesley and the Anglo-Catholic Revival* (London: SPCK, 1905), accessed October 1, 2015, http://anglicanhistory.org/misc/taylor_wesley.html.

between Church and State”²² that inspired expediency and spiritual compromise. Rationalism resulted largely from the Enlightenment’s emphasis on science, rational explanations, and natural religion (deism).²³

The Anglican Church became lifeless. A flourishing deism “undermined traditional Christianity,”²⁴ which, for Wesley, was very much alive. He believed the Anglican Church had lost its moorings; he also believed that dead orthodoxy and rationalism were the instruments of Providence to prepare a people for “real Christianity” by “causing a total disregard for all religion to pave the way for the revival of the only religion which was worthy of God.”²⁵

In using the word *revival*, Wesley expressed his sense that the church’s life had waned and must be restored by some means. Revival as a notion occupied his consciousness from the beginning, both for the Church of England and the church worldwide.²⁶

Wesley’s Roots: The Eastern Fathers

Although cessationism was widespread, demonstration of the Spirit’s power was not new to the Christian tradition. Wesley recognized ample evidence of the Spirit’s ongoing supernatural activities throughout church history.

²² Ibid.

²³ Dissonance was inevitable, as rational explanations could not explain the miraculous.

²⁴ Howard A. Snyder, preface to *The Radical Wesley: The Patterns and Practices of a Movement Maker* (Franklin, TN: Seedbed, 2014), preface, Kindle.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Desperately needed was renewal from within, which involved personal devotion to God.

Wesley's experiential viewpoint is important to the historical context for a proper semiotics of prophetic perceptuality. What, then, were the foundations of his perspective? Rybarczyk espouses a profound connection between Wesley and "some of the patristic Orthodox fathers,"²⁷ particularly the Eastern Orthodox fathers.²⁸ Rybarczyk claims that Eastern Orthodoxy is rooted in mystical experience.²⁹ At the core of this mysticism is the experiential character of life in Christ by the Spirit, which the Eastern fathers celebrated. Wesley's Eastern leanings are also noted by Ted A. Campbell who asserts that Wesley preferred Eastern Orthodox fathers over their Western counterparts.³⁰

Wesley's study of Eastern voices produced seemingly paradoxical beliefs. Rybarczyk contends that, because Wesley studied the fathers "through the writings of other Anglican scholars,"³¹ he was not fully cognizant of the "ramifications of the Greek fathers' own philosophical constructs."³² Therefore, Rybarczyk claims, Wesley rejected their neo-Platonic terminologies, such as *theosis* and *apatheia*,³³ because they meant something different to him and his understanding of Greek.

²⁷ Snyder, *Radical Wesley*.

²⁸ This connection is contrasted with Wesley's link to the Western Orthodox fathers, which Wesley studied during his time at Oxford, prior to his dismissal for preaching two challenging sermons.

²⁹ "For nearly two thousand years, millions of Christians in Eastern Europe and the Middle East have practiced what is by Western standards a very mystical form of Christianity. These Christians call themselves the Eastern Orthodox church." Edmund J. Rybarczyk, *Beyond Salvation: Eastern Orthodoxy and Classical Pentecostalism on Becoming Like Christ* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2004), 1.

³⁰ "These included Athanasius, Basil, John Chrysostom, Clement of Alexandria, Clement of Rome, Dionysius the Areopagite (Pseudo-), Gregory of Nazianzus, Ephraem Syrus, Ignatius, Irenaeus, Justin Martyr, Origen, Polycarp, and (Pseudo-) Macarius." Ted A. Campbell, *John Wesley and Christian Antiquity: Religious Vision and Cultural Change* (Nashville: Kingswood Books, 1991), 125–134.

³¹ Rybarczyk, *Beyond Salvation*, 1.

³² *Ibid.*

³³ Although the English word *apathy* is derived from the Greek *apatheia*, the latter word's meaning within the context of Eastern Orthodoxy involves the fathers' descriptions of self-control from sinful passions.

To Eastern Orthodox fathers, these terms were rooted in ontology. Wesley's terminology was phenomenological, using "affective terms" to describe experiential dimensions of life in the Spirit.³⁴ He therefore taught against using such Greek terms from a phenomenological perspective. Despite this caveat, Wesley did not reject the experiential nature of the fathers' teaching, but practiced the monastic ascetic disciplines they followed. Like them, he believed the practices were therapeutic, so that "the soul's therapy could be facilitated through ascetic cures."³⁵ Wesley's stated differences with the Eastern fathers do not, therefore, preclude the mystical roots of his beliefs and experiences in the Spirit.

Commenting on Wesley's integration of Eastern spirituality as relates to partaking of the divine nature, Steven McCormick declares it "eastern in [its] healing of corrupt nature and its restoration of the *imago dei*."³⁶ Wesley's Eastern leanings are important to the argument for an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality, particularly in light of the opposing Western Reformed view that embraces cessationism.

Wesley's paradoxical roots do not invalidate his viewpoint. Leonard Sweet has "argued that the essence of orthodoxy is paradox and that every Christian must learn how to put on the spectacles of paradox and become a paradoxalist."³⁷ The tension of seeming opposites can signal mystery rather than negation (mystery being intrinsic to the Gospel).

³⁴ Rybarczyk, *Beyond Salvation*, 1.

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ Steven McCormick, "Theosis in Chrysostom and Wesley," *The Wesleyan Theological Journal* 26 (1991): 38.

³⁷ Leonard Sweet, *So Beautiful: Divine Design for Life and the Church* (Colorado Springs: David C. Cook, 2009), 46.

McCormick addresses the approaches of Western and Eastern spirituality in relation to the doctrines of incarnation and redemption and the paradoxical orthodoxy embraced by Wesley:

The East, on the one hand, with its basic interest in sanctification, has understood humankind to be basically corrupt and in desperate need of healing. The incarnation is understood to be a recapitulation of humankind which makes possible our participation in God, our true and absolute healing. The West, on the other hand, with its fixation on justification, has understood humankind as absolutely powerless to atone for itself. The incarnation is understood in the light of the Cross, which juridically pardons one of guilt.³⁸

McCormick differentiates between Eastern and Western thought. The Eastern variety focuses on Christ's Incarnation and Cross as the means of ransom and recovery through the process of sanctification, thereby healing the human condition. Western thought focuses on God as the righteous Judge who requires penal substitutionary atonement as judgment against sin, so the soul can be justified. Reformed Western theologians would dispute "fixation on justification,"³⁹ as even Calvin saw a twofold grace in relation to justification and sanctification. Apart from Calvin's extensive work on pneumatology in Volumes III and IV of his *Institutes*, his strong refutation of the immorality of the Libertines⁴⁰ indicates that Calvin understood sanctification and justification as being equally important:

For of late, certain giddy men have arisen who, with great haughtiness exalting the teaching office of the Spirit, despise all reading and laugh at the simplicity of those who, as they express it, still follow the dead and killing letter.⁴¹

³⁸ McCormick, "Theosis," 39.

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ The name *Libertine* was ascribed due to the erroneous belief that life in Spirit implied liberty to behave in clearly unscriptural ways.

⁴¹ John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, ed. John T. McNeill, trans. Ford Lewis Battles, vol. 1, Library of Christian Classics (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2011), 93.

For Calvin, to violate the Spirit-inspired Scriptures was to despise the Spirit's work in the inward person. He believed that "the Holy Spirit is the bond by which Christ effectually binds us to himself."⁴²

Although Calvin and Wesley largely agreed about the Spirit's ongoing work in the believer's life, they had other significant differences. Shelton notes that Wesley viewed the atonement as "universal in extent" and "conditional upon faith."⁴³ Unlike Calvin, Wesley believed the condition of faith was not limited by predestination. Calvin developed an extensive forensic theory of penal substitutionary atonement rooted in the "satisfaction theory" of Anselm.⁴⁴ Wesley's concern focused on the phenomenological and experiential aspects of the atonement. As Wood explains, "even though John Wesley claimed that the atonement was crucial to his theology, he never articulated a systematic theory of atonement."⁴⁵ Thorson contrasts Wesley's view with Calvin's need to systematize theology, saying Wesley's "beliefs and values were more flexible, built upon a dynamic understanding of the *ongoing presence of God's Holy Spirit* in the lives of people."⁴⁶

Wesley as continuationist differed with Calvin the cessationist. Each man's views were formed by their experiences and the polarities of their times. Regarding Calvin's reaction to Rome's excesses, were he alive today, his response to the

⁴² Ibid., 537.

⁴³ R. Larry Shelton, *Cross and Covenant: Interpreting the Atonement for 21st Century Mission* (Colorado Springs: Paternoster, 2006), 191.

⁴⁴ Stephen Edmondson, *Calvin's Christology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 98.

⁴⁵ Darren Cushman Wood, "John Wesley's Use of the Atonement," *The Asbury Journal* 62, no. 2 (2007): 55.

⁴⁶ Don Thorsen, introduction to *Calvin Vs. Wesley: Bringing Belief in Line with Practice* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2013), introduction, Kindle.

Pentecostal/Charismatic movement might be more affirming than negating, if only at the practical level.

Wesley's Roots: His Mother, Susanna

Thorson contends that “Wesley provides a better understanding of Christianity and the Christian life in *practice* than Calvin does in *theory*.”⁴⁷ Wesley’s practical Christianity was partly attributable to his interest in Eastern influences, but also to the influence of his mother, Susanna. Wesley’s father spent significant time away from their large family, and Susanna set the atmosphere for godly living. According to Schmidt, “the household drew its sustenance from the Puritan culture of family life and from the nurture of individual souls found in Romanic mysticism.”⁴⁸

Susanna’s influence is seen in the many letters she wrote to her children. In thirty-six letters to John, Susanna addressed issues of “practical divinity”⁴⁹ and offered guidance throughout his educational and vocational career as a minister of the Gospel. According to V. H. Green, the young Wesley and his mother “exchanged devotional tracts and read to each other from the *mystical authors* on several occasions.”⁵⁰

Mystical experience will be viewed in the context of consciousness studies and phenomenology in Chapter 5. Here, a theological understanding is aided by Inge, who defines *mysticism* as “the attempt to realize the presence of the living God in the soul and

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ Martin Schmidt, *John Wesley: A Theological Biography* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1963), 1:63. Romanic, as in Roman Catholicism, aspects with which Susanna had an affinity.

⁴⁹ Susanna Wesley, *Susanna Wesley: The Complete Writings*, ed. Charles Wallace Jr. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 31.

⁵⁰ Vivian Hubert Howard Green, *The Young Mr. Wesley: A Study of John Wesley and Oxford* (London: Edward Arnold, 1961), 231. In some circles, the words *mystical* and *mysticism* conjure up a range of ideas and recriminations. However, the reality of the mystical can be honored and defined without violating sound and acceptable theological boundaries.

in nature ... in thought and feeling, the *immanence* of the temporal in the eternal, and of the eternal in the temporal.”⁵¹ Tuttle affirms the Wesleyan tradition, defining mysticism as “anything that gets one in touch with reality beyond the physical senses.”⁵²

Regarding Wesley’s upbringing and mystical roots, his father was a devout Anglican. Somewhat independent and free-thinking, Susanna was deeply influenced by the Roman Catholic Counter Reformation. Tuttle notes that her “favorite authors” included some among “the Capuchins, the Theatines ... and the Barnabites,”⁵³ orders rooted in Eastern mystical practices.

Susanna’s traversing of church borders and investigation of Catholic mystics’ teachings could have influenced Wesley’s openness to their insights and the shaping of his consciousness, by which he challenged Anglican paradigms.⁵⁴ One could reasonably suspect that Susanna’s “outsider” approach would have impacted John’s becoming an “outsider.”

Because Wesley seems to have “borrowed”⁵⁵ the 1686 Bonhours translation of *The Life of Ignatius Loyola* from his brother Charles’ library, Tuttle suggests that John was impacted by the Catholic mystic. “A copy is still among Charles’ books in the Manchester archives” and “the marks and marginal notes look more like John’s ... and emphasize Loyola’s spiritual struggle between God and the world ... his extreme

⁵¹ William Ralph Inge, *Christian Mysticism: The Bampton Lectures, 1899* (London: Methuen, 1899), lect. 1, Kindle.

⁵² Robert G. Tuttle Jr., *Mysticism in the Wesleyan Tradition* (Grand Rapids: Francis Asbury Press, 1989), 22.

⁵³ Tuttle, *Mysticism in Wesleyan Tradition*, 29.

⁵⁴ Wesley’s “method” became a movement that reached beyond the parameters of Anglican Church practices.

⁵⁵ Tuttle, *Mysticism in Wesleyan Tradition*, 29.

mortification ... his devotion to God ... and the high degree of perfection that he reached in such a short time.”⁵⁶

It is unlikely that Loyola’s appeal to Wesley was purely contemplative. Wesley’s practical “bent” suggests his attraction to Loyola’s desire to “create active and heroic rather than contemplative Christians.”⁵⁷ Tuttle suggests the attraction was that mystics “speak the language of mystical contemplation, they live highly ascetical lives, exhibiting considerable moral, ethical, and even missionary zeal.”⁵⁸ Wesley’s words about Ignatius support his practical focus:

... surely one of the greatest men that ever was engaged in the support of so bad a cause! I wonder any man should judge him to be an enthusiast. No; but he knew the people with whom he had to do: and setting out (like Count Zinzendorf) with a full persuasion that he might use guile to promote the glory of God, or (which he thought the same thing) the interest of his Church, he acted, in all things, consistent with his principles.⁵⁹

Like earlier Reformers, Wesley opposed Roman Catholicism. Yet certain Counter Reformation voices spoke to his heart. Apparently, Wesley was satisfied to hear from both camps and synthesize ideas that found in him some compatibility. Tuttle acknowledges this, saying that “Wesley combined the genius of Luther and Loyola, the Reformed doctrine of grace with the piety and organized strength of the Roman Catholic saint.”⁶⁰

⁵⁶ Ibid., 30.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 27.

⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁹ John Wesley, *The Journal of the Rev. John Wesley*, ed. Nehemiah Curnock (London: Charles H. Kelly, 1916), 3:40.

⁶⁰ Tuttle, *Mysticism in Wesleyan Tradition*, 30.

From Roman Catholicism, Wesley drew the practicality of deep, contemplative prayer that fueled his methodistic approach to the outworking of the Spirit's life in the believer. For Wesley, the mystical and contemplative side of experiential reality was compatible with practical expressions of divine life. Both were evident in his approach to life in the Spirit.

Wesley's Practical Theology

Wesley's theological views present a platform for further development of an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality. In practical terms, Wesley believed that saving faith involves "a full reliance on the blood of Christ; a trust in the merits of his life, death, and resurrection; a recumbency upon him as our atonement and our life, as given for us, and living in us."⁶¹ Essentially, the Christ follower's journey begins with justification by faith and progresses through continued openness to Christ's life within, by faith and in the Spirit's power.

Wesley believed that Christ's death and resurrection made grace possible universally. Those who apply the work of the Cross to solve the sin issue (and its resulting guilt and separation from God), enter "by faith into this grace in which we stand."⁶² Considering the significance of the moment, and the Wesleyan and Eastern belief that the Last Adam came for the "restoration of the imago dei,"⁶³ would that restoration not imply the full blessedness of communion with God? Would this

⁶¹ John Wesley, "Salvation by Faith," in *The Works of John Wesley*, ed. Albert C. Outler, (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1984), 1:121.

⁶² Rom. 5:2.

⁶³ McCormick, *Theosis*, 39.

blessedness not include the Father's revealing of his continuing work so his children might participate and accomplish the "greater works" Jesus promised?

Calvinists and others opposed Wesley's views of this continuing work and accused him of advocating a righteousness by works. In reality, Wesley affirmed justification by faith resulting from God's grace.⁶⁴ He believed grace first "permitted" God to indwell us; then sanctification by faith enabled him to perfect us. Surely that perfecting involves not only the hearing, discerning, and perceiving of God's ways within the human soul, but also how God wills to work within it.

Wesley did not entirely dismiss Calvin's systematic approach to theology, but believed it to be exclusionary. In Wesleyan thought, systems "view Christianity too narrowly in terms of what fits into the system and what does not."⁶⁵ For example, Calvin's reaction to a putatively corrupt Roman Catholic Church and papacy came to mean that the "greater works" no longer involved the signs, wonders, and miracles that Catholicism embraced. From Wesley's perspective, such systematic positions forced the rejection of accepted, historic Christian fundamentals.

Wesley's Interaction with John 5

Wesley's response to the healing at the Pool of Bethesda is useful in moving toward the development of an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality. What did Wesley say about how our pattern, the Incarnate Son, revealed himself in the pericope?

⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁵ Thorsen, *Calvin Vs. Wesley*.

In his *Explanatory Notes upon the New Testament*, Wesley described Jesus's self-disclosure about doing nothing but what he saw his Father doing:⁶⁶

This is not his imperfection, but his glory, resulting from his eternal, intimate, indissoluble unity with the Father. Hence it is absolutely impossible, that the Son should *judge, will, testify, or teach* any thing without the Father, ver. 30, &c. ch. vi 38. ch. vii:16 or that he should be known or believed on, separately from the Father. And he here defends his doing good every day, without intermission, by the example of his Father, from which he cannot depart: *These doth the Son likewise*—All *these*, and only *these*; seeing he and the Father are one.”⁶⁷

For Wesley, Jesus's *doing* was the consequence of His *being* the Eternal Son. Wesley addressed Jesus's ontology here, but not his phenomenology as regards his way of seeing. Wesley's attribution of the Son's glory to “eternal, intimate, and indissoluble unity with the Father” demands our recognition of the Father-Son relational dynamics.⁶⁸ The intimacy of their interaction would require the Son's present-moment, real-time awareness—the phenomenological and subjective aspect of Jesus's seeing what He saw.

Jesus *saw* the Father working, and *did* exactly what he saw. In attributing Jesus's actions to his relational unity with the Father, Wesley affirmed Jesus's nature as Son. Although he stopped short of describing Jesus's subjective experience, his silence on *how* Jesus saw the Father working was not absolute; intimate relational unity implies direct, subjective experience. The fourth evangelist's Gospel makes clear that Jesus saw something dynamic. Wesley's additional comments referenced the process Jesus described when he said, “For the Father loves the Son, and shows Him all things that He Himself is doing; and the Father will show Him greater works than these, so that you will

⁶⁶ John 5:19.

⁶⁷ John Wesley, *Explanatory Notes upon the New Testament*, 4th Amer. ed. (New York: J. Soule and T. Mason, 1818), 232n19.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*

marvel.”⁶⁹ Wesley spoke to Jesus’s way of seeing and described the direct, present-moment, Father-Son encounter: “At the same time (not at different times) the Father showeth and doth, and the Son seeth and doth.”⁷⁰ This *showing* is a “pointing out,”⁷¹ a “presenting to sight, to cause to see.”⁷² In Jesus’s wilderness temptation, the word describes how Satan caused Jesus to see “all the kingdoms of the world.”⁷³ This aspect of visionary experience is outside the ordinary sense perception that fits within Tuttle and Inge’s definitions of mystical experience.⁷⁴

Wesley seemed to argue the impossibility of Jesus acting independently of the Father. His spiritual senses were attuned to the Father’s intentions because of their shared love and communion. Human, but unhindered by sin, the Son perfectly and immediately perceived his Father’s active intentions. According to Wesley, the Son’s spiritual sensory awareness—his seeing as well as his hearing⁷⁵—enabled him to judge as the Father judges.⁷⁶

Jesus verbalized his self-disclosure in the third person, present active subjunctive.⁷⁷ While the voice addressed the Father-Son relationship, the tense implied

⁶⁹ John 5:20.

⁷⁰ Wesley, *Explanatory Notes*, 232n20.

⁷¹ “δεικνύω.” Zodhiates, *Complete Word Study Dictionary*, s.v. “to show.”

⁷² Ibid.

⁷³ Matt. 4:8; Luke 4:5.

⁷⁴ In Chapter 5, study of the father of American psychology, William James, and his understanding of the mystical state, might beg some difference with this view.

⁷⁵ John 5:30.

⁷⁶ “*I can do nothing of myself*—It is impossible I should do any thing separately from my Father. *As I hear*—Of the Father, and see, so I judge and do; because I am essentially united to him. See ver. 19.” Wesley, *Explanatory Notes*, 233n30.

⁷⁷ Zodhiates, *Complete Word Study Dictionary*, s.v. “see.”

immediacy. Furthermore, Wesley said the Son cannot “judge, will, testify, or teach”⁷⁸ without the Father. Judging and willing are products of immediate and personal perceptivity, subjectivity, and phenomenology, which also suggests the immediacy of the Father-Son relational dynamics.

Wesley recognized that Jesus’s ability to see what the Father was doing and then do it was dependent upon Jesus being filled with and in subjection to the Holy Spirit.

Wesley’s response to Matthew’s account of Jesus’s baptism affirms this:

Probably in a glorious appearance of fire, perhaps in the shape of a dove, descending with a hovering motion, till it rested *upon him*. This was a visible token of those *secret operations of the blessed Spirit*, by which he was anointed in a peculiar manner; and *abundantly fitted for his public work*.⁷⁹

Wesley’s articulation of “those *secret operations of the blessed Spirit*” attested to the works Jesus would do.⁸⁰ Wesley recognized that in the descent of the dove-like theophany, Jesus was being anointed by the Spirit to fulfill his Messianic role as the Anointed One.

Matthew’s account reveals the semiotics of the event. The “visible token” signified the Holy Spirit’s “secret operations” in the “public work” of Jesus⁸¹ (and portended his “secret” role in the future works of Jesus’s followers). This work included all Jesus accomplished in the fourth evangelist’s Gospel, all of which the Father first

⁷⁸ Wesley, *Explanatory Notes*, 232n19.

⁷⁹ Wesley, *Explanatory Notes*, 17n16; italics in the second sentence are mine.

⁸⁰ Ibid.

⁸¹ Ibid.

showed him. This *showing*, disclosed in John 5:19, was also among “those secret operations of the blessed Spirit.”⁸²

Here again, in an age when rationalism was already widespread, Wesley addressed functions that transcended purely rational and cognitive dimensions of experience. As is often said in our day, so people said in Wesley’s: “[I]f it cannot be seen or heard (or perhaps reasoned), it does not exist.”⁸³ Wesley rejected the supposition. His journal communicated his heart to the Methodist movement, and recounted many encounters individuals had with angelic and demonic powers. He also refuted the rationalists of his day:

It is true, likewise, that the English in general, and indeed most of the men of learning in Europe, have given up all accounts of witches and apparitions, as mere old wives’ fables. I am sorry for it; and I willingly take this opportunity of entering my solemn protest against this violent compliment which so many that believe the Bible pay to those who do not believe it.⁸⁴

Such manifestations were for Wesley part of a very real world described by the Scriptures as being “unseen” and “eternal.”⁸⁵ The purely rational-minded do not see this world; seeing it requires the Spirit.

Wesley’s “Silence” on the Miraculous

Wesley affirmed the ongoing presence and activity of the Spirit in the earth and through Jesus’s followers, for the fulfillment of the “greater works.” Yet his preaching remained focused on justification by faith and sanctification, so that his methodology

⁸² Ibid.

⁸³ Tuttle, *Mysticism in Wesleyan Tradition*, 171.

⁸⁴ John Wesley, *The Works of John Wesley*, 3rd ed. (London: Wesleyan Methodist Book Room, 1872), 3:324.

⁸⁵ 2 Cor. 4:18.

fostered the maturation of character among Jesus's followers. This maturation is essential to the development of an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality.

In teaching the demonstration of the Spirit and power, even with First Corinthians 2:4 as the text,⁸⁶ Wesley emphasized not God's power to heal or set free from the demonic, but the human conscience. He wrote: "With that powerful kind of demonstration which flows from the Holy Spirit; which works on the conscience, with the most convincing light and the most persuasive evidence."⁸⁷

Speaking of the Spirit's demonstration and power, Luke and Paul spoke of miracles, signs, and wonders. Luke mentioned Christ, who presented "Himself alive, after his suffering, by many convincing proofs."⁸⁸ Paul described the One who "provides you with the Spirit and works miracles among you."⁸⁹ Wesley's focus on the Pauline text centered on the preaching of justification by faith, but acknowledged that miracles confirm such preaching:

And at the present time, Doth he that ministereth the gift of the Spirit to you, and worketh miracles among you, *do it by the works of the law?*—That is, in confirmation of his preaching justification by works? Or of his preaching justification by faith?⁹⁰

For Wesley, justification by faith underlies the working of miracles. Likewise, Paul argued for the Galatians to be perfected by the Spirit through the walk of faith; he also indicated that the miraculous was ongoing within their community. Regarding faith and

⁸⁶ "[M]y message and my preaching were not in persuasive words of wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power."

⁸⁷ Wesley, *Explanatory Notes*, 424n4.

⁸⁸ Acts 1:3.

⁸⁹ Gal. 3:5.

⁹⁰ Wesley, *Explanatory Notes*, 493n5.

the miraculous, Paul's words went beyond the message of salvation from sin. Yet, in the above selection, Wesley offered no such commentary. Notice, however, the italics with which Wesley emphasized justification by faith rather than law. Without explicitly commenting on miracles, he maintained the tenor of Paul's argument.

What explains Wesley's apparent silence on the miraculous? Why would a man whose ministry was marked by miracles omit commentary on the same? Tuttle offers an explanation: "Within the Wesleyan tradition, mystics on the contemporary scene focus on the *presence* more than the profound, more on *piety* than power."⁹¹ Tuttle's insight is tenable; yet it must be noted that critics of Wesley's revivalism accused him of allowing emotional outbursts and "enthusiasm."

If contemporary Wesleyans follow their founder's cues, the question becomes: "Must the contemporary focus eliminate power in favor of piety?" Does not Paul argue for the "demonstration of the Spirit *and* power"?⁹² Wesley's lack of focus on the miraculous was not a rejection of the Spirit's power in manifestation. Without question, his preaching on justification and sanctification by faith, and his insistence on piety through "discipline and personal holiness,"⁹³ brought such manifestations of power that people "fell to the ground under conviction from God's Spirit."⁹⁴

⁹¹ Tuttle, *Mysticism in Wesleyan Tradition*, 173.

⁹² 1 Cor. 2:4; italics mine.

⁹³ Tuttle, *Mysticism in Wesleyan Tradition*, 165.

⁹⁴ Craig Keener, "Rumors of Miracles," Good News, December 30, 2014, accessed October 5, 2015, <http://goodnewsmag.org/2014/12/rumors-of-miracles/>.

Wesley and the Restoration of Wholeness

Regarding Wesley's focus on restoration of the *imago Dei*, divine intent is key. Wesley demonstrated his belief in the miraculous by praying the prayer of faith for the sick. Supernatural manifestation was not the purpose of his prayer, however. His purpose was the restoration and fulfillment of the divine intent.

In one instance, Wesley and a Mr. Meyrick fell sick. Only Wesley recovered. Although Meyrick responded to Wesley's prayers of faith, his health declined.⁹⁵ Did Wesley *see* that God intended to heal Meyrick? Did he pray the prayer of faith in response to the injunction of James 5:15? Or did Wesley respond to both impetuses?

Regarding the divine intent, Wesley understood Jesus's self-disclosure in Luke 4:18 this way: Jesus was anointed with the Spirit "[t]o preach the gospel to the poor—Literally and spiritually."⁹⁶ For Wesley, the scriptural mandate of deliverance and restoration of sight contrasted Christ, who embodied the intended "spiritual state of man,"⁹⁷ with "the miserable state of those captives, who are not only cast into prison, but, like Zedekiah, had their eyes put out, and were laden and bruised with chains of iron."⁹⁸

For Wesley, the remedy for all demonic bondages was healing of the whole person, "literally and spiritually."⁹⁹ This explains Wesley's concern for the poor and their

⁹⁵ Ibid.

⁹⁶ Wesley, *Explanatory Notes*, 155n18.

⁹⁷ Ibid., 156n18.

⁹⁸ Ibid.

⁹⁹ Ibid., 155n18.

afflictions.¹⁰⁰ For any condition that deviated from the divine intent, the goal was divine restoration to wholeness. Hiatt states that “Wesley believed in multi-dimensional healing and used it regularly in his pastoral practice. He did not use spiritual warfare terminology as such, but engaged regularly in its practice through these suggested means.”¹⁰¹

Regarding the demonstration of the Spirit and Wesley’s way of seeing what the Father was doing, his secret to power might not lend itself to a one-dimensional summation. It is clear, however, that his contemplative, mystical posture and deep passion for personal piety made Wesley prolific in “personal prayer.”¹⁰² According to Hiatt, Wesley “prayed as easily as he breathed.”¹⁰³

As was true of Jesus, Wesley’s deep compassion in identifying with others in their suffering played a role in his ministry.¹⁰⁴ Jesus’s many signs and wonders demonstrated a profound connection between his identification with the afflicted and his power to bring them relief.¹⁰⁵ His compassion moved and propelled him, and was always accompanied by power, as Scripture attests: “When He went ashore, He saw a large crowd, and felt compassion for them and healed their sick.”¹⁰⁶ Compassion similarly moved and propelled Wesley.

¹⁰⁰ Wesley’s concern was particularly focused on eighteenth-century England, where health care for the poor was inadequate. However, his biblical perspectives on deliverance and healing would hold in every era.

¹⁰¹ R. Jeffrey Hiatt, “John Wesley and Healing: Developing A Wesleyan Missiology,” *The Asbury Journal* 59, no. 1 (Spring 2004): 90.

¹⁰² Ibid.

¹⁰³ Ibid.

¹⁰⁴ *Online Etymology Dictionary*, s.v. “compassion,” accessed October 8, 2015, http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?allowed_in_frame=0&search=compassion&searchmode=none.

¹⁰⁵ Compassion, by its very nature, is never helpless.

¹⁰⁶ Matt. 14:14.

Regarding what Wesley called “the secret operations of the blessed Spirit, by which [Jesus] was anointed in a peculiar manner; and abundantly fitted for his public work,”¹⁰⁷ could Wesley express this idea without personally experiencing it? For a man who believed orthopraxy was as important as orthodoxy,¹⁰⁸ this would seem impossible. Wesley demanded practicality in all things. Beth Spencer Anderson cites him in this regard:

By salvation I mean not barely, according to the vulgar notion, deliverance from hell, or going to heaven; but a present deliverance from sin, a restoration of the soul to its primitive health ... the renewal of our souls after the image of God, in righteousness and true holiness, in justice, mercy, and truth.”¹⁰⁹

For Wesley, salvation was an ongoing reality, a day-by-day process of being saved from sin and darkness and being washed in living rivers of redemption. The indwelling Spirit’s presence and power provided for Wesley the means by which the soul was renewed according to the image of God. His view of healing was not limited to direct, supernatural interventions, however. Regarding the charismatic gift of healing in First Corinthians 12:9, Wesley took this posture:

The gift of healing need not be wholly confined to the healing diseases with a word or a touch. It may exert itself also, though in a lower degree, where natural remedies are applied. And it may often be this, not superior skill, which makes some physicians more successful than others.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁷ Wesley, *Explanatory Notes*, 17n16.

¹⁰⁸ “Correctness or orthodoxy of practice or action.” Dictionary.com, s.v. “orthopraxy,” accessed October 8, 2015, <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/orthopraxy>.

¹⁰⁹ John Wesley, *The Works of the Rev. John Wesley, A.M.* (London: Wesleyan Conference Office, 1872), 8:47.

¹¹⁰ Wesley, *Explanatory Notes*, 447–448n9.

Wesley affirmed the power of a healing word and healing touch, but included “natural remedies” and the work of some skilled “physicians.”¹¹¹ Although healing can occur through natural remedies or medical skill, the charismata Paul described in First Corinthians 12 was a supernatural and *not* a natural healing manifestation. The theological lens of Charismatics and Pentecostals differs with Wesley’s in this regard, as it does regarding some of the other charismata.

An Applied Semiotics of Prophetic Perceptuality: Wesley’s Legacy

In developing an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality, Wesley’s emphasis resonates with that of the Son (our pattern) who saw the Father’s intent to restore the lame man, and affirmed the Father’s love as motivation of the intent and of the Father’s revealing it to the Son.¹¹²

Wesley’s approach to life in the Spirit was powerful and practical. He understood the “secret operations of the blessed Spirit” that equipped him for his work.¹¹³ Yet, his exposition of John 5 (and other passages related to the demonstrations of the Spirit and power) never revealed *how* the Spirit worked in the miraculous nor *how* Jesus saw. One can only surmise that, although Wesley discerned both, neither was the focus of his methodology for performing the “greater works.” He instead reveled in the grace that allowed such things to occur, then directed his curiosity to other foci in preaching the Gospel.

¹¹¹ Ibid.

¹¹² John 5:20.

¹¹³ Wesley, *Explanatory Notes*, 17n16.

What Wesley does provide toward the development of an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality comes from the Eastern fathers, his Anglican upbringing, those Counter Reformation mystics he respected, and his mother, Susanna: it is the profound influence of the mystical-contemplative approach to prayer. Wesley's faith grew by his abiding in prayer, Scripture, the love of God, and the love of fellow-heirs with whom he practiced his methodology.

In summary, the roots of the modern-day cessationist argument were largely seeded by leading Reformation voices such as Calvin and Luther. Wesley, whose teachings did not center on the miraculous, nevertheless fostered a continuationist view via his practical ministry "model." His experiential perspective, affinity for Eastern mystical approaches, views on restoration, and overall legacy contribute to the modern Pentecostal and Charismatic tradition, as well as to the development of an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality.

CHAPTER 5

CONSCIOUSNESS STUDIES AND JESUS'S PHENOMENOLOGY

From the intersection of theology and the history of consciousness, this chapter considers the precedents for, and the implications of, Jesus's face-to-face communion with his Father. It also explores his perceptuality from the perspective of *tacit knowing*, and studies his phenomenology, transpersonal consciousness, possible mystical experiences, and intentionality. The chapter also addresses the connection between Jesus's consciousness and the operation of the Holy Spirit, as well as the inseparability of his identity and consciousness of mission, which this dissertation argues are essential to the "foundation of the method and the mission of the Church."¹

Face-to-Face Communion

This study continues its focus on how Jesus saw what his Father was doing,² and considers this premise: assuming the biblical Adam and Moses experienced "face-to-face" interaction with God, the consciousness and phenomenology of the Only Begotten Son was more exquisitely based in face-to-face communion with his Father.

When questioned after the healing at the Pool of Bethesda, Jesus confessed doing only what he *saw* his Father doing.³ I argued based on duothelite Chalcedonian Christology that, ontologically speaking, Jesus did all his works as an entire human being entirely empowered by the Holy Spirit, through whom he saw the Father. I also argued

¹ Fr. Anthony C. Dimkpa, *The Self-Consciousness of Jesus Christ: An Analysis of Its Main Christological Trends* (Enumclaw: Pleasant Word, 2010), xxiii.

² John 5:19.

³ Ibid.

that, rather than an independent self-consciousness, his phenomenological experience was a holistic Father-Son consciousness based in transpersonal⁴ perception that actualized the Father's intentions. Additionally, I proposed that because Jesus was "made like His brethren in all things,"⁵ his human first-person point of view connects his experience to ours.

To comprehend Jesus's way of seeing, the phenomenology of consciousness—"the study of the structures of consciousness as experienced from the first person point-of-view"⁶—offers applicable insights. The ultimate aim is to see as Jesus saw, and do his works (and even "greater works").⁷ This phenomenological approach considers the context of Jesus's consciousness and state of mind,⁸ including his self-consciousness, Father-consciousness, and inner experience.

The essence of consciousness is central to understanding and developing an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality. Hence, this chapter will include insights from modern and contemporary scholars including, Galot, Smith, Husserl, Brentano, Spear, James, Gallagher, Zahavi, Walach, Schmidt, Jonas, Lancaster, Baruss, Tsakiris, and Graziano. These voices in philosophy, consciousness studies, psychology, and contemporary phenomenology will help illuminate the way of being that leads to seeing

⁴ Transpersonal work in psychology and psychiatry "adds those deeper or higher aspects of human experience that transcend the ordinary and the average—experiences that are, in other words, 'transpersonal' or 'more than personal,' personal plus." Ken Wilber, foreword to *The Textbook of Transpersonal Psychiatry and Psychology*, ed. Bruce W. Scotton, Allan B. Chinen, and John R. Battista (New York: Basic Books, 1996), foreword, Kindle.

⁵ Heb. 2:17.

⁶ David Woodruff Smith, "Phenomenology," *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Edward N. Zalta, Winter 2013, accessed April 24, 2015, <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2013/entries/phenomenology/>.

⁷ John 14:12.

⁸ 1 Cor. 2:16.

and doing, and help establish the sense of self and others that is central to consciousness and prophetic perceptuality.

Overview of Consciousness in History

Our pattern is the first-century Incarnate Son; therefore a synopsis of historical consciousness study is meaningful. It must first be stated that although the study of consciousness is “thriving” in the twenty-first century,⁹ the investigatory construct is challenging. Consciousness implies relationship between and among living subjects and physical objects, and between self and others. A state of consciousness is a prerequisite to any investigation of consciousness. As a consequence, consciousness is necessarily examined by way of itself.

In some form, the question remains: “What exactly is consciousness?” In arguably the oldest book in biblical canon, Elihu declared unreservedly, “It is a spirit in man, and the breath of the Almighty gives them understanding.”¹⁰ The spirit in this context is “that aspect of existence, human or otherwise, which is noncorporeal and immaterial.”¹¹ According to Elwell and Beitzel, the term “indicates the vitalizing, energizing, empowering agent” within a human being.¹² Elihu also associated the human spirit with

⁹ Susan Blackmore, *Consciousness: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 1.

¹⁰ Job 32:8.

¹¹ Walter A. Elwell and Barry J. Beitzel, *Baker Encyclopedia of the Bible*, s.v. “spirit” (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1988), 1991.

¹² Walter A. Elwell and Philip Wesley Comfort, *Tyndale Bible Dictionary*, s.v. “spirit,” (Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House, 2001).

“the breath of the Almighty,”¹³ which “essentially defines the life principle, especially in man—infused by deity.”¹⁴

Elihu did not question the human spirit’s existence; he invoked its reality and presented God’s breath as the divine bridge by which understanding enters the spirit. The Hebrew text suggests aspects of understanding, including “to make clear,”¹⁵ “perceive,” and “discern.”¹⁶ How, then, does the operation of the human spirit become the experience of understanding?

In the current mind-body debate, answers vary. The arguments began as Reformation-era philosophers addressed questions of consciousness, with René Descartes proposing the divide between mind and body and holding that “the mind is non-physical and non-extended,”¹⁷ an immaterial, nonphysical, undefined substance not occupying physical space and not located in a specific place in the material body.¹⁸ Nevertheless, for Descartes the mind and the body were united to “form a human being.”¹⁹ This has

¹³ Job 32:8.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Ludwig Koehler, M. E. J. Richardson, and J. J. Stamm, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, s.v. “understanding” (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2000).

¹⁶ “995 בִּינָה [*biyn* /bene/] v. A primitive root; TWOT 239; GK 1067 ... 1 to discern, understand, consider. 1A (Qal). 1A1 to perceive, discern. 1A2 to understand, know (with the mind). 1A3 to observe, mark, give heed to, distinguish, consider. 1A4 to have discernment, insight, understanding. 1B (Niphal) to be discerning, intelligent, discreet, have understanding. 1C (Hiphil). 1C1 to understand. 1C2 to cause to understand, give understanding, teach. 1D (Hithpolel) to show oneself discerning or attentive, consider diligently. 1E (Polel) to teach, instruct. 2 (TWOT) prudent, regard.” James Strong, *Enhanced Strong’s Lexicon*, s.v. “understanding” (Woodside Bible Fellowship, 1995).

¹⁷ Blackmore, *Consciousness*, 3. The concept is now known as *Cartesian Dualism*; Ibid., 4.

¹⁸ However, for a person to be aware and conscious, the material and immaterial must interact. Practically speaking, the mind must exist within the person’s physical being.

¹⁹ Justin Skirry, “René Descartes: The Mind-Body Distinction,” *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, accessed December 2, 2015, <http://www.iep.utm.edu/descmind/>.

become perhaps his most “lasting legacy” and is at the core of the current debates and problems related to “mind-body causal interaction.”²⁰

Solving today’s mind-body question remains difficult. McGinn affirms: “We cannot answer the question of what the basis of consciousness is, but we can answer the question of how to respond to the philosophical perplexities raised by this difficulty.”²¹

McGinn’s approach is philosophical, acknowledging no supernatural element, but admitting that within the philosophical spectrum of possibilities “[w]e do have supernatural dualisms of various forms”²² (McGinn, however, disagrees with these). Moreland pinpoints McGinn’s reluctance, saying that if McGinn appeals “to a conscious God to explain finite consciousness, we generate a vicious *infinite regress* for we will have to explain why God Himself is conscious.”²³

Elihu resonates with and states this very premise.²⁴ Moreland affirms the state of current consciousness studies: any philosophical approach to consciousness requiring a conscious God is seen as a *regression* in the debate (regarding consciousness and the mind-body split), and is dismissed from secular humanistic psychology’s monistic perspective.²⁵ Within the field of transpersonal psychology and the study of

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Colin McGinn, *Consciousness and Its Objects* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 61.

²² Ibid.

²³ J. P. Moreland, *Consciousness and the Existence of God: A Theistic Argument* (New York: Routledge, 2008), 96; italics mine.

²⁴ Job 32:8.

²⁵ “Materialism is the belief that nothing exists apart from the material world (i.e. physical matter like the brain); materialist psychologists generally agree that consciousness (the mind) is the function of the brain. Mental processes can be identified with purely physical processes in the central nervous system, and that human beings are just complicated physiological organisms, no more than that.” Saul McLeod, “Mind Body Debate,” Simply Psychology, 2007, accessed October 19, 2015, www.simplypsychology.org/mindbodydebate.html. “Phenomenalism (also called Subjective Idealism)

consciousness, adherents to Eastern thought within Buddhistic and Hindu traditions hold the divine as essential. This is true of Vrinte, who affirms Sri Aurobindo's integral psychology, which professes that "the human soul is only potentially the eternal companion of the Divine."²⁶ To realize its full potential "it needs to be awakened and pass from potentiality to actuality."²⁷ Such an awakening requires "living consciously in the Divine and acting from that consciousness, i.e., union between the Divine and man."²⁸

Regarding the nature of consciousness and its relation to the divine, Orthodox Christians would find reason to challenge Buddhistic and Hindu worldviews. Yet, the similarities and points of agreement are striking. Christian thought declares that the believer is a partaker of the divine nature in Christ, being "joined" to the Lord and being "one spirit" with Christ.²⁹ In the Hindu tradition, Brahman is spoken of as "the divine absolute"³⁰ and Atman as "the indwelling divine,"³¹ unified within a human being. This is acknowledgment of a divine presence in close association with human experience. Both Hindu and Buddhistic mysticism affirm the "transcendent and imminent" present.³² In

believes that physical objects and events are reducible to mental objects, properties, events. Ultimately, only mental objects (i.e., the mind) exist. Bishop Berkeley claimed that what we think of as our body is merely the perception of mind." Ibid.

²⁶ Joseph Vrinte, *The Quest for the Inner Man: Transpersonal Psychotherapy and Integral Sadhana* (Kennedy Nagar: All India Press, 1996), 136.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ 2 Pet, 1:4; 1 Cor. 6:17.

³⁰ David Fontana, "Mystical Experience," in *The Blackwell Companion to Consciousness*, ed. Max Velmans and Susan Schneider (Malden: Blackwell 2007), 165.

³¹ Ibid.

³² Ibid.

Buddhistic mysticism, “the distinction between oneself and the Divine disappears.”³³

Although Christian thought never equates the divine and the human, Christian, Hinduistic, and Buddhistic worldviews espouse the reality of the divine presence.

From the biblical perspective, the human spirit’s existence is indisputable (and arguably pragmatic as regards human function). Within the context of Elihu’s arguments to Job, biblical scholar John E. Hartley addressed the essential reflective character of consciousness:

The spirit in a human being is an essential source of insight, for it searches one’s deepest thinking (cf. 1 Cor. 2:10–16). It is the seat of a person’s reflective thought. The spirit enables one to evaluate ideas and actions and to discern attitudes.³⁴

If, as Hartley says, the human spirit is essential in receiving insight because it mines deep thought processes, then reflective thought—the evaluation of ideas and actions, and the discerning of attitudes—comprises consciousness functions that engage the human spirit. Ironically, atheist consciousness scholar, Michael Graziano, claims, “When a scientist observes humans behaving irrationally, especially if that irrationality has anything to do with religion, suddenly the science goes out the window.”³⁵ Graziano proposes that, if the purpose of science is “gaining insight into the world,”³⁶ and if neuroscience is about

³³ Ibid., 166.

³⁴ John E. Hartley, *The Book of Job*, New International Commentary on the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1988), 434.

³⁵ Michael S. A. Graziano, *Consciousness and the Social Brain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 197.

³⁶ Ibid.

“gaining insight into the brain and behavior,”³⁷ then “spirituality and religion are non-ignorable parts of human behavior.”³⁸

To what then does Graziano ascribe the spiritual aspect of consciousness in human beings? He asserts that the “spirit world is the world of perceived consciousness,”³⁹ implying that, via perception, humans relate certain realities to the realm of spirit. As scientist, Graziano argues that spirituality is “an intensely human phenomenon.”⁴⁰ Although he recommends exploring the issue scientifically and phenomenologically, his quandary is his disbelief in an actual dimension of spirit apart from the brain’s own evolution. In Elihu’s disclosure, Hartley finds ample grounds to challenge Graziano’s premise:

By *spirit* does he mean his own spirit or the Spirit of God? Since the phrase *the spirit in man* is paralleled by *the breath of Shaddai*, it seems to be referring to the insight that the human spirit receives from the Spirit of God, i.e., *the breath of Shaddai*, which gives human beings life.⁴¹

Speaking psychologically and phenomenologically, consciousness and worldview are inextricably linked. Psychologist Gregg Henriques notes three worldviews intimately tied to the nature of consciousness: supernatural dualism, parapsychological mysticism, and naturalism.⁴² Supernatural dualism, by contrast, acknowledges an invisible or

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Ibid., 198.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ John E. Hartley, *Book of Job*, 434.

⁴² Gregg Henriques, “Three Worldviews on the Nature of Consciousness: Supernatural, Mystical, and Natural Views on Consciousness,” *Psychology Today*, March 7, 2013, accessed October 25, 2015, <https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/theory-knowledge/201303/three-worldviews-the-nature-consciousness-1>.

spiritual world⁴³ consisting of God, angels, and demons (substantively different beings from dwellers of the physical world). From psychology's perspective, most traditional religions fall into this worldview.

Parapsychological mysticism addresses a "conscious reality that surpasses conventional scientific understanding."⁴⁴ This perspective overlaps supernatural dualism; however, parapsychological mysticism intentionally addresses consciousness apart from divinity. Mayer speaks of certain "paradoxical state[s] of mind" that we are "unable to comprehend because they bear no relationship" to current "brain-mind models."⁴⁵ This worldview acknowledges the transcendent and paranormal, yet separates them from religious connotations. It views consciousness as part of human evolutionary development and a function of the nervous system.⁴⁶

Whether or not we can explain the connection between the noncorporeal (spirit and mind) and physical realms (brain and body), human consciousness is an experienced reality. The question then involves worldview and our conscious and unconscious projections. If humans have a spirit as this study presumes, how can they not be conscious or practice pre-reflective and self-reflective consciousness?

Adam's alive state involved awareness, making him a conscious being. Becoming a living soul implies his awareness of himself *before* he reflected on his thoughts. This

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ Ibid. Consider the Christian belief in the supernatural power of prayer and faith, for example.

⁴⁵ Elizabeth Lloyd Mayer, *Extraordinary Knowing: Science, Skepticism, and the Inexplicable Powers of the Human Mind* (New York: Bantam, 2007), 40.

⁴⁶ Henriques, "Three Worldviews."

pre-reflective self-consciousness is “an awareness we have before we do any reflecting on our experience.”⁴⁷

Contemporary consciousness scholars hold widely varied evolutionary (philosophical and psychological) beliefs about human consciousness and the evolving brain. Theistic Evolutionary Theory includes a view that, according to Brown (himself a theistic evolutionist), is theologically Christian-affirming while embracing an evolutionary approach to humanity. Brown and his associates have named this view “nonreductive physicalism” whereby “humans are considered to be physical beings with mental functions and spiritual capacities.”⁴⁸ For Brown, the position “admits the fundamental biological nature of humans (physicalism) but asserts that there are nonreductive properties of mind.”⁴⁹ Such theories are derived from Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, who claimed that in the process of evolution, things “proceed from the material to the spiritual.”⁵⁰ In de Chardin’s reasoning, consciousness gives birth to spirit. He called this “The Law of Complexity/Consciousness.”⁵¹ Because this supposed law is foundational to de Chardin’s thought, it must be asked how it is analytically confirmable. Consciousness scholars have already admitted that the nature of consciousness defies explanation. Wolfgang Smith strongly asserts that “consciousness as such is not

⁴⁷ Shaun Gallagher and Dan Zahavi, “Phenomenological Approaches to Self-Consciousness,” Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, ed. Edward N. Zalta, Spring 2015, accessed April 24, 2015, <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2015/entries/self-consciousness-phenomenological/>. Adam’s pre-reflection produced all subsequent and ongoing reflection.

⁴⁸ Warren S. Brown, “Evolution, Cognitive Neuroscience, and the Soul,” in *Perspectives on an Evolving Creation*, ed. Keith B. Miller (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2003), 503.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ Wolfgang Smith, *Theistic Evolution: The Teilhardian Heresy* (Tacoma: Angelico Press, 2012), 53.

⁵¹ Ibid.

observable at all.”⁵² While the “law” which undergirds de Chardin’s entire system must be acknowledged, according to Smith, it “must be questioned.”⁵³ As already stated, all consciousness is self-consciousness; one cannot be conscious of another person’s consciousness. Hence, we operate in both pre-reflective and reflective self-consciousness, which allows us to be others-conscious.

Scripture attests to the “the dignity and perfection of our first parents,”⁵⁴ created in the *imago Dei*. Hodges’ use of the terms *dignity* and *perfection* seem to imply that from a theocentric view of humanity, a fully-conscious God created human beings in His image and likeness who share the capacity for consciousness.

The non-theistic evolutionary view ignores and rejects the divine intent—that humans were created to speak, commune, and communicate, and therefore reflect and interact with the divine and human others, as well as with all living creatures at some level. The Creator was clear: the construction of Adam’s social identity and the fulfillment of his divinely-appointed potential required other living beings. Hence, the Creator declared that Adam’s life without other humans was “not good.”⁵⁵

Regarding social identity and consciousness, it could be postulated that the first face of which Adam became *consciously* aware was not his own, but God’s. What mirroring process existed that would enable Adam to reflect back on himself in both mind and body? Assuming that Adam was made in the image and likeness of God and

⁵² Ibid., 54.

⁵³ Ibid., 53.

⁵⁴ Charles Hodge, “Synopsis of Biblical Criticism: The Antiquity and History of the Hebrew Language,” *Biblical Repertory: A Collection of Tracts in Biblical Literature* 2, no. 2 (1826): 295.

⁵⁵ Gen. 2:18. To God, identity is more than individual; it is also social.

had communion with God in Eden,⁵⁶ and assuming his only physical “mirror” was water (in water “face reflects face” even as the “heart of man reflects man”),⁵⁷ is it not conceivable that the Creator would reveal himself to his son⁵⁸ Adam and become the first face, whether metaphorical or physical, from which Adam could reflect back on himself?

David’s prophetic yearnings and intuitions in Psalm 17 imply God’s original intention with Adam and, by extension, about the required restorative work of the Last Adam: “As for me, I shall behold Your face in righteousness; I will be satisfied with Your likeness when I awake.”⁵⁹

If we are to “trust the story” as Leonard Sweet suggests,⁶⁰ we can surmise that when Adam first opened his eyes, he met, by some means, the One who made him in the divine image and likeness.⁶¹ Adam and God communicated with one another, and the man was commissioned to do a work.⁶² Adam’s conscious state preceded his being rendered unconscious for God’s removal of a bone for the construction of his mate.⁶³ When Adam awoke from the “procedure,” he faced the woman, another mirroring agent for the reflection process, which further shaped his identity.⁶⁴

⁵⁶ Gen. 1:26; Gen. 3:8.

⁵⁷ Prov. 27:19.

⁵⁸ Luke 3:38.

⁵⁹ Ps. 17:15.

⁶⁰ “A parable sets one thing beside another; an allegory substitutes one thing for another.” Leonard Sweet, Twitter post, October 16, 2015, <https://twitter.com/lensweet/status/655030205669470208>.

⁶¹ Gen. 1:26.

⁶² Gen. 2:15–17.

⁶³ Gen. 2:21–22.

⁶⁴ “It is not good for the man to be alone.” (Gen. 2:18). The adage “You cannot know yourself by yourself” captures the Creator’s assessment.

Consciousness and identity are inseparable from interaction and relationship. A study conducted by psychology scholar Manos Tsakiris indicates “the image we hold of our own face can actually change through shared experiences with other people’s faces.”⁶⁵

The interaction of man’s face and God’s in the scriptural record bears great importance.⁶⁶ Consider Jacob: Just prior to his dreaded reunion with Esau, Jacob wrestled with the angel and saw God “face to face.”⁶⁷ God changed Jacob’s name to Israel, signifying transformation of his sense of self and, therefore, his self-consciousness. Following the encounter, God told Jacob “you have striven with God and men and have prevailed.”⁶⁸ Astounded at having and surviving a meeting with God, Jacob named the place “the face of God (Penuel or Peniel).”⁶⁹ His subsequent reconciliation with Esau more fully revealed Jacob’s transformation. When he saw Esau’s face “as one sees the face of God,”⁷⁰ there is an indication of a change of consciousness; conscious and unconscious fears relating to Esau no longer seem to rule his sense of self.

These “snapshots” in consciousness study provide historical context for the interface between human consciousness, Jesus’s way of seeing, and an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality.

⁶⁵ Manos Tsakiris, “Looking for Myself: Current Multisensory Input Alters Self-Face Recognition,” *PloS ONE* (December 24, 2008) 3 (12): e4040, accessed October 12, 2015, <http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0004040>.

⁶⁶ Num. 6:26.

⁶⁷ Gen. 32:30.

⁶⁸ Gen. 32:28.

⁶⁹ Gen. 32:30.

⁷⁰ Gen. 33:10.

John 5 and Polanyi's "Tacit Knowing"

To understand Jesus's way of seeing requires relating to his consciousness in terms familiar to our own. In establishing this basis of shared experience, the work of Polanyi and others is helpful. This scholarship will also be considered in light of the pericope from John 5. Although Polanyi's work in philosophy does not directly address the Incarnation or any Christian dogma, Polanyi "sees his own philosophical contribution standing in significant relation to religious practice and theological thought."⁷¹

Polanyi's epistemology is rooted in scientific knowing, whereas God exists in a realm "beyond that which science can discover."⁷² Nevertheless, in concluding *The Tacit Dimension*,⁷³ Polanyi appraised the disempowering state of religion in his day. His insights into the connection between perception and action, and the tacit dimension that is "at the heart of his philosophical efforts"⁷⁴ have bearing upon the development of an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality.

⁷¹ Tony Clark, "Polanyi on Religion," *Tradition and Discovery: The Polanyi Society Periodical* 32, no 2: 30, accessed November 2, 2015, <https://www.missouriwestern.edu/orgs/polanyi/TAD%20WEB%20ARCHIVE/TAD32-2/TAD32-2-fnl-pg25-37-pdf.pdf>.

⁷² Ibid., 26.

⁷³ "Men need a purpose which bears on eternity. Truth does that; our ideals do it; and this might be enough, if we ever could be satisfied with our manifest moral shortcomings and with a society which has such shortcomings fatally involved in its working. Perhaps this problem cannot be resolved on secular grounds alone. But its religious solution should become more feasible once religious faith is released from pressure by an absurd vision of the universe, and so there will open up instead a meaningful world which could resound to religious pressure by an absurd vision of the universe, and so there will open up instead a meaningful world which could resound to religion." Michael Polanyi, *The Tacit Dimension* (London: University of Chicago Press, 2009), 92.

⁷⁴ Andrew T. Grosso, *Personal Being: Polanyi, Ontology, and Christian Theology* (New York: Lang, 2007), 12.

Because Jesus *knew* the man at the pool had been incapacitated for a long time,⁷⁵ it would seem that Jesus's state of consciousness was already being influenced by his Father's intentions. His disclosure that he did nothing unless he saw his Father doing it summarized his unfolding awareness,⁷⁶ which began when he entered the Sheep Gate and intentionally approached the "asylum where rejected people [were] lying around unwanted."⁷⁷

This gathering of the unwanted perfectly suited the Messiah's assignment as expressed in Isaiah 61:1 and Luke 4:18. Catholic theologian and philosopher Jean Vanier contends that this "asylum" was as much "the Father's house" as the Temple was.⁷⁸ The infirmed, banned from Temple worship,⁷⁹ were nevertheless worthy of occupying Jesus's conscious awareness. Assuming that Vanier is accurate, it can be said that Jesus's consciousness of his mission⁸⁰ equally influenced his perception of what the Father was doing, where he was doing it, and what the Father sent him (and his followers) to do.⁸¹ To those in charge of Temple and Sabbath regulations, however, Jesus's approach contradicted God's intent and any "acceptable" ways of knowing and perceiving.⁸² They

⁷⁵ John 5:6. The word translated "knew" in this verse is "*ginōskō* – properly, *to know*, especially through *personal experience* (*first-hand* acquaintance). *ginōskō* ('experientially know')." Bible Hub, s.v. "*ginōskō*," accessed November 3, 2015, <http://biblehub.com/greek/1097.htm>.

⁷⁶ John 5:19.

⁷⁷ Jean Vanier, *Drawn into the Mystery of Jesus through the Gospel of John* (New York: Paulist Press, 2004), 101.

⁷⁸ Ibid.

⁷⁹ Lev. 21:17.

⁸⁰ This is the mission delineated in Luke 4:18–19.

⁸¹ John 20:21.

⁸² "Tractate Shabbat: Chapter 7," Jewish Virtual Library, accessed October 25, 2015, <https://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsourc/Talmud/shabbat7.html>. Mishnah Tractate Shabbat 7:2 forbade

failed to accurately assess Jesus's ways of being, seeing, and doing, and they failed to properly assess the intent of Torah.

Polanyi believes "the mind actively participates in our sensory awareness of things."⁸³ Scripture indicates an active process for renewing the believer's mind⁸⁴ that ultimately proves God's intention. The Incarnate Son's mind did not need renewing. Yet Jesus proved what he saw by demonstrating God's intent and power, through the Agency of the Holy Spirit.

Perception and action function together, by "the prompting of a conscious motive."⁸⁵ Perception implies a process of "consciously discriminating" and "getting to know an external object by the impression made by it on our senses."⁸⁶ In the pericope under study, Jesus consciously perceived something about the man,⁸⁷ about his own ability as the Last Adam, and about the activity of the Father. This could be posited as a tacit knowing, which Polanyi describes as "we can know more than we can tell."⁸⁸

Polanyi offers this example:

thirty-nine Sabbath-day activities. The approach taken in this paper is that Jesus is *the most reliable* source for understanding of the Father.

⁸³ Michael Polanyi, *Personal Knowledge: Towards a Post-Critical Philosophy* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1962), 312.

⁸⁴ Rom. 12:2.

⁸⁵ Polanyi, *Personal Knowledge*, 380.

⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁸⁷ The question could be raised as to what exactly was activated in Jesus' consciousness at the sight of the lame man and why, among the multitude of infirmed individuals within the colonnade, Jesus was specifically drawn to him.

⁸⁸ Polanyi, Tacit Dimension, 4. A "sharp difference" separates Polanyi's theory of knowledge from the positivism of Poincare, Duhem, and Ernst Mach. The latter group held that "all knowledge is explicit knowledge, at all times strictly and objectively ascertained and evaluated." David W. Long, *Body Knowledge: A Path to Wholeness; The Philosophy of Michael Polanyi* (Bloomington: Xlibris, 2011), 73. Because every individual maintains presuppositions, Polanyi and other realists posited that even "objective" scientists work somewhat subjectively. Realists postulate that "the objects of scientific

We know a person's face, and can recognize it among a thousand, indeed among a million. Yet we usually cannot tell how we recognize a face we know. So most of this knowledge cannot be put into words.⁸⁹

Polanyi's assertion regarding our precise but inexplicable facial recognition might be answered in terms of an embodied knowing. Essentially, something embodied is visceral, existing in the mind, but also known in the muscles and tendons. Within an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality, might an *incarnational knowing* that is *tacit* exist?

We readily identify familiar faces, but struggle to articulate *how* we recognize them. The process is more than we can tell. Likewise, we recognize other people's moods by looking at their faces.⁹⁰ According to Polanyi, such recognition is possible "without being able to tell, except quite vaguely, by what signs we know it."⁹¹ For Polanyi, what cannot be put into words is the "proximal" place from which we attend to what is

knowledge exist independently of the minds or acts of scientists and that scientific theories are true of that objective (mind-independent) world." Arthur Fine, "Scientific Realism and Antirealism," in Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy, ed. Edward Craig, vol. 1, A Posteriori–Bradwardine (London: Routledge, 1998), accessed February 16, 2016, <http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:K7gJ4cauol0J:www.unige.ch/lettres/baumgartner/docs/real/fine.pdf+&cd=5&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us>. For Polanyi, the "anti-metaphysical" and "anti-realist" position of Mach and others in the Vienna Circle was "too narrow"; a robust theory of knowledge should include the "ineffable or inarticulate, unconscious or subliminal, and tacit or unspecifiable." Paul Pojman, "Ernst Mach," Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, ed. Edward N. Zalta, Winter 2011, accessed February 16, 2016, <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2011/entries/ernst-mach>; Long, *Body Knowledge*, 73. Ibid., 200. Many arguments by Polanyi's detractors waned as post-positivist realism gained acceptance. Among its strongest voices was Karl Popper, "crowned" by a Vienna Circle member as "the official opposition," who argued that "all knowledge is provisional, conjectural, hypothetical." Stephen Thornton, "Karl Popper," Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, ed. Edward N. Zalta, Winter 2015, accessed February 16, 2016, <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/popper/#CriEva>.

⁸⁹ Polanyi, *Tacit Dimension*, 4.

⁹⁰ Ibid., 5. With how much more clarity of perception, then, can "the only begotten God who is in the bosom of the Father, [the One who] has explained Him" (John 1:18), describe by his own self-disclosure, which is rooted in his consciousness, what the Father is like and what he does?

⁹¹ Polanyi, *Tacit Dimension*, 5.

“distal.”⁹² Polanyi says, “It is the proximal ... of which we have a knowledge that we may not be able to tell.”⁹³

From Polanyi’s natural example of tacitly knowing a person’s face, we can bridge Jesus’s recognizing the lame man’s condition and Jesus’s spiritual perception of the Father’s face. The John 5 account does not explain *how* Jesus perceived, but several points support the Holy Spirit’s involvement: Jesus disclosed in Luke 4:18 that healing the infirmed was part of his mission. John 5:20 foretold that this miracle and sign would be followed by “greater works.” Jesus disclosed⁹⁴ that he beheld the Father. The Spirit’s empowering released Jesus to accomplish his mission and perform his works.⁹⁵

If Jesus’s knowledge of the Father was tacit to some extent, then Jesus explained (exegeted)⁹⁶ the Father to his followers because what he knew was visceral and beyond telling. Based on these assertions of divine intent and the Father-Son relationship, and because the Father did not physically manifest himself, it seems reasonable to surmise the Spirit’s operation in Jesus’s *knowing* (an aspect of his perceiving).

David wrote, “I keep my eyes always on the LORD. With him at my right hand, I will not be shaken.”⁹⁷ In its Messianic context, this verse confirms this beholding and indicates some sort of facial recognition and an intentional setting of Yahweh’s face

⁹² Ibid., 10.

⁹³ Ibid.

⁹⁴ John 5:19.

⁹⁵ John 1:32–33; Luke 3:22.

⁹⁶ John 1:18. Ultimately, the Father has to be known, not merely intellectually, but phenomenologically and experientially by those to whom he reveals himself. Matt. 11:27. According to Ephesians 1:18–19, such a knowing on the part of his followers is possible post-Pentecost, for the “eyes of the heart” can be “enlightened” by the Spirit for a more comprehensive knowing.

⁹⁷ Ps. 16:8 (NIV).

before the Messiah's own consciousness. The Hebrew word for *before* implies what is "in sight of ... in front of oneself," "what is conspicuous."⁹⁸ How Jesus knew his Father's face, actions, and intentions is a matter of internal perception and phenomenology. This psalm suggests a connection to what Jesus described in John 5:19.⁹⁹

If Jesus, the Last Adam, as archetypal pattern, perceived the person and activity of the Father in his own interiority, then it must be possible, by the Spirit and within the domain of human consciousness, for his followers to do the same. This comports with Polanyi's idea of knowing more than we can tell,¹⁰⁰ as knowing by the Spirit differs from perceiving by natural means,¹⁰¹ which more easily lends itself to the telling.

From "knowing more than we can tell," we refer also to Gestalt psychology, which explores the nature of perception and emphasizes that "the whole of anything is greater than its parts."¹⁰² Jesus's perception of his Father far exceeded what he described; yet his description allows his followers to integrate into their own consciousness a way of seeing, perceiving, and knowing that serves their "greater works" mission.

Gestalt psychology validates phenomenological¹⁰³ ways of *knowing more than one can tell*. Essentially, it concerns "the description of direct psychological experience,

⁹⁸ "נֶגֶד [neged /neh·ghed/] subst. ... 1 what is conspicuous, what is in front of adv. 2 in front of, straight forward, before, in sight of. 3 in front of oneself, straightforward. 4 before your face, in your view." James Strong, *Enhanced Strong's Lexicon*, s.v. "before."

⁹⁹ Evident in the Incarnate Son's consciousness are his knowing and perceiving, which were rooted in his intimacy with the Father. Jesus intentionally maintained this intimacy by his surrender to the Father's will, by his abiding in the Father, and by the Father's abiding in him. John 14:10.

¹⁰⁰ Polanyi, *Tacit Dimension*, 4.

¹⁰¹ 1 Cor. 2:12; 2 Cor. 5:16.

¹⁰² *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, s.v. "Gestalt psychology," November 12, 2014, accessed October 12, 2015, <http://www.britannica.com/science/Gestalt-psychology>.

¹⁰³ Ibid.

with no restrictions on what is permissible in the description.”¹⁰⁴ This is essential to that which exceeds the telling. Can one have a direct psychological experience with the divine, perceiving the presence and activity of God, and then describe it from a first-person perspective that makes sense to others who have not had the experience?

If the tacit dimension has any application here, then Polanyi might be correct in saying that all true “discovery must be arrived at by the tacit powers of the mind.”¹⁰⁵ The challenge is to bridge the psychological dynamics of discovery and the reality of Holy Spirit revelation;¹⁰⁶ but how does the mind’s discovery process engage and recognize the spiritual dimension?

Polanyi argues that “*scientific knowing consists in discerning gestalten that indicate a **true coherence** in nature.*”¹⁰⁷ Natural perception filters out the multiple dynamics that occur as an object passes before the eye (such as Polanyi’s example of a hand moving before his eyes).¹⁰⁸ Science, however, integrates changes, discerning and isolating the multiple dynamics the observer takes into account, but does not describe.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid.

¹⁰⁵ Michael Polanyi, *Knowing and Being: Essays by Michael Polanyi*, ed. Marjorie Greene (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969), 138.

¹⁰⁶ John 16:14.

¹⁰⁷ Polanyi, *Knowing and Being*, 138. Polanyi’s italics; additional emphasis is mine.

¹⁰⁸ “When I move my hand before my eyes, it would keep changing its color, its shape and its size, but for the fact that I take into account a host of rapidly changing clues, some in the field of vision, some in my eye muscles, and some deeper still in my body, as in the labyrinth of the inner ear. My powers of perceiving coherence make me see these thousand varied and changing clues jointly as one single object moving about at different distances, seen from different angles, under variable illuminations. A successful integration of a thousand changing particulars into a single constant sight makes me recognize a real object in front of me.” Polanyi, *Knowing and Being*, 139.

Perception emphasizes the object's coherence; science integrates all things that "indicate true coherence in nature."¹⁰⁹

The natural eye of an adult performs integration "effortlessly."¹¹⁰ Its "powers of seeing" are "acquired by early training in the infant child and are continuously developed by practice."¹¹¹ If the natural senses are developed to the point of true coherence, cannot that corollary also apply to the spiritual senses?

Maximus the Confessor argued that the development of spiritual perception "is the fulfillment of the ascetic struggle."¹¹² With the supporting presence of the Holy Spirit,¹¹³ Jesus's spiritual senses developed as he grew in wisdom and in stature.¹¹⁴ This paper contends that his followers can expect the same integrative assistance of the Spirit in developing their way of seeing the activities of God.

Jesus's Phenomenology

Phenomenology exists in the realm of consciousness. According to the eminent scholar of Christology, Jean Galot, "Consciousness is distinct from person."¹¹⁵ "The person is the subject and object of consciousness, but he is not consciousness itself."¹¹⁶

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 138.

¹¹⁰ Ibid., 139.

¹¹¹ Ibid.

¹¹² Paul L. Gavriluk and Sarah Coakley, *The Spiritual Senses: Perceiving God in Western Christianity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 105.

¹¹³ Jesus the man was also the divine Person who "possesses perfection totally." Jean Galot, *The Person of Christ: Covenant Between God and Man; A Theological Insight* (Rome: Georgian University Press, 1981), 47. This is true because he and his Father are one. John 10:30. Jesus' followers "acquire his perfection progressively." Ibid., 47.

¹¹⁴ Luke 2:52.

¹¹⁵ Galot, *Person of Christ*, 45.

¹¹⁶ Ibid.

Consciousness is a “door opening outward, or more precisely, the inner light by which the person opens himself outward to others and makes contact with them.”¹¹⁷

Human beings are conscious, and also self-conscious.¹¹⁸ Phenomenologically speaking, “a minimal form of self-consciousness is a constant structural feature of conscious experience.”¹¹⁹ All that we do, as experienced and issuing from our first-person point of view, is our phenomenology. What then constitutes a minimal form of self-consciousness? Gallagher and Zahavi explain: “Experience happens for the experiencing subject in an immediate way and as part of this immediacy, it is implicitly marked as my experience.”¹²⁰

Jesus’s “my” experience in John 5:19 was an immediate Father-Son consciousness disclosed by the words *My* and *Father* (*My* indicating consciousness of self, and *Father* indicating immediate, direct experience of God as Father). Phenomenologically speaking, it could be said that the Last Adam perceived himself in the same pre-reflective way ascribed earlier to the First Adam. By Jesus’s own words, he was aware of his Father and his Father’s activity. His awareness preceded his bringing it to speech.¹²¹ From Polanyi’s perspective, Jesus knew more than he told, but he relayed what he could to those who didn’t know the Father.

¹¹⁷ Ibid.

¹¹⁸ Ibid.

¹¹⁹ Gallagher and Zahavi, “Phenomenological Approaches to Self-Consciousness,” <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2015/entries/self-consciousness-phenomenological/>. Adam’s pre-reflection produced all subsequent and ongoing reflection.

¹²⁰ Ibid.

¹²¹ Jesus also perceived his Father’s intention to heal *before* he actualized that healing.

This profound, immediate, and experiential consciousness of his Father¹²² was evident from Jesus's youth. Even his self-consciousness was rooted in his consciousness as Son of the Father.¹²³ Galot's framework for reflective self-consciousness speaks of transitive consciousness in the spiritual dimension: "It is of the nature of spirit to be able to reflect upon itself, in a 'reflection' that concerns the whole of its being, and is not simply the turning back of one part upon another."¹²⁴

To Galot, this reflection is entirely inward-looking,¹²⁵ as the entire person "reflects on himself."¹²⁶ This is not exclusively so, otherwise "the destiny of a person would consist in looking at himself, and his perfection would lie in feeding on this egocentric gaze."¹²⁷ As an aspect of the fallen consciousness; this gaze contradicts the inward look by which Jesus recognized his Father's presence. His orientation was firstly Father-ward and then directed toward those with whom he engaged and shared his love.

Would the Incarnate Son have actualized the Father's intent *without* desiring, thinking, and feeling it? Are not these elements of intrinsic motivation?

¹²² Luke 2:49. In John 5:19, Jesus' explicit response revealed a momentary reflection phenomenologically indicating a certain quality and *feel* to his *seeing* of the Father. As Gallagher and Zahavi note, pre-reflective self-awareness includes a "certain (phenomenal) quality of 'what it is like' or what it 'feels' like to have [experiences]." Gallagher and Zahavi, "Phenomenological Approaches to Self-Consciousness," <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2015/entries/self-consciousness-phenomenological/>. Pre-reflective perceptual experiences can involve both sensory-rich stimuli in relation to the five senses and "experiences of desiring, feeling, and thinking." Ibid. All of these were part of Jesus' human experience.

¹²³ "The Jews" in John 5:18 knew that, in calling God his Father, Jesus made himself equal with God. Ontologically, he was the Only Begotten Son of the Father. However, his consciousness of his Sonship was the source of his phenomenology.

¹²⁴ Galot, *Person of Christ*, 46.

¹²⁵ "The act of looking within oneself." Dictionary.com, s.v. "introspection," accessed August 20, 2015, <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/introspection>.

¹²⁶ Galot, *Person of Christ*, 46.

¹²⁷ Ibid.

Another aspect of the Greek word *blépō* (translated “see”) is from the definition first presented in this paper. It involves the sense of perceiving “as with the eyes meaning to discern, to understand.”¹²⁸ This knowing by seeing describes Jesus’s situational phenomenological experience of the Father. Walach calls this a “holistic type of knowing that manifests cognitively, emotionally, and motivationally.”¹²⁹

Jesus’s holistic knowing ensured that what he realized cognitively moved him emotionally and motivationally to accomplish his Father’s intention. Rather than the dysfunction of the First Adam’s “egocentric gaze,”¹³⁰ Jesus’s sinless beholding remained Father-aware, and others-aware, even as he was self-aware. When tempted to be egocentric, Jesus declared, “Man shall not live on bread alone.”¹³¹ He identified, not with his ego, but with the human race, the “others” he came to redeem, and his status as the Father’s Son.

Jesus’s Transpersonal Consciousness and the Possibility of Mystical Experience

The qualities of Jesus’s consciousness and spiritual experiences are key to this study. The source of his phenomenology was the Father-Son relationship. This consciousness, as presented in John 1:18,¹³² indicates the Son’s being “in the closest possible relationship to the Father.”¹³³ The Greek word translated “seen” in this verse is

¹²⁸ Zodhiates, *Complete Word Study Dictionary*, s.v. “see” (βλέπω).

¹²⁹ Harald Walach, Stefan Schmidt, and Wayne B. Jonas, eds., *Neuroscience, Consciousness, and Spirituality* (Dordrecht: Springer, 2011), 6.

¹³⁰ Galot, *Person of Christ*, 46.

¹³¹ Matt. 4:4.

¹³² “No one has seen God at any time; the only begotten God who is in the bosom of the Father, He has explained Him.”

¹³³ Morris, *Gospel According to John*, 100.

horáō,¹³⁴ implying the act of seeing, and also “the actual perception of some object.”¹³⁵

According to Liddel and Scott, *horáō* is ordinary sight, but also denotes “spiritual perception, seeing in dreams and visions, and ‘perceiving’ or ‘understanding’ mental complexities.”¹³⁶

Assuming Jesus’s consciousness was rooted in his Father-consciousness as already proposed, did his perception of the Father exceed Walach’s idea of a “holistic type of knowing”?¹³⁷ Walach contends that spirituality is “an effort to understand the general principles or structure of the world through inner experience.”¹³⁸ Scripturally speaking, can the world structure be understood by inner experience absent interaction with the One who structured it?

Biological conscious perception, according to Feinstein et al., is the “awareness of a sensory stimulus.”¹³⁹ For the Incarnate Son, this awareness transcended natural, biological, and sensory stimuli, and could be termed *transpersonal*, going “beyond (trans) our personal and corporeal sense of self.”¹⁴⁰ Jesus carried this fully-conscious Father-Son

¹³⁴ “horaó—properly, *see*, often with *metaphorical* meaning: ‘to see with the mind’ (i.e. spiritually see), i.e. perceive (with inward spiritual perception).” Bible Hub, s.v. “horaó,” accessed April 23, 2015, <http://biblehub.com/greek/3708.htm>.

¹³⁵ Ibid.

¹³⁶ Henry George Liddell, Robert Scott, Henry Stuart Jones, Roderick McKenzie, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, s.v. “horaó” (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996).

¹³⁷ Walach, Schmidt, and Jonas, *Neuroscience, Consciousness, and Spirituality*, 6.

¹³⁸ Ibid., 1.

¹³⁹ Justin S. Feinstein, Murray B. Stein, Gabriel N. Castillo, and Martin P. Paulus, “From Sensory Processes to Conscious Perception,” *Consciousness and Cognition* 13 (2004): 324, accessed April 23, 2015, <http://journalpsyche.org/articles/0xc079.pdf>.

¹⁴⁰ Christopher Wynter and Fiona Tulk, “Transpersonal Psychology,” The Transpersonal Notebooks, March 21, 2011, accessed April 18, 2015, <http://www.transpersonal.com.au/transpersonal-psychology/>.

perception from his formative years,¹⁴¹ influenced by his pre-existent unity with the Father.¹⁴²

Are Jesus's consciousness and perception "mystical" in this regard, and what might such mysticism look like? Luke records Jesus's unfolding development both naturally and spiritually,¹⁴³ suggesting that from adolescence through adulthood Jesus (a first-century orthodox Jew) mastered natural and spiritual disciplines.¹⁴⁴ In addition to his rigorous Rabbinic education, Scripture reveals that he was sought out for his mastery,¹⁴⁵ and from the age of twelve, fully engaged the doctors of the Law.¹⁴⁶

Lancaster, in describing the methodologies of spiritual and mystical approaches to consciousness notes, "Participation in such dialogue demands a clear understanding of both the accepted meanings of sacred texts and the approaches to exegesis and commentary deemed legitimate to that tradition."¹⁴⁷ At twelve, Jesus's questions about the

¹⁴¹ Luke 2:49.

¹⁴² John 6:46, 8:38. Jesus' self-disclosure attested that he retained this awareness when he descended into humanity.

¹⁴³ "Jesus kept increasing in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and men." Luke 2:52.

¹⁴⁴ "The Mishnah (1) describes the educational process for a young Jewish boy in Jesus' time. At five years old [one is fit] for the Scripture, at ten years the Mishnah (oral Torah, interpretations) at thirteen for the fulfilling of the commandments, at fifteen the Talmud (making Rabbinic interpretations), at eighteen the bride-chamber, at twenty pursuing a vocation, at thirty for authority (able to teach others)." Ray Vander Laan, "Rabbi and Talmidim," *That the World May Know*, accessed December 9, 2015, <http://followtherabbi.com/guide/detail/rabbi-and-talmidim>.

¹⁴⁵ "The best students continued their study (while learning a trade) in Beth Midrash (secondary school) also taught by a rabbi of the community. Here they (along with the adults in the town) studied the prophets and the writings (3) in addition to Torah and began to learn the interpretations of the Oral Torah (4) to learn how to make their own applications and interpretations ... A few (very few) of the most outstanding Beth Midrash students sought permission to study with a famous rabbi often leaving home to travel with him for a lengthy period of time. These students were called talmidim (talmid, s.) in Hebrew, which is translated disciple. ... Eventually they would become teachers passing on a lifestyle to their talmidim." Ibid.

¹⁴⁶ Luke 2:46–47.

¹⁴⁷ Brian L. Lancaster, *Approaches to Consciousness: The Marriage of Science and Mysticism* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2004), chap. 3, sec. "Methods," Kindle.

sacred text confounded his elders.¹⁴⁸ Citing Odeberg and Schlatter, Leon Morris attests to Jesus's mastery and his fluency in Rabbinic thought and training, explaining that his language regarding the Father-Son relationship¹⁴⁹ was "characteristic Rabbinic thought and language."¹⁵⁰

Modern psychological approaches to consciousness "frequently downplay this textual dimension in favor of a second aspect of training which involves issues of introspection and experience."¹⁵¹ Lancaster offers Robert Scharf's insight: "such a bias constitutes a misrepresentation of the world's mystical literature."¹⁵² Spiritual mastery according to Lancaster is achieved by way of "text-based knowledge, and not through access to spiritual states."¹⁵³

While being immersed in text-based knowledge, the Rabbinic student was trained in the psychological processes of "will and attention."¹⁵⁴ This resulted from following "long, convoluted arguments, but it also facilitates conscious grasp of the forms of logic which seem to rule the unconscious."¹⁵⁵ Essentially, we can conclude that Jesus's immersion in Scripture and Rabbinic thought, with the maturing focus of his will and attention, shaped him at a level of conscious awareness *and* at the depths of his psyche.

¹⁴⁸ Luke 2:46–47.

¹⁴⁹ John 5:19.

¹⁵⁰ Morris, *Gospel According to John*, 100.

¹⁵¹ Lancaster, *Approaches to Consciousness*.

¹⁵² Ibid.

¹⁵³ Ibid.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid.

Where I part company with contemporary scholarship regarding Jesus's conscious perception is that within the mystical approaches to consciousness there is always "some notion of individual betterment."¹⁵⁶ The human nature of the Incarnate Son had no need of betterment. Nor did the Mosaic system provide a way for people to "see"¹⁵⁷ God the Father. Although Moses was the paradigm prophet within the Torah tradition,¹⁵⁸ Jesus Christ is The Prophet who actually reveals the Father.¹⁵⁹

The work of philosopher and psychologist William James' on mystical states of consciousness might offer insights into an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality in relation to the Incarnate Son. For James, "personal religious experience has its root and centre in mystical states of consciousness."¹⁶⁰ The link between spiritual development and mystical states is fundamental to James. Was this true in relation to the Incarnate Son?

For James, "four marks" qualify mystical states:¹⁶¹ "ineffability, noetic quality, transiency, and passivity."¹⁶² The first two are always prominent; the last two, "less sharply marked."¹⁶³ Regarding ineffability, spiritual experience "defies expression, that no adequate report of its contents can be given in words."¹⁶⁴ The challenge is that when the Incarnate Son fully revealed what he heard and saw from the Father, it did not defy

¹⁵⁶ Ibid.

¹⁵⁷ John 1:17–18.

¹⁵⁸ Deut. 18:15; Acts 3:22.

¹⁵⁹ John 1:18.

¹⁶⁰ William James, *The Varieties of Religious Experience: A Study in Human Nature* (London, Routledge, 2002), 294.

¹⁶¹ Ibid.

¹⁶² Ibid., 295.

¹⁶³ Ibid.

¹⁶⁴ Ibid.

expression.¹⁶⁵ Jesus may have known more than he could tell,¹⁶⁶ but had no difficulty communicating what he perceived. In James' view of the four marks, ineffability implies the inability to communicate what was perceived. The mark of ineffability fails in application to what Jesus experienced in relation to John 5:19.

As to noetic quality, James claims these marks are "states of insight into depths of truth unplumbed by the discursive intellect."¹⁶⁷ He does not directly invoke Kant's notion of discursive,¹⁶⁸ however the connection seems present when James establishes that such a quality of experience involves "illuminations, revelations, full of significance and importance, all inarticulate."¹⁶⁹ To be inarticulate implies these cannot be verbalized. This is inconsistent with Jesus's self-disclosure in John 5:19. To assume that any of Jesus's experiences with the Father remained inarticulate would be conjecture, as the Gospels are silent on this. If Jesus could articulate that what he was doing was the Father's work, this seems precisely articulate, even if he knew more than he said.

Speaking of transiency, James argues that mystical states "cannot be sustained for long,"¹⁷⁰ suggesting an intermittent or episodic quality. However, Jesus's consciousness of his Father was continual, even if spiritual activity was sometimes more apparent. Luke

¹⁶⁵ John 15:15.

¹⁶⁶ Polanyi, *Tacit Dimension*, 4.

¹⁶⁷ James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*, 295.

¹⁶⁸ "Kant contrasts discursive concepts ('general concepts') with time, which is not discursive but a form of sensible intuition. [A68/B93] By holding that our intellect is discursive, Kant holds that our knowledge of objects involves the application of concepts to the intuitive 'given.' When characterizing understanding at the beginning of the analytic of concepts, Kant writes 'the knowledge yielded by understanding, or at least by the human understanding, must ... be by means of concepts, and so is not intuitive, but discursive.'" *Philosophy Dictionary*, "Kant Dictionary," s.v., "discursive," accessed April 25, 2015, <http://www.philosophy-dictionary.org/Kant-Dictionary/DISCURSIVE>.

¹⁶⁹ James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*, 295.

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

records a moment when God's healing power was especially present,¹⁷¹ implying a sense of transiency. Whether this can be connected to a mystical state of consciousness is questionable.¹⁷²

James' final mark is passivity, meaning "the mystic feels as if his own will were in abeyance."¹⁷³ Although Jesus said, "The Son can do nothing,"¹⁷⁴ to suggest his will was suspended is not precisely accurate. This was not an involuntary immobilization of the Son's will, but his fully-conscious cooperation in executing the Father's intent. Jesus the man lived in *willing*, loving, selfless surrender to the Father.¹⁷⁵ He was not "grasped and held by a superior power,"¹⁷⁶ as James' passivity suggests.

James' understanding of mystical states seems *not* to apply to Jesus's self-disclosure.¹⁷⁷ The particular state of Father-Son consciousness which directed Jesus also enabled him to see objectively beyond himself to both cooperate with the Father's will and explain him to us.¹⁷⁸

¹⁷¹ Luke 5:17.

¹⁷² The idea of other, altered states of consciousness exists within consciousness studies. They are described as "stable patterns of physiological, cognitive, and experiential events different from those of the ordinary waking state." Imants Baruss, introduction to *Alterations of Consciousness: An Empirical Analysis for Social Scientists* (Washington D.C.: American Psychological Association, 2010), introduction, Kindle. Although we might consider the "transient" moments when Jesus operated in signs and wonders as altered states of consciousness, this too would be conjecture.

¹⁷³ James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*, 295.

¹⁷⁴ John 5:19.

¹⁷⁵ Phil. 2:7.

¹⁷⁶ James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*, 295.

¹⁷⁷ John 5:19.

¹⁷⁸ John 1:18.

Jesus's Intentionality

As regards his consciousness, Jesus's actions and intentionality were congruent. His intentionality was also congruent with the Father's intentionality, reflecting the intimacy of their relationship. Jesus disclosed that he saw what his Father was doing, so that our seeing and intentionality might be affected.

Following requires seeing. The desire to see the One being worshiped is intrinsically human, as the Gospels reveal. A devout man of prayer, Jean Galot, was deeply moved by Philip's request of Jesus to "show us the Father" and by Jesus's response that seeing Jesus was seeing the Father.¹⁷⁹ In *Who Is Christ?* Galot demonstrates the deep relatedness that governed Jesus's consciousness:

Jesus refuses to be absorbed by a function. He is not merely sent by God. He is the Son, and He comes as the Son. His personal identity as the Son comes first, before any mission, and this reality remains in His glorious triumph.¹⁸⁰

Jesus's identity as the Son is the context within which he was sent to perform his Messianic function. Thus, he "refuses to be absorbed by a function."¹⁸¹ Given this, we can say that his actions issued from his identity as Son of the Father. Although his mission was evident in his activities and discourses, his consciousness derived from his Person, not his mission. How he saw himself and his Father determined what he did. Therefore, whenever the Father was working, the Son also worked. His working and mission were not his consciousness (though he was conscious of both); instead, his consciousness of Sonship was the reason he worked.

¹⁷⁹ John 14:8; Jean Galot, *Abba Father: We Long to See Your Face; Theological Insights into the First Person of the Trinity* (Staten Island: Alba House, 1992). Galot details the exchange in this work.

¹⁸⁰ Jean Galot, *Who Is Christ? A Theology of Incarnation* (Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1981), 135.

¹⁸¹ Ibid.

Jesus's intentionality came from Father-Son intimacy. For Galot, "'Abba' attests to the absence of any remoteness between Father and Son."¹⁸² This unbroken intimacy has profound implications in an age when patriarchy is widely renounced,¹⁸³ and relational remoteness stemming from "father absence, father deficit, and father hunger"¹⁸⁴ (also known as "father wound")¹⁸⁵ is increasingly common in the West. The trend sharply contrasts the pattern Son's example. For Jesus to see what the Father was doing and respond *in real time*, *there could be no remoteness* in space, time, or relation. Instead their proximity produced the immediacy and direct experience (the phenomenological reality of Jesus's subjective experience) and resulted in Jesus *intentionally* doing it.

Husserl contends that consciousness is "essentially intentional,"¹⁸⁶ and intentionality is the "directedness or about-ness of mental states."¹⁸⁷ For Husserl (who borrowed the concept from Brentano's "science of mental phenomena,")¹⁸⁸ thought is intentional because "it is the nature of thought to be directed toward or about objects."¹⁸⁹

¹⁸² Ibid., 180.

¹⁸³ "What Is Patriarchy?" London Feminist Network, accessed December 8, 2015, <http://londonfeministnetwork.org.uk/home/patriarchy>.

¹⁸⁴ Edward Kruk, "Father Absence, Father Deficit, Father Hunger: The Vital Importance of Paternal Presence in Children's Lives," *Psychology Today*, May 23, 2012, accessed November 2, 2015, <https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/co-parenting-after-divorce/201205/father-absence-father-deficit-father-hunger>.

¹⁸⁵ Dr. Richard Fitzgibbons, interview by Fathers for Good, "The Father Wound Epidemic," Fathers for Good, accessed November 2, 2015, <http://www.fathersforgood.org/ffg/en/month/archive/march10.html>.

¹⁸⁶ Dermot Moran and Joseph Cohen, *The Husserl Dictionary* (London: Continuum International, 2012), 47.

¹⁸⁷ Ibid., 145.

¹⁸⁸ Franz Brentano, *Psychology from an Empirical Standpoint* (Oxon: Routledge, 2015), 9.

¹⁸⁹ Andrew D. Spear, "Edmund Husserl: Intentionality and Intentional Content," *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, accessed April 17, 2015, <http://www.iep.utm.edu/huss-int/>.

What then does Jesus's self-disclosure reveal about his intent?¹⁹⁰ I contend that, beyond mere consciousness of what the Father was doing, Jesus also *intended* to participate in doing it.¹⁹¹ How then might Brentano's mental phenomena (which he understands to mean "appearance")¹⁹² apply to Jesus's experience? Brentano claims they are "contrasted with reality," which truly exists.¹⁹³ He questions any "underlying reality behind the phenomena."¹⁹⁴ For Jesus, reality existed and was connected to his phenomenology. He saw what the Father was doing, and because his phenomenology was more than appearance, what he saw had power to become actuality, based on his intentionality.

Assuming that thought is directed toward an object, Brentano says the object exists in the mental phenomena as "intentional inexistence."¹⁹⁵ From Brentano's philosophical point of view, this inexistence is contrasted with its living reality from Jesus's phenomenological point of view, precisely because the Father was actively doing in his heavenly domain that which Jesus intended to actualize on earth.

Regarding Jesus's intentional conscious state, Husserl's about-ness is tied to Jesus's seeing the man in John 5 lying paralyzed *and* the Father's intention to heal the man.¹⁹⁶ By using words—not *mere* words, but "spirit and life" words¹⁹⁷—Jesus then

¹⁹⁰ In John 5:19.

¹⁹¹ Jesus' intentionality was revealed in his works, as seen in John 9:4 when Jesus declared, "We must work the works of Him who sent Me as long as it is day; night is coming when no one can work."

¹⁹² Brentano, *Psychology from Empirical Standpoint*, 9.

¹⁹³ Ibid.

¹⁹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁹⁵ Ibid., 93.

¹⁹⁶ John 5:6–19.

actualized the Father's intent.¹⁹⁸ It could be said that, based on what the Father was doing, Jesus saw the man as being healed.

For Brentano, only inner perception provides such "immediate, infallible self-evidence."¹⁹⁹ He is not speaking of the supernatural realm, but of natural human perception. The Incarnate Son experienced mental phenomena as all human beings do. What was conveyed to the Son as coming from the Father (inwardly by means of the Spirit) necessarily operated through normal processes of human consciousness.

Jesus intended what his Father intended. Within the framework of Jesus's consciousness and intentionality, what he perceived, the works he did, and what those works accomplished was teleological, being grounded in the Father-Son consciousness that matched Jesus's intentionality to his Father's eternal purpose.

Jesus's Consciousness and the Spirit

As shown, Jesus's consciousness, particularly in regard to his relationship with the Father, necessarily involved the operation of the Holy Spirit. How closely involved was the Spirit in regard to the Incarnate Son's consciousness, and how does their interaction inform our fulfillment of the "greater works"?

For New Testament scholar James D. G. Dunn, Jesus's "consciousness is summed up in the word 'Spirit.'"²⁰⁰ Dunn cannot separate Jesus's consciousness from the Spirit's

¹⁹⁷ John 6:63.

¹⁹⁸ This indicates the operative presence and power of the Spirit.

¹⁹⁹ Brentano, *Psychology from Empirical Standpoint*, 95.

²⁰⁰ James D. G. Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit: A Study of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Christians as Reflected in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1975), sec. 3, sub-sec. 9, Kindle.

operation, saying “it becomes appropriate to describe him as a charismatic figure.”²⁰¹

Jesus the charismatic was aware of the Father’s intent; so he healed the sick and cast out demons by the power of the Spirit,²⁰² and commissioned his followers to do the same.²⁰³

Spiritual mission results from a consciousness of something beyond the natural realm. According to Walach, et al., spiritual consciousness is “an experiential realization of connectedness with a reality beyond the immediate goals of the individual.”²⁰⁴ The greatest example of true spiritual consciousness would be that of the Incarnate Son who “is in the bosom of the Father.”²⁰⁵

Phenomenologically, their continuing union describes a Father-Son consciousness so encompassing that Jesus was never aware of himself apart from being aware of his Father. Their profoundly intimate relationship was sustained without conscious or unconscious separation.²⁰⁶ Any attempt to turn our consciousness similarly heavenward is impossible absent communion with the Father and Son via the Spirit. Not surprisingly, Scripture invites us to access the Incarnate Son’s consciousness not by human effort, but by allowing his consciousness to awaken our own to a fresh awareness of his union with the Father, which he shares with us by the Spirit.²⁰⁷

²⁰¹ Ibid.

²⁰² Matt. 8:16, 12:28; Mark 1:34, 39; Luke 4:41.

²⁰³ “Heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse the lepers, cast out demons. Freely you received, freely give.” Matt. 10:8.

²⁰⁴ Walach, Schmidt, and Jonas, *Neuroscience, Consciousness, and Spirituality*, 6.

²⁰⁵ John 1:18. “[T]he copula ‘is’ expressed a continuing union.” Morris, *Gospel According to John*, 101.

²⁰⁶ Any human attempt to understand the Incarnate Son’s consciousness apart from direct experience would be akin to exploring swimming without knowing what it means to get wet.

²⁰⁷ 1 Cor. 2:9–3; Eph. 5:14–17.

Basing our consciousness in a heavenly perspective means sharing the mind of Christ. This speaks not only to individual destiny and church mission, but to developing an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality. The Incarnate Son's approach to perceptual consciousness involves bringing this heavenly perspective into earthly awareness—a reality made possible by his death, resurrection, and ascension.

For us, this requires cultivating the mind of Christ by yielding to the Spirit and a Father-Son consciousness within our own interiority. Because only the Incarnate Son has perceived the Father entirely accurately, and (as the Last Adam) fully consciously, his perception provides the gateway and central reference point for any and all perceptions of the Triune God. By virtue of his Person and work, the Incarnate Son forever alters the possibilities and potentialities of our human consciousness and concomitant actions in relation to his Father's eternal purpose.²⁰⁸

The eschatological Prophet, Jesus, experienced unhindered communion with the Father. The biblical Adam and Moses saw God face-to-face; the Son experienced uninterrupted unity of relationship, thought, and action. The history of consciousness, as reported in the Book of Job and traced through contemporary consciousness study, has been one of debate regarding mind and body, the existence of the human spirit, and the mystery of the spiritual realm. Throughout this history, the existence of the human spirit has been demonstrated; in the Incarnate Son, it was revealed in perfection. The challenge of describing the human experience of consciousness, as captured in Polanyi's exploration of tacit knowing, reveals areas of conscious experience that exceed our ability to tell. Nevertheless, the pattern Son's ability to see the Father and the Father's

²⁰⁸ Rom. 8:19.

activities in his own interiority, assures his followers that they were created to do the same. Therefore, we can be moved to fulfill the Father's intention, as Jesus was also moved. His intentions and actions being entirely congruent informs our own potential in regard to congruency with the divine intent. Finally, the consciousness offered to us—the consciousness by which we flourish in and through the divine intent—is the mind of Christ.

Jesus possessed an “other-consciousness,” being never conscious of himself apart from his consciousness of his Father. What he knew came from his intimate union with the Father. His was a life of abiding made possible for us through his incarnation, death, and resurrection, and sending of the Spirit, and made manifest as we adjust our minds, hearts, and wills in keeping with the divine intent. This yields the unity Jesus prayed for us in John 17: (1) to be one with the Father as Jesus is one with him, (2) to be one in love with both the Father and the Son, (3) to share the mind of Christ, producing unity among the saints, and (4) to be one in the same glory that Jesus shares with the Father.²⁰⁹

In summary, the study of Jesus's phenomenology is instructive to the believer's experience with the Father and in fulfilling the “greater works.” His face-to-face communion with the Father defines our potential. The exploration of tacit knowing and of Jesus's transpersonal consciousness, and of the nuances of his mystical experiences, intentionality, and interaction with the Holy Spirit, serve not only to demystify the Last Adam, but to illuminate our participation in the “greater works” and the development of an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality.

²⁰⁹ John 17:22–23, 26.

CHAPTER 6

TOWARD AN APPLIED SEMIOTICS OF PROPHETIC PERCEPTUALITY

The Direction of Inquiry

To develop an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality rooted in Jesus's ontological and phenomenological way of seeing, this study has carefully considered ancient and recent scholarship regarding what is revealed in John 5 and the pericope of the intentional Sabbath-day healing of the lame man. Based on this body of research, this chapter now considers the inferences and applications that might be instructive to Jesus's followers in fulfilling the "greater works" he promised, specifically:

It must first be stated that anything Jesus offers his followers as promise and insight derives from his very own Person and work. He was indeed the eschatological Prophet of whom Moses spoke.¹ I will argue that his experience and example therefore inform the semiotics of prophetic perceptuality being developed here. As the "uniquely anointed prophet,"² "mighty in deed and word,"³ he established the paradigm from which we are to prophesy in his name. This requires our being of one mind with him, which is the union to which he has invited his followers.

¹ Deut. 18:15; Acts 3:22.

² Roger Stronstad, *The Prophethood of All Believers: A Study in Luke's Charismatic Theology* (Cleveland: CPT Press, 2010), chap. 1, sec. 3, Kindle.

³ Luke 24:19.

Jesus's actions awaken us to the eschatological expectation of divine visitation from God because "[a] great prophet has arisen among us!"⁴ The descent of the Spirit⁵ during Jesus's baptism marked his anointing of Jesus the man,⁶ who was then "led around by the Spirit" for forty days of probationary testing.⁷ Having faced powers and principalities, including Satan himself, Jesus returned to Galilee victorious, "in the *power* of the Spirit."⁸

Stronstad considers Jesus "a charismatic prophet,"⁹ noting that his prophetic expression involved deeds and works.¹⁰ In a Capernaum synagogue, Jesus cast out a demon.¹¹ He also healed the sick.¹² More than once, he raised the dead,¹³ something only Elijah and Elisha had done. Angering the Pharisees, he forgave sins by his spoken word.¹⁴ Stronstad references Jesus's use of words in "pronouncing blessings (Luke 6:20–23) and dire curses (Luke 6:25–26)."¹⁵ Historically, God's prophets spoke both blessings and cursings, as Elisha did in Second Kings 2:21–24.

⁴ Luke 7:16.

⁵ Luke 3:22.

⁶ When reading Isaiah 61:1 (Luke 4:18–21) in his inaugural sermon, Jesus self-referenced that anointing and confirmed that he was the prophet Isaiah foretold.

⁷ Luke 4:1.

⁸ Luke 4:14; italics mine.

⁹ Stronstad, *Prophethood of All Believers*.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Luke 4:35.

¹² Luke 4:38–39.

¹³ Luke 7:11–17; Mark 5:38–43; Matt. 9:18–26; Luke 8:40–56; John 11:1–44.

¹⁴ Luke 5:20; Mark 2:5; Matt. 9:2.

¹⁵ Stronstad, *Prophethood of All Believers*.

From the perspective of the anointed eschatological Prophet, prophetic utterance and fulfillment are connected: the speaking of divine intent is inseparable from the demonstration of the Spirit and power. When an uncertain John the Baptist asked, by way of Jesus's messengers, "Are You the Expected One?" Jesus responded: "Go and report to John what you have seen and heard: the BLIND RECEIVE SIGHT, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, the POOR HAVE THE GOSPEL PREACHED TO THEM."¹⁶ For Jesus, Isaiah 61 was more than metaphorical. The acts it described—"[t]o bring good news to the afflicted ... bind up the brokenhearted ... proclaim liberty to captives and freedom to prisoners ... to proclaim the favorable year of the LORD."¹⁷—were demonstrations of power that released healing and deliverance from bondage.¹⁸

Jesus's words articulated the Father's intent and produced efficacious actions. Stronstad explains: "Jesus ha[d] miracle-working power in his mind as much as preaching."¹⁹ This is important because, with his earthly mission completed and his ascension imminent, he promised his disciples would be baptized in the same Spirit and power.²⁰ On the Day of Pentecost, a theophany of wind and fire attended the eschatological fulfillment of Jesus's words and the promise of Joel 2:28–32.²¹

¹⁶ Luke 7:22.

¹⁷ Isa. 61:1–2.

¹⁸ Luke 7:22.

¹⁹ Stronstad, *Prophethood of All Believers*.

²⁰ Luke 24:49; Acts 1:5.

²¹ Acts 2:1–21.

The promised baptism and its subsequent fulfillment affirm the divine intent regarding our prophetic role as Jesus's followers. As "heirs and successors to Jesus' prophetic ministry,"²² can we not, by the same Spirit, accomplish what Jesus promised? Further, in following his example, can we not expect similar demonstrations of the Spirit's power?

The Book of Acts abounds with miracles, signs, and wonders done "at the hands of the apostles."²³ Even Stephen (not an apostle but a deacon appointed to care for widows) "was performing great wonders and signs among the people."²⁴ The Spirit's empowering provides access to "the mind of Christ"²⁵ and the charismata.²⁶ This dissertation has shown that by virtue of the Spirit, the Son saw what the Father was doing. This chapter argues that followers of Jesus are to be similarly empowered by the same Spirit.²⁷

The fourth evangelist affirmed God's abiding in Jesus.²⁸ Kanagaraj likewise notes that when Jesus said, "the Father abiding in Me does His works,"²⁹ he "implies that in the mutual abiding of Jesus and his disciples they abide in God himself."³⁰ Because of the

²² Stronstad, *Prophethood of All Believers*.

²³ Acts 5:12.

²⁴ Acts 6:8.

²⁵ 1 Cor. 2:16.

²⁶ 1 Cor. 12:4–11.

²⁷ 1 Cor. 2:9.

²⁸ John 14:10.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Jey J. Kanagaraj, *'Mysticism' in the Gospel of John: An Inquiry into Its Background* (London: Bloomsbury, 2014), 264. This mutual abiding between Jesus and his disciples is described in John 15:4.

Incarnation, the Son's mutual abiding with the Father is the inheritance of Jesus's disciples. Therefore, *Jesus's way of seeing is to be his followers' way of seeing*.

Likewise, for the apostle Paul, being "in Christ" implies being "new creation[s]," "sons of God," "heirs of God and fellow heirs with Christ",³¹ "not lacking in any gift" (charismata),³² and participating fully in the Son's fellowship with the Father.³³ To reduce this to something less than operating in the fullness of the Spirit with all His manifestations and gifts would be to deny Christ's very promises to his church.

This can be confidently asserted: Jesus's announcement to those he now called *brothers*—"I ascend to My Father and your Father, and My God and your God"³⁴—indicated that what was true of him was now true of them, because of the work accomplished in his death, burial, and resurrection. To deny the potential within every believer to see and do as Jesus saw and did, is to deny the rightful reward of his Messianic mission: to "bring many sons and daughters to glory."³⁵ What is glory if not the realization of each believer coming "to the measure of the stature which belongs to the fullness of Christ"?³⁶

³¹ 2 Cor. 5:17; Gal. 3:26; Rom. 8:17.

³² 1 Cor. 1:7.

³³ 1 Cor. 1:9.

³⁴ John 20:17.

³⁵ Heb. 2:10; paraphrased.

³⁶ Eph. 4:13.

Signs: Wilderness Wanderings and the Man at the Pool

This potential—“the measure of the stature belonging to the fullness of Christ.”³⁷—marks the crux of the Bethesda Pool encounter. The lame man is semiotic, a sign first and foremost to Israel, but also to the believer and to the church. The text reveals his thirty-eight years of disability.³⁸ Semiotically, this corresponds to the statement in Deuteronomy that judgment befell an entire generation that left Egypt as slaves,³⁹ wandered for thirty-eight years, and *never attained the Land of Promise*.

Was the fourth evangelist drawing this parallel? Biblical scholar Raymond E. Brown thinks not, saying, “The suggestion that the number is symbolic, e.g., the 38 years of wandering in Deut. 2:14, is unnecessary.”⁴⁰ Andreas Köstenberger nevertheless affirms the idea and acknowledges other scholars who agree:

The man had been an invalid for thirty-eight years—longer than many people in antiquity lived (the average life expectancy for men barely exceeded forty years), and roughly as long as Israel’s wanderings in the wilderness (Deut. 2:14; see Hengel 1999: 316; cf. Borchert 1996: 232).⁴¹

This paper holds that Israel’s thirty-eight-year wilderness trek is purposefully paralleled by the thirty-eight-year infirmity of the man at Bethesda’s pool, as recorded in the Gospel of John. A brief synopsis is helpful to the larger discussion. God did not intend the nation he delivered to spend forty years in the wilderness. Scripture indicates an eleven-day

³⁷ Ibid.; paraphrased.

³⁸ John 5:5.

³⁹ “Thirty-eight years passed from the time we left Kadesh Barnea until we crossed the Zered Valley. By then, that entire generation of fighting men had perished from the camp, as the Lord had sworn to them. The LORD’s hand was against them until he had completely eliminated them from the camp.” Deut. 2:14 (NIV).

⁴⁰ Brown, *Gospel according to John (I–XII)*, 207.

⁴¹ Andreas J. Köstenberger, *John*, Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004), 179.

journey from Horeb to Kadesh-barnea.⁴² Yet God led them through a two-year probationary period, his stated purpose being “that He might make you understand that man does not live by bread alone, but man lives by everything that proceeds out of the mouth of the LORD.”⁴³ The journey’s length was extended because “the hand of the LORD was against them.”⁴⁴ Due to their hardness of heart, God waited for an entire generation to die in the wilderness.

The sign of the impotent man at the pool is similarly significant: the New Moses offered a new exodus to a new generation rooted in a new creation founded on “grace and truth.”⁴⁵ The law was impotent to bring Israel from slavery to sonship. Christ’s grace abolished the law’s tyranny and ushered in the promise and privilege of sonship by virtue of his Person and work.

Semiotically, the lame man speaks to Jesus’s perceived mission and intention as described in Isaiah 61:1 and as expressed in terms of Sabbath: to heal, deliver, and bring to rest and fulfillment a people whose potential was exemplified by the Prophet himself. How does this affect the promised “greater works”? What is central to Jesus’s way of seeing, and what implications exist for those who wholeheartedly embrace the promise of “greater works”? The answers impact development of an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality.

⁴² Deut. 1:2.

⁴³ Deut. 8:3. Declaring this very section of Scripture, Jesus defeated the powers of darkness and Satan himself in the wilderness, and returned to Galilee triumphant.

⁴⁴ Deut. 2:15.

⁴⁵ John 1:17.

Jesus's Purposeful View of the Sabbath

The timing of the lame man's healing in John 5 is significant and only fully understood in the light of Jesus's views on the Sabbath. These are explored in this section along with the implications for the "greater works" and those who benefit from their fulfillment.

Where perception is inaccurate and understanding is imbalanced, wholeness is absent. Fromke declares: "there is no ultimate healing until we find the ultimate center."⁴⁶ The healing in John 5 addressed more than the lame man's physical condition. Jesus also exposed "the Jews" misinterpretation of the Sabbath. Defending his decision to heal on that day, Jesus said, "My Father is working until now, and I Myself am working."⁴⁷

Noting Jesus's statements is important: he refers to "working"; a few verses later he speaks of "greater works than these";⁴⁸ and in his farewell discourse, he speaks of his disciples doing "greater works."⁴⁹ Making the connections among these statements and the Father's intent means "connecting the dots" semiotically.⁵⁰ Jesus seemed to expect resistance from authorities precisely because he chose to heal on the Sabbath. So was there an ultimate Sabbath issue in the Incarnate Son's consciousness?

Three points frame the question's answer: First, as already shown, the Son's consciousness is based in the Father's intent. Second, the Father cannot rest where his will is not accomplished. Third, the Incarnate Son lived to please the Father, who seeks

⁴⁶ DeVern Fromke, *The Ultimate Intention* (Cloverdale: Sure Foundation, 1974), 11.

⁴⁷ John 5:17.

⁴⁸ John 5:20.

⁴⁹ John 14:12.

⁵⁰ Leonard Sweet, "DMIN SFS 12" (lecture, Orlando, 2013).

rest within those he sent his Son to deliver. As long as any among them are broken, bruised, demonized, oppressed, and infirmed, the Father cannot rest.⁵¹

When his original Sabbath was in its pristine default position, God rested, not from weariness, but profound satisfaction. He affirmed that his works were “very good.”⁵² In concluding the second three-day heptad of blessings on all life, he then blessed the seventh day.⁵³ This was the culminating blessing of the Creation account;⁵⁴ God also sanctified the Sabbath,⁵⁵ essentially setting it apart for himself. Consider Jukes’ insight in this regard:

In the days of labor God does not get His own. But the day or state of rest is wholly His.

By it, in holy contemplation, far more than in action, is the creature perfected. God may get something from our works; He gets much more when we rest, and so pass out of self and its variableness wholly into His will.⁵⁶

For Jukes, the Sabbath is both a day and a state belonging to God, yet designed for the perfection of humanity. The notion that God “gets much more when we rest” seems to imply that the works humanity does essentially need to flow from the grace that is given in Sabbath rest. Essentially, grace has to precede works, and “holy contemplation” enables a human being to rest in the work of God and then work his works with him by grace. From the perspective of sonship and fulfillment of the “greater works,” believers are called to cease from laboring. Demonstration of the Spirit and

⁵¹ Similarly, there is no greater motivation for Christ’s followers to fulfill the Savior’s heart than his promise of the “greater works.”

⁵² Gen. 1:31.

⁵³ Gen. 2:3.

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶ Andrew Jukes, *Types in Genesis* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1976), 45.

power is not accomplished by self-effort or formulaic methods, but a will yielded to God's will in utter dependence on the Spirit, by faith. This necessary alignment is revealed in Jesus's profound question to the lame man: "Do you wish to get well?"⁵⁷ Jesus would not have raised the question had wholeness not been the Father's desire and intent for the man.

Regarding the ultimate Sabbath, Jesus saw himself as the Son of Man in fulfillment of Daniel 7:13–14 and, therefore, as "Lord of the Sabbath."⁵⁸ Messiah revealed what Sabbath observance really meant, and he determined how it must be worked out.⁵⁹ For him, Sabbath "deeds of mercy are not merely permitted, but required."⁶⁰ As Morris reports:

The rabbis permitted healing on the Sabbath if life was in danger, and they were fairly liberal in their interpretation: "Whenever there is doubt whether life is in danger this overrides the Sabbath" (*Yoma* 8:6). But if there was no danger there was to be no healing.⁶¹

The rabbis held a restrictive view, but for Jesus, the final arbiter of Sabbath observances, healing was always "lawful."⁶²

The original Sabbath was instituted on the seventh day because God finished his work in six days and rested on the seventh.⁶³ He instituted Sabbath for his people to

⁵⁷ John 5:6.

⁵⁸ Matt. 12:8.

⁵⁹ Leon Morris, *The Gospel according to Matthew*, Pillar New Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1992), 304.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 305.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*

⁶² Matt. 12:9–13.

⁶³ Gen. 2:2.

remember and honor the principle.⁶⁴ Ostensibly, his Sabbath-day healing seemed a violation; but was the Jewish leaders' interpretation accurate? The psalmist wrote of the generation that perished in the wilderness: "[T]hey are a people who err in their heart, and they do not know My ways. Therefore I swore in My anger, truly they shall not enter My rest."⁶⁵ Centuries later, the writer to persecuted Hebrew believers issued the same warning as they considered reverting to the Old Covenant:⁶⁶ they would fall short of God's promised rest if they allowed their hearts to harden. Thus, the early church learned that rest is the Sabbath fulfilled in Christ alone.

The Sabbath can be seen as a sign of God's original default position, which the Father seeks to restore through His Incarnate Son. Nineteenth-century Cambridge-trained churchman and author Andrew Jukes spoke of the semiotics of the seventh day: "The rest is come because through the Word of God his will is done perfectly. No rest can come until his will is done."⁶⁷ In the Incarnate Son, the Logos, the will and intention of the Father are done perfectly. This is when rest comes. Apart from the Son there can be no rest. True rest is not found in our will being done. It is found in getting in the yoke with Christ as he does the Father's will and works his works.⁶⁸

In comparing the perished wilderness generation to Christians considering a retreat to the Mosaic economy, the writer to the Hebrews said: "Therefore let us be diligent to enter that rest, so that no one will fall, through following the same example of

⁶⁴ Exod. 20:8.

⁶⁵ Ps. 95:10–11.

⁶⁶ Heb. 4:1–11.

⁶⁷ Jukes, *Types in Genesis*, 43.

⁶⁸ Matt. 11:29. To date, God's perfect rest has been perfected only in Jesus; the believer's Sabbath rest is in Him.

disobedience.”⁶⁹ The disobedience of the children of Israel was rooted in unbelief, which resulted in their falling from the grace intended to empower them.⁷⁰ The Father’s will and work are perfected in us only as we rest in Christ. Jesus indicated that the lame man’s condition sprang from a conflict between his will and the Father’s will.⁷¹ When the human and divine wills are at odds, there is no rest. Even the Incarnate Son wrestled over a potential conflict of wills to the point that drops of blood poured from his brow.⁷² Yet, because his faith rested in the Father’s perfect work, the Father’s work and will were perfectly accomplished in him. Likewise, our faith must ultimately rest in Christ; resting in Christ’s work is necessary in fulfilling the “greater works.”⁷³

Sabbath rest was as much about the Father resting in the Son, as the Son resting in the Father. Jesus was the Temple, as he affirmed in John 2:19.⁷⁴ In him, the Father’s glory rested. Essentially, Jesus was “the place of My [i.e. the Father’s] sanctuary; and I shall make the place of My feet glorious.”⁷⁵ God’s glory can only abide where there is no contradiction. In Jesus, there was none. “[W]e saw His glory, glory as of the only begotten from the Father.” This glory pre-dated the Incarnation. Jesus said, “Father, glorify Me together with Yourself, with the glory which I had with You before the world was.”⁷⁶ Where the Father’s feet rested, his glory also rested.

⁶⁹ Heb. 4:11.

⁷⁰ Heb. 3:12.

⁷¹ John 5:14.

⁷² Luke 22:42; Luke 22:44.

⁷³ John 15:5 explains that we can do nothing apart from him.

⁷⁴ “Jesus answered them, ‘Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up.’” John 2:19.

⁷⁵ Isa. 60:13.

⁷⁶ John 17:5.

Both Father and Son were still working because of the Fall; sin violated the Father's ability to rest in humanity. Restoring that default position required the Son's person and work. The Father was able to fully rest in him, even as the Spirit was free to descend like a dove and rest on Jesus.⁷⁷

Nevertheless, Jesus's intentional Sabbath-day healing challenged the Jewish authorities' interpretation of Sabbath-keeping. It also demonstrated the Father's active desire for the man's total well-being, precisely because it aligned, both literally and figuratively, with the purpose of the Sabbath. The leaders did not interrogate Jesus for causing the man to work on the Sabbath. Instead, it was the fact that healing freed him from a prone position, so he could "take up" his pallet and fulfill his potential.⁷⁸

Like many spiritually impotent people, the disabled man and the Pharisees lay paralyzed by perceptions and a consciousness that fell short of God's glory. As a result, the man had not entered the Sabbath rest in decades, just as many Pharisees missed the ultimate Sabbath Messiah offered. Today, this metaphorical paralysis keeps many from realizing their potential as "joint-heirs" with him⁷⁹—full-fledged sons and daughters of the Father through genuine faith. It seems reasonable to minister today to those who wrestle with the same issues the impotent man and the powerful Pharisees faced.

⁷⁷ Luke 3:22.

⁷⁸ John 5:8 (KJV); "The man had been an invalid for thirty-eight years—longer than many people in antiquity lived (the average life expectancy for men barely exceeded forty years), and roughly as long as Israel's wanderings in the wilderness (Deut. 2:14; see Hengel 1999: 316; cf. Borchert 1996: 232)." Andreas J. Köstenberger, *John*, Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004), 79. Köstenberger mentions the man's advancing age, which makes the healing more dramatic and significant, challenging not only the prevailing Sabbath-keeping paradigm, but also cultural perspectives regarding the value of an aged life now restored to well-being.

⁷⁹ Rom. 8:17 (KJV).

The Role and Condition of Intentionality

Because intentionality is central to an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality, the respective intentions of Jesus and the lame man are essential in its development. This thesis has engaged questions of ontology, phenomenology, and metaphysics in relation to “the fundamental nature of mental states” that include “perceiving, remembering, believing, desiring, hoping, knowing, intending, feeling, and experiencing.”⁸⁰ Pierre Jacob says that as “‘intentionality’ indicates, the relevant idea of directedness or tension (an English word which derives from the Latin verb *tendere*) arises from pointing towards or attending to some target.”⁸¹ This tension implies “stretching, intensity, will, thought,”⁸² so that when intentionality is present in a mental state such as perceiving, there is a stretching of the will and mind in a specific direction.

Intentionality and intention are related to *attention*, so that whatever one intends, to that one will attend. In the sign-healing from John 5, the “attending target” for Jesus was the lame man because, based on the Father’s intent, Jesus intended to heal him. Seeing the man involved a directedness and a tension that sought resolution. Jesus’s perceptual state was directed at someone “other than” himself,⁸³ the directedness implying intentionality. Jesus confidently expected to impart life, releasing a dimension of the Father’s glory in and through the man. This heightened Jesus’s focus, which in turn

⁸⁰ Pierre Jacob, “Intentionality,” *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Edward N. Zalta, Winter 2014, accessed October 27, 2015, <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/intentionality/>.

⁸¹ Ibid.

⁸² *Online Etymology Dictionary*, s.v. “intention,” accessed November 4, 2015, http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?allowed_in_frame=0&search=intention&searchmode=none.

⁸³ Richard Menary, “Intentionality and Consciousness,” in *The Encyclopedia of Consciousness*, ed. William P. Banks (Oxford: Academic Press, 2009), 1:417.

heightened his perception, activated his volition, and led to his action, resulting in the man's healing.

The power of Jesus's intentionality overrode the negation of the man's own intentionality. Jesus inquired, "Do you *wish* to get well?"⁸⁴ The Greek term is *thélō*, meaning, "To will, i.e., to have in mind, purpose, intend, please."⁸⁵ Clearly, the man was conscious and occupied with "introspection,"⁸⁶ his focus being "I have no"⁸⁷ His challenge was that whatever he intended was physically impossible. Whatever his will, his body was uncooperative. He longed to be first in the water, but was dependent upon others' assistance. Jesus knew this; therefore, his question did not address the waters of Bethesda, but the "dark and undifferentiated waters of the man's unconscious" and the sense of purpose containing his intentionality.⁸⁸

One's sense of identity is inseparable from one's interactions with the external world. The man *saw* himself as "the helpless, powerless lame man." Seligman's original studies of learned helplessness⁸⁹ show that "you can become passive if you give up completely, if you believe that nothing at all you do ... matters."⁹⁰ The man believed that nothing he did would change his diminished state. Conditioned not to hope, he could only

⁸⁴ John 5:6; italics mine.

⁸⁵ Zodhiates, *Complete Word Study Dictionary*, s.v. "thélō." Jesus also used this word in regard to his Father's "will" being done in Matthew 6:10.

⁸⁶ Stephen Verney, *Water into Wine: An Introduction to John's Gospel* (London: Darton, Longman, and Todd, 1995), 71.

⁸⁷ John 5:7. The man's consciousness was reflexive.

⁸⁸ Verney, *Water into Wine*, 71; *Ibid.*, 70.

⁸⁹ In these 1960s studies, dogs confined in shuttle boxes were electrically shocked.

⁹⁰ Martin P. Seligman, *Learned Optimism: How to Change Your Mind and Your Life* (New York: Vintage E-Books, 2006), pt. 1, sec. 2, Kindle.

vainly wish for help getting into the water first. In thirty-eight years, this had never happened. His lens of perception was shattered; he perceived a reality void of power.

Invoking the premise that our preconceptions govern our choices, Oxford cleric Sydney Smith said this in 1801:

It is, then, a matter of sovereign necessity, before we decide on great, and momentous questions, which affect our own happiness, and the peace of the world, to make a wise, and virtuous pause, and review, with an honest severity, those peculiarities of disposition, situation, and education, which may communicate an unfair bias to the mind, and induce us to decide, *not as the truth of things is, but as we are ourselves*.⁹¹

Smith understood that the state of each life and its impact on other lives can be negatively framed by the *self* we perceive we are. In the presence of Truth personified, the lame man maintained his limited view, based on his self-perception. His impotence was not only physical, but also spiritual, psychological, emotional, and volitional. Echoing Smith, Stephen Covey said: “We see the world, not as it is, but as we are—or, as we are conditioned to see it. When we open our mouths to describe what we see, we in effect describe ourselves, our perceptions, our paradigms.”⁹² “I have no ...”⁹³ was the man’s paradigm.

When mental models of reality and identity are skewed, there is consequence for performing the “greater works.” Such internal issues require the Spirit’s demonstrated healing power as much as our physical infirmities do. Perceived powerlessness and

⁹¹ Sydney Smith, “On the Predisposing Causes to the Reception of Republican Opinions,” in *Sermons, by the Reverend Sydney Smith, A.M. Late Fellow of New College, Oxford*, 2nd ed. (London: Longman & Rees, 1801), 1:103–104; italics mine.

⁹² Stephen R. Covey, *The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People: Powerful Lessons in Personal Change* (New York: RosettaBooks, 2013), 36.

⁹³ John 5:7.

helplessness expressed through behavior and self-disclosure reveal a self-concept that needs transformation.

Biblical interpreter and philosopher Martin Buber offers insight into this bondage of the will that opposes one's intent to reach one's full potential:

The free man is he who wills without arbitrary self-will. He knows he must go out to meet his destiny with his whole being, and he sacrifices his puny, unfree will, that is controlled by things and instincts, to his grand will, which quits defined for destined being.⁹⁴

In Buber's view, we are free to reject debilitating mental models in order to apprehend our divinely-willed, divinely-appointed destinies. It was not that the lame man could not be free, but that he *would not*. Had the Last Adam not intervened, the man would not have earnestly stretched to meet his destiny, having not sacrificed his "puny, unfree will."⁹⁵

The intentionality of the Last Adam overrode the man's consciousness of powerlessness, thus empowering a reversal of destiny. Jesus, the quintessential physician of the soul, is our pattern. Yet, even among continuationists who believe in healing, a profoundly reductionistic approach stemming from deficiencies in training and wisdom often hinders the integration of sound theological and psychological principles that would otherwise accompany the prayer of faith.

To replicate the healing of the lame man through rote repetition of Jesus's words, would in many cases grossly and presumptuously oversimplify the healing process. Though beyond the scope of this study, careful consideration of Jesus's approach,

⁹⁴ Maurice S. Friedman, *Martin Buber: The Life of Dialogue*, 4th ed. (London: Routledge, 2002), 77.

⁹⁵ Ibid.

insightful questions, and perfectly-gauged responses would offer significant insights into an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality.

Union with Christ, by Faith, through the Spirit

In addition to being versed in the healing patterns, Christ's followers are to draw by faith from their union with him. Kanagaraj explains that "*union* with Jesus is already granted by God as a *gift* to the disciples."⁹⁶ Jesus told them, "Abide in Me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself unless it abides in the vine, so neither can you unless you abide in Me."⁹⁷ Jesus described what Len Sweet calls "a life of abiding,"⁹⁸ inviting them to "hold on loyally and continually to that *givenness*,"⁹⁹ that gift of union. Union is essential to faith, which is the foundational dynamic for performing the "greater works." Mutual abiding is the "environment" that makes faith's operation possible. As the Father and Son abide mutually, so the Son and his followers abide mutually. In him, we live and function.¹⁰⁰

Without faith, nothing occurs. God requires faith.¹⁰¹ According to the writer of Hebrews, faith is *substantive*; it is hypostatic,¹⁰² denoting reality as distinct from

⁹⁶ Kanagaraj, *'Mysticism' in Gospel of John*, 265; italics mine.

⁹⁷ John 15:4.

⁹⁸ Leonard Sweet, "DMIN SFS 12."

⁹⁹ Kanagaraj, *'Mysticism' in Gospel of John*, 265.

¹⁰⁰ Gal. 2:20.

¹⁰¹ Heb. 11:6.

¹⁰² ὑπόστασις *hupóstasis*; gen. *hupostáseōs*, fem. noun from *huphistēmi* (n.f.), to place or set under. In general, that which underlies the apparent, hence, reality, essence, substance; that which is the basis of something, hence, assurance guarantee, confidence (with the obj. sense)." Zodhiates, *Complete Word Study Dictionary*, s.v. "*hupóstasis*."

appearances. The Last Adam performed miracles, not by his own divinity,¹⁰³ but by faith in the One who sent him. His followers cannot replicate his results without the same kind of faith.

How, then, does a believer's faith operate? Paul's words explain: "I have been crucified with Christ; and it is no longer I who live, but Christ lives in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave Himself up for me."¹⁰⁴ Robert Stutzman examines Paul's disclosure, revealing that faith and faithfulness are attributes of the Son,¹⁰⁵ as they are of the Father. Paul lived by *the Son's* faith and faithfulness.¹⁰⁶ Paul also admonished: "be renewed in the spirit of your mind,"¹⁰⁷ and intentionally and actively "put on the new self"¹⁰⁸ that is in union with Christ and his life. This renewing implies having received power from the Spirit.¹⁰⁹ The new self in Christ cannot be made new or be renewed apart from the active Agency of the Spirit. The new self requires a way of knowing by the Spirit.¹¹⁰

Loder supports this internal relationship with Paul's statements on the indwelling Spirit. For example, Paul said: "[T]he thoughts of God no one knows except the Spirit of

¹⁰³ John 5:19.

¹⁰⁴ Gal. 2:20.

¹⁰⁵ "I-live^a in/by^b faith/faithfulness,^c the-(faith/faithfulness) of-the Son of-God. ... 1. It indicates the means by which he lives ... I live by having faith in the Son of God. 2. It indicates the sphere in which he lives ... I live in the element of faith in the Son of God. 3. It indicates the reason he lives ... I live because of the faithfulness of the Son of God." Robert Stutzman, *An Exegetical Summary of Galatians*, 2nd ed. (Dallas: SIL International, 2008), 79–81.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid.

¹⁰⁷ Eph. 4:23.

¹⁰⁸ Eph. 4:24.

¹⁰⁹ Luke 4:14.

¹¹⁰ 1 Cor. 2:10.

God.”¹¹¹ Paul pointed to the intimacy of communication with these words: “The Spirit Himself testifies with our spirit that we are children of God.”¹¹² Paul revealed the inner workings of God saying, “So then, my beloved, just as you have always obeyed, not as in my presence only, but now much more in my absence, work out your salvation with fear and trembling; for it is God who is at work in you, both to will and to work for His good pleasure.”¹¹³

Loder speaks of “convictional knowing,” a “patterned process by which the Holy Spirit transforms all transformations of the human spirit.”¹¹⁴ For Loder, an important aspect of Christ’s work in the believer is accomplished when, by his presence, “the Holy One creates the self as spirit ... implying that the self’s transformational activity takes on a creative, ‘letting flourish’ nature of being.”¹¹⁵ For Loder, the flourishing based in “‘letting flourish’ nature of being” is ontological, with phenomenological ramifications, effecting the inner “eyes of faith”¹¹⁶ and causing the human spirit to see and recognize the presence of the Holy Spirit. Loder supports this internal relationship with Paul’s statements on the indwelling Spirit.¹¹⁷

The transforming role of the Holy Spirit in the healing of the lame man in John 5 is seen together with the presence of the Incarnate Son. The man had no idea who Jesus

¹¹¹ 1 Cor. 2:11.

¹¹² Rom. 8:16.

¹¹³ Phil. 2:12–13.

¹¹⁴ James E. Loder, *The Transforming Moment* (Colorado Springs: Helmers & Howard, 1918), 93.

¹¹⁵ Ibid.

¹¹⁶ Ibid.

¹¹⁷ 1 Cor. 2:11; Rom. 8:16; Phil. 2:12–13.

was. Yet Jesus's presence and compelling question were transformative. He addressed the man's "ungrounded self,"¹¹⁸ which by virtue of separation from the image and likeness of Christ was devoid of destiny. The man encountered the Logos made flesh, "the true Light which, coming into the world, enlightens every man."¹¹⁹ He is the true ground of being for the ungrounded self.

Apart from the Holy Spirit, transformation of the self is impossible. It must be mediated by Christ, becoming "actual and historical only through Christ."¹²⁰ Without such intervention, the intentionality of the "ungrounded self" is "self-defeating in its negation of divine initiative."¹²¹ The man's response to Jesus's provocative question was therefore negating: "I have *no* man."¹²² The man was apparently ignorant of the One who had entered his physical space in order for his negation to be "negated by divine intention."¹²³

Jesus invited the man to be made whole, implying that Jesus's very utterance—"Get up, pick up your pallet, and walk"¹²⁴—contained the power of performance.¹²⁵ Such direct and immediate demonstrations of power that bypass therapeutic processes are only attributable to the working of the Spirit.

¹¹⁸ Loder, *Transforming Moment*, 94.

¹¹⁹ John 1:9.

¹²⁰ Loder, *Transforming Moment*, 94.

¹²¹ Ibid.; Ibid., 105.

¹²² John 5:7; italics mine.

¹²³ Loder, *Transforming Moment*, 105.

¹²⁴ John 5:8.

¹²⁵ John 6:63.

For those who desire to do the “greater works,” such power *is* available through the *charismata*, which Paul said are accessible if we “earnestly desire” them.¹²⁶ A key aspect of the Pentecostal/ Charismatic hermeneutic is that “the Holy Spirit addresses us in ways which transcend human reason.”¹²⁷ This is true of the gifts of the Spirit. For example, Spirit-inspired words such as the “word of knowledge” or the “word of wisdom”¹²⁸ are “not in persuasive words of wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power.”¹²⁹ In that they are timeless, immediate, direct presentations to the human spirit by the Holy Spirit, they are revelatory.

Seeing as Jesus Saw

As stated in Chapter 1, Jesus’s way of seeing the Father was a *first-order observation*, which led to his *second-order* interactions.¹³⁰ His first-order observation issued from a primary encounter with the divine Father, who was its source. In it, the Incarnate Son saw the timeless, eternal realm, and what he saw by the Spirit was directly

¹²⁶ 1 Cor. 12:31. The exegesis of First Corinthians 12 (particularly verses 27 through 31) from a Pentecostal/Charismatic hermeneutic differs from a Non-Pentecostal/non-Charismatic one. For further insight, see Kenneth J. Archer, *A Pentecostal Hermeneutic: Spirit, Scripture, and Community* (Cleveland: CPT Press, 2009).

¹²⁷ Rickie D. Moore, “A Pentecostal Approach to Scripture,” in *Pentecostal Hermeneutics: A Reader*, ed. Lee Roy Martin (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 11.

¹²⁸ 1 Cor. 12:8.

¹²⁹ 1 Cor. 2:4.

¹³⁰ James K. A. Smith, *Thinking in Tongues: Pentecostal Contributions to Christian Philosophy* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2010), 3. “Trinitarian doctrine is one type of second order reflection on first order Christian experience, oneness theologians will counter that the Nicene articulation betrays the biblical revelation of the unity of God. Interestingly, however, both Tillich and oneness theologians have high christologies and robust pneumatologies, although Tillich is not wedded to the classical Orthodox articulations and oneness Pentecostals wholly reject the Nicene tradition.” Velli-Mati Kärkkäinen, “Spiritual Power and Spiritual Presence: The Contemporary Renaissance in Pneumatology in Light of a Dialogue Between Pentecostal Theology and Tillich,” in *Paul Tillich and Pentecostal Theology: Spiritual Presence and Spiritual Power*, ed. Nimi Wariboko and Amos Yong (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2015), chap. 1, Kindle.

imprinted on his mind and psyche. As the Agency for first-order observation, the Spirit mediated all that transpired between the Father and the Son. All three Persons of the Godhead were involved.

To establish a premise for first-order observations, it is important from a phenomenological perspective to consider other factors relevant to the argument being made for Jesus's followers being able to see in the same manner as Jesus saw. For example, first-order observations are made directly in and by the Agency of the Holy Spirit to the disciple's spirit, in a way that he or she can apprehend phenomenologically and experientially, and can discern as having come from the same Spirit that indwelt Jesus.

This comports with Jesus's promise in John 14:19 that, after his ascension, the Holy Spirit would enable his followers to see him and, in seeing, draw life from his endless supply. In this verse, the Greek word translated "see" is *theōreō*, the word from which we derive the English word *theater*; it means "to observe something with sustained attention, *be a spectator, look at, observe, perceive, see.*"¹³¹ The word translated "live" is *zao*; beyond mere biological life, it implies "having life."¹³²

Cessationist Leon Morris has difficulty with the present-tense use of *theōreō* in this text, because it does not comport with his broader presuppositions.¹³³ These seem to force his conclusion that the text refers only to the disciples' seeing Jesus at the

¹³¹ William Arndt, Frederick W. Danker, and Walter Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, s.v. "see" (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000).

¹³² Zodhiates, *Complete Word Study Dictionary*, s.v. "zao."

¹³³ "'You will see me' (the verb is actually present) is difficult. The crucifixion meant the same separation for them as for the world. They then saw Jesus no more than the world did. Probably we should understand the saying to look right through the crucifixion to the resurrection." Morris, *Gospel According to John*, 579.

resurrection, and not to the revelatory experiences of all believers. The argument suffers because the text quite clearly speaks of more than Jesus's resurrection; it speaks post-Pentecost of the coming and abiding presence of the Spirit of God who reveals Christ and causes his followers to *know* his abiding presence in their very depths.¹³⁴

Essential to the argument for seeing as Jesus saw is the statement of Paul, a contemporary of Jesus: "though we have known Christ according to the flesh, yet now we know Him in this way no longer."¹³⁵ Paul did not claim that he no longer *knew* Christ. By contrasting flesh and Spirit, he implied that, in and by the Spirit, he now knew the existential Christ who is seated at the Father's right hand in heavenly places.¹³⁶

Consider Paul's words: "But we all, with unveiled face, beholding as in a mirror the glory of the Lord, are being transformed into the same image from glory to glory, just as from the Lord, the Spirit."¹³⁷ Taken within the context of the passage, scholars may struggle to accurately convey the text's meaning; but it certainly presupposes that God spoke with Moses face to face.¹³⁸ Because the glory residually shone on Moses' face, he "used to put a veil over his face so that the sons of Israel would not look intently at the end of what was fading away."¹³⁹ The *end* of what dissipated from his face was the glory of Christ. The word translated "end" is *telos*, meaning "a point of time marking the end of

¹³⁴ John 14:20.

¹³⁵ 2 Cor. 5:16.

¹³⁶ Eph. 1:20.

¹³⁷ 2 Cor. 3:18.

¹³⁸ Ibid.

¹³⁹ Exod. 33:11.

a duration, end, termination, cessation.”¹⁴⁰ Paul was clear: “For Christ is the end [telos] of the law for righteousness to everyone who believes.”¹⁴¹

This transforming glory is effected when the believer beholds and reflects it. For New Covenant believers in Christ, the beholding and reflecting can be continual,¹⁴² and “all who have that Spirit gaze with unveiled face on the face of Christ.”¹⁴³ This internal posture is accomplished with the eyes of faith, producing an immediacy of revelation (a first-order observation that is a direct, experiential communication from the Spirit to the human spirit) of the presence of Christ. For this reason, Paul concluded that “we presently see the glory of the Lord and know that we are changed in his likeness through the working of the Holy Spirit.”¹⁴⁴

Paul spoke to the workings of God’s transforming glory. Consider Paul’s prayer for the saints: “that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give you the Spirit of wisdom and of *revelation* in the *knowledge* of him.”¹⁴⁵ This *revelation* indicates “to reveal ... uncovering, unveiling, disclosure”,¹⁴⁶ *knowledge* implies a

¹⁴⁰ Arndt, Danker, and Bauer, *Greek-English Lexicon*, s.v. “end.” 998.

¹⁴¹ Rom. 10:4.

¹⁴² “Every [Bible] version has its own strengths and defenders, but the issue is really between the translations *beholding* and *reflecting*. Some translators omit the words *in a mirror*, for they reason that the phrase is implied in the translations *behold* or *reflect*. I have adopted the middle voice in a combination of the second and third readings: ‘beholding the reflected glory of the Lord.’ ... The verb is in the present tense and passive in voice, which means that transformation is a process with an implied agent doing this work in us.” Simon J. Kistemaker, *Exposition of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, New Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 2001), 128–129.

¹⁴³ Ben Witherington III, *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1995), 382.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 129.

¹⁴⁵ Eph. 1:17; italics mine.

¹⁴⁶ Zodhiates, *Complete Word Study Dictionary*, s.v. “revelation.”

“thorough participation in the acquiring of knowledge on the part of the learner.”¹⁴⁷ The unveiling or disclosing of activity by the Spirit involves the beholder’s thorough participation. It is a realm of knowing by revelation that is equivalent to the *seeing as knowing* that both Dodd and Kanagaraj address.

Could Jesus have given the disciples such detailed and intimate awareness of the operation and activity of the Spirit in John 14–16 without having experienced the same deep, intimate, relational, and revelational interaction with the Spirit himself? This is the first-order observation already discussed; it is timeless, immediate, and direct. So, was Jesus’s self-disclosure in John 5:19 a mere casual mention? Or was it intended to register on the consciousness of his followers, leading us beyond the historicity of the Incarnate Son toward a working model, timeless in its application to life and ministry—an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality for the fulfillment of the “greater works” he promised?

In summarizing this chapter, the latter seems evident. By purposing to “bring many sons and daughters to glory,”¹⁴⁸ and establishing the prophetic paradigm of utterance that is inseparable from demonstrations of the Spirit and power, Jesus’s finished work set the table for the “greater works” he promised. In addition, as *the* pattern and sign, Jesus healed a man whose infirmity bound him for thirty-eight years—a sign of a new exodus to new creation and of the struggle between intentionality and negation. The healing at the Pool of Bethesda demonstrated the operation of the “greater works”:

¹⁴⁷ ἐπίγνωσις *epignōsis*; gen. *epignōseōs*, fem. noun from *epiginōskō* (1921), to recognize. It is more intens. than *gnōthō* (1108), knowledge, because it expresses a more thorough participation in the acquiring of knowledge on the part of the learner. In the NT, it often refers to knowledge which very powerfully influences the form of religious life, a knowledge laying claim to personal involvement.” Ibid., s.v. “knowledge.”

¹⁴⁸ Heb. 2:10; paraphrased.

human beings drawing from their union with Christ, by faith seeing as Jesus saw and doing exploits in His name. This is the aim of an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality.

CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

Divine Intent: Prophetic Perceptuality and Power

What can we now establish toward the development of an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality? At issue is the experiential knowing of *how to see* as Jesus saw, via the indwelling Spirit.¹ To that end, Chapter 1 discussed the disconnect between the promised “greater works” and the experiences of many believers, holding that this gap is rooted in the failure to understand the Son’s way of seeing. Chapter 2 explored the Son’s phenomenology through modern scholarship and established encouraging and empowering parallels for the believer and showed how the believer’s experience can parallel that of Jesus. Chapter 3 examined the Fathers’ legacy regarding Jesus’s ontology and phenomenology from the perspective of their Christological views and defense of orthodoxy, concluding that their work built a strong ontological foundation, but failed to address Jesus’s phenomenology. Chapter 4 studied the Reformation era as context for a current-day applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality, discussed the ongoing continuationism-cessationism debate, and noted its impact on beliefs about prophetic perceptuality. Chapter 5 studied historical insights into human consciousness and its relatedness to Jesus’s phenomenology, and established the “mind of Christ” as the foundation for seeing as Jesus saw.² Chapter 6 focused on the semiotics of the pericope from John 5, the divine intent regarding the Sabbath, and the roles of intentionality and identity, to the end that believers would behold the Father as Jesus did. It concluded that

¹ Jesus’ *seeing* and *knowing* were integrated and synonymous, being his very *consciousness*.

² 1 Cor. 2:16.

Jesus's example of first-order observation was based in his experience and was offered for our instruction.

This study has sought to show that Jesus was continuously conscious of his Father's Person, activity, impulses, and intuitions. I have termed this a "Father-consciousness," arguing its availability, through the indwelling Spirit, to those who "have the mind of Christ."³ Just as the Father sent the Son as "the eschatological anointed prophet,"⁴ the Son sends his disciples, "a community of Spirit-baptized prophets."⁵ This sending implies empowerment to fulfill the divine intent.⁶ Thus, Jesus said: "*Whatever you ask in My name*, that will I do, so that the Father may be glorified in the Son."⁷ The "exercise of this power honors the Father, who communicates everything to His Son and accomplishes his works through him."⁸

Accordingly, the story in Acts regarding Peter's invocation of Jesus's name at the Gate Beautiful resulted in a miracle and testifies that believers *can see* what the Father is doing.⁹ Peter and John "fixed [their] gaze" on a lame man.¹⁰ Peter said, "Look at us!"¹¹

³ Ibid.

⁴ Stronstad, *Prophethood of All Believers*.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Acts 1:8.

⁷ John 14:13; italics mine.

⁸ Galot, *Abba Father*, 184.

⁹ Acts 3:1–9.

¹⁰ Acts 3:4.

¹¹ Ibid.

focusing the man's attention on a vision of wholeness (two men standing). Peter spoke a word of command from the Spirit, and healing was imparted.¹²

Father-Consciousness and "Greater Works"

This study argues that such "greater works" are often lacking today, in part due to insufficient understanding of Jesus's seeing via the Spirit, who reveals by timeless, direct presentation, through *first-order observation* to those prepared and willing to receive.¹³

The Spirit imparted to Jesus's both a "prophetic perceptuality," that is, Jesus's comprehensive consciousness of the Father's activities and love,¹⁴ and enabled Jesus to respond "with compassion."¹⁵ This Father-consciousness is the birthright of those who cry, "Abba, Father"¹⁶—those who yearn to participate in the Father's works so his intent might be fulfilled; those who find wholeness in their intimacy with *Abba* and are empowered to participate in the Father's works.¹⁷

Yet, as worldviews compete, uncertainty and skepticism increase. Father-consciousness recedes so that believers become functionally unaware that the Father loves them *as he loved the Son*. With receptivity to that level of love compromised, they

¹² 1 Cor. 12:9.

¹³ 1 Cor. 2:10–13. As the continuationist-Cessationist dispute shows, various interpretations of the charismata exist. Even within the Pentecostal/Charismatic community a fresh, objective look at First Corinthians 12 and a dialogue with those who have experienced the charismata, could revitalize such expression where it has fallen into disuse.

¹⁴ 1 Cor. 13.

¹⁵ Matt. 9:36; Matt. 14:14.

¹⁶ Matt. 6:9–13; Rom. 8:15–16. To do the "greater works," our consciousness must be cultivated in terms of our identity as sons and daughters with and before the Father. Sonship (the term, used editorially, includes male and female, as it does in Scripture) is to define our consciousness.

¹⁷ Galot suggests that *Abba* "expresses filial affection with a warmth." Galot, *Abba Father*, 188; He adds, "Sincere filial love yearns above all else to see the Father hold sway in the world." Ibid.; "Doing the Father's will means accepting the intentions of paternal love." Ibid., 190; Addressing the Father as *Abba* "contributes to the enhancement of the human personality and of its role in the universe." Ibid., 191.

neither expect nor experience the perceptuality Jesus modeled for them. Father wounds affect their well-being and produce judgments/projections regarding fatherhood. The question is whether the judgments levied against earthly fathers are being projected onto God the Father,¹⁸ and whether believers—whether *we*—are hindered as we pray to Abba.¹⁹

These questions apply beyond the pew. Although theological discussion of God's Fatherhood is common, church leaders rarely mention "Abba" conversationally. Will we then aim toward a prophetic perceptuality by which leaders emphasize the Father-consciousness that meets their own unmet needs for affirmation and engenders broader fulfillment of the "greater works"?

Application: Facilitating an Applied Semiotics of Prophetic Perceptuality

Father-consciousness is central to the "mind of Christ."²⁰ It embraces dependence on the Spirit's willingness to give the charismata, and heeds Paul's admonition to "covet earnestly the best gift"²¹ (i.e., the one most needed in a given situation). How then can we facilitate a semiotics of prophetic perceptuality in our contemporary context?

As Jesus's perceptuality was rooted in uninterrupted abiding in his Father's presence, his urging to abide is foundational.²² First, a contemplative approach to prayer

¹⁸ "Projection is a form of defense in which unwanted feelings are displaced onto another person, where they then appear as a threat from the external world." *Encyclopedia Britannica*, "s.v." Projection: Psychology; Defense Mechanism, accessed December 8, 2015, <http://www.britannica.com/topic/projection-psychology>.

¹⁹ The unavoidable question regards the incalculable and often unrecognized cost to the "greater works."

²⁰ 1 Cor. 2:16.

²¹ 1 Cor. 12:31 (KJV).

²² John 15:4. The aspects of abiding noted here assume an abiding in Scripture.

and the practice of the presence of the Father and Son as empowered by the Spirit's presence (i.e., intentional abiding in the life of the Trinity) are essential in producing a greater open-mindedness and open-heartedness to the Spirit's realm and to pinpointing awareness of skeptical, cynical impulses and fears that discourage confidence in God.

The abiding life and prophetic perceptuality flourish in conjunction with the practice of appropriate ascetic disciplines, as Maximus the Confessor attested.²³ This abiding urges ascent in and toward God, being rooted in the very "*faith of the Son of God.*"²⁴ Faith works by love;²⁵ hence, an abiding consciousness of the divine love is essential.²⁶ Certain intentional adjustments are required as well: (1) adaptation of will, so it coincides with that of both Father and Son,²⁷ (2) adjustment of one's ways in accordance with the divine intent,²⁸ and (3) modifications of speech, as Jesus's words were primary in demonstrating the Spirit and power.²⁹ In addition, Jesus's way of seeing requires surrendering perceptualities clouded by doubt, fear, and unbelief, ungodly desires and pleasures, or any "thorn" that renders God's truth unfruitful for the believer.³⁰

²³ Maximus' ascetic practices are discussed in Chapter 3 of this paper. They include prayer and contemplation, and union with God based on love. They have theoretical and practical implications in the stages of ascent, or movement, toward God. Ideally, for Maximus, they are a working out of what God is working within the human spirit.

²⁴ Gal. 2:20 (KJV); italics mine.

²⁵ Gal. 5:6.

²⁶ Jude 1:21; 1 John 4:18; John 3:35, 5:20.

²⁷ Phil. 2:13.

²⁸ Ps. 86:11.

²⁹ John 6:63, 12:49, 14:10; Prov. 18:21. The list of disciplines is not comprehensive. The examples are aids to developing an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality.

³⁰ Matt. 13:22.

A yielding to the Spirit in one's interiority redirects *seeing* toward the Father, so contrary ways of seeing can be recognized, released to God, and replaced.

Suggestions for Future Research

Developing an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality based on Jesus's way of seeing is more complex than can be fully covered here. Further lines of research are needed. First, even a cursory study of the thirty-seven miracles of Jesus in the New Testament reveals that no simple formula for signs and wonders exists. For deeper insights into an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality to emerge, further research would include careful study of Jesus's linguistic, physiological, and interactive patterns with the suplicants.

Second, much remains to be explored regarding consciousness and phenomenology and its integration into the theological framework of Christ's life and his life in the believer. What cognitive mechanisms allow perception of "Another" who is not physical, yet is knowable in our interiority? Are William James' four marks exhaustive, or are there dimensions of *unio mystica* he did not consider from the perspective of Eastern Christianity?³¹ What other work in consciousness studies, phenomenology, and transpersonal psychology might add to James' insight and benefit the development of prophetic perceptuality?

³¹ *Dictionary of Spiritual Terms*, s.v. "unio mystica," accessed December 21, 2015, <http://www.dictionaryofspiritualterms.com/public/Glossaries/terms.aspx?ID=478>.

Third, this paper did not consider Eastern Orthodoxy's perspective on the energies of God as being distinct from his essence. What substantive insights regarding *energia* would aid comprehension of prophetic perceptuality?³²

Fourth, how did Jesus's affective experience influence his way of seeing and knowing? Jesus felt virtue leave his body and enter the body of another.³³ He was moved with compassion.³⁴ How is affective impulse to be evaluated in relation to corresponding actions in doing the "greater works"?

Finally, Jesus gave his disciples authority to operate in divine power for healing and deliverance from demonic oppression.³⁵ As it relates to authority, what is involved from a perspective of consciousness and phenomenology that can further aid in developing an applied semiotics of prophetic perceptuality?

The integration of theology, psychology, phenomenology, and the dynamics of consciousness on the part of leaders will add great value to those they serve as they pursue the "greater works." Because these works have been mandated by Jesus, it is imperative that his followers obey his ongoing directives, however feeble their attempts might seem. With the intentionality of faith and the resolve and fearlessness to risk failing or looking foolish, twenty-first century disciples of Jesus can and will find the

³² Stanley J. Grenz, *The Named God and the Question of Being: A Trinitarian Theo-Ontology*, (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005), 317.

³³ Luke 8:46.

³⁴ Matt. 14:14.

³⁵ Matt.10:1.

Lord testifying with them, “both by signs and wonders and by various miracles and by gifts of the Holy Spirit according to His own will.”³⁶

³⁶ Heb. 2:4.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- “73. What Are Patristics and Why Should We Study Them?” Monergism.com. Accessed October 9, 2015.
<http://www.monergism.com/thethreshold/articles/onsite/qna/patristics.html>.
- Akala, Adesola Joan. *The Son-Father Relationship and Christological Symbolism in the Gospel of John*. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2014.
- Allen, Pauline and Bronwen Neil, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Maximus the Confessor*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Ambrose of Milan. “Three Books of St. Ambrose on the Holy Spirit.” In *St. Ambrose: Select Works and Letters*. Translated by E. De Romestin. A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, 2nd ser., edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, vol. 10, 91–158. New York: Christian Literature, 1896.
- Anderson, Paul N. *The Christology of the Fourth Gospel: Its Unity and Disunity in the Light of John 6*. Eugene: Cascade Publications, 2010.
- . *The Fourth Gospel and the Quest for Jesus: Modern Foundations Reconsidered*. New York: T&T Clark, 2007.
- . “Jesus and Transformation.” In *Psychology and the Bible: A New Way to Read the Scriptures*. Vol. 4, edited by J. Harold Ellens and Wayne G. Rollins, 305–328. Westport: Praeger, 2004.
- “An Introduction to the Protestant Reformation.” KHAN Academy. Accessed October 1, 2015. <https://www.khanacademy.org/humanities/history/1500-1600-Renaissance-Reformation/protestant-reformation/a/an-introduction-to-the-protestant-reformation>.
- Aquinas, Saint Thomas. *Summa Theologica*, complete English ed. Translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2009.
- Archer, Kenneth J. *A Pentecostal Hermeneutic: Spirit, Scripture, and Community*. Cleveland: CPT Press, 2009.
- Arndt, William, Frederick W. Danker, and Walter Bauer. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Ashton, John. *The Interpretation of John*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996.

Athanasius of Alexandria. *St. Athanasius: Select Works and Letters*. Edited by Archibald Robertson. A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, 2nd ser., edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, vol. 4. New York: Christian Literature, 1892.

———. “Four Discourses Against the Arians.” In *Select Works and Letters*, 303–447.

———. “Introduction to the Treatise on the Incarnation of the Word.” In *Select Works and Letters*, 36–67.

Augustine of Hippo. “Sermons on Selected Lessons of the New Testament.” In *Saint Augustine: Sermon on the Mount, Harmony of the Gospels, Homilies on the Gospels*. Edited by Philip Schaff. A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, 1st ser., edited by Philip Schaff, vol. 6, 237–545. New York: Christian Literature, 1888.

Augustine of Hippo. *The Trinity*. Translated by Stephen McKenna. The Fathers of the Church 45. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1963.

Barclay, William. *Jesus As They Saw Him*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1962.

———. *The Mind of Jesus*. New York: Harper & Row, 1960.

Barrett, C. K. *The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1978.

Barrios, George. *The Fathers Speak: St. Basil the Great, St. Gregory Nazianzus, St. Gregory of Nyssa*. Crestwood: St. Vladimir’s Press, 1986.

Barth, Karl. *Church Dogmatics*. Vol. 4. Pt. 1, *The Doctrine of God*, edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley and Thomas F. Torrance. London: T&T Clark, 2004.

———. *The Humanity of God*. Zollikon-Zurich: Evangelischer, 1956.

———. *Witness to the Word: A Commentary on John I*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1988.

Barthrellos, Demetrios. *The Byzantine Christ: Person, Nature, and Will in the Christology of St. Maximus the Confessor*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.

- Bartos, Emil. *Deification in Eastern Orthodox Theology*. Milton Keynes, UK: Paternoster, 1999.
- Baruss, Imants. *Alterations of Consciousness: An Empirical Analysis for Social Scientists*. Washington D.C.: American Psychological Association, 2010. Kindle.
- Baxter, J. Sidlow. *A New Call to Holiness: A Restudy and Restatement of New Testament Teaching concerning Christian Sanctification*. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1967.
- Bernard, John Henry. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John*. Edited by A. H. McNeile. Vol. 1. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1929.
- Bezuidenhout, Ilze. "A Discursive-Semiotic Approach to Translating Cultural Aspects in Persuasive Advertisements." MA thesis, 1998. Accessed October 29, 2015. <http://ilze.org/semio/008.htm>.
- Bible Hub. Accessed November 3, 2015. <http://biblehub.com/greek/1097.htm>. Accessed April 23, 2015, <http://biblehub.com/greek/3708.htm>.
- Bingaman, Brock. *All Things New: The Trinitarian Nature of the Human Calling in Maximus the Confessor and Jürgen Moltmann*. Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2014.
- Blackmore, Susan. *Consciousness: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Blowers, Paul M. "The Dialectics and Therapeutics of Desire in Maximus the Confessor." *Vigiliae Christianae* 65, no. 4 (2011): 425–451. Accessed December 2, 2015. <http://booksandjournals.brillonline.com/content/journals/10.1163/157007210x524286>.
- Borchert, Gerald L. *John 1–11*. Edited by E. Ray Clendenen. New American Commentary 25A. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1996.
- Borgen, P. *The Interpretation of John*. Edited by John Ashton. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997.
- Brentano, Franz. *Psychology from an Empirical Standpoint*. Oxon: Routledge, 2015.
- Brooke, A. E. *The Commentary of Origen on St. John's Gospel*. Montana: Kessinger, 2010.

- Brother André Marie. "The Epistle of Straw." Catholicism.org. January 30, 2006. Accessed November 25, 2015. <http://catholicism.org/epistle-of-straw.html> retrieved November 25, 2015.
- Browning, W. R. F., ed. *A Dictionary of the Bible*. Oxford Biblical Studies Online. Accessed June 5, 2015. <http://www.oxfordbiblicalstudies.com/article/opr/t94/e512>.
- Brown, Michael. *Authentic Fire: A Response to John MacArthur's Strange Fire*. Lake Mary: Excel, 2014.
- Brown, Raymond E., ed. *The Gospel according to John (I–XII): Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. Vol. 1. Anchor Yale Bible 29. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.
- Brown, Warren S. "Evolution, Cognitive Neuroscience, and the Soul." In *Perspectives on an Evolving Creation*, edited by Keith B. Miller, 502–523. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2003.
- Brueggemann, Walter. *The Collected Sermons of Walter Brueggemann*. Vol. 2. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2015. Kindle.
- . *The Prophetic Imagination*. 2nd ed., Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.
- Bruner, Frederick Dale. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2012.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. Translated by G. R. Beasley-Murray, R. W. N. Hoare, and J. K. Riches. Blackwell, 1971.
- . *New Testament and Mythology and Other Basic Writings*. Edited by Schubert M. Ogden. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Bustaan, Richard A. In *The Jesus People Movement: A Story of Spiritual Revolution among the Hippies*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications. 2014. Kindle.
- Calvin, John. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Edited by John T. McNeill, Vol. 1. Library of Christian Classics. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2011.
- Calvin, John, and William Pringle. *Commentary on the Gospel According to John*. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2010.

- Campbell, Ted A., *John Wesley and Christian Antiquity: Religious Vision and Cultural Change*. Nashville: Kingswood Books, 1991.
- Cantalamesa, Raniero. *Contemplating the Trinity: The Path to the Abundant Christian Life*. Frederick: The Word Among Us Press, 2007.
- . *The Holy Spirit in the Life of Jesus*. Collegeville: The Order of St. Benedict, 1994.
- . *Sober Intoxication of the Spirit: Filled with the Fullness of God*. Cincinnati: Servant Books, 2005.
- Carson, D. A. *The Gospel According to John*. Pillar New Testament Commentary, edited by D. A. Carson. Leicester: W. B. Eerdmans, 1991.
- Carter, Joe. "How to Tell the Difference between the PCA and PCUSA." The Gospel Coalition. Accessed June 5, 2015. <http://www.thegospelcoalition.org/article/how-to-tell-the-difference-between-the-pca-and-pcusa>.
- Cartledge, Mark. J. *Encountering The Spirit: The Charismatic Tradition*. London: Darton, Longman, & Todd, 2006.
- "Catechism of the Catholic Church." The Holy See. Accessed April 25, 2014. http://www.vatican.va/archive/ccc_css/archive/catechism/p122a3p1.htm.
- Chalmers, David. *The Character of Consciousness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Chandler, Daniel. *Semiotics for Beginners*. July 3, 2014. Accessed October 29, 2015. <http://visual-memory.co.uk/daniel/Documents/S4B/sem07.html>.
- Chan, Simon. *Pentecostal Theology and the Christian Spiritual Tradition*. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- . *Semiotics: The Basics*. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Cherry, Kendra. "Perception and the Perceptual Process: What Is Perception?" Accessed August 21, 2015. <http://psychology.about.com/od/sensationandperception/ss/perceptproc.htm>.
- Chesterton, G. K. *The Everlasting Man*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1925.

- Chilton, Bruce. *Jesus' Baptism and Jesus' Healing: His Personal Practice of Spirituality*. Harrisburg: Trinity Press, 1998.
- Chrysostom, John. "Homilies of St. John Chrysostom, Archbishop of Constantinople, on the Gospel of St. John." In *Saint Chrysostom: Homilies on the Gospel of St. John and Epistle to the Hebrews*. A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, 1st ser., edited by Philip Schaff, vol. 14, 1–334. New York: Christian Literature, 1889.
- . "The Homilies on the Statues." In *Saint Chrysostom: On the Priesthood; Ascetic Treatises; Select Homilies and Letters; Homilies on the Statutes*. Translated by W. R. W. Stephens, A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, 1st ser., edited by Philip Schaff, vol. 9, 317–489. New York: Christian Literature, 1889.
- Clarke, Adam. *The Holy Bible with a Commentary and Critical Notes*. New ed. Vol. 3. Bellingham, WA: Faithlife, 2014.
- Clark, Tony. "Polanyi on Religion." *Tradition and Discovery: The Polanyi Society Periodical* 32, no 2: 25–37. Accessed November 2, 2015.
<https://www.missouriwestern.edu/orgs/polanyi/TAD%20WEB%20ARCHIVE/TAD32-2/TAD32-2-fnl-pg25-37-pdf.pdf>.
- Covey, Stephen R. *The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People: Powerful Lessons in Personal Change*. New York: RosettaBooks, 2013.
- Cross, F. L., and E. A. Livingstone, eds. *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Cyril of Alexandria. *Commentary on John*. Edited by Joel C. Elowsky. Vol. 1. Ancient Christian Texts, edited by Thomas C. Oden and Gerald L. Bray. Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2013.
- Davidson, Donald. "Actions, Reasons, and Causes." In *Essays on Actions and Events*, 3–20. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Davies, Margaret. *Rhetoric and Reference in the Fourth Gospel*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.
- Del Colle, Ralph. *Christ and the Spirit: Spirit-Christology in Trinitarian Perspective*. New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Dennett, Daniel C. *Consciousness Explained*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1991.

- Dimkpa, Fr. Anthony C. *The Self-Consciousness of Jesus Christ: An Analysis of Its Main Christological Truth*. Enumclaw, WA: Pleasant Word, 2010.
- Di Sabatino, David. "History of the Jesus Movement." November, 1997. Accessed June 2, 2015. http://www.allsavedfreakband.com/jesus_movement.htm.
- Dodd, Charles Harold. *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.
- Dodd, C. H. *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*. New York: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge, 1963.
- . *More New Testament Studies*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1968.
- Downing, Crystal L. *Changing Signs of Truth: A Christian Introduction to the Semiotics of Communication*. Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2012. Kindle.
- Dunn, James D. G. *Jesus and the Spirit: A Study of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Christians as Reflected in the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1975. Kindle.
- Eco, Umberto. *Semiotics and the Philosophy of Language*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press 1986.
- . *A Theory of Semiotics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1976.
- Edelman, Gerald. *The Remembered Present: A Biological Theory of Consciousness*. New York: Basic Books, 1989.
- Edersheim, Alfred. *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1953.
- Edmondson, Stephen. *Calvin's Christology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Elder Paisios of the Holy Mountain. *With Pain and Love for Contemporary Man: Spiritual Counsels of the Elder Paisios of Mount Athos*. Sarouti: Holy Monastery of St. John the Theologian, 2011.
- Elowsky, Joel C., ed. *John 1–10*, Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture: New Testament, edited by Thomas C. Oden, vol. 4a. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2006.

- . *John 11–21*, Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture: New Testament, edited by Thomas C. Oden, vol. 4b. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2007.
- Elwell, Walter A., and Barry J. Beitzel. *Baker Encyclopedia of the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1988.
- Elwell, Walter A. and Philip Wesley Comfort. *Tyndale Bible Dictionary*. Tyndale Reference Library. Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House, 2001.
- Ervin, Howard M. *Spirit-Baptism: A Biblical Investigation*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1987.
- Fee, Gordon D. *Paul, the Spirit, and the People of God*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1996. Kindle.
- Feinstein, Justin S., Murray B. Stein, Gabriel N. Castillo, and Martin P. Paulus. “From Sensory Processes to Conscious Perception.” *Consciousness and Cognition* 13 (2004): 323–335. Accessed April 23, 2015.
<http://journalpsyche.org/articles/0xc079.pdf>.
- Fine, Arthur. “Scientific Realism and Antirealism.” In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, edited by Edward Craig. Vol. 1, *A Posteriori–Bradwardine*. London: Routledge, 1998. Accessed February 16, 2016.
<http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:K7gJ4cauol0J:www.unige.ch/lettres/baumgartner/docs/real/fine.pdf+&cd=5&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us>.
- Fontana, David. “Mystical Experience.” In *The Blackwell Companion to Consciousness*, edited by Max Velmans and Susan Schneider, 163–172. Malden: Blackwell 2007.
- Ford, Norman. *When Did I Begin? Conception of the Human Individual in History, Philosophy and Science*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Forman, Robert K. C. *The Innate Capacity: Mysticism, Psychology, and Philosophy*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- . *Mysticism, Mind, Consciousness*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1999.
- Foutz, Scott. “On the Implications of the Self-Consciousness of the Divine Essence: An Examination of Augustine’s Application of the Triunal Nature of Human Self-consciousness to the Godhead.” February 23, 2007. Accessed September 9, 2014.
<http://www.foutz.net/writings/foutz-trinity.html>.

- Freddi, Roger. *Jesus Christ the Word Incarnate: Considerations Gathered from the Works of the Angelic Doctor St. Thomas Aquinas*. Translated by F. J. Sullivan. St. Louis: B. Herder, 1904.
- Frei, Hans W. *The Identity of Jesus Christ: The Hermeneutical Bases of Dogmatic Theology*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967.
- Friedman, Maurice S. *Martin Buber: The Life of Dialogue*. 4th ed. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Fromke, DeVern. *The Ultimate Intention*. Cloverdale: Sure Foundation, 1974.
- Gaffin, Richard B. Jr. *Resurrection and Redemption: A Study in Paul's Soteriology*. Presbyterian and Reformed, 1978.
- Gallagher, Shaun, and Dan Zahavi. "Phenomenological Approaches to Self-Consciousness." *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Edited by Edward N. Zalta. Spring 2015. Accessed April 24, 2015.
<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2015/entries/self-consciousness-phenomenological/>.
- Galot, Jean. *Abba Father We Long to See Your Face: Theological Insights into the First Person of the Trinity*. Staten Island: Alba House, 1992.
- . *The Person of Christ: Covenant Between God and Man; A Theological Insight*. Rome: Georgian University Press, 1981.
- . *Who Is Christ? A Theology of Incarnation*. Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1981.
- Gangel, Kenneth O. *John*, Holman New Testament Commentary 4. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2000.
- Gavrilyuk, Paul L., and Sarah Coakley. *The Spiritual Senses: Perceiving God in Western Christianity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- González, Justo L. *The Story of Christianity*. Vol. 2, *The Reformation to the Present Day*. San Francisco: Harper One, 2010.
- Graziano, Michael S. A. *Consciousness and the Social Brain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

- Green, Vivian Hubert Howard. *The Young Mr. Wesley: A Study of John Wesley and Oxford*. London: Edward Arnold, 1961.
- Gregory of Nazianzus. "Critique of Apollinarius and Apollinarianism, Epistle 101." Early Church Texts. Accessed December 6, 2014.
http://www.earlychurchtexts.com/public/gregoryofnaz_critique_of_apollinarianism.htm.
- Grenz, Stanley J. *The Named God and the Question of Being: A Trinitarian Theology*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005.
- Grosso, Andrew T. *Personal Being: Polanyi, Ontology, and Christian Theology*. New York: Lang, 2007.
- Grudem, Wayne. "The Offices of Christ: Prophet, Priest & King." The Spiritual Life Network. August 28, 2007. Accessed August 20, 2015.
<http://life.biblechurch.org/about/48-paradigm/paradigm-av/3229-the-offices-of-christ-prophet-priest-a-king-wayne-grudem-systematic-theology>.
- Guillet, Jacques. *The Consciousness of Jesus*. New York: Newman Press, 1971.
- Gunton, Colin. *Father, Son, and Holy Spirit: Toward a Fully Trinitarian Theology*. London: T&T Clark, 1991.
- . *The One, the Three, and the Many*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- . *The Promise of Trinitarian Theology*. London: T&T Clark, 1997.
- . *Yesterday and Today*. London: SPCK, 1997.
- Hall, G. Stanley. *Jesus, the Christ, in the Light of Psychology*, Vols. 1 and 2. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1921.
- Hartley, John E. *The Book of Job*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1988.
- Hendriksen, William, and Simon J. Kistemaker. *Exposition of the Gospel According to John*. New Testament Commentary 1. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 2001.
- Henriques, Gregg. "Three Worldviews on the Nature of Consciousness: Supernatural, Mystical, and Natural Views on Consciousness." *Psychology Today*, March 7, 2013. Accessed October 25, 2015.

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/theory-knowledge/201303/three-worldviews-the-nature-consciousness-1>.

Hiatt, R. Jeffrey. "John Wesley and Healing: Developing A Wesleyan Missiology." *The Asbury Journal* 59, no. 1 (Spring 2004): 89–109.

Hitchcock, Albert W. *The Psychology of Jesus: A Study of the Development of His Self-Consciousness*. Lancashire: 2009.

Hodge, Charles. "Synopsis of Biblical Criticism: The Antiquity and History of the Hebrew Language." *Biblical Repertory: A Collection of Tracts in Biblical Literature* 2, no. 2 (1826): 291–317.

Hollenweger, Walter J. *Pentecostalism: Origins and Developments Worldwide*. Peabody: Hendricksen, 1997).

Humphrey, William Gilson, with Thomas Aquinas. *A Digest of the Doctrine of S. Thomas on the Incarnation*. London: J. T. Hayes, 1868.

Inge, William Ralph. *Christian Mysticism: The Bampton Lectures, 1899*. London: Methuen, 1899. Kindle.

Jacob, Pierre. "Intentionality." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Edited by Edward N. Zalta. Winter 2014. Accessed October 27, 2015.
<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/intentionality/>.

James, William. *The Varieties of Religious Experience: A Study in Human Nature*. London: Routledge, 2002.

Jaynes, Julian. *The Origin of Consciousness in the Breakdown of the Bicameral Mind*. New York: Mariner, 2000.

Jones, G. Curtis. *1000 Illustrations for Preaching and Teaching*. Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 1986.

Jukes, Andrew. *The New Man and the Eternal Life*. New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1882.

———. *Types in Genesis*. Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1976.

Kanagaraj, Jey, J. "Jesus the King, Merkabah Mysticism, and the Gospel of John." *Tyndale Bulletin* 47.2. (November, 1996): 349–366.

———. *'Mysticism' in the Gospel of John: An Inquiry into Its Background*. London: Bloomsbury, 2014.

Kasper, Walter. *Jesus the Christ*. Kent: Burnes and Oates, 1976.

Kay, William K. "C. S. Lewis: A Pentecostal Reading." *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 23 (2014): 129–140.

Keener, Craig. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. Vol. 1. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012.

———. "Rumors of Miracles." Good News. December 30, 2014. Accessed October 5, 2015. <http://goodnewsmag.org/2014/12/rumors-of-miracles/>.

Kegan, Robert. *The Evolving Self*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1962.

Kim, Stephen S. "The Christological and Eschatological Significance of Jesus' Miracle in John 5." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 165:660 (October–December 2008).

Kinn, James W. *The Practice of Contemplation According to John of the Cross*. Washington, DC: ICS Publications, 2009.

Kistemaker, Simon J. *Exposition of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 2001.

Kline, Meredith G. *Kingdom Prologue*. South Hamilton: Gordon Conwell Theological Seminary, 1993.

Koehler, Ludwig, M. E. J. Richardson, and J. J. Stamm. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2000.

Köstenberger, Andreas J. *John*, Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004.

Köstenberger, Andreas J., and Scott R. Swain. *Father, Son, and Spirit: The Trinity and John's Gospel*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2008.

Kruk, Edward. "Father Absence, Father Deficit, Father Hunger: The Vital Importance of Paternal Presence in Children's Lives." *Psychology Today*, May 23, 2012. Accessed November 2, 2015. <https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/co-parenting-after-divorce/201205/father-absence-father-deficit-father-hunger>.

- Kysar, Robert. *John, the Maverick Gospel*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1976.
- Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- Lancaster, Brian L. *Approaches to Consciousness: The Marriage of Science and Mysticism*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2004. Kindle.
- Lange, John Peter, and Philip Schaff. *A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures: John*. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2008.
- Latin Dictionary*. Accessed April 28, 2013. http://www.latin-dictionary.org/Nemo_dat_quod_non_habet.
- Lawler, Paul. "Wesley, Wrath, and the Revival that Changed a Nation." *The Seedbed Blog*. June 16, 2014. Accessed October 1, 2015. <http://seedbed.com/feed/wesley-wrath-revival-changed-nation/>.
- Lee, Seung Goo. "The Relationship between the Economic Trinity and the Ontological Trinity." *Journal of Reformed Theology* 3, no. 1 (2009): 90–107. Brill Online Books and Journals. Accessed December 2, 2015. <http://booksandjournals.brillonline.com/content/journals/10.1163/156973109x403741>.
- Leithart, Peter J. *Athanasius*. Grand Rapids: Baker Publishing, 2011.
- Leonard, W. "The Gospel of Jesus Christ according to St John." In *A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture*. Edited by Bernard Orchard and Edmund F. Sutcliffe. Toronto: Thomas Nelson, 1953.
- Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, Henry Stuart Jones, and Roderick McKenzie. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- Lindars, Barnabas. *The Gospel of John*. New Century Bible Commentary. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1981.
- Loder, James E. *The Transforming Moment*. Colorado Springs: Helmers & Howard, 1918.
- Lonergan, Bernard. *The Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*. Vol. 7, *The Ontological and Psychological Constitution of Christ*. Canada: University of Toronto Press, 2002.

- Long, A. A. *The Cambridge Companion to Early Greek Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Long, David W. *Body Knowledge: A Path to Wholeness; The Philosophy of Michael Polanyi*. Bloomington: Xlibris, 2011.
- Louth, Andrew. *Maximus the Confessor: The Early Church Fathers*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- “Luther at the Sick Bed of Melancthon.” In *The Lutheran Home Journal*. Vol. 3. Philadelphia: Lutheran Board of Publication, 1858.
- Luther, Martin. *Luther’s Works*. Vol. 24, *Sermons on the Gospel of St. John: Chapters 14–16*, edited by Jaroslav Jan Pelikan, Hilton C. Oswald, and Helmut T. Lehmann. Saint Louis: Concordia, 1999.
- . *Martin Luther: Selections from His Writings*. Edited by John Dillenberger. New York: Anchor Books, 1962.
- Lyons, Craig M. “The Soul in Amenta #3.” Bet Emet Ministries. Accessed October 25, 2015. http://egyptianchristianity.com/soul_amenta_no3.
- MacArthur, John. *Strange Fire: The Danger of Offending the Holy Spirit with Counterfeit Worship*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2013.
- Macquarrie, John. *Christology Revisited*. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998.
- Marsen, Sky. “The Role of Meaning in Human Thinking.” *The Journal of Evolution and Technology* 17, no.1 (March 2008): 45–58.
- Maximos the Confessor. “Ambiguum 7.” In *The Ambigua: On Difficulties in the Church Fathers*. Edited by Nicholas Constas. Vol. 1. Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library, 29. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2014.
- Mayer, Elizabeth Lloyd. *Extraordinary Knowing: Science, Skepticism, and the Inexplicable Powers of the Human Mind*. New York: Bantam, 2007.
- McClymond, Michael J. “Charismatic Renewal and Neo-Pentecostalism: From North American Origins to Global Permutations.” In *The Cambridge Companion to Pentecostalism*, edited by Cecil M. Robeck, Jr. and Amos Yong, 31–51. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

- McCormick, Steven. "Theosis in Chrysostom and Wesley." *The Wesleyan Theological Journal* 26 (1991): 38–103.
- McDonnell, Kilian, and George T. Montague. "The Early Post-Biblical Evidence." In *Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit: Evidence from the First Eight Centuries*, 104–338. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991.
- McGinn, Bernard. *The Foundations of Mysticism: Origins to the Fifth Century*. The Presence of God: A History of Western Christian Mysticism 1. New York: Crossroad, 2003.
- McGinn, Colin. *Consciousness and Its Objects*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- McGrath, Alister E. *Christian History: An Introduction*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, 2013.
- . *Historical Theology: An Introduction to the History of Christian Thought*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, 2013.
- McGrath, James F. "A Rebellious Son? Hugo Odeberg and the Interpretation of John 5:18." *New Testament Studies* 44, no. 3 (July 1998): 470–473.
- McIntyre, John. *The Shape of Christology: Studies in the Doctrine of the Person of Christ*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1966.
- . *The Shape of Pneumatology: Studies in the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997.
- McLeod, Saul. "Mind Body Debate" Simply Psychology, 2007. Accessed October 19, 2015. www.simplypsychology.org/mindbodydebate.html.
- Menary, Richard. "Intentionality and Consciousness." In *The Encyclopedia of Consciousness*. Edited by William P. Banks. Vol. 1. Oxford: Academic Press, 2009.
- Merrill, Eugene H. *Deuteronomy*. Edited by E. Ray Clendenen. New American Commentary 4. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1994.
- Michaels, J. Ramsey. *The Gospel of John*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids. Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2010.
- Molnar, Paul D. *Divine Freedom and the Doctrine of the Immanent Trinity*. London: T&T Clark, 2002.

Moltmann, Jurgen. *The Church in the Power of the Spirit: A Contribution to Messianic Ecclesiology*. Canterbury: SCM Press, 1977.

———. *The Way of Jesus Christ*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993. Kindle.

Montejo, Gregorio. “The Dynamic Structure of Human Consciousness in the Theandric Person of Christ According to St. Thomas Aquinas and Bernard J. F. Lonergan.” Abstract, Lonergan on the Edge Conference. Accessed June 30, 2014. <http://lonergansociety.files.wordpress.com/2009/09/gregorio-montejo-loe-2009.pdf>.

Moore, Rickie D. “A Pentecostal Approach to Scripture.” In *Pentecostal Hermeneutics: A Reader*, edited by Lee Roy Martin, 11–14. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Moran, Dermot, and Joseph Cohen. *The Husserl Dictionary*. London: Continuum International, 2012.

Moreland, J. P. *Consciousness and the Existence of God: A Theistic Argument*. New York: Routledge, 2008.

Morris, Leon. *The Gospel According to John*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1995.

———. *The Gospel according to Matthew*. Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1992.

“Moses (1393–1273 BCE).” Chabad.org. Accessed October 12, 2015. http://www.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/73398/jewish/Moses.htm.

Moule, C. F. D. “The Manhood of Jesus in the New Testament.” In *Christ, Faith and History: Cambridge Studies in Christology*, edited by S. W. Sykes and J. P. Clayton, 95–110. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.

Murashko, Alex. “Megachurch Pastor: Christians Thinking in Secular Way Contribute to Fast Rise of the ‘Nones.’” *Christian Post*, May 21, 2014. Accessed September 2, 2015. <http://www.christianpost.com/news/megachurch-pastor-christians-thinking-in-secular-way-contribute-to-fast-rise-of-the-nones-120101/>.

“The Nicene Creed.” Anglicans Online. April 15, 2007. Accessed August 20, 2015. <http://anglicansonline.org/basics/nicene.html>.

“The Nicene Creed,” accessed September 29, 2015, <http://www.creeds.net/ancient/nicene.htm>.

O'Collis, Gerlad. *Interpreting Jesus*. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1983.

O'Connor, James T. *The Father's Son*. Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2001.

Odeberg, Hugo. *The Fourth Gospel: Interpreted in Its Relation to Contemporaneous Religious Currents in Palestine and the Hellenistic-Oriental World*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksells, 1929.

Oden, Thomas C. *Systematic Theology*. Vol. 3, *Life in the Spirit*. San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1992.

Oden, Thomas C., and Christopher A. Hall, eds. *Mark*. Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture: New Testament, edited by Thomas C. Oden, vol. 2. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2005.

Online Etymology Dictionary. Accessed August 15, 2015.

http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?allowed_in_frame=0&search=contemplation&searchmode=none. Accessed October 8, 2015.

http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?allowed_in_frame=0&search=compassion&searchmode=none. Accessed November 4, 2015,

http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?allowed_in_frame=0&search=intention&searchmode=none.

Papantaoniou, Anthony. "The Theandric Mystery of Jesus Christ in Byzantine Christology," *Studii Teologice* 5, no. 3 (March 2009): 177–195.

Patton, C. Michael. "The Rise of the Intellectual Charismatics." *Credo House Blog*. October 4, 2007. Accessed September 1, 2015.
<http://www.reclaimingthemind.org/blog/2007/10/the-intellectual-rise-of-the-charismatics/>.

Philosophy Dictionary. "Kant Dictionary." Accessed April 25, 2015.

<http://www.philosophy-dictionary.org/Kant-Dictionary/DISCURSIVE>.

Pidel, Aaron. "The Consciousness and Human Knowledge of Christ According to Lonergan and Balthasar." *Lumen Et Vita*, 1, no. 1 (2011). PDF. Accessed December 18, 2015.

<http://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/lumenetvita/article/view/1699/1554>.

Pinnock, Clark. *Flame of Love: A Theology of the Holy Spirit*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1996.

Plummer, Alfred. *Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges: The Gospel according to S. John*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1896.

Pojman, Paul. "Ernst Mach." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Edited by Edward N. Zalta. Winter 2011. Accessed February 16, 2016.
<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2011/entries/ernst-mach>.

Polanyi, Michael. *Knowing and Being: Essays by Michael Polanyi*. Edited by Marjorie Greene. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969.

———. *Personal Knowledge: Towards a Post-Critical Philosophy*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1962.

———. *The Study of Man: The Lindsay Memorial Lectures 1958*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1959.

———. *The Tacit Dimension*. London: University of Chicago Press, 2009.

"Protestant Reformation." *Theopedia*. Accessed September 30, 2015.
<http://www.theopedia.com/protestant-reformation>.

Psychology Dictionary. Accessed August 20, 2015.
<http://psychologydictionary.org/awareness/>.

Rahner, Karl. *Foundations of the Christian Faith*. New York: Seabury Press, 1978.

———. *Theological Investigations*. Vol. 5, *Later Writings*. Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1969.

Rainbow, Paul A. *Johannine Theology: The Gospel, the Epistles, and the Apocalypse*. Nottingham: Apollos, 2014.

Ratzinger, Joseph. *Jesus of Nazareth*. New York: Doubleday, 2007.

Rich, Tracey R. "Bar Mitzvah, Bat Mitzvah and Confirmation." *Judaism 101*. Accessed December 2, 2014. <http://www.jewfaq.org/barmitz.htm>.

Robertson, A. T. *Word Pictures in the New Testament*. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1933.

Ruthven, Jon Mark. *On the Cessation of the Charismata: The Protestant Polemic on Post-Biblical Miracles*. Sheffield: Sheffield Press, 1997.

- Rybarczyk, Edmund J. *Beyond Salvation: Eastern Orthodoxy and Classical Pentecostalism on Becoming Like Christ*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2004.
- Saint Symeon the New Theologian. *Divine Eros: Hymns of St. Symeon, the New Theologian*. Translated by Daniel K. Griggs. Popular Patristics, edited by John Behr and Augustine Casiday. Yonkers: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2010.
- Sanford, John. *Mystical Christianity: A Psychological Commentary on the Gospel of John*. New York: Crossroad, 1997.
- Schafer, Peter. *The Hidden and Manifest God: Some Major Themes in Early Jewish Mysticism*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992.
- Schaff, Philip. *The Life and Work of St. John Chrysostom*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1886.
- Schmidt, Martin. *John Wesley: A Theological Biography*. Vol. 1. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1963.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolf. *The Gospel According to St. John: 001*. New York: Seabury Press, 1980.
- . *The Gospel According to St. John*. Vols. 1 and 2. New York: Crossroad, 1990.
- Schwartz, Benjamin I. "Transcendence in Ancient China." *Daedalus* 104, no. 2 (Spring 1975): 57–68.
- S. Cyril, Archbishop of Alexandria. *Five Tomes against Nestorius: Scholia on the Incarnation; Christ Is One; Fragments against Diodore of Tarsus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, the Synousiasts*. Oxford: James Parker and Rivingtons, 1881.
- S. Cyril and S. Gregory. "Gregory Nazianzen, Archbishop of Constantinople: Select Orations." In *S. Cyril of Jerusalem: Catechetical Lectures [and] S. Gregory of Nazianzen: Select Orations, and Letters*. A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, 2nd ser., edited by Henry Wace and Philip Schaff, vol. 7, 203–436. Oxford: Christian Literature, 1894.
- Seligman, Martin P. *Learned Optimism: How to Change Your Mind and Your Life*. New York: Vintage E-Books, 2006. Kindle.
- Shelton, R. Larry. *Cross and Covenant: Interpreting the Atonement for 21st Century Mission*. Colorado Springs: Paternoster, 2006.

- Siewert, Charles. "Consciousness and Intentionality." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Edited by Edward N. Zalta. Fall 2011. Accessed September 18, 2015. <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2011/entries/consciousness-intentionality>.
- Skirry, Justin. "René Descartes: The Mind-Body Distinction." *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Accessed December 2, 2015. <http://www.iep.utm.edu/descmind/>.
- Slick, Matt. "Apollinarianism." Christian Apologetics and Research Ministry. Accessed April 23, 2014. <http://carm.org/apollinarianism>.
- . "Economic Trinity," Christian Apologetics and Research Ministry. Accessed September 29, 2015. <http://carm.org/dictionary-economic-trinity>.
- Smith, David Woodruff. "Phenomenology." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Edited by Edward N. Zalta. Winter 2013. Accessed April 24, 2015. <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2013/entries/phenomenology>.
- Smith, D. Moody. *The Theology of the Gospel of John*. New Testament Theology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Smith, James K. A. *Thinking in Tongues: Pentecostal Contributions to Christian Philosophy*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2010.
- . "Thinking in Tongues." *First Things*, April 2008. Accessed September 1, 2015. <http://www.firstthings.com/article/2008/04/003-thinking-in-tongues>.
- Smith, M. L. *Love Set Free: Meditations on the Passion According to St. John*. London: Canterbury Press, 2011.
- Smith, Sydney. "On the Predisposing Causes to the Reception of Republican Opinions." In *Sermons, by the Reverend Sydney Smith, A.M. Late Fellow of New College, Oxford*. Vol. 1., 2nd ed, 102–135. London: Longman & Rees, 1801.
- Smith, Wolfgang. *Theistic Evolution: The Teilhardian Heresy*. Tacoma: Angelico Press, 2012.
- Snyder, Howard A. *The Radical Wesley: The Patterns and Practices of a Movement Maker*. Franklin, TN: Seedbed, 2014. Kindle.
- Sparks, T. Austin. "Prophetic Ministry: Chapter 1—What Prophetic Ministry Is." The Online Library of T. Austin-Sparks. Accessed August 20, 2015. <http://www.austin-sparks.net/english/books/001003.html>.

- Spear, Andrew D. "Edmund Husserl: Intentionality and Intentional Content." *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Accessed September 18, 2015. <http://www.iep.utm.edu/huss-int/>.
- Spence-Jones, H. D. M., ed. *The Pulpit Commentary*. Vol. 2, *Psalms*. London: Funk & Wagnalls, 1909.
- St. Augustin. "Lectures or Tractates on the Gospel According to St. John," In *St. Augustin: Homilies on the Gospel of John; Homilies on the First Epistle of John; Soliloquies*. A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, 1st ser., edited by Philip Schaff, vol. 7, tractate 18, chap. 5, v. 19. New York: Christian Literature, 1888.
- St. Basil the Great. *On the Holy Spirit*. Yonkers: St. Vladimir's Press, 2011.
- Stevenson, James, and B. J. Kidd, eds. *Creeds, Councils, and Controversies: Documents Illustrative of the History of the Church A.D. 337–461*. New York: Seabury Press, 1966.
- St. Gregory of Nazianzus. *On God and Christ: The Five Theological Orations and Two Letters to Cledonius*. Translated by Frederick Williams and Lionel Wickham. Popular Patristics Series, edited by John Behr and Augustine Casiday. Yonkers: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2002.
- S. Thomas Aquinas. *Catena Aurea: Commentary on the Four Gospels, Collected out of the Works of the Fathers; St. Matthew*. Edited by John Henry Newman. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1841.
- St. Irenaeus. *Against Heresies*. Edited by Paul A. Boer, Sr. Dublin: Veritatis Splendor, 2012.
- St. Maximus the Confessor. *The Ascetic Life: The Four Centuries on Charity*. Translated and annotated by Polycarp Sherwood. Ancient Christian Writers 21. New York: Newman Press, 1955.
- "Strange Fire Conference: A Case for Cessationism." Challies.com. Accessed October 5, 2015. <http://www.challies.com/liveblogging/strange-fire-conference-a-case-for-cessationism>.
- Strong, James. *Enhanced Strong's Lexicon*. Woodside Bible Fellowship, 1995.
- Stronstad, Roger. *The Charismatic Theology of St. Luke: Trajectories from the Old Testament to Luke–Acts*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012.

- . *The Prophethood of All Believers: A Study in Luke's Charismatic Theology*. Cleveland: CPT Press, 2010. Kindle.
- Stutzman, Robert. *An Exegetical Summary of Galatians*. 2nd ed. Dallas: SIL International, 2008.
- Sweet, Leonard. "DMIN Applied Semiotics and Future Leadership Studies." Lectures, George Fox University, Newberg, OR, September 2013–June 2015.
- . "DMIN SFS 12." Lecture. Orlando, 2013.
- . *I Am a Follower: The Way, Truth and Life of Following Jesus*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2012.
- . Untitled manuscript.
- . *The Well-Played Life*. Carol Stream: Tyndale House, 2014.
- Synan, Vinson. *The Century of the Holy Spirit: 100 Years of Pentecostal and Charismatic Renewal; How God Used a Handful of Christians to Spark a Worldwide Movement*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2001. Kindle.
- . *The Holiness-Pentecostal Tradition: Charismatic Movements in the Twentieth Century*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1971. Kindle.
- Taylor, G. W. *John Wesley and the Anglo-Catholic Revival*. London: SPCK, 1905. Accessed October 1, 2015. http://anglicanhistory.org/misc/taylor_wesley.html.
- Tertullian. "On the Flesh of Christ." In *Ante-Nicene Fathers*. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Vol. 3, *Latin Christianity: Its Founder, Tertullian*, 321–343. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905.
- Theodore of Mopsuestia. *Commentary on the Gospel of John*. Translated by Marco Conti. Edited by Joel C. Elowsky. Ancient Christian Texts, edited by Thomas C. Oden and Gerald L. Bray. Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2010.
- Theophylact, Blessed. *The Explanation of the Holy Gospel According to John*. House Springs, MO: Chrysostom Press, 2007.
- Theron, Jacques P. J. "Towards a Practical Theological Theory for the Healing Ministry in Pentecostal Churches." *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 7, no. 14 (1999): 49–64.

- Thornton, Stephen. "Karl Popper." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Edited by Edward N. Zalta. Winter 2015. Accessed February 16, 2016.
<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/popper/#CriEva>.
- Thorsen, Don. *Calvin Vs. Wesley: Bringing Belief in Line with Practice*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2013. Kindle.
- Toivanen, Juhana. *Perception and the Internal Senses: Peter of John Olivi on the Cognitive Functions of the Sensitive Soul*. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- "Tractate Shabbat: Chapter 7." Jewish Virtual Library. Accessed October 25, 2015.
<https://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/Talmud/shabbat7.html>.
- Tsakiris, Manos. "Looking for Myself: Current Multisensory Input Alters Self-Face Recognition," *PloS ONE* 3 (12) (December 24, 2008): e4040. Accessed October 12, 2015.
<http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0004040>.
- Tuttle, Robert G., Jr. *Mysticism in the Wesleyan Tradition*. Grand Rapids: Francis Asbury Press, 1989.
- Urban Dictionary. Accessed August 21, 2015.
<http://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=perceptuality>.
- Vander Laan, Ray. "Rabbi and Talmidim." That the World May Know. Accessed December 9, 2015. <http://followtherabbi.com/guide/detail/rabbi-and-talmidim>.
- Van Gulick, Robert. "Consciousness." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Edited by Edward N. Zalta. Spring 2014. Accessed August 23, 2015.
<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2014/entries/consciousness/>.
- Vanier, Jean. *Drawn into the Mystery of Jesus through the Gospel of John*. New York: Paulist Press, 2004.
- . *Knowing Eternity: A Probing Examination of the Gospel of John Chapters 1–10*. DVD-ROM. Worcester, PA: Norflicks Productions, 2006.
- Verney, Stephen. *Into the New Age*. Great Britain: William Collins Sons, 1976.
- . *Water into Wine: An Introduction to John's Gospel*. London: Darton, Longman, and Todd, 1995.

- . *Water into Wine: An Introduction to John's Gospel*. London: Fount Paperback, 1985.
- Vincent, Marvin Richardson. *Word Studies in the New Testament*. Vol. 2. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1887.
- Von Wahlde, Urban C. *The Gospel and Letters of John*. Vols. 1, 2, and 3. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2010.
- Vrinte, Joseph. *The Quest for the Inner Man: Transpersonal Psychotherapy and Integral Sadhana*. Kennedy Nagar: All India Press, 1996.
- Walach, Harald, Stefan Schmidt, and Wayne B. Jonas. *Neuroscience, Consciousness, and Spirituality*. Dordrecht: Springer, 2011.
- Walsham, Alexandra. "Miracles and the Counter-Reformation Mission to England." *The Historical Journal* 46, no. 4 (December 2003): 779–815.
- Watters, Fraser, ed. *Jesus and Psychology*. West Conshohocken, PA: Templeton Foundation Press, 2007.
- Watts, Alan W. *Behold The Spirit*. New York: Random House, 1971.
- Watts, Fraser, and Mark Williams. *The Psychology of Religious Knowing*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Weinandy, Thomas G. *Does God Suffer?* Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000.
- . *The Father's Spirit of Sonship: Reconceiving the Trinity*. Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 1995.
- . *In the Likeness of Sinful Flesh: An Essay on the Humanity of Christ*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993.
- . "Jesus' Filial Vision of the Father." *Pro Ecclesia* 8, no. 2 (Spring 2004): 189–201.
- . *Jesus the Christ*. Huntington, IN: Our Sunday Visitor, 2003.
- Wesley, John. *Explanatory Notes upon the New Testament*, 4th Amer. ed. New York: J. Soule and T. Mason, 1818.

- . *The Journal of the Rev. John Wesley*. Edited by Nehemiah Curnock. Vol. 3. London: Charles H. Kelly, 1916.
- . “Salvation by Faith.” In *The Works of John Wesley*. Edited by Albert C. Outler. Vol. 1. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1984.
- . *The Works of John Wesley*, 3rd ed. Vol. 3. London: Wesleyan Methodist Book Room, 1872.
- . *The Works of the Rev. John Wesley, A.M.* Vol. 8. London: Wesleyan Conference Office, 1872.
- Wesley, Susanna. *Susanna Wesley: The Complete Writings*. Edited by Charles Wallace Jr. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Westcott, B.F., and A. Westcott. *The Gospel According to St. John Introduction and Notes on the Authorized Version*. London: J. Murray, 1908.
- “What Is Patriarchy?” London Feminist Network. Accessed December 8, 2015. <http://londonfeministnetwork.org.uk/home/patriarchy>.
- Wilber, Ken. “Foreword.” In *The Textbook of Transpersonal Psychiatry and Psychology*, edited by Bruce W. Scotton, Allan B. Chinen, and John R. Battista. New York: Basic Books, 1996. Kindle.
- . *Integral Spirituality: A Startling New Role for Religion in the Modern and Postmodern World*. Boston: Integral Books, 2011.
- . *The Spectrum of Consciousness*. Wheaton, IL: Quest Books, 1977.
- Williams, J. Rodman. *Renewal Theology: Systematic Theology from a Charismatic Perspective*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.
- Williams, Rowan. *The Wound of Knowledge: Christian Spirituality from the New Testament to Saint John of the Cross*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1979.
- Wilson, Ian. *Jesus: The Evidence*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1984.
- Witherington, Ben III, *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1995), 382.

———. *John's Wisdom: A Commentary on the Fourth Gospel*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995.

Wood, Darren Cushman. "John Wesley's Use of the Atonement." *The Asbury Journal* 62, no. 2 (2007): 55–70.

Wright, N. T. *John for Everyone: Part 1, Chapters 1–10*. London: SPCK, 2002.

———. *Who Was Jesus?* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.

Wynter, Christopher, and Fiona Tulk. "Transpersonal Psychology." *The Transpersonal Notebooks*. Last modified March 21, 2011. Accessed September 18, 2015. <http://www.transpersonal.com.au/transpersonal-psychology/>.

Zodhiates, Spiros. *The Complete Word Study Dictionary: New Testament*. Chattanooga, TN: AMG, 2000.